AN EVALUATION OF SELECTED SUPERVISORY SERVICES AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

BY

R. GARY RYTI

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Education degree
in the Department of Education
Montana State University
August, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Vita	ii
List of Tables	iv
Abstract	vi
Chapter I	
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Procedure	2
Limitations	5
Chapter II	
Review of Literature	6
Related Studies	10
Summary	16
Chapter III	
Treatment of Data	17
Teaching Assignments of Participating Teachers	17
Correlation of Teachers and Principals Evaluation: Part One	18
Correlation of Teachers and Principals Evaluation: Part Two	22
Teachers Evaluation Part One	24
Teachers Evaluation Part Two	26
Principals Evaluation Part One	28
Principals Evaluation Part Two	30
Chapter IV	
Summary	32
Conclusions	32
Recommendations	34
Appendix A: Introductory Letter to Teachers	35
Appendix B: Teachers' Questionnaire	36
Appendix C: Introductory Letter to Principals	39
Appendix D: Principals' Questionnaire	40
Literature Cited	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table I

Number and Percentage of Teachers Assigned to Each Grade Level. 18

Table II

Items from Part One of the Questionnaire in Which No Significant Differences Were Found in Population Variances. 19

Table III

Summary of Statistical Treatment of Data Gathered from Part One of the Questionnaire Showing F and t Values. 20

Table IV

Items from Part One of the Questionnaire in Which Statistically Significant Differences were Found Between the Two Populations. 21

Table V

Items from Part Two of the Questionnaire in Which No Significant Differences Were Found in Population Variances. 22

Table VI

Summary of Statistical Treatment of Data Gathered from Part Two of the Questionnaire Showing F and t Values. 23

Table VII

Items from Part Two of the Questionnaire in Which Statistically Significant Differences Were Found Between the Two Populations. 23

Table VIII

Teachers Ranking of Items in Terms of Supervisory Value on Part One of the Questionnaire. 24

List of Tables (Cont.)

Table IX

Teachers Ranking of Items in Terms of Supervisory Value on Part Two of the Questionnaire. 27

Table X

Principals Ranking of Items in Terms of Supervisory Value on Part One of the Questionnaire. 28

Table XI

Principals Ranking of Items in Terms of Supervisory Value on Part Two of the Questionnaire. 31

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there were differences in the evaluation of selected supervisory services commonly recognized by principals and teachers and to determine which of these supervisory services were considered most helpful by each of the groups.

A questionnaire of selected supervisory services was constructed and distributed to ninty-three elementary teachers in two Montana class A school systems. Also, twenty-seven elementary principals from the same schools participated in the study.

Results indicated that the principals tended to evaluate the items on the questionnaire more helpful, than did the teachers. The principals evaluated fourteen items, between very helpful and quite helpful compared to four items evaluated in this range by the teachers. However, in the comparative analysis of item evaluation by the two groups, a statistically significant difference was found in only nine items.

Recommendations made were that future investigations: (1) determine the supervisory services that are actually being used by administrators in elementary school systems, (2) determine what relationship, if any, exists between the length of teaching experience and the attitudes which teachers have toward changes in education methods and toward persons in supervisory positions, (3) determine the personal qualifications of supervisors which are most likely to foster inter-personal relations with teachers conducive to the betterment of teaching.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Increased enrollment, broader curriculum, new insights into teaching and learning, and a larger number of inexperienced teachers entering the teaching profession yearly, seemed to have caused concern among educators for instructional improvement. Consequently, educators have become committed to continuous evaluation of curricular programs and instruction services. One such educator, whose role has changed from an overseer or inspector to improving the teaching-learning environment, is the elementary school principal.

The elementary school principal has been charged with the supervision of instruction in his school. Professional education writers of the "60's" seem to feel that the principal should share the responsibility for instruction improvement with his staff. Placing the responsibility for instructional improvement on the principal and staff, requires a sensitivity to sound human relationships and effective communication among all participants. According to Wiles (17), "A group's productiveness is affected by the quality of its human relations, and the supervisor must work constantly for the improvement of group cohesiveness."

For elementary school principals, adapting a program of supervisory services to meet the needs of the teachers who receive these services has historically been a problem. From the material reviewed by this writer, there appeared evidence that a number of supervisors believed their supervision worked well and therefore they were contented. Without analyzing and critically assessing the various devices

they used in supervision, it seemed some supervisors kept repeating them in the belief that they were time-tested and consequently were the best possible.

It was important that the techniques which elementary principals used to improve instruction were seen by the recipient of their techniques, the teacher, as being effective. Therefore, in an attempt to assist prospective school administrators in understanding their roles as a supervisor, this writer initiated a study to evaluate certain selected supervisory services commonly recognized by teachers and principals. The effectiveness of these services, as seen by teachers and principals, was assessed through the administration of a questionnaire by the techniques outlined under the PROCEDURE portion of this paper.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to make a comparative analysis of the evaluation of selected supervisory services commonly recognized by principals and teachers and to determine which of these supervisory services were considered most helpful by each of the groups.

PROCEDURE

To determine the development of supervision in relation to the elementary school principal and to examine related studies, a review of literature was made in the libraries of Montana State University and the School of Education.

Several weeks were spent in the development of a thirty-two

item questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part one consisted of supervisory services provided by school personnel including such people as the principal, superintendent, curriculum supervisor, or other professional persons. Part two consisted of supervisory services provided by the school system as a result of school policy. The purpose of the questionnaire was to provide participants an opportunity to evaluate certain selected supervisory services. The supervisory services selected for the questionnaire were found in the review of literature.

The questionnaire was then tested with the graduate students at Montana State University. Also, several of the faculty members assisted by examining the questionnaire. As a result, minor changes intended to clarify the questionnaire were made.

Permission to conduct the study in two Montana class A school systems was obtained. An interview was held with the administrators of these two school systems in which the questionnaire was presented for review and an explanation of the intent of the study was given. The two school systems used in this study were chosen because: (1) the writer believed that the principals in the two systems were making a conscientious leadership effort; (2) the writer assumed that all of the selected supervisory services in the questionnaire would be offered to the teachers in the two systems; (3) the writer was familiar with one of the systems because he taught there; (4) the size of the two systems would be more representative, one being a larger system and the other being one of the smaller class A school systems in Montana.

The elementary teachers who had been employed in the two schools

systems during the 1966-67 school year composed the population from which the participating teachers were selected. From this population a total of ninety-three teachers, ten percent of the total number of teachers employed in the two systems, was selected. The selection was made by consecutively numbering the elementary teachers in directories containing the names of the elementary faculty members. A random number table, found in Downie and Heath (7), was used to obtain corresponding teacher numbers. A questionnaire, cover letter, and a stamped self-addressed envelope were sent to each participating teacher. Completed questionnaires were received from eighty-one teachers for 87.1 percent return.

Upon receipt of the teachers' completed questionnaires a similar questionnaire, cover letter, and stamped self-addressed envelope were sent to the twenty-seven elementary principals from whom the participating teachers indicated they received their supervision. A total of twenty-seven, or 100.00 percent were returned and completed by the principals.

The return envelopes for each group were numbered in consecutive order using the postal zip code number to determine those participants that had not returned their questionnaire. After two weeks from the date of mailing, a reminder note was sent to these people in an attempt to obtain a higher rate of return on the questionnaire.

The null hypothesis was stated and tested for each item on the questionnaire using the t test. The null hypothesis was that no significant difference would exist in the mean evaluation of the two

groups. To test the null hypothesis, the data obtained from the questionnaire was analyzed by comparing the teachers' evaluations of each supervisory service with that of the principals'.

The presumptions which were accepted and considered to be satisfied by the data in order to make the t test were the following:

1. The observations were independent.
2. The observations were drawn from normally distributed populations.
3. The populations had the same variance or they had a known variance.
4. The variables had been measured in an interval scale, so that it was possible to use the operations of arithmetic on the scores.
5. The means of these normal and homoscedastic populations were linear combinations of effects due to columns and/or rows. That is the effects were additive (16).

Also, an analysis was made from the data obtained in the questionnaire to determine the supervisory services the teachers thought most helpful and the services the principals thought most helpful. The computer at Montana State University Computer Center was used in evaluations.

LIMITATIONS

Certain limitations were apparent in this study. The study was limited to two Montana class A school systems. Furthermore, only teachers and principals employed in the elementary schools during 1966-67 were used for the selected samples. The evaluations by the participants were limited to a five-point scale on thirty-two selected supervisory services. The responses to the items were further limited in time, in that the respondees completed their questionnaire at one time rather than extending their responses over a period of one academic year or longer.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

HISTORY OF SUPERVISION AND THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

Shortly after public schools were established in the early American colonies, the selectmen of the towns were directed by the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony to choose teachers with certain religions and moral qualities. There was no record of supervision being required until early in the eighteenth century in the Boston area. Laymen were given the responsibility of making inspectional tours of the schools in order to evaluate their school facilities, upkeep, and the progress of pupils.

A description of this early expression of supervision is given by Kyte (9) as cited from Reports of the Record Commission of the City of Boston.

> In 1709, Boston set a new precedent by establishing a committee of officially constituted school inspectors to 'Visit ye School from time to time, when and as Oft, as they shall thinck fit to Enform themselves of the methodes used in teaching of ye Schollars and to Inquire of their proficiency, and to present at the performance of Some of their Exercises, the Master being before Notified of their comeing, And with him to consult and Advise of further Methodes for ye Advancement of Learning and the Good Government of the Schoole.'

As various aspects of colonial life continued to develop in complexity, the lay committees and teachers were faced with ever expanding pressures. Increased enrollments and the burdens of organizing and administering the schools' responsibilities required the delegation of authority. Someone closer to the task had to assume a part of the additional control that had been maintained by the lay committees.

> Schools increased in size, as towns grew, until several teachers were working in one building. One teacher was singled out and given certain administrative and managerial duties, thus becoming the principal teacher, later to become a building principal. Supervisory duties, even the meager one of inspection, were not delegated to principals to comparatively modern times. We are even now struggling to make the principal an important supervisory officer (4).

It seemed apparent that supervision in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was more like inspection than supervision. "As early as 1722, a committee in Boston reported adversely regarding the achievement of the pupils, and the town accepted the recommendation that the teacher be dismissed." (9) However, during the latter part of the eighteenth century, visiting committees in some towns assumed the responsibility to aid a teacher to become more efficient.

"Although the high school principalship predates the elementary school principalship, both developed in response to similar influences." (5) During the nineteenth century, the principal as inspector and keeper of the school, and implementor of lay-committee edicts became a more commonly observed fact. In 1839, a committee especially appointed by the Cincinnati Board of Education outlined the responsibilities of the principal teacher as follows:

1. To function as the head of the school charged to his care;
2. To regulate the classes and courses of instruction of all the pupils;
3. To discover any defects in the school and apply remedies;
4. To make defects known to the visitor or trustee of the ward or district if he were unable to remedy conditions;
5. To give necessary instruction to his assistants;
6. To classify pupils;
7. To safeguard school houses and furniture;
8. To keep the school clean;
9. To instruct assistants;
10. To refrain from imparing the standing of assistants, especially in the eyes of their pupils;

11. To require the cooperation of his pupils.

> The special committee further pointed out that the qualifications for the position of principal teacher were to include a knowledge of teaching methods, an understanding of children's characteristics and behavior, and a feeling for the common problems of schools. Despite the requirements that he have these qualities, the principal teacher never really exercised them, preferring instead to occupy his time with clerical, routine tasks (5).

However, not long after superintendents of schools were appointed in various cities, principals were given some time to observe teachers and to help those who were inadequately prepared for their responsibilities. Kyte (9) states, "In some cities superintendents began requesting and school boards began permitting that certain principals be released from their teaching, in order to be of some assistance to all teachers in their buildings."

The freeing of the principal from teaching duties to visit other rooms appeared to be the opening wedge for supervision by the principal. However, poor preparation and lack of interest in supervision seemed to deter the principal from carrying out this function. Gwynn (8) cites an example by Pierce that illustrates this attitude in the following:

> The principals were slow individually and as a group to take advantage of the opportunities for professional leadership which were granted them. This tendency was especially marked during the period 1895-1910. The principalship was well established from an administrative point of view, and at that point, principals appeared content to rest. Except for sporadic cases, they did little to study their work, experiment with administrative procedures, or publish articles on local administration and supervision. The large body of them were satisfied to attend to clerical and petty routine, administering their schools on a policy of laissez faire. They were generally entrenched behind their tenure rights and they usually hesitated to show vigorous leadership to their teachers who naturally were often as reactionary, professionally, as the principals themselves. They were content to use "rule of thumb" procedures in dealing with supervision of instruction.

It was not uncommon in these early days to select a principal primarily on the length of service in a building or by seniority to a school system. This was possible because the elementary principalship was not recognized as having any major importance in the general scheme for school administration.

> Thirty years ago, only 11 states had special certification for elementary school principalships; possession of the elementary teachers' certificate was adequate qualification for becoming a principal in the other 37 states. In 1958, however, 45 states had some type of administrative certificate for elementary school principals, and 23 of them required at least an M. A. (12)

While practices vary depending on the community and the individuals involved, the elementary school principal today, generally, carries great responsibility for the educational program of the school. However, the chief difference between the duties of the early principal and the principal of today is the responsibility he assumes toward supervision. Barr, Burton, and Bruckner (4) contrast traditional and modern supervision as follows:

Traditional Supervision	Modern Supervision
1. Inspection	1. Study and Analysis
2. Teacher-focused	2. Aim, material, method, teacher pupil, and environment focused
3. Visitation and conference	3. Many diverse functions
4. Random and haphazard	4. Definitely organized and planned
5. Impose and authoritarian	5. Derived and cooperative
6. One person, usually	6. Many persons.

The above comparison indicates that traditional supervision consisted largely of inspection by means of random visitation and conference with direction imposed on the teacher through authority usually practiced by one person. Modern supervision, by contrast, involves the systematic study and analysis of the entire teaching-learning situation, utilizing a carefully planned program that has

been cooperatively derived and which is adapted to the needs of those involved in it. Special help is also provided individual teachers who are confronted with problems that cannot be solved by ordinary group supervisory methods. (4)

Analysis of the literature reveals that supervision today has a broader scope than ever before. The ways in which supervisors work indicates the vast change that has come about in method. If the elementary principal, who is now recognized as the person most responsible for the improvement of instruction, is not contributing to more effective learning in the classroom his existence seems unjustified. "Organization, equipment, staff relationship, and teachers' welfare are important only as devices for improving learning opportunities for children. Supervision is a service activity that exists to help teachers do their jobs better." (17)

RELATED STUDIES

A study conducted by the Research Division of the National Education Association (11) entitled "First Year Teachers in 1954-55" produced interesting results. All respondents were asked to report how much help they received from building principals. Although 36.2 percent of the participants said they received much help from building principals, 30.5 percent reported either little or no help from this source. The percents reporting various amounts of help from principals did not vary widely from one size system to another. However, first year teachers in large school systems generally received more help from principals than first year teachers in small

systems.

In addition, the study revealed that first year teachers need more help than they are getting; the only exceptions to this being in the area of understanding the goals of the school and getting acquainted with the community and its people.

Cappa and Van Meter (6) made an attempt to discover which techniques and procedures now being used by principals and supervisors were found to be most helpful to teachers.

In order to discover which general supervisory methods and techniques could bring benefit to elementary teachers of the Santa Barbara, California school system, a questionnaire was developed with a five-point scale for each item ranging from most helpful to not helpful. The questionnaire consisted of twenty-four commonly used techniques and procedures which were selected through research, discussion with educators, and personal experience.

One hundred seventy-one questionnaires were sent out to teachers and one hundred thirty-seven were returned and checked for completeness. Fifty of these returns were then selected at random and were used as basic data for the survey.

Results of the study indicated that the teachers of the sample group preferred (1) small group meetings, (2) bulletins, (3) scheduled and unscheduled classroom visitation by the principal, (4) personal conferences with principals and consultant, (5) demonstration lessons, (6) intervisitation, (7) institutes, (8) helpful teaching aids supplied or suggested, (9) the principal acquainting them with a variety of teaching methods, (10) participating in planning school policies and

(11) help from the principal on problems concerning pupil control.

Saunders (14) in a recent study at the University of Wyoming, reported how 312 teachers rated several variables which seemed of paramount importance in their good relations to the supervisor with whom the teachers had been associated.

The teachers were asked:

(1) How does a supervisor gain your confidence?
(2) How does a supervisor promote morale?
(3) How does a supervisor show his interest in you as a teacher?
(4) How does a supervisor show his interest in you as a person?

The teachers most frequently recognized the following attributes: (1) they gained confidence in the supervisor when he cooperated in solving problems; (2) the supervisor can promote morale by recognizing individuality and by providing a class load which the teacher feels he can carry; (3) the teacher believes the supervisor is interested in teachers when the supervisor helps them satisfy their basic security needs; (4) when the supervisor respects the teacher as a worthwhile individual, the teacher is aware of the supervisor's personal interest.

Antell (1), in 1945, conducted a study in eight elementary schools in New York City regarding teacher appraisal of twenty-five common supervisory practices. These practices of supervision were included in a questionnaire given to representative teachers for their investigation.

In analyzing the teacher appraisal of these practices, Antell has listed, in order of preference, those which at least fifty percent of the teachers find very helpful.

They follow:

1. Availability of professional library in school ------86%

2. The supervisor acts as a consultant or technical advisor----------81%
3. Demonstration lessons----------74%
4. Grade conferences to discuss common problems--------73%
5. Visiting an outstanding school----------73%
6. Participation in the formulation of school policies----------70%
7. Individual conference at which there is open discussion of a topic of interest to the group------67%
8. Intervisitation----------67%
9. An after school conference with supervisor----------65%
10. In-service courses or workshops----------63%
11. Participation in course-of-study making----------56%
12. Teachers' interest committee in the school----------51%

Antell concluded that teachers favored those supervisory practices which gave them widest latitude to participate in curriculum improvement, which made available to them sources of pertinent information, and which gave them genuine assistance. They wanted help in their everyday tasks. They did not care for inspectorial supervision.

In an attempt to compare the types of supervisory services which teachers desire with those which they received, members of Bail's (3) graduate class in school supervision at Butler University interviewed 460 teachers, principals, and superintendents during the summer session of 1946.

In response to the question, "What do you want of supervision?" the finding showed that teachers most frequently desire constructive criticism, recommended new techniques and methods, demonstration teaching and recommended materials and equipment.

Answers to the question, "What kind of supervision do you receive?" showed that the supervision received by these teachers bears little resemblance to the kind of supervision they desired. Approximately forty percent stated they were inspected regularly, twenty-nine percent

received very little supervision and another 25.7 percent felt they received no supervision. Only 4.3 percent or twenty of the teachers felt that they received the type of supervision they desired.

Replogel (13) in 1950, at Wilmette, Illinois, sought to find out what kind of help teachers wanted, and went directly to teachers by means of an interview and questionnaire. Over 300 teachers representing various school systems in the mid-west were contacted. They were asked to express themselves in respect to two phases of supervision: the area in which help was most desired, and the manner and atmosphere in which they wanted the requested help to be given.

Teachers generally agreed that the supervisor should first of all be a respector of human personality and should be concerned with people; that he should be someone who likes and understand both children and teachers; and that he should put final emphasis upon pupil behavior rather than on teacher performance. They wanted a supervisor who could take suggestions as well as give them and who thoroughly understood the subject or area supervised. They gave high regard to the person who could provide group leadership and was able to weld a faculty into a productive working group. They wanted someone who could communicate on their own level and who could express his ideas in concrete, understandable terms.

Kyte (10) in 1951, made a study of 189 elementary teachers regarding their reactions to specified administrators with whom they served. This study yielded characteristic examples of the findings of what teachers want from the principal as a supervisor. Teachers want (1) planned constructive supervision democratically applied;

(2) careful planning of supervision; (3) sympathetic, discerning supervisory observation; (4) a friendly, helpful conference; (5) individual help from each faculty meeting; (6) constructive help in bulletins; (7) observation of good teaching; (8) helpful, understanding professional leadership.

Gwynn (8) conducted a study during a twenty-year period in which he asked 381 teachers who were engaged in graduate study to list five ways that a supervisor could help them. Gwynn combined similar responses and developed a list of twenty-four services. The most frequently mentioned services are listed in the form of ways teachers felt a supervisor could help them.

1. Plan classwork
2. Finding teaching material
3. With evaluation
4. With discipline
5. With my problems--professional, community, and social
6. By rating teachers and recommending promotion
7. In understanding children better
8. By revising the curriculum
9. By long term planning of units of work
10. Selecting audio-visual materials and aids

A study of teachers' attitudes toward supervision, among 481 experienced teachers who attended the summer session at Indiana State Teachers' College in 1935, was reported by Shannon (15) who used a one-page questionnaire. They were asked to rate various types of supervision on a four-point scale concerning the helpfulness and the acceptance of their supervision. The number of hours supervised and the favorable or unfavorable comments concerning supervision were solicited. The following conclusions were drawn for the study. All teachers wanted to be included in supervisory planning. Furthermore, the teachers' attitudes toward the supervision

they actually received was not favorable, the amount of supervision actually received was discouragingly small, and fifty-six percent of the teachers said supervision was child-centered. Because of the limited amount of time spent on supervision, teachers thought it was ineffective, and they also considered supervisors poorly informed and not likely to be able to give constructive or helpful suggestions.

This investigator has been unable to find prior research related to the present study conducted in the State of Montana.

SUMMARY

From the investigations reviewed, it seemed that teachers did have numerous ideas and convictions regarding supervision. When given an opportunity to express their feelings freely and openly, teachers responded in a constructive, professional manner. Also, teachers wanted suggestions and help which could result in improving the quality of classroom instruction they offered children. The material reviewed seemed to indicate that teachers could improve and therefore, could benefit by supervision.

CHAPTER III

TREATMENT OF DATA

The data for this study was reviewed in the following order: (1) teaching assignments of participating teachers, (2) correlation of teachers' and principals' evaluations, (3) teachers' evaluations, (4) principals' evaluations. The procedures outlined for computation of F and t tests, used below, were followed from those prescribed by Downie and Heath (7).

Since the respondents were given an opportunity to mark their choices on the questionnaire on a five-point scale, the following weighted system was used: (1) very helpful, choices were given a one point value; (2) quite helpful, choices were given a two point value; (3) helpful, choices were given a three point value; (4) of little help, choices were given a four point value; and (5) of no help, choices were given a five point value.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part one consisted of supervisory services provided by school personnel including such people as the principal, superintendent, curriculum supervisor, or other supervisory persons. Part two consisted of supervisory services provided by the school system as an outgrowth of school policy. The data, with the exception of teaching assignments of participating teachers, was treated in two parts as per the questionnaire.

TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS OF PARTICIPATING TEACHERS

Table I shows the teaching assignments of teachers participating

in this study. The teaching assignments were quite evenly distributed throughout the grades with the exception of special education.

TABLE 1. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO EACH GRADE LEVEL.

Grade	Number of Teachers	Percent
1	12	14.8
2	13	16.1
3	12	14.8
4	15	18.5
5	13	16.1
6	14	17.3
Sp. Ed.	2	2.4
Total	81	100.0

Special education personnel comprised 2.4 percent of the total teacher population.

CORRELATION OF TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' EVALUATION: PART ONE

The weighted values of the individual items on part one of the questionnaire were summed. A mean value was determined for each group on the individual items. A statistical technique, F test, was used to determine at the five percent level if the null hypothesis could be accepted. The null hypothesis was that no significant difference in variances of the two populations existed. There was no significant difference on items 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 23. Table 2 presents the items from part one of the questionnaire in which no significant difference in population variance was found. Since a significant difference in population variance was

TABLE 2. ITEMS FROM PART ONE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN WHICH NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND IN POPULATION VARIANCES.

3.	The supervisor suggests periodicals or books for guided professional reading.
4.	The supervisor provides for stimulating and helpful faculty meetings.
6.	The supervisor provides bulletins for teachers containing helpful suggestions.
7.	The supervisor offers assistance and encouragement in making plans for teachers in advanced or graduate study.
9.	The supervisor provides help in administering and evaluating standardized tests.
11.	The supervisor makes an observation of your (a) classroom for less than a class period followed by a conference.
23.	The supervisor requires teachers to hand in to the office daily, weekly or unit lesson plans.

found in the remaining items, it was determined that the means of these items were obtained from different populations. Therefore, a formula developed by Cochran and Cox (7) was used to determine critical values for the items in which a significant population variance existed.

A t test, test of significant difference of the means, was computed for each item on the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis was that no significant difference would exist in the mean evaluations by the teachers and principals. A significant difference, as noted by Summary Table 3, was found on items 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, and 22. The null hypothesis was rejected at the five percent level for these items. Based on the results of the t test this writer concluded that there seemed to be a statistically significant difference between the mean evaluations of the teachers and those of the principals on the indicated

items. For each of the items the mean evaluation by the principals was significantly greater than the mean evaluation by the teachers.

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF DATA GATHERED FROM PART ONE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWING F AND t VALUES.

Item	Teachers' Mean Evaluation	Principals' Mean Evaluation	F Test Value	t Test Value
1	1.99	1.63	1.98*	.90
2	2.72	2.22	2.63*	1.88
3	2.83	2.51	1.63	1.30
4	2.57	2.11	1.48	1.84
5	1.69	1.41	1.95*	1.65
6	2.20	2.19	1.77	.05
7	2.77	2.44	1.68	1.04
8	2.35	2.15	2.11*	1.00
9	2.38	2.33	1.11	.18
10	2.40	2.07	2.10*	1.45
11	2.73	2.74	1.77	.04
12	2.94	2.26	2.39*	2.61**
13	2.56	1.74	2.27*	3.68**
14	2.53	1.67	2.07*	3.34**
15	2.41	2.37	1.85*	.10
16	2.19	2.22	1.85*	.13
17	2.27	1.70	2.35*	2.85**
18	2.28	2.00	1.92*	1.27
19	2.58	1.93	2.53*	2.64**

TABLE 3. (Continued)

20	2.52	2.26	2.10*	1.00
21	2.33	1.74	3.60*	2.68**
22	2.25	1.52	4.16*	3.32**
23	3.05	3.59	1.72	1.23

* F test values significant beyond the five percent level.

** t test values significant beyond the five percent level.

Table 4 presents the items from part one of the questionnaire in which a significant difference in evaluation by the teachers and principals was found.

TABLE 4. ITEMS FROM PART ONE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN WHICH STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND BETWEEN THE TWO POPULATIONS.

12. The supervisor makes an observation of your (a) classroom for less than a class period followed by a conference.

13. The supervisor makes an observation of your (a) classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by an evaluative statement.

14. The supervisor makes an observation of your (a) classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by a conference.

17. The supervisor provides help on individual teaching problems by recommending materials and procedures.

19. The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in policy formation and school planning.

21. The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in curriculum revision.

22. The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in textbook adoption.

CORRELATION OF TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' EVALUATION OF PART TWO

The mean evaluation for the items in part two of the questionnaire were determined for each population. An F test was employed to determine if a significant difference existed between the two population variances. No statistically significant difference was found on items 1, 6, and 7 as presented in Table 5. The means of the remaining items were considered to have been obtained from different

TABLE 5. ITEMS FROM PART TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN WHICH NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND IN POPULATION VARIANCES.

1.	The school system provides time with pay for visitation of another classroom within the building where you are teaching.
6.	The school system provides consultant help in art, music and physical education.
7.	The school system provides library services for obtaining the specific data on research, on teaching methods, or other instructional materials.

populations. Therefore, the critical values for these items were found using the formula developed by Cochran and Cox (7).

A statistically significant difference was found in the mean evaluations on items 2, 4, as noted in Summary Table 6, using the t test. Based on the results of the t test this writer concluded that there seemed to be a significantly higher evaluation by the principals on items 2 and 4 than the evaluation by the teachers.

TABLE 6. SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF DATA GATHERED FROM PART TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWING F AND t VALUES.

Item	Teachers' Mean Evaluation	Principals' Mean Evaluation	F Test Value	t Test Value
1	2.54	2.52	1.18	.06
2	2.05	1.48	2.76*	2.15**
3	2.22	2.07	2.65*	.68
4	2.06	1.52	2.45*	2.50**
5	1.55	1.74	2.90*	1.36
6	1.84	1.84	1.64	.05
7	2.41	2.37	1.31	.12
8	2.024	1.85	3.29*	.85
9	2.04	1.70	1.83*	1.38

* F test values significant beyond the five percent level.

** t test values significant beyond the five percent level.

Table 7 shows the items on part two of the questionnaire in which a significant difference in evaluations was found between the teachers and principals.

TABLE 7. ITEMS FROM PART TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN WHICH STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND BETWEEN THE TWO POPULATIONS.

2. The school system provides time with pay for visitation of another classroom in schools other than your own.

4. The school system provides for a consultant that you may call to aid you in teaching if you are having difficulties in instruction.

TEACHERS' EVALUATION PART ONE

Using the computed means, Table 8 presents the items and rank order assigned by teachers to the items on part one of the questionnaire. The results of the rank order of the items by teachers in this study tended to complement the results found by Cappa and Van Meter (6). Among the items which they found teachers preferred were: (1) personal conferences with principals and consultants, (2) the principal acquainting them with a variety of teaching methods. The teachers ranked similar items in this study as one and two respectively. These items, 1 and 5, were evaluated between very helpful and quite helpful. Item 23 in the following table was ranked lowest, twenty-third, and evaluated between helpful and of little help. The remainder of the items were evaluated between quite helpful and helpful.

TABLE 8. TEACHERS' RANKING OF ITEMS IN TERMS OF SUPERVISORY VALUE ON PART ONE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

Teachers' Ranking	Actual Item No.	Teachers' Mean Evaluation
1. The supervisor provides for individual conferences with teachers whenever requested by the teacher.	5	1.69
2. The supervisor provides encouragement and opportunities for teachers to experiment within their classrooms with new teaching procedures.	1	1.99
3. The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for an entire class period only by appointment followed by a conference.	16	2.19

TABLE 8. (Cont.)

4.	The supervisor provides bulletins for teachers containing helpful suggestions.	6	2.20
5.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in textbook adoption.	22	2.25
6.	The supervisor provides help on individual teaching problems by recommending materials and procedures.	17	2.27
7.	The supervisor conducts grade level or subject meetings to discuss and solve common problems.	18	2.28
8.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in curriculum revision.	21	2.33
9.	The supervisor provides for cooperative study between teacher-supervisor or teacher-teacher on individual pupil needs or problems.	8	2.35
10.	The supervisor provides help in administering and evaluating standardized tests.	9	2.38
11.	The supervisor provides avenues through which teachers may express their views.	10	2.40
12.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for an entire class period only by appointment followed by an evaluative statement.	15	2.41
13.	The supervisor provides for discussion of a teacher's evaluation as formulated by the supervisor.	20	2.52
14.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by a conference.	14	2.53
15.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by an evaluative statement.	13	2.56
16.	The supervisor provides for stimulating and helpful faculty meetings.	4	2.57

TABLE 8. (Cont.)

17.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in policy formation and school planning.	19	2.58
18.	The supervisor provides demonstration lessons by other teachers and/or supervisor followed by discussion of the demonstration lesson.	2	2.72
19.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for less than a class period followed by an evaluative statement.	11	2.73
20.	The supervisor offers assistance and encouragement in making plans for teachers in advanced or graduate study.	7	2.77
21.	The supervisor suggests periodicals or books for guided professional reading.	3	2.83
22.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for less than a class period followed by a conference.	12	2.94
23.	The supervisor requires teachers to hand in to the office daily, weekly, or unit lesson plans.	23	3.05

TEACHERS' EVALUATION PART TWO

Using the computed means, a rank order of the items as evaluated by the teachers on part two of the questionnaire was determined as noted in Table 9. Items 5 and 6 were ranked one and two respectively. These items were also evaluated between very helpful and quite helpful by the teachers. An item pertaining to audio-visual aids, similar to item 5 in this study, was found to be preferred by teachers in studies made by Cappa and Van Meter (6) and Gwynn (8). Antell (1) listed an item, the supervisor acts as a consultant or technical supervisor, as being considered very helpful by teachers in his study. This item tended to complement

item 6 as being evaluated between very helpful and quite helpful by the teachers in the present study.

TABLE 9. TEACHERS' RANKING OF ITEMS IN TERMS OF SUPERVISORY VALUE ON PART TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

Teachers' Ranking		Actual Item No.	Teachers' Mean Evaluation
1.	The school system provides audio-visual aids for your classroom when requested.	5	1.55
2.	The school system provides consultant help in art, music, and physical education.	6	1.84
3.	The school system provides in-service courses offered for credit by a college or university.	8	2.02
4.	The school system provides preschool orientation meetings or workshops.	9	2.04
5.	The school system provides time with pay for visitation of another classroom in schools other than your own.	2	2.05
6.	The school system provides for a consultant that you may call to aid you in teaching if you are having difficulties in instruction.	4	2.06
7.	The school system provides a professional library that is readily available.	3	2.22
8.	The school system provides library services for obtaining specific data on research, on teaching methods, or other instruction materials.	7	2.41
9.	The school system provides time with pay for visitation of another classroom within the building where you are teaching.	1	2.54

PRINCIPALS' EVALUATION PART ONE

Using the computed means, Table 10 shows the rank order assigned by principals to the items on part one of the questionnaire. The principals ranked items 5, 22, 1, 14, 17, 13, 21, and 19 in respective position from one through eight. They also evaluated these items between very helpful and quite helpful. Item 23 was ranked lowest, twenty-third, and evaluated between helpful and of little help. The remainder of the items were evaluated between quite helpful and helpful by the principals. Perhaps worthy of notation was that teachers evaluated two items in comparison to eight items by the principals on part one of the questionnaire between very helpful and quite helpful. Also, both the teachers and the principals evaluated item 23 between helpful and of little help.

TABLE 10. PRINCIPALS' RANKING OF ITEMS IN TERMS OF SUPERVISORY VALUE ON PART ONE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

Principals' Ranking		Actual Item No.	Principals' Mean Evaluation
1.	The supervisor provides for individual conferences with teachers whenever requested by the teacher.	5	1.41
2.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in textbook adoption.	22	1.52
3.	The supervisor provides encouragement and opportunities for teachers to experiment within their classrooms with new teaching procedures.	1	1.63

TABLE 10.(Cont.)

4	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by a conference.	14	1.67
5	The supervisor provides help on individual teaching problems by recommending materials and procedures.	17	1.70
6.5	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by an evaluative statement.	13	1.74
6.5	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in curriculum revision.	21	1.74
8	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in policy formation and school planning.	19	1.93
9	The supervisor conducts grade level or subject meetings to discuss solve common problems.	18	2.00
10	The supervisor provides avenues through which teachers may express their views.	10	2.07
11	The supervisor provides for stimulating and helpful faculty meetings.	4	2.11
12	The supervisor provides for cooperative study between teacher-supervisor or teacher-teacher on individual pupil needs or problems.	8	2.15
13	The supervisor provides bulletins for teachers containing helpful suggestions.	6	2.19
14.5	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for an entire class period only by appointment followed by a conference.	16	2.22
14.5	The supervisor provides demonstration lessons by other teachers and/or supervisor followed by discussion of the demonstration lesson.	2	2.22
16.5	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for less than a class period followed by a conference.	12	2.26
16.5	The supervisor provides for discussion of a teacher's evaluation as formulated by the supervisor.	20	2.26

TABLE 10.(Cont.)

18	The supervisor provides help in administering and evaluating standardized tests.	9	2.33
19	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for an entire class period only by appointment followed by an evaluative statement.	15	2.37
20	The supervisor offers assistance and encouragement in making plans for teachers in advanced or graduate study.	7	2.44
21	The supervisor suggests periodicals or books for guided professional reading.	3	2.51
22	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for less than a class period followed by an evaluative statement.	11	2.74
23	The supervisor requires teachers to hand in to the office daily, weekly or unit lesson plans.	23	3.59

PRINCIPALS' EVALUATION PART TWO

Table 11 shows the rank order determined by the principals on the items in part two of the questionnaire using the computed means. Items 2, 4, 9, 5, 6, and 8 were evaluated between very helpful and quite helpful and ranked in respective order from one through six by the principals. The remaining items were evaluated between quite helpful and helpful by this group. Perhaps worthy of note was that the teachers evaluated two items compared to six items by the principals between very helpful and quite helpful on this portion of the questionnaire.

TABLE 11. PRINCIPALS' RANKING OF ITEMS IN TERMS OF SUPERVISORY VALUE ON PART TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

Principals' Ranking		Actual Item No.	Principals' Mean Evaluation
1	The school system provides time with pay for teachers to visit another classroom in schools other than their own.	2	1.48
2	The school system provides for a consultant that the teacher may call to aid them in teaching if they are having difficulties in instruction.	4	1.52
3	The school system provides preschool orientation meetings or workshops.	9	1.70
4	The school system provides audio-visual aids for the teachers' classrooms when requested.	5	1.74
5.5	The school system provides consultant help in art, music and physical education.	6	1.85
5.5	The school system provides in-service courses offered for credit by a college or university.	8	1.85
7	The school system provides a professional library that is readily available.	3	2.07
8	The school system provides library services for obtaining specific data on research, on teaching methods, or other instruction materials.	7	2.37
9	The school system provides time with pay for teachers to visit another classroom within the building where they are teaching.	1	2.52

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there were differences in the evaluation of selected supervisory services commonly recognized by principals and teachers and to determine which of these supervisory services were considred most helpful by each of the groups.

To assess these criteria a questionnaire was developed. The questionnaire consisted of selected supervisory services that were evaluated by the participants on a five-point scale.

The population from which the teachers were selected for this study was that of all elementary teachers in two Montana Class A school systems. A total of ninty-three teachers were selected at random from this population. Also, twenty-seven elementary principals from the same schools participated in the study.

The study was conducted during the 1966-67 school year.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions based on the analysis of data gathered from the questionnaire were summarized in the following statements.

1. Generally, principals seemed to evaluate items on the questionnaire as being more helpful than did the teachers. However, in the comparative analysis of item evaluation by the principals and teachers, it was found that there existed a statistically significant difference in the following nine items.

1. Classroom observation by the supervisor for less than a class period followed by a conference.
2. Classroom observation by the supervisor for an entire class period when he desired followed by an evaluative statement.
3. Classroom observation by the supervisor for an entire class period when he desired followed by a conference.
4. Supervisors' help on individual teaching problems.
5. Teachers' participation in policy formation and school planning.
6. Teachers' participation in curriculum revision.
7. Teachers' participation in textbook adoption.
8. Inter-visitation for teachers.
9. Consultant help for teachers with instruction problems.

In each of the above items the principals tended to evaluate the item as more helpful than did the teachers. These results seemed to indicate that the principals considered their actions, as supervisors, more beneficial than the perceptions of these actions held by the teachers.

2. The elementary principals considered the following supervisory services most helpful:

1. Individual conferences with teachers.
2. Teachers participation in textbook adoption.
3. Encouragement and opportunity for classroom experimentation.
4. Classroom observation by the supervisor when he desired followed by a conference.
5. Supervisors' help on individual teaching problems.
6. Classroom observation by the supervisor when he desired followed by an evaluative statement.
7. Teachers' participation in curriculum revision.
8. Teachers' participation in policy formation and school planning.
9. Inter-visitation for teachers.
10. Consultant help for teachers with instruction problems.
11. Preschool orientation meetings.
12. Audio-visual aids for the classroom.
13. Consultant help in art, music and physical education.
14. Inservice courses offered for college credit.

3. The elementary teachers in this study considred as most helpful the following supervisory services:

1. Individual conferences with supervisor.
2. Encouragement and opportunity for experimentation.
3. Audio-visual aids for the classroom.
4. Consultant help in art, music and physical education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made:

(1) This writer recommends that future studies be made to determine the supervisory services that are actually being used by administrators in elementary school systems.

(2) It is also recommended that research be conducted to learn what relationship, if any, exists between the length of teaching experience and the attitudes which teachers have toward changes in educational methods and toward persons in supervisory positions.

(3) In addition, further studies should be conducted to determine the personal qualifications of supervisors which are most liekly to foster inter-personal relations with teachers conducive to the betterment of teaching.

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO TEACHERS

Dear teacher,

While working toward my Master's degree in school administration at Montana State University, I have found only a limited amount of current information pertaining to teacher's evaluation of supervision. Therefore, in an attempt to assist prospective school administrators in understanding their roles in developing supervisory services, I have initiated a study to survey the present teacher's evaluation of selected supervisory services offered by the school system or performed by principals, superintendents, curriculum supervisors, or other persons.

I am asking you, as a teacher, to help in this survey by completing the questionnaire enclosed and placing it in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided, as soon as possible.

Your signature is not required on the questionnaire as this study is designed to deal with the general evaluation of all selected teachers and not with individual evaluation by teachers. The information I receive will be confidential and no attempt will be made to identify any individual.

Thank you for your cooperation and time.

Sincerely,

s.s. Gary Ryti

R. Gary Ryti

APPENDIX B

TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: On the following questionnaire please circle one number for each statement that most nearly represents your evaluation of the supervisory service mentioned. The scale used for the valuation follows:

1 - very helpful
2 - quite helpful
3 - helpful
4 - of little help
5 - of no help

	very helpful	quite helpful	helpful	of little help	of no help
I. Supervisory services provided by the principal, superintendent, curriculum supervisor, or other persons.					
1. The supervisor provides encouragement and opportunities for teachers to experiment within their classrooms with new teaching procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The supervisor provides demonstration lessons by other teachers and/or supervisor followed by discussion of the demonstration lesson.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The supervisor suggests periodicals or books for guided professional reading.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The supervisor provides for stimulating and helpful faculty meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The supervisor provides for individual conferences with teachers whenever requested by the teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The supervisor provides bulletins for teachers containing helpful suggestions.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The supervisor offers assistance and encouragement in making plans for teachers in advanced or graduate study.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The supervisor provides for cooperative study between teacher-supervisor or teacher-teacher on individual pupil needs or problems.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The supervisor provides help in administering and evaluating standardized tests.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The supervisor provides avenues through which teachers may express their views.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for less than a class period followed by an evaluative statement.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for less than a class period followed by a conference	1	2	3	4	5

		very helpful	quite helpful	helpful	of little help	of no help
13.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by an evaluative statement.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by a conference.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for an entire class period only by appointment followed by an evaluative statement.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	The supervisor makes an observation of your classroom for an entire class period only by appointment followed by a conference	1	2	3	4	5
17.	The supervisor provides help on individual teaching problems by recommending materials and procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	The supervisor conducts grade level or subject meetings to discuss and solve common problems.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in policy formation and school planning.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	The supervisor provides for discussion of a teacher's evaluation as formulated by the supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in curriculum revision.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	The supervisor requires teachers to hand in to the office daily, weekly, or unit lesson plans.	1	2	3	4	5

Check the official whom you consider to be most directly responsible for your supervision.

1)_____principal
2)_____superintendent
3)_____curriculum supervisor
4)_____Other (specify)

_____

II. Services provided by your school system.	very helpful	quite helpful	helpful	of little help	of no help
1. The school system provides time with pay for visitation of another classroom within the building where you are teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The school system provides time with pay for visitation of another classroom in schools other than your own.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The school system provides a professional library that is readily available.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The school system provides for a consultant that you may call to aid you in teaching if you are having difficulties in instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The school system provides audio-visual aids for your classroom when requested.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The school system provides consultant help in art, music and physical education.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The school system provides library services for obtaining specific data on research, on teaching methods, or other instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The school system provides in-service courses offered for credit by a college or university.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The school system provides preschool orientation meetings or workshops.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

Dear principal,

While working toward my master's degree in school administration at Montana State University, I have found only a limited amount of current information pertaining to a comparison of principals and teacher's evaluations of supervision. Therefore, in an attempt to assist prospective school administrators in understanding their roles in developing supervisory services, I have initiated a study to survey the present principal's and teacher's evaluation of selected supervisory services offered by the school system or performed by principals, superintendents, curriculum supervisors, or other persons.

I am asking you as a principal to help in this survey by completing the questionnaire enclosed and placing it in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided, as soon as possible.

Your signature is not required on the questionnaire as this study is designed to deal with the general evaluation of all participants and not with individual evaluations. The information I receive will be confidential and no attempt will be made to identify any individual.

Thank you for your cooperation and time.

Sincerely,

s.s. R. Gary Ryti

R. Gary Ryti

APPENDIX D

PRINCIPALS QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: On the following questionnaire please circle one number for each statement that most nearly represents your evaluation of the supervisory service mentioned. The scale used for the evaluation follows:

1 - very helpful
2 - quite helpful
3 - helpful
4 - of little help
5 - of no help

I. Supervisory services provided by the principal, superintendent, curriculum supervisor, or other person.	very helpful	quite helpful	helpful	of little help	of no help
1. The supervisor provides encouragement and opportunities for teachers to experiment within their classrooms with new teaching procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The supervisor provides demonstration lessons by other teachers and/or supervisor followed by discussion of the demonstration lesson.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The supervisor suggests periodicals or books for guided professional reading.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The supervisor provides for stimulating and helpful faculty meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The supervisor provides for individual conferences with teachers whenever requested by the teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The supervisor provides bulletins for teachers containing helpful suggestions	1	2	3	4	5
7. The supervisor offers assistance and encouragement in making plans for teachers in advanced or graduate study.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The supervisor provides for cooperative study between teacher-supervisor or teacher-teacher on individual pupil needs or problems.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The supervisor provides help in administering and evaluating standardized tests.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The supervisor provides avenues through which teachers may express their views.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for less than a class period followed by an evaluative statement.	1	2	3	4	5

		very helpful	quite helpful	helpful	of little help	of no help
12.	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for less than a class period followed by a conference.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by an evaluative statement.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for an entire class period whenever he sees fit followed by a conference.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for an entire class period only by appointment followed by an evaluative statement.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	The supervisor makes an observation of a classroom for an entire class period only by appointment followed by a conference.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	The supervisor provides help on individual teaching problems by recommending materials and procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	The supervisor conducts grade level or subject meetings to discuss and solve common problems.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in policy formation and school planning.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	The supervisor provides for discussion of a teacher's evaluation as formulated by the supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in curriculum revision.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	The supervisor encourages teachers to participate in text-book adoption.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	The supervisor requires teachers to hand in to the office daily, weekly or unit lesson plans.	1	2	3	4	5

II. Services provided by your school system.	very helpful	quite helpful	helpful	of little help	of no help
1. The school system provides time with pay for teacher to visit another classroom within the building where they are teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The school system provides time with pay for teachers to visit another classroom in schools other than their own.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The school system provides a professional library that is readily available.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The school system provides for a consultant that the teacher may call to aid them in teaching if they are having difficulties in instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The school system provides audio-visual aids for the teachers classroom when requested.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The school system provides consultant help in art, music and physical education.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The school system provides library services for obtaining specific data on research, on teaching methods, or other instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The school system provides in-service courses offered for credit by a college or univeristy.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The school system provides preschool orientation meetings or workshops.	1	2	3	4	5

LITERATURE CITED

1. Antell, Henry. "Teachers Appraise Supervision." Journal of Educational Research 38:606-11; April, 1945.

2. Ayer, Fred C. Fundamentals of Instructional Supervision. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954, 509 pp.

3. Bail, P. M. "Do Teachers Receive the Kind of Supervision They Desire?" Journal of Educational Research 40:713-16, May, 1947.

4. Barr, A. S., William Burton, and Leo Brueckner. Supervision (Second Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1947, 865 pp.

5. Bradfield, Luther E. Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964, 168 pp.

6. Cappa, Dan, and Margaret Van Meter. "Opinions of Teachers Concerning the Most Helpful Supervisory Procedures." Educational Administration and Supervision 43:217-22, April, 1957.

7. Downie, N. M. and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965, 317 pp.

8. Gwynn, Minor J. Theory and Practice of Supervision. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1961, 449 pp.

9. Kyte, George C. How to Supervise. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930, 457 pp.

10. Kute, George C. "This is the Kind of Supervision that Teachers Welcome and Appreciate." Nations Schools 48:33-34, July, 1957.

11. National Education Association, NEA Research Bulletin. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1956, pp. 33-34.

12. National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals Yearbook, 1958. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1958, p. 163.

13. Replogle, Vernon L. "What Help Do Teachers Want?" Educational Leadership 7:445-49, April, 1950.

14. Saunders, Jack O. L. "Teachers Evaluate Supervisors, Too." Educational Administration and Supervision 41:402-06, November, 1955.

15. Shannon, J. R. "Teachers Attitudes Toward Supervision." Educational Method 16:9-14, October, 1936.

16. Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956, 359 pp.

17. Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools (Second Edition). New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955, 391 pp.