

Statement of Permission to Copy

In presenting this professional paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this professional paper for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature

Date

Donald E. Stiller

May 24, 1972

AN EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALSHIP PROGRAM

AT MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

by

HAROLD GLEN MADER

A professional paper submitted to the Graduate Faculty  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

with concentration in

Elementary Administration

Approved:

*Ernest W. Sullivan*  
Head, Major Department

*Ernest W. Sullivan*  
Chairman, Examining Committee

*Henry L. Parsons*  
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Bozeman, Montana

June, 1972

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I near the end of my Masters Degree program, and look forward to graduation in the next few weeks, it becomes increasingly aware to me the roles that others have played in helping me climb this one more step. I am especially indebted to Dr. Gerald E. Sullivan, Chairman of the Elementary Education Department, for his patience and guidance during the past year. Special thanks are also extended to all of the Elementary Education Staff, but most especially to Dr. Frank Greenough, who helped teach me to be myself.

Appreciation is extended to my colleagues, the other graduate students in the field of education. Their friendship, guidance, and encouragement has helped to make the past year one which I will remember fondly.

Deepest appreciation is extended to my wife Marge, and to our children, for patience and encouragement they have shown me during the past school year, and specially during the writing of this paper.

Writing this professional paper has been a rewarding experience for me, and I offer it with the hope that the information contained herein might prove of some value to someone.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                     | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| VITA . . . . .                                                      | ii   |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .                                          | iii  |
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .                                            | vi   |
| ABSTRACT . . . . .                                                  | vii  |
| Chapter                                                             |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .                                           | 8    |
| Statement of the Problem . . . . .                                  | 8    |
| Purpose of the Study. . . . .                                       | 8    |
| Questions to be Answered . . . . .                                  | 10   |
| General Procedures . . . . .                                        | 10   |
| Limitations and Delimitations . . . . .                             | 11   |
| Definitions of Selected Terms . . . . .                             | 11   |
| Summary . . . . .                                                   | 12   |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .                          | 14   |
| A Brief History of the Principalship . . . . .                      | 14   |
| Recent Trends in the Training of Elementary<br>Principals . . . . . | 16   |
| The Future Elementary Principal . . . . .                           | 21   |
| Summary . . . . .                                                   | 22   |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

| Chapter                                              | Page |
|------------------------------------------------------|------|
| III. PROCEDURES . . . . .                            | 23   |
| Introduction . . . . .                               | 23   |
| The Instrument . . . . .                             | 23   |
| Specific Procedures . . . . .                        | 24   |
| Analysis of the Date . . . . .                       | 24   |
| Summary . . . . .                                    | 25   |
| IV. DATA . . . . .                                   | 26   |
| Survey Data . . . . .                                | 26   |
| V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . | 51   |
| Conclusions . . . . .                                | 55   |
| Recommendations. . . . .                             | 57   |
| APPENDIX A . . . . .                                 | 60   |
| APPENDIX B . . . . .                                 | 62   |
| APPENDIX C . . . . .                                 | 71   |
| REFERENCES CITED . . . . .                           | 73   |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Tables                                                                                                          | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Objectives . . . . .                                                                                         | 28   |
| 2. Respondents' Values as to Instruction, Staff<br>and Curriculum . . . . .                                     | 31   |
| 3. Respondents' Values as to Preparation in Various<br>Administrative Areas . . . . .                           | 33   |
| 4. Respondents Rate the Elementary Methods . . . . .                                                            | 34   |
| 5. Respondents rate the Administrative Courses<br>Required by the State Department of Education. . . . .        | 35   |
| 6. The Respondents' Graduate Minor Areas. . . . .                                                               | 37   |
| 7. Was the Minor Area Helpful to the Elementary<br>Principal? . . . . .                                         | 38   |
| 8. The Desirability of a Required Minor Area . . . . .                                                          | 38   |
| 9. Number of Respondents Suggesting Specific<br>Required Minor Areas . . . . .                                  | 38   |
| 10. Most Relevant Courses . . . . .                                                                             | 40   |
| 11. Least Relevant Courses . . . . .                                                                            | 42   |
| 12. Suggested Areas of Training to be Added to the<br>Curriculum . . . . .                                      | 44   |
| 13. Suggested Areas of Training to be Deleted From<br>the Curriculum . . . . .                                  | 46   |
| 14. Suggested Ways to Improve the Elementary School<br>Administration Program . . . . .                         | 48   |
| 15. The Years in Which the Respondents Obtained Their<br>Masters Degrees From Montana State Univrsity . . . . . | 50   |

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study, which was undertaken during the Spring of 1972, was to evaluate the Elementary Principalship Program at Montana State University. It was determined that the study would involve elementary principals of Montana who had earned their Masters Degrees from Montana State University during the previous ten years.

Basically, the study had two purposes. First, it was designed to help the Elementary Education Department meet NCATE standards for their graduate programs in elementary education. Secondly, it was believed that the results of the study would help the Department continue to improve their elementary principalship program.

The basic instrument used to gather data was a mailed questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to all the elementary principals in Montana who had obtained their Masters Degrees from Montana State University during the previous ten years. A 94 percent response was obtained.

There were two major facets to the study. First the program was evaluated in terms of whether it was meeting the objectives established by the Elementary Education Department. Secondly, the participants of the study were asked to indicate their opinions concerning the adequacy of the training program they had received.

As the questionnaires were returned, the data was tabulated. The findings of the study were presented in written and tabular form, and were mostly expressed in sums and percentages.

Among the conclusions derived from the study were:

- (1) A high percentage of the respondents favored the objectives established by the Elementary Education Department for the Elementary Principalship Program.

- (2) It was questionable whether all of the objectives were being achieved to a satisfactory degree.

- (3) The quality of the Staff, Instruction, and Curriculum at Montana State University was generally regarded as average to strong.

- (4) The respondents were generally well satisfied with the administrative preparation they had received at Montana State University.

- (5) The Elementary Education Department should consider incorporating an internship program into the Elementary School Administration Program.

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

This study evolved as the result of the desire of the Elementary Education Department of Montana State University to evaluate their program in Elementary School Administration. Evaluation of a program is inevitable when judgments need to be made. (Gronlund, 1965) Certainly in order to know what is being accomplished, evaluation must take place. It is hoped that the results of this study will enable the Elementary Education Department to improve the training of elementary school principals.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to evaluate the elementary principalship program at Montana State University. There were two facets to the study. First the program was evaluated in terms of whether it was meeting the objectives established by the Elementary Education Department. Secondly, Montana elementary principals who had completed the program during the previous ten years were asked to indicate their opinions concerning the adequacy of the training program they had received.

#### Purpose of the Study

The evaluation of an educational program is important, and should be a continuous process. (Gronlund, 1965) One aspect of any such evaluation should be to get feedback from the participants. To the

knowledge of this researcher, such an evaluation of the elementary principalship program at Montana State University had not been formally conducted.

Montana State University was approaching a National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) evaluation to be held during 1972. The College of Education was accredited by NCATE for the undergraduate programs in education, and was applying for accreditation by NCATE for its graduate programs in education. One qualification which had to be met was that a continuous process of evaluation of program offerings be implemented. For his doctoral dissertation, Ron Madsen was developing a model for evaluating the undergraduate programs offered by the College of Education. Evaluation of the graduate programs was also needed if the College of Education was to gain NCATE accreditation for those programs. This researcher believed that this study would help the Department of Elementary Education and the College of Education in meeting standards established by NCATE.

This researcher believed that the research conducted in this study would be important to the Department of Elementary Education in continuing to improve their elementary principalship training program.

Another aspect of the evaluation was to examine the departmental objectives for the Master of Education program in Elementary School

Administration. First, the objectives were examined in terms of whether they were being met, or to what extent they were being met. Secondly, the objectives were examined critically in terms of validity and pertinence.

#### Questions to be Answered

The questions to be answered by the study were as follows:

1. Were the objectives established for the elementary principalship program being met?
2. Were the current objectives in need of revision?
3. Had the program met the needs of the participants?
4. What facets of the program were strong?
5. What facets of the program were weak?
6. Were there any areas of training which should be added to or deleted from the program?
7. How could the program have been improved?

#### General Procedures

1. A review of the literature was conducted to describe the history of the principalship and determine current trends in the training of elementary school principals, and methods of evaluating training programs.
2. The names of all practicing principals in the state of Montana were obtained from the Educational Directory. (1971-1972).

3. This list of names was sent to the State Department which supplied the list of names of colleges and universities from which the various principals obtained their Masters Degrees.
4. After receiving the needed information from the State Department, this researcher sent a mailed questionnaire to those principals who had received their Masters Degree at Montana State University.
5. The data received from the participants was used as the basic resource for this research.

#### Limitations and Delimitations

This research was limited to elementary principals who received their Masters Degrees at Montana State University on or after the date of spring graduation, 1962, and who were currently serving as elementary principals in Montana. In order to be included in the study, a principal's major administrative duty must have been that of elementary principal. Superintendents who also served as elementary principals were not included in the study.

#### Definitions of Selected Terms

Program--The word "program" as used in this research means the elementary principalship program as offered by Montana State University between 1962 and 1972, which ended with a Masters Degree and state certification for the elementary principalship.

Participants--The word "participants" as used in this research means practicing elementary principals who were serving in Montana during the 1971-1972 school year, and who, during the previous ten years, had received their Masters Degree from Montana State University. Participants were fully certified for the elementary principalship, and their major administrative position was that of elementary principal.

State Department--The words "State Department" as used in this research means the State Department of Public Instruction, State of Montana, Helena, Montana.

Practicing Principals--The words "practicing principals" as used in this research means persons who were serving as elementary principals in Montana during the 1971-1972 school year. It included only persons whose major administrative position was that of elementary principal.

Department--The word "Department" as used in this research means the Department of Elementary Education, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.

### Summary

This research paper was intended to provide an examination and evaluation of the elementary principalship training program offered at Montana State University. The objectives established by the Department were to be examined, and an effort was made to determine

if the objectives were being met. Information concerning the principals of Montana was to be obtained from the State Department. From this information participants were to be selected. Mailed questionnaires were to be sent to the participants to obtain the information needed for the investigation. The results of the study should be helpful to the Department in improving the program, and in meeting the NCATE standards.

The first procedure in the study was to review the literature to recount the history of the principalship and determine the current trends in the training of elementary school principals and methods of evaluating training programs. This is discussed in chapter 2.

## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature in this chapter is on a historical basis. The researcher began with a brief history of the principalship, continued with current trends in the training of elementary school principals, and ended with a projection into the future.

#### A Brief History of the Principalship

The history of the elementary principalship is indeed an interesting part of our educational culture. The position is assumed to have originated during the first half of the nineteenth century. At first the principal was really the "principal teacher" of a small urban school. As schools grew larger and adopted new ideas, such as the graded concept and departmentalization, the position of the principal assumed greater importance. (Faber and Shearron, 1970) His duties were largely clerical, and consisted of such tasks as taking roll, keeping attendance records, scheduling, and organizing. (Otto and Sanders, 1964)

As school organizations continued to grow, the need for better administration was evident. This led to principals teaching less and assuming more management duties. One of the first schools to have a full time supervising principal was Quincy School in Boston, Massachusetts in 1847. (Faber and Shearron, 1970) The "principal's office" was first mentioned in 1874. Toward the end of the nineteenth

century the principal began to assume a greater supervisory role. This led to a greater status of the position as became evident in the early twentieth century. (Otto and Sanders, 1964)

Although the growth of the principalship has been evident since the time of its beginning, the process was a slow one. According to Otto and Sanders (1964) by 1928 fifty-four percent of the elementary principals in the nation still did not have an academic degree. A 1929 study in New York state revealed that thirty-four percent of the elementary principals in large New York schools still did some part-time teaching. (Otto and Sanders, 1964)

Images which the elementary principal has held according to "The Right Principal for the Right School" (1967) are headmaster, administrative mechanic, change agent, and leader. The headmaster was a nineteenth century image in which the principal knew more about every subject than did any of the other teachers, and supposedly he could teach any subject better than any other teacher. The administrative mechanic image coincides with the period from 1900 to 1950, in which the principal worked long hours completing stacks of reports and statistics about students and teachers. He scarcely had time to get to know the students, or to work closely with the teachers. The principals' image in the decade of the sixties was one of change agent, in which the principal senses potential for educational improvement, convinces others of its importance, and implements the new

idea into a program. Theoretically the principal has always assumed the role of leader, although this image has not been evident in practice. The leadership role of the principal is receiving increasing importance in the late sixties and early seventies.

#### Recent Trends in the Preparation of Elementary Principals

The quality of leadership of the public schools has been undergoing a systematic examination in the nineteen-sixties. Administrative improvement aimed mainly at superintendents during the nineteen-fifties was broadened to include principals later in the decade. (Culbertson, 1965) College preparation programs attempted to enable the elementary principal to improve communication skills, and to deal effectively with decision making and organizational change. (Culbertson, 1965) In addition, the newer collegiate programs have provided candidates with the necessary skills for the change in roles from teacher to principal. Such teaching strategies as simulation, case studies, role playing, and internship have been used. Historically the change from the role of teacher to principal was accomplished by sudden shifting roles, and survival of the fittest. (Ferreira, 1970)

Simulated materials gained widespread use during the early nineteen-sixties. One of the first sets of materials involved the study of an actual elementary school, and became known as the Whitman School study. Created by John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffith, and Norman Frederiksen, these materials enabled practicing

elementary principals and future elementary principals to practice their skills in almost every phase of elementary school administration. (Hemphill, Griffith, and Frederiksen, 1962) Through carefully prepared materials, the trainees were able to become familiar with the school and school district used for the simulation. Then they would be presented with specific "in basket" problems which each was to solve in his own way. Problems were also presented through the use of tape recordings and a kinescope. By discussing the various solutions to problems with their peers and with professional administrators, the trainees were able to gain valuable insight and knowledge about elementary school administration. By 1965 some 12,000 students had experienced the simulated materials, and they were being used by seventy-five colleges and universities in the United States and Canada. (Culbertson, 1965)

A more recent trend has been toward administrative internship. Although used on a limited basis, this technique was gaining in use. (Ferreira, 1970) An Article in School and Society (1968) reports that the internship method was being utilized in the training of sixty Puerto Rican and Negro prospective school administrators. In addition to the internship, the trainees attended Fordham University. This program was sponsored by the Ford Foundation. It utilized the internship to gradually increase responsibility in the areas of teacher supervision, curricular revision, community-school relations,

and structural organization. (Training Negroes and Puerto Ricans as School Administrators, 1968) Fifteen of the trainees interned out of state, fifteen interned in New York State but away from the city, and the other thirty did their internship in the New York City elementary and intermediate schools.

Sensitivity training is another aspect of administrator training which is on the increase according to Thomas. (1971) He goes on to say that a study of training provided by the Northwest Regional Laboratory to a group of Oregon elementary school principals shows that sensitivity training helps principals become more considerate of the needs of their staff, increases leadership, helps principals gain higher group morale, to run schools more openly, and to have higher executive professional leadership. (Thomas, 1971)

Executive professional leadership (EPL) refers to a principal's efforts to conform to the role which emphasizes his obligation to increase the effectiveness of teacher performance. (Gross and Merriott, 1966) In a study done in an effort to determine the qualities needed by elementary principals, Gross and Herriott (1966) reported several findings: (1) a principal's EPL is positively affected by his immediate superior's EPL; (2) principals had higher EPL if they helped in the selection of teachers; (3) principals have higher EPL if their administrative superiors support their efforts to improve teacher performance; (4) principals exhibit higher EPL if

they receive social support from their immediate administrative superior; (5) no relationship was found between previous administrative experience and EPL; and (6) a negative relationship was found between graduate courses in educational administration and EPL.

What qualities do the best elementary school principals possess? Goldhammer and Becker (1970) in an extensive nationwide study reported several findings: (1) extremely good schools inevitably had an aggressive, determined, dynamic principal; (2) the best principals were excellent strategists; (3) the best principals were so aggressive that superiors were unhappy with them, but they were kept because they were delivering the goods; (4) beacon principals were able to adapt to ambiguous situations; and (5) forty-five percent of the principals interviewed had no formal training for the job.

Goldhammer and Becker (1970) go on to say that a leadership crisis exists in elementary education today. They state that the "Elementary schools are in trouble because principals are in trouble."

(Goldhammer and Becker, 1970:13) Reasons listed were: (1) public apathy toward elementary education; (2) deficiencies in training programs for elementary principals; (3) absence of theory of administrative roles; (4) dominance of the higher education syndrome; and (5) considerable professional obsolescence.

During the early nineteen-sixties, the training of elementary principals was based more upon common learnings than upon specialized

learnings. (Culbertson, 1965) Reasons given for this trend were: (1) because specific techniques are likely to become obsolete; (2) it is recognized that the educational leader needs to have a wide general perspective with the ability to see relationship between educational objectives and the needs of society, implications between present educational needs and those of the future, and the relationship between objectives and educational programs. The social sciences have come more and more into focus as tools of the school administrator. Thus, we see a trend toward a broad general education for all administrators.

In summing up his article, Culbertson (1965) admits that elementary principals need specialized skills as well as a broad general knowledge of administration. The differences in function of an elementary principal and the school administrator would imply that each would have need for different specialized learnings.

In a continuing effort to improve educational administration, the United States Office of Education has funded a program which has gone outside education to search for educational leadership. (Gifford, 1971) The "National Program for Educational Leadership" is a five year program to recruit leadership talent from all phases of society. The persons chosen for the program are professional managers or administrators from throughout the United States. Each will undergo two years of training before going to work as school administrators.

The idea behind the program is to bring some of the innovative leadership from the business world into education. (Gifford, 1971)

#### The Future Elementary Principal

What will the next decade bring for elementary school principals? Undoubtedly there will be many changes. However, the function of the principal will remain the same; the facilitation of teaching and learning. (Faber and Shearron, 1970)

In the future, funds may be appropriated directly so that each principal has a budget for his particular school. Within broad guidelines, he will be able to allocate the funds to various purposes. This means that the principal will be more of an educational leader within his school because he will have much greater opportunity to pursue innovative programs or programs of special emphasis. (Faber and Shearron, 1970)

The image of the principal will undoubtedly change during the next decade. Faber and Shearron noted,

Perhaps the greatest change in elementary school administration in the future will be one change that is already clearly visible on the horizon. That is, the change in attitude that will come when the principal finally gives up his attempt to be "superteacher" --the instructional expert who can solve all the teachers' problems with a few words of sage advice, and who views himself as an administrator, whose expertise is in organization, decision making, coordination, and conflict resolution. (1970:376)

Faber and Shearron (1970) also believe that the administration of the elementary school will be done by an administrative team. Most schools will have an assistant principal and other quasi-administrators. This addition to the staff will enable the principal to do the job which should have always been his, that of improving teaching and learning, facilitating, and being an educational leader.

#### Summary

The functions and importance of the elementary school principal have greatly changed since the principalship originated. From the time when principals had no special training for their positions, we have advanced to a period when training is greatly increased, both in specialized areas and in the broad fields of education and administration. The role of the principal has changed from that of the best teacher in the school, to that of educational leader and change agent.

The next step in this study was to specify procedures to be followed in surveying the field of Montana elementary school principals who had received Masters Degrees from Montana State University. These procedures will be described in Chapter 3.

## Chapter 3

### PROCEDURES

This study grew out of the desire of the Elementary Education Department at Montana State University to evaluate their Masters Degree program in Elementary School Administration. The design of the study evolved after considering the problem of the study with Dr. Gerald Sullivan, Head of the Elementary Education Department, and after studying the related literature.

In this chapter, this researcher will discuss the instrument used, the procedures used in the research, and the procedures used in analysis of the data.

#### The Instrument

The basic instrument used to gather data for this study was a questionnaire. (see appendix B) It consisted of eleven main parts, each of which was designed to answer part or all of one of the seven questions to be answered by the study. The closed-form type of questionnaire was used but was supplemented by using three open-form questions. Also, space for comment was given after each item on the instrument. After considering the advantages and disadvantages of both types of questionnaires, it was decided by this research that a combination of both types of questions best served the purpose of the research being conducted.

### Specific Procedures

The names of all practicing elementary principals in the state of Montana were obtained from the Educational Directory. (1971-1972) This list of principals' names was sent to the State Department, which informed this researcher of the name of the college or university from which each of the practicing principals had obtained his Masters Degree.

The population of the study was all of the practicing elementary principals in Montana who had received their Masters Degrees from Montana State University during the period 1962-1971. Mailed questionnaires were sent to each member of the population. Included with the questionnaire was a cover letter (see appendix A) explaining the purposes of the study, and a stamped self-addressed envelope.

The questionnaires were mailed to the participants on March 12, 1971. Each participant was urged to return the instrument before April 1972. On April 5, 1972, follow-up questionnaires were mailed to those members of the population who had not responded. A new cover letter was used for the follow-up (see appendix C).

### Analysis of the Data

The data received from the participants of this study was analyzed and presented in charts. The number of respondents answering each question was charted according to each possible response. Percentages were used in each category for each question.

The information obtained from the open-ended questions was summarized to present all the opinions of the various participants. Similar responses from these questions were also charted and analyzed.

#### Summary

This study involved the use of a mailed questionnaire to gather data in order to evaluate the Elementary School Administration Program at Montana State University. The instrument was mailed to all of the practicing elementary principals in Montana who had obtained their Masters Degrees at Montana State University on or after spring graduation 1962.

It is believed that the results of this study will aid the Elementary Education Department in their efforts to gain NCATE accreditation, and also in their continued efforts to improve the training of elementary school principals.

Data received from the questionnaires will be present in chapter 4.

## Chapter 4

### DATA

In this chapter, the information received from the respondents of the study is reported. The reporting of the data follows the order of the questionnaire items which was mailed to the participants.

A ninety-four percent response was obtained by the mailed questionnaire. Twenty-four graduates (73 percent) responded to the first mailing, and nine graduates (27 percent) responded to the second mailing of the questionnaire for a total of thirty-three respondents. Some of the graduates did not respond to each question, thus accounting for various numbers of total responses for the various items on the instrument. Percentages listed take into account only the number of responses for each item. Persons who did not answer a certain question are not considered in the statistics for that item unless it is specifically stated.

#### Survey Data

The first part of the survey dealt with the objectives established by the Elementary Education Department for the Elementary Principalship Program. Each objective was analyzed separately after listing the objective as stated on the questionnaire.

After reading each objective, the participants checked appropriate blanks to indicate their opinion as to whether the objective was

appropriate or inappropriate, and if the objective had been fulfilled or had not been fulfilled.

A very high percentage of the respondents indicated that they felt all of the objectives were appropriate. The mean percentage of respondents favoring all of the objectives was ninety-eight percent. Six of the objectives were approved by all of the respondents, while the other three objectives obtained an approval rate of ninety-four percent.

While the objectives were deemed appropriate, whether they had been achieved appeared much more doubtful. The mean percentage of respondents believing that all objectives had been achieved was sixty-four percent. Especially critical were objectives B, G. and I, where only forty-four percent, fifty-three percent, and fifty percent respectively believed that those objectives were being achieved. Table 1 lists all of the objectives, the number of responses in each category, and the appropriate percentages.

Table 1

OBJECTIVES

"Each candidate upon completion of the Masters Degree in Elementary School Administration will:

A....be able to meet all the commitments of the graduate elementary teacher, because he possesses the same legal teaching rights."

|                                       | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| appropriate objective . . . . .       | 30       | .94      |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .     | 2        | .06      |
| objective was fulfilled . . . . .     | 25       | .81      |
| objective was not fulfilled . . . . . | 6        | .19      |

B....be able to plan, organize, and evaluate curricula suitable for children k-8."

|                                       |    |      |
|---------------------------------------|----|------|
| appropriate objective . . . . .       | 33 | 1.00 |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .     | 0  | .00  |
| objective was fulfilled . . . . .     | 14 | .44  |
| objective was not fulfilled . . . . . | 18 | .56  |

C....be knowledgeable in functional school organization related to instruction k-8."

|                                       |    |      |
|---------------------------------------|----|------|
| appropriate objective . . . . .       | 33 | 1.00 |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .     | 0  | .00  |
| objective was fulfilled . . . . .     | 27 | .87  |
| objective was not fulfilled . . . . . | 4  | .13  |

D....be introduced to counseling theory and practice."

|                                       | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| appropriate objective . . . . .       | 33       | 1.00     |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .     | 0        | .00      |
| objective was fulfilled . . . . .     | 20       | .63      |
| objective was not fulfilled . . . . . | 12       | .37      |

E....be skillful in sound school administration and community relations."

|                                       |    |      |
|---------------------------------------|----|------|
| appropriate objective . . . . .       | 33 | 1.00 |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .     | 0  | .00  |
| objective was fulfilled . . . . .     | 20 | .61  |
| objective was not fulfilled . . . . . | 13 | .39  |

F....be skillful in communication both within and outside school circles."

|                                       |    |     |
|---------------------------------------|----|-----|
| appropriate objective . . . . .       | 31 | .94 |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .     | 2  | .06 |
| objective was fulfilled . . . . .     | 20 | .67 |
| objective was not fulfilled . . . . . | 10 | .33 |

G....be skillful in good human relations as they relate to effective supervision."

|                                      |    |      |
|--------------------------------------|----|------|
| appropriate objective . . . . .      | 33 | 1.00 |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .    | 0  | .00  |
| objective was achieved . . . . .     | 16 | .53  |
| objective was not achieved . . . . . | 14 | .47  |

H....understand recent trends and innovations in elementary school curriculum."

|                                      | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|--------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| appropriate objective . . . . .      | 33       | 1.00     |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .    | 0        | .00      |
| objective was achieved . . . . .     | 24       | .73      |
| objective was not achieved . . . . . | 9        | .27      |

G....develop action research skills to the level of conducting in-school investigations and comprehending research reports."

|                                      |    |     |
|--------------------------------------|----|-----|
| appropriate objective . . . . .      | 30 | .94 |
| inappropriate objective . . . . .    | 2  | .06 |
| objective was achieved . . . . .     | 16 | .50 |
| objective was not achieved . . . . . | 16 | .50 |

Part two of the questionnaire was designed to measure the Program in terms of instruction, staff, and curriculum. Two graduates reported that the instruction they received was weak, eighteen graduates reported that the quality of instruction they received was average, and thirteen graduates reported that the quality of instruction they received in their Elementary Administration Program at Montana State University was strong.

In regard to the staff, one respondent rated the staff as weak, eighteen respondents felt that the staff was average, and fourteen respondents reported that they felt the staff was strong.

The quality of the curriculum offered in the Program was reported as weak by two persons, average by twenty-four persons, and strong by seven persons. The data from part two of the questionnaire is summarized in table 2.

Table 2

Respondents' Values as to Instruction,  
Staff and Curriculum

|                          | <u>Weak</u> |     | <u>Average</u> |     | <u>Strong</u> |     |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----|----------------|-----|---------------|-----|
|                          | N           | %   | N              | %   | N             | %   |
| A. Instruction . . . . . | 2           | .06 | 18             | .55 | 13            | .39 |
| B. Staff . . . . .       | 1           | .03 | 18             | .55 | 14            | .42 |
| C. Curriculum . . . . .  | 2           | .06 | 24             | .73 | 7             | .21 |

Part three of the instrument asked the respondents to indicate whether or not they felt they had been adequately prepared by Montana State University in various administrative areas. The administrative areas listed were supervisory duties, administrative management of the elementary school, curriculum development, parent, community, and public relations, coordination of the related services of the district, pupil guidance and discipline, leadership, school finance and budgeting, and implementation of new programs. Especially significant was the fact that less than fifty percent of the respondents felt that they were adequately prepared in three areas; namely, curriculum development, coordination of related services of the district, and implementation of new programs. The areas in which the respondents felt they were best prepared were administrative management of the elementary school (88 percent), and leadership (79 percent.) Table 3 shows the complete results of this part of the survey.

Table 3

Respondents' Values as to Preparation  
in Various Administrative Areas

|                                                                   | Yes |     | No |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|-----|
|                                                                   | N   | %   | N  | %   |
| A. Supervisory duties . . . . .                                   | 23  | .70 | 10 | .30 |
| B. Administrative management of the<br>elementary school. . . . . | 29  | .88 | 4  | .12 |
| C. Curriculum development . . . . .                               | 15  | .45 | 18 | .55 |
| D. Parent, community and public<br>relations . . . . .            | 20  | .61 | 13 | .39 |
| E. Coordination of related services<br>of the district . . . . .  | 16  | .48 | 17 | .52 |
| F. Pupil Guidance and discipline . .                              | 22  | .71 | 9  | .29 |
| G. Leadership . . . . .                                           | 26  | .79 | 7  | .21 |
| H. School finance and budgeting . . .                             | 23  | .74 | 8  | .26 |
| I. Implementation of new programs . .                             | 13  | .41 | 19 | .59 |
| J. Other (Specify) . . . . .<br>school construction .             |     |     | 1  |     |

In part four of the questionnaire, the participants of the study were asked to evaluate the elementary education methods courses, or their graduate equivalents, in terms of value to them as an elementary principal. The courses being evaluated in this portion were Teaching of Reading, Teaching of Arithmetic, Teaching of Science, Teaching of Social Studies, Teaching of Language Arts, and Teaching of Art. Of these courses, Teaching of Reading received the highest rating with twenty-two (92 percent) of the respondents rating it a high value course. Teaching of Art received the lowest rating with two respondents (17 percent) rating it a high value course. Please see table 4 for the complete rating of these courses.

Table 4

Respondents Rate the Elementary Methods

Courses

|                               | High<br>value |     | Some<br>value |     | Little<br>value |     |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----|---------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
|                               | N             | %   | N             | %   | N               | %   |
| A. Teaching of Reading . . .  | 22            | .92 | 1             | .04 | 1               | .04 |
| B. Teaching of Arithmetic...  | 9             | .60 | 6             | .40 | 0               | .00 |
| C. Teaching of Science . . .  | 6             | .46 | 6             | .46 | 1               | .08 |
| D. Teaching of Social Studies | 4             | .33 | 8             | .67 | 0               | .00 |
| E. Teaching of Language Arts  | 9             | .47 | 9             | .47 | 2               | .06 |
| F. Teaching of Art . . . . .  | 2             | .17 | 6             | .50 | 4               | .33 |

Part five of the study asked the respondents to rate the following administrative courses, which are required by the State Department of Education for certification of elementary principals in Montana. The courses listed were School Administration, Elementary School Administration, School Supervision or Elementary School Curriculum, and a course in Guidance or Counseling. Elementary School Administration got the highest rating, with eighteen respondents (67 percent) rating it as a strong course. School Supervision or Elementary School Curriculum and Guidance or Counseling received the poorest ratings with only twenty-five percent and thirty percent, respectfully, rating these courses as strong. Fourteen respondents (44 percent) rated School Administration as a strong course. The complete results are tabulated in table 5.

Table 5

Respondents Rate the Administrative Courses  
Required by the State Department of Education

|                                                          | weak |     | average |     | strong |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|---------|-----|--------|-----|
|                                                          | N    | %   | N       | %   | N      | %   |
| A. School Administration . . . . .                       | 1    | .03 | 17      | .53 | 14     | .44 |
| B. Elementary School<br>Administration . . . . .         | 0    | .00 | 9       | .33 | 18     | .67 |
| C. School Supervision or<br>Elementary School Curriculum | 6    | .21 | 15      | .54 | 7      | .25 |
| D. Guidance or Counseling . . . .                        | 5    | .17 | 16      | .53 | 9      | .30 |

In part six of the instrument, the participants were asked to list their graduate minor, and if they felt that their minor had been helpful to them as an elementary principal. Also, they were asked if they felt a specific minor area should be required for potential elementary principals, and if so, what that minor should be.

History had been the most popular graduate minor, with nine respondents (30 percent) reporting a history minor. Psychology, Mathematics, Government, and Science had been chosen as a graduate minor by only one person each, thus being the least popular graduate minors.

Twenty-one graduates (72 percent) reported that their minor area had been helpful to them as an elementary principal. Eight graduates (28 percent) reported that their graduate minor had been of no value to them.

When asked if they would suggest a specific required minor area for potential elementary principals, thirteen respondents (46 percent) said yes. Fifteen respondents (54 percent) reported that they would not suggest a specific required minor for potential elementary principals. Of the thirteen respondents who reported that they would suggest a specific minor area, the following areas were mentioned: Elementary School Administration, Reading, Social Studies, Language Arts, Sociology, Guidance and Counseling, and Elementary School

Curriculum. Three persons suggested two areas, thus accounting for sixteen responses in the table, even though only thirteen respondents indicated that they favored a required minor area. Please see tables 6, 7, 8, and 9 for complete results regarding the graduate minor.

Table 6

The Respondents Graduate Minor Area

|                          | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|
| Social Studies . . . . . | 3        | .10      |
| English . . . . .        | 3        | .10      |
| History. . . . .         | 9        | .30      |
| Sociology . . . . .      | 5        | .17      |
| Geography . . . . .      | 4        | .14      |
| Psychology . . . . .     | 1        | .03      |
| Mathematics . . . . .    | 1        | .03      |
| Government . . . . .     | 1        | .03      |
| Counseling . . . . .     | 2        | .07      |
| Science . . . . .        | 1        | .03      |

Table 7

Was the Minor Area Helpful to the  
Elementary Principal?

| Yes |     | No |     |
|-----|-----|----|-----|
| N   | %   | N  | %   |
| 21  | .72 | 8  | .28 |

Table 8

The Desirability of  
A Required Minor Area

| Yes |     | No |     |
|-----|-----|----|-----|
| N   | %   | N  | %   |
| 13  | .46 | 15 | .54 |

Table 9

Number of Respondents Suggesting Specific  
Required Minor Areas

|                                            | N |
|--------------------------------------------|---|
| Elementary School Administration . . . . . | 1 |
| Reading . . . . .                          | 4 |
| Social Studies . . . . .                   | 1 |
| Language Arts . . . . .                    | 2 |
| Sociology . . . . .                        | 2 |
| Guidance and Counseling . . . . .          | 5 |
| Elementary School Curriculum . . . . .     | 1 |

In part seven of the instrument, respondents were asked to list the two most relevant courses and the two least relevant courses in their Masters Degree Program. The courses most frequently chosen by the respondents as most relevant were Elementary School Administration, Teaching of Reading, and School Law. Thirteen respondents (39 percent) chose Elementary School Administration as most relevant. Seven respondents (21 percent) chose Teaching of Reading or School Law as most relevant. The courses most frequently listed by the respondents as least relevant were Counseling, School Curriculum, Creative Processes, and Supervision of Instruction. Seven respondents (21 percent) chose Counseling as least relevant. Six respondents (18 percent) chose School Curriculum as least relevant, and five respondents (15 percent) chose Creative Processes and Supervision of Instruction as least relevant. Tables 10 and 11 summarize the complete data concerning most relevant and least relevant courses.

Table 10

Most Relevant Courses\*

|                                            | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|--------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Elementary School Administration . . . . . | 13       | .39      |
| Teaching of Reading . . . . .              | 7        | .21      |
| School Law . . . . .                       | 7        | .21      |
| School Finance . . . . .                   | 5        | .15      |
| Trends in Reading . . . . .                | 5        | .15      |
| Counseling . . . . .                       | 5        | .15      |
| School Curriculum . . . . .                | 3        | .09      |
| Supervision of Instruction . . . . .       | 3        | .09      |
| School Administration. . . . .             | 2        | .06      |
| Corrective Reading . . . . .               | 2        | .06      |
| Investigations in Education. . . . .       | 2        | .06      |
| Teaching of Language Arts. . . . .         | 1        | .03      |
| Comparative Education. . . . .             | 1        | .03      |
| Plains Indians . . . . .                   | 1        | .03      |
| Linguistics . . . . .                      | 1        | .03      |
| Creative Processes . . . . .               | 1        | .03      |
| Psychology . . . . .                       | 1        | .03      |
| Public Relations . . . . .                 | 1        | .03      |

Table 10 (cont.)

|                                            | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|--------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Teaching of Arithmetic . . . . .           | 1        | .03      |
| Problems in Elementary Education . . . . . | 1        | .03      |

\* Percentages listed in Table 10 are percents of the total number of respondents which was thirty-three.

Table 11

Least Relevant Courses\*

|                                                | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Counseling . . . . .                           | 7        | .21      |
| School Curriculum . . . . .                    | 6        | .18      |
| Supervision of Instruction . . . . .           | 5        | .15      |
| Creative Processes . . . . .                   | 5        | .15      |
| History of Education . . . . .                 | 4        | .12      |
| Professional Paper . . . . .                   | 3        | .09      |
| Educational Statistics . . . . .               | 3        | .09      |
| History . . . . .                              | 2        | .06      |
| Teaching of Art . . . . .                      | 2        | .06      |
| Tests and Measurements . . . . .               | 2        | .06      |
| Public Relations . . . . .                     | 1        | .03      |
| Teaching of Social Studies . . . . .           | 1        | .03      |
| Teaching of Language Arts . . . . .            | 1        | .03      |
| Childrens Literature . . . . .                 | 1        | .03      |
| History of the American Constitution . . . . . | 1        | .03      |
| Teaching of Music . . . . .                    | 1        | .03      |
| Teaching of Science . . . . .                  | 1        | .03      |
| Public Finance and Fiscal Policy . . . . .     | 1        | .03      |

\* Percentages listed in Table 11 are percents of the total number of respondents to the study which was thirty-three.

Part nine of the study asked the participants to list areas of training which they felt should be added to the Elementary School Administration Curriculum at Montana State University. Only one area was mentioned by more than three respondents, that being More Workshops and Seminars, which was suggested by five respondents. Table 12 summarizes the suggestions made by the respondents in regard to areas of training which they felt should be added to the curriculum.

Table 12

Suggested Areas of Training to be Added to the  
Curriculum\*

|                                                                                                                     | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| More Workshops and Seminars . . . . .                                                                               | 5        | .15      |
| More Elementary Counseling and Guidance. . .                                                                        | 3        | .09      |
| School Finance . . . . .                                                                                            | 3        | .09      |
| More Reading . . . . .                                                                                              | 3        | .09      |
| Public and Human Relations . . . . .                                                                                | 3        | .09      |
| Administration and Supervision of Open Space<br>Classrooms, Team Teaching, and<br>Differentiated Staffing . . . . . | 3        | .09      |
| More Techniques of Teacher Evaluation and<br>Supervision. . . . .                                                   | 2        | .06      |
| School Law . . . . .                                                                                                | 2        | .06      |
| Elementary Curriculum Development . . . . .                                                                         | 2        | .06      |
| More Language Arts at Primary Level . . . . .                                                                       | 1        | .03      |
| More Specific Subject Area Materials . . . . .                                                                      | 1        | .03      |
| Drugs, Alcohol, and Family Living. . . . .                                                                          | 1        | .03      |
| Communications. . . . .                                                                                             | 1        | .03      |
| Inquiry Method of Teaching. . . . .                                                                                 | 1        | .03      |
| Special Education. . . . .                                                                                          | 1        | .03      |

\* Percentages listed in Table 12 are percents of the total number of respondents to the study which was thirty-three.

In part ten of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to list areas of training which they felt should be deleted from the Elementary School Administration Curriculum, if there were any such areas. The response to this part of the study was minimal, with a total of only sixteen responses. The only area which received more than two responses was the Professional Paper. Six respondents felt that the Professional Paper should be deleted from the curriculum. For complete results of the responses which indicated areas of training which the participants felt should be deleted, see table 13.

Table 13

Suggested Areas of Training to be Deleted From  
the Curriculum\*

|                                                            | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Professional Paper . . . . .                               | 6        | .18      |
| Minor in a Specific Subject Field . . . . .                | 2        | .06      |
| Behavioral Modification Courses. . . . .                   | 2        | .06      |
| Written Comprehensive Examination. . . . .                 | 1        | .03      |
| Educational Research . . . . .                             | 1        | .03      |
| GRE Entrance Examinations. . . . .                         | 1        | .03      |
| Language Arts. . . . .                                     | 1        | .03      |
| Childrens Literature . . . . .                             | 1        | .03      |
| Interaction Analysis and Sensitivity<br>Training . . . . . | 1        | .03      |

\* Percentages listed in Table 13 are percents of the total number of respondents to the study which was thirty-three.

In part eleven of the questionnaire, the respondents listed ways in which they felt the Masters Degree Program in Elementary School Administration could be improved at Montana State University. A total of ten areas were mentioned, but the only one listed by more than one respondent was Internship and Practical Experience, which was listed by ten respondents. Table 14 summarizes the data from this part of the study.

Table 14

Suggested Ways to Improve the Elementary School

Administration Program\*

|                                                                                           | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Internship and Practical Experience . . . . .                                             | 10       | .30      |
| Better Screening of Applicants . . . . .                                                  | 1        | .03      |
| Professional Paper Research Should be in the<br>Area of Elementary Education . . . . .    | 1        | .03      |
| One Quarter of Student Teaching at the<br>Primary Level . . . . .                         | 1        | .03      |
| Teach Curriculum Through Workshops to Add<br>Practical Experience. . . . .                | 1        | .03      |
| Employ Instructors Who Are Familiar With<br>the Educational Problems of the State . . . . | 1        | .03      |
| More In-Service Training . . . . .                                                        | 1        | .03      |
| Less Theory, More Practice. . . . .                                                       | 1        | .03      |
| Break the Barrier Between the Student and<br>the Professor . . . . .                      | 1        | .03      |
| Have a Core Curriculum--Give the Student<br>More Choice . . . . .                         | 1        | .03      |

\*Percentages listed in Table 14 are percents of the total number of respondents to the study which was thirty-three.

Part twelve of the instrument asked the respondents to list the year in which they obtained their Masters Degree from Montana State University. Seven respondents listed 1970 as the year in which they had graduated, with six respondents listing 1966 as the year in which they had obtained their degrees. None of the respondents had graduated in 1971. Table 15 shows the complete data in regard to the number of respondents who obtained their degrees in the various years.

A summary of the study, conclusions revealed from the data and recommendations will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Table 15

The Years in Which The Respondents Obtained Their  
Masters Degrees From Montana State University

|               | <u>N</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------|----------|----------|
| 1962. . . . . | 2        | .06      |
| 1963. . . . . | 3        | .09      |
| 1964. . . . . | 2        | .06      |
| 1965. . . . . | 2        | .06      |
| 1966. . . . . | 6        | .18      |
| 1967. . . . . | 4        | .12      |
| 1968. . . . . | 5        | .15      |
| 1969. . . . . | 2        | .06      |
| 1970. . . . . | 7        | .21      |
| 1971. . . . . | 0        | .00      |

## Chapter 5

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

This study evolved as the result of the desire of the Elementary Education Department of Montana State University to evaluate their program in Elementary School Administration. There were two major facets to the study. First, the program was evaluated in terms of whether it was meeting the objectives established by the Elementary Education Department. Secondly, Montana elementary principals who had completed the program during the previous ten years were asked to indicate their opinions concerning the adequacy of the training program they had received.

The study had two purposes. First, it was designed to help the Elementary Education Department meet NCATE standards for their graduate programs. Secondly, it was believed that the results of this study would help the Department continue to improve their elementary principalship training program.

The basic instrument used to gather data for the study was a mailed questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to all the elementary principals in Montana who had obtained their Masters Degrees from Montana State University during the previous ten years. As the questionnaires were returned, the data was tabulated. The data and findings of the study were presented written and tabular form, and were mostly expressed in sums and percentages.

The following statements generally summarize the results obtained from the questionnaire.

(1) A ninety-four percent response was obtained by the mailed questionnaire. Twenty-four graduates (73 percent) responded to the first mailing, and nine graduates (27 percent) responded to the second mailing of the questionnaire, for a total of thirty-three respondents. The total population of the study was thirty-five.

(2) The mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) percentage of respondents favoring all of the objectives established by the Department of Elementary Education for Elementary Principalship Program was ninety-eight percent. Six of the objectives were approved by all of the respondents, while the other three objectives obtained an approval rate of ninety-four percent.

(3) The mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) percentage of respondents believing that all the objectives had been achieved was only sixty-four percent.

(4) The quality of the Staff, Instruction, and Curriculum at Montana State University, was generally regarded as average to strong.

(5) More than fifty percent of the respondents felt that they had been well prepared in the various administrative areas of supervisory duties; administrative management of the elementary school; parent, community, and public relations; pupil guidance and discipline; leadership; and school finance and budgeting.

(6) More than fifty percent of the respondents felt they had not been well prepared in the administrative areas of curriculum development, coordination of related services of the district, and implementation of new programs.

(7) The respondents generally rated the elementary methods courses they had taken at Montana State University as having had some value to high value, with only Teaching of Art being rated as having had some value to little value. Teaching of Reading rated the highest, with ninety percent of those responding rating it a high value course.

(8) The administrative courses required by the State Department of Education for certification as an elementary principal, were generally rated average to strong. Elementary School Administration rated the highest with sixty-seven percent of the respondents rating it a strong course.

(9) History had been the most popular graduate minor with thirty percent of the respondents reporting that minor. Seventeen percent reported that they had taken Sociology as a graduate minor. The least popular graduate minor areas were Science, Government, Mathematics, and Psychology, with only three percent of the respondents reporting each of those areas.

(10) When asked if their minor area had been helpful to them as an elementary principal, seventy-two percent reported yes and twenty-eight percent said no.

(11) When asked if potential elementary principals should be required to take a specific minor, fifty-four percent said no, while the other forty-six percent believed that a specific minor area should be required.

(12) Of those who believed that a specific minor area should be required, Guidance and Counseling, and Reading were the areas most often mentioned.

(13) When asked to list the most relevant courses they had taken in their Masters Degree program, Elementary School Administration was most often mentioned, with thirty-nine percent of the respondents listing it. The other two most relevant courses were Teaching of Reading and School Law, both of which were reported by twenty-one percent of the respondents.

(14) When asked to list relevant courses they had taken in their Masters Degree program, twenty-one percent listed Counseling, eighteen percent listed School Curriculum, and fifteen percent listed Supervision of Instruction and Creative Processes.

(15) Five respondents (15 percent) believed that the curriculum should include more workshops and seminars. Other suggested areas of training to be added to the curriculum which were mentioned by three respondents (9 percent) were more Elementary Counseling and Guidance; School Finance; more Reading; Public and Human Relations; and Ad-

ministration and Supervision of Open Space Classrooms, Team Teaching, and Differentiated Staffing.

(16) It was suggested by six respondents (18 percent) that the Professional Paper be deleted from the curriculum.

(17) Ten respondents (30 percent) suggested that an internship and practical experience be incorporated into the training program of elementary school principals.

(18) Seven respondents (21 percent) had obtained their Masters Degree in 1970, and six respondents (18 percent) had obtained their Masters Degree in 1966. None of the respondents had graduated in 1971, and only two had graduated in the years 1962, 1964, 1965, and 1969.

### Conclusions

Based upon the data which was compiled in this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted.

(1) The objectives established by the Department of Elementary Education at Montana State University for Elementary Administration Program were well accepted by the participants of the study.

(2) While it is apparent that most of the objectives are being achieved, there is some doubt as to whether all of them are being achieved.

(3) The instruction, staff, and curriculum at Montana State University was well accepted by the graduates.

(4) The respondents were generally satisfied with the administrative preparation they had received at Montana State University.

(5) Some of the administrative courses offered at Montana State University need to be made more meaningful.

(6) The methods courses taught by the Elementary Education Department at Montana State University generally appear to be worthwhile.

(7) It was not generally supported that a specific minor area should be required for potential elementary principals.

(8) If potential elementary principals ask that a specific minor be recommended, Counseling or Reading would be good suggestions.

(9) Elementary School Administration, Teaching of Reading, and School Law had been especially valuable courses to the respondents of the study.

(10) The Counseling, School Curriculum, Supervision of Instruction, and Creative Processes courses taught at Montana State University did not meet the needs of many of the respondents.

(11) The respondents suggested that more workshops and seminars should be offered.

(12) Eighteen percent of the respondents felt that the Professional Paper should be deleted from the program.

(13) Thirty percent of the respondents believed that an Internship should be incorporated into the Elementary Administration Curriculum at Montana State University.

Recommendations

(1) More meaningful study in Elementary School Curriculum should be incorporated into the Elementary Principalship Program at Montana State University.

(2) The Elementary Education Department should consider teaching a course regarding coordination of the related services of school districts.

(3) The Elementary Education Department should spend more time teaching prospective elementary principals how to implement new programs.

(4) The Elementary Education Department should continue to allow prospective elementary principals to choose their graduate minor area. If the student asks for advice, the areas of Counseling or Reading should be recommended.

(5) The Counseling course required for elementary school principals should deal more with elementary school age children.

(6) More workshops and seminars should be incorporated into the Elementary School Administration Curriculum.

(7) The Elementary Education Department should consider a course of study, wherein the Professional Paper would not be required.

(8) The Elementary Education Department should consider incorporating an internship program into the Elementary School Administration Curriculum.

**APPENDIX A**

**ORIGINAL LETTER SENT TO GRADUATES**

March 12, 1972

Dear MSU Graduate,

I am conducting an evaluation of the Elementary School Administration Program at Montana State University. The study is being done in cooperation with Dr. Gerald Sullivan, Chairman of the Elementary Education Department. The results of this research are needed by the Department to help them continue to improve the training of elementary school principals. Also, the Department is at this time applying for accreditation from National College Association of Teacher Education (NCATE). The results of this research are needed in meeting the standards of NCATE. Dr. Sullivan has granted me permission to use this study for my professional paper in partial fulfillment of Masters Degree requirements.

We believe that as a recipient of a Masters of Education Degree from MSU, you will be able to furnish valuable information about the program. The seven broad areas which we are attempting to evaluate are: 1. Are the objectives established by the Department being met? 2. Are the current objectives in need of revision? 3. Did the program meet the needs of those elementary principles now in the field? 4. What facets of the program are strong? 5. What facets of the program are weak? 6. Are there any areas of training which should be added to or deleted from the program? and 7. How can the program be improved?

All information will be confidential. As you will notice the questionnaire is coded. The only reason for the code is so that follow-up letters may be sent to those who do not respond.

I would like to thank you in advance for completing this questionnaire. I would greatly appreciate receiving your return response by March 31, 1972. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your cooperation will help the Elementary Education Department to better serve the needs of all elementary principals in the future.

Sincerely,

Glen Mader

Enc.

**APPENDIX B**

**QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO GRADUATES**

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The objectives established by the Elementary Education Department at MSU for the Masters Degree in Elementary School Administration are listed below. Please indicate if you feel that each objective is appropriate or inappropriate, and if you feel the objective is being achieved. Please mark with an "X" the areas which apply.

"Each candidate, upon completion of the Masters Degree in Elementary School Administration will:

- A...be able to meet all the commitments of the graduate elementary teacher, because he possesses the same legal teaching rights.

|                                            |                          |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Appropriate objective . . . . .            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Inappropriate objective . . . . .          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is being fulfilled . . . . .     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is not being fulfilled . . . . . | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

- B...be able to plan, organize, and evaluate curricula suitable for children k-8.

|                                            |                          |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Appropriate objective . . . . .            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Inappropriate objective . . . . .          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is being fulfilled . . . . .     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is not being fulfilled . . . . . | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

C...be knowledgeable in functional school organization related to instruction k-8.

Appropriate objective . . . . . ☐  
Inappropriate objective . . . . . ☐

Objective is being fulfilled . . . . . ☐  
Objective is not being fulfilled . . . . . ☐

Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

D...be introduced to counseling theory and practice.

Appropriate objective . . . . . ☐  
Inappropriate objective . . . . . ☐

Objective is being fulfilled . . . . . ☐  
Objective is not being fulfilled . . . . . ☐

Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

E.. be skillful in sound school administration and community relations.

Appropriate objective . . . . . ☐  
Inappropriate objective . . . . . ☐

Objective is being fulfilled . . . . . ☐  
Objective is not being fulfilled . . . . . ☐

Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

F...be skillful in communication both within and outside school circles.

|                                           |                          |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Appropriate objective . . . . .           | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Inappropriate objective . . . . .         | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is being achieved . . . . .     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is not being achieved . . . . . | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

G...be skillful in good human relations as they relate to effective supervision.

|                                            |                          |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Appropriate objective . . . . .            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Inappropriate objective . . . . .          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is being fulfilled . . . . .     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is not being fulfilled . . . . . | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

H...understand recent trends and innovations in elementary school curriculum.

|                                            |                          |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Appropriate objective . . . . .            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Inappropriate objective . . . . .          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is being fulfilled . . . . .     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is not being fulfilled . . . . . | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

I...develop action research skills to the level of conducting in-school investigations and comprehending research reports.

|                                            |                          |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Appropriate objective . . . . .            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Inappropriate objective . . . . .          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is being fulfilled . . . . .     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Objective is not being fulfilled . . . . . | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

2. Please evaluate the MSU Elementary School Administration program in terms of:

|                | Weak | Average | Strong |
|----------------|------|---------|--------|
| A. Instruction |      |         |        |
| B. Staff       |      |         |        |
| C. Curriculum  |      |         |        |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

3. Do You feel that you were adequately prepared by MSU in the following major administrative areas?

|                                                                 | yes | no |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| A. Supervisory duties . . . . .                                 |     |    |
| B. Administrative management of the elementary school . . . . . |     |    |
| C. Curriculum development . . . . .                             |     |    |
| D. Parent, community, and public relations. .                   |     |    |
| E. Coordination of related services of the district . . . . .   |     |    |
| F. Pupil guidance and discipline. . . . .                       |     |    |
| G. Leadership . . . . .                                         |     |    |
| H. School finance and budgeting . . . . .                       |     |    |
| I. Implementation of new programs . . . . .                     |     |    |
| J. Other (specify). . . . .                                     |     |    |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. If you took the following elementary education courses, or their graduate equivalents at MSU, please rate each course in terms of its value to you as an elementary principal. —

|                                         | high<br>value | some<br>value | little<br>value |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| A. Teaching of Reading . . . . .        |               |               |                 |
| B. Teaching of Arithmetic . . . . .     |               |               |                 |
| C. Teaching of Science . . . . .        |               |               |                 |
| D. Teaching of Social Studies . . . . . |               |               |                 |
| E. Teaching of Language Arts . . . . .  |               |               |                 |
| F. Teaching of Art . . . . .            |               |               |                 |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

5. The State Department of Education requires elementary principals to take the following courses or equivalents. How do you rate the following courses offered at MSU?

|                                                                 | weak | average | strong |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------|---------|--------|
| A. School Administration . . . . .                              |      |         |        |
| B. Elementary School Administration.                            |      |         |        |
| C. School Supervision or Elementary School Curriculum . . . . . |      |         |        |
| D. Guidance or Counseling . . . . .                             |      |         |        |

Comment \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

6. In what area was your graduate minor? \_\_\_\_\_

Do you feel your minor area has been helpful to you  
as an elementary principal? \_\_\_\_\_

Would you suggest a specific required minor area for elementary  
principals? \_\_\_\_\_. If so, what  
area would you suggest for a required minor area?  
\_\_\_\_\_

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

7. Please list the two most relevant courses and the two least  
relevant courses in your Masters Degree Program.

most relevant

least relevant

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

9. If there are any areas of training which you feel should be added to the Elementary Administration curriculum at MSU, please list them below.
10. If there are any areas of training which you feel should be deleted, please list them below.
11. Please list ways in which you feel the Masters Degree program in Elementary School Administration at MSU could be improved.
12. What year did you receive your Masters Degree from MSU? .

**APPENDIX C**

**FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO GRADUATES**

April 5, 1972

Dear MSU Graduate:

A few weeks ago a questionnaire regarding the Elementary School Administration Program at Montana State University was mailed to you. As a recipient of a Master's of Education Degree at Montana State University, it was felt that you would be able to render valuable information about the program. I have not received the questionnaire which was sent to you, and I am mailing you another one. Please reconsider your decision not to fill in the first one and return it to me. The results of this study are needed by the Elementary Education Department at Montana State University in attempting to meet the standards of NCATE and in continuing to improve the program in Elementary School Administration.

We at Montana State University are aware of your busy schedule, but we would hope that you can find time to complete this questionnaire which will render important information to us. We feel that this study, which is being done in cooperation with Dr. Gerald Sullivan, Head of the Elementary Education Department, will help us to improve our program with the end results benefiting all Montana educators.

As mentioned before, all information will be kept confidential. The instrument is coded only so that follow-up letters may be sent to those who do not respond.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter. We need to receive your response by April 20, 1972. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Glen Mader

Enc.

#### REFERENCES CITED

#### REFERENCES CITED

- Colburg, Delores. Education Directory: State of Montana. Helena: State of Montana, 1971-1972.
- Culbertson, Jack A. "Changes in the Preparation of School Administrators." National Elementary Principal, 44:54-59, April, 1965.
- Faber, Charles F., and Gilbert F. Shearron. Elementary School Administration. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Ferreira, Joseph L. "The Administrative Internship and Role Change." Educational Administration Quarterly, 6:77-79, Winter, 1970.
- Gifford, Beverly. "A New Path to Educational Leadership." American Education, 7:9-12, December, 1971.
- Goldhammer, Keith, and Gerald L. Becker. "What Makes a Good Elementary Principal?" American Education, 6:11-13, April, 1970.
- Gronlund, Norman E. Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.
- Gross, Neal, and Robert E. Herriott. "The EPL of Elementary Principals: A Study of Executive Professional Leadership." National Elementary Principal, 45:66-71, April, 1966.
- Hemphill, John K., Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederkisen. Administrative Personality and Performance. New York: Teachers College Press, 1962.
- Otto, Henry J., and David C. Sanders. Elementary School Organization and Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.
- The Right Principal for the Right School. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 14-16, 1967.  
Cited from Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders.  
Elementary School Organization and Administration.

Thomas, T. A. "Human Relations Training for Elementary School Principals." National Elementary Principal, 50:59-62, May, 1971.

"Training Negroes and Puerto Ricans as School Administrators." School and Society, 96:263, Summer, 1968.