



The supervisory role of the elementary school principal in Montana
by Donald Louis Easton

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
Montana State University
© Copyright by Donald Louis Easton (1971)

Abstract:

It was the purpose of the study to compare perceptions and predictions of supervisory responsibility that various Montana educator groups held for the elementary school principalship, and to investigate the existence of significant differences of response of three educator-groups for twenty selected supervisory practices. It was also the purpose of the study to suggest methods of adjusting existing programs and planning future programs of elementary supervision to better meet the expectations of participating educators.

Identical survey instruments were sent to participating Montana school districts which contained elementary schools of twelve or more classroom teachers. On closed-response survey instruments, district superintendents, elementary teachers, and elementary principals estimated the current supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal for twenty supervisory practices, and predicted change in that responsibility. The total response of 382 participants represented an average return of 88.4 percent for the three educator groups.

Major findings of the study were: (1) Significant differences of perception and prediction were found to exist among the three educator groups. (2) Greatest agreement was found between the two administrator groups; greatest differences were found between the teacher and administrator groups. (3) Evidence suggested that superintendents and principals ascribed greater importance to the classroom visit than did the classroom teachers. (4) Smallest prediction for increase in supervisory responsibility was shown for those practices which employ large-group meeting procedures. (5) All educator groups provided evidence of predicted increase in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. (6) Evidence for greatest increase was provided by superintendents; smallest evidence was provided by elementary teachers. (7) All educator groups agreed upon increased future responsibility for those supervisory practices which involve the elementary principal as an instructional leader. (8) In age, level of formal preparation, and extent of professional experience, superintendents ranked first, followed by principals and classroom teachers. (9) Although principals and superintendents reported broad experience in both elementary and secondary teaching, elementary teachers reported little secondary experience.

THE SUPERVISORY ROLE OF THE ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN MONTANA

by

DONALD LOUIS EASTON

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

of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved:

Donald W. Sullivan
Head, Major Department

Frank W. Greenough
Chairman, Examining Committee

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

August, 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This writer is grateful to the many persons whose valuable assistance made this study possible. Gratitude is expressed to the Montana educators who participated in the study, to the Graduate Committee who provided constant encouragement, and to Dr. Franklin Greenough for his timely criticisms and suggestions.

Finally, a special acknowledgment to my wife, Evelyn, and to our two daughters, Christine and Carol, whose sacrifices were cheerfully made and whose constant encouragement provided the necessary support when the road seemed so long.

D.L.E.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.	vii
ABSTRACT.	x

Chapter

1. SUPERVISION AND THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL.	1
Introduction.	1
Definition of Terms	3
Evolution of Supervision.	5
The Emerging Supervisory Role of the Elementary Principal.	11
Current Status of the Elementary Principal.	16
Need for the Study.	18
Delimitations	22
Procedures.	23
Statement of the Problem.	27
Summary	28
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	30
Introduction.	30
Teacher-Principal-Superintendent Relationships.	30
Lack of Professional Concensus.	39
Influences for Change	45
Dissatisfaction with Traditional Supervisory Programs.	47

Chapter	Page
Related Studies	51
Summary	64
3. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF TEACHER RESPONSE.	66
Summary	79
4. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL RESPONSE.	82
Summary	96
5. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF SUPERINTENDENT RESPONSE	98
Summary	113
6. STATISTICAL COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS	115
Personal and Professional Information	115
STATISTICAL TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG EDUCATOR GROUP PERCEPTIONS.	127
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF PREDICTION- TYPE RESPONSES OF EDUCATOR GROUPS	141
7. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	153
Summary	153
Conclusions	156
Recommendations	160
Prognosis	167
APPENDICES.	171
Appendix A: Letter to Superintendents.	172
Appendix B: History Sheet.	173
Appendix C: Survey Instrument.	174

Chapter	Page
Appendix D: Letter to Principals	175
Appendix E: Letter to Teachers	176
Appendix F: Follow-up Letter to District Superintendents . . .	177
Appendix G: Follow-up Letter to Teachers and Principals. . . .	178
LITERATURE CITED.	179

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Years Elementary Teachers Have Served in Their Present Positions.	67
2. Previous Teaching Experience of Elementary Teachers.	68
3. Total Professional Service of Elementary Teachers.	69
4. Highest Degree Held by Elementary Teachers	69
5. Population of Communities Served by Responding Teachers.	70
6. Age Categories of Responding Elementary Teachers	71
7. Teacher Estimation of Principal Responsibility for Selected Supervisory Practices	73
8. Teacher Estimation of Principal Responsibility	77
9. Length of Service in Present Position: Elementary Principal Response.	83
10. Previous Education Positions Held by Elementary Principals.	84
11. Total Years of Professional Service of Elementary Principals.	85
12. Highest Degree Held by Elementary Principals	86
13. Populations of Communities Served by Reporting Elementary Principals.	87
14. Reported Ages of Responding Elementary Principals.	88
15. Analysis of Elementary Principal Estimate of Supervisory Responsibility	90
16. Elementary Principal Prediction of Future Supervisory Responsibility	94

Table	Page
17. Superintendent Report of Years in Present Position	99
18. Previous Educational Positions Held by Responding District Superintendents	100
19. Total Professional Service Reported by Responding Superintendents.	101
20. Formal Preparation Reported by District Superintendents. .	102
21. Reported Ages of District Superintendents.	103
22. Analysis of District Superintendent Response of Perceived Responsibility	105
23. Supervisory Responsibility Change Predicted by Superintendents.	109
24. Three-group Comparison of Years in Present Position. . . .	116
25. Previous Position Comparison of Three Educator Groups. . .	117
26. Total Professional Experience Reported by Three Educator Groups.	119
27. Highest Degree Held as Reported by Three Educator Groups	120
28. Community Size of Responding Educators	121
29. Educators Who Would Choose Education Career Again.	122
30. Ages Reported by Responding Educators.	122
31. Mean Score Ranking of Responsibility for Nineteen Supervisory Techniques as Perceived by Three Educator Groups.	125
32. Chi Square Statistical Test of Significant Difference: Teacher-Principal Response	129
33. Chi Square Statistical Test of Significant Difference: Teacher-Superintendent Response.	130

Table	Page
34. Chi Square Statistical Test of Significant Difference: Principal-Superintendent Response.	131
35. Summary of Statistically Significant Differences Among Superintendent-Principal-Teacher Responses	132
36. Ranking Comparison of Predicted Increase in Supervisory Responsibility of Elementary Principals.	137
37. Predicted Change in Principal Supervisory Responsibility: Statistical Test of Teacher-Superintendent Response. . .	143
38. Predicted Change in Principal Supervisory Responsibility: Statistical Test of Teacher-Principal Response	144
39. Predicted Change in Principal Supervisory Responsibility: Statistical Test of Principal-Superintendent Response. .	145
40. Predictions for Change in Supervisory Responsibility of Montana Elementary Principals: A Summary of Statisti- cally Significant Differences Among Educator Group Responses.	146
41. Comparison of Ranking Placements: Perceived Responsi- bility - Predicted Increase in Responsibility.	149

ABSTRACT

It was the purpose of the study to compare perceptions and predictions of supervisory responsibility that various Montana educator groups held for the elementary school principalship, and to investigate the existence of significant differences of response of three educator groups for twenty selected supervisory practices. It was also the purpose of the study to suggest methods of adjusting existing programs and planning future programs of elementary supervision to better meet the expectations of participating educators.

Identical survey instruments were sent to participating Montana school districts which contained elementary schools of twelve or more classroom teachers. On closed-response survey instruments, district superintendents, elementary teachers, and elementary principals estimated the current supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal for twenty supervisory practices, and predicted change in that responsibility. The total response of 382 participants represented an average return of 88.4 percent for the three educator groups.

Major findings of the study were: (1) Significant differences of perception and prediction were found to exist among the three educator groups. (2) Greatest agreement was found between the two administrator groups; greatest differences were found between the teacher and administrator groups. (3) Evidence suggested that superintendents and principals ascribed greater importance to the classroom visit than did the classroom teachers. (4) Smallest prediction for increase in supervisory responsibility was shown for those practices which employ large-group meeting procedures. (5) All educator groups provided evidence of predicted increase in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. (6) Evidence for greatest increase was provided by superintendents; smallest evidence was provided by elementary teachers. (7) All educator groups agreed upon increased future responsibility for those supervisory practices which involve the elementary principal as an instructional leader. (8) In age, level of formal preparation, and extent of professional experience, superintendents ranked first, followed by principals and classroom teachers. (9) Although principals and superintendents reported broad experience in both elementary and secondary teaching, elementary teachers reported little secondary experience.

Chapter 1

SUPERVISION AND THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

Introduction

After serving three years as an elementary school principal, a disappointed Montana educator resigned his position to return to classroom work. He summarized his frustration and disappointment with the single statement that, "Whenever I tried to accomplish something, the superintendent suggested that I leave things as they were."

Student teachers have suggested that their assignment in an elementary school is a very difficult one because of their obligation to meet the expectations of the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the building principal. Too frequently, they suggest, all three have varying and even conflicting explanations and suggestions for the improvement of student teacher performance.

Elementary classroom teachers, too, may feel that their own estimates of successful teaching and their impressions of effective procedures may not agree with those of their building principal, and may conclude that their teaching effectiveness is limited by the lack of agreement.

Elementary principals are hired by the district superintendent to represent the school administration and the board of trustees, and often feel that their educational role is made difficult by a multiple

responsibility to various groups and individuals. Elementary principals tend to recognize responsibility for interpreting educational programs and philosophies to school patrons and the school community, for reflecting philosophies and policies of the school superintendent, and for maintaining and improving instructional programs that conform to the general goals and objectives of the school district. Elementary principals also recognize their responsibility to provide instructional leadership that is consistent with the expectations of the building of instructional staff. To the extent that goals of concerned educators vary, the effectiveness of the elementary principal is limited.

Professional preparation for a specific educational position in education cannot insure success. Frequently, the lack of success has been the result of an inability to work cooperatively and harmoniously with other members of the professional team or with the patrons of the school. The need that successful educators meet the expectations of various groups provides the purpose of this study.

It was the purpose of this study to examine the supervisory role perceptions that elementary teachers, elementary principals, and district superintendents in Montana hold for the elementary principalship. It was also the purpose of this study to identify changes that the three professional groups anticipate for the supervisory role of the elementary principal, and to identify patterns of response that suggest supervisory responsibilities of the elementary principal that

will be consistent with the role expectations of the three educator groups. It was a final purpose to analyze and interpret the information assembled by the study and to offer suggestions which could contribute to improved future programs of elementary supervision.

Definition of Terms

In order to provide greater clarity of meaning and to aid the reader in the interpretation of this study, the terms, as they are used in this study, are defined as follows:

Elementary school principal. An administrative or supervisory officer responsible for an elementary school, usually limited to a single school or attendance area (Good, 28:197).

Supervising elementary school principal. An elementary school principal who has been relieved of instructional duties to devote half time or more to the supervision of instruction.

Superintendent. The chief advisory and executive officer of a city school system, usually elected by and responsible to the local board of education.

Teacher. A person employed in an official capacity to guide and direct the learning experiences of pupils in an educational institution.

Supervision. All efforts of designated school officials directed toward providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction (Good, 28:539).

Role. Behavior patterns or functions expected of or carried out by an individual in a given societal or professional context (Good, 28:471).

Mean. The mean of a series of measures is equal to the sum of the measures divided by their number. "It is the 'average' most often referred to in popular usage" (Lindquist, 50:52).

Supervisory technique. A particular procedure or process employed to stimulate teacher attitude or action which leads to the improvement of learning.

Human relations. The interaction of personalities among individuals who identify with a particular group of educators.

Administration. Consists of those activities which have for their purpose the general regulation, direction, and control of the affairs of the school district that are not confined to one school, subject, or phase of school activity (Mort, 62:383).

Evolution of Supervision

The American people have always been characterized by their high regard for education. The regard is shown by evidence that schools were established early in the American colonies when the courts ordered towns to secure teachers of religious and moral qualities for the instruction of the children.

Further evidence of regard and concern for education is shown by frequent visits to the colonial elementary schools made by local citizens, religious officers, and special committees of laymen. The various members of the community were granted the power to visit and "inspect the schools" (Lucio, 51:4). Thus, first attempts in programs of supervision of instruction were begun.

The initial attempts were characterized by their emphasis on autocratic inspection. Through arbitrarily set standards, examinations, and school visitations, members of the community attempted to improve instruction by removing those teachers whom they judged to be deficient.

The transition from community to professional responsibility for programs of elementary supervision was not deliberate. While little was done to provide for expanded or improved programs of supervision and inspection of schools, the towns and cities continued to increase in size until it became common for several teachers to be assigned to a single school building. As a result, community leaders began singling out instructors whom they considered to be most competent, and

assigning those instructors certain additional administrative and managerial duties. Those instructors were designated "head teachers" and represented the earliest form of the elementary principalship in America.

Although lay members of the community were reluctant to relinquish their supervisory authority over the elementary schools, the first legal provision for instructional supervision by school officials was authorized in 1654 by the Massachusetts Bay Colony General Court (McKean, 52:2). Thus, began a tradition in American education under which supervisory responsibility was placed with the "principal teacher", the "head teacher", or the "schoolmaster", and thus managerial control by an educator within the school had its beginning.

Earliest attempts at programs of supervision by educators were characterized by efforts to improve or remove those teachers who did not meet expected levels of performance, and early in the nineteenth century the powers and duties of supervision were placed in the hands of school "boards", the "school clerk", or the "school superintendent". Lucio and McNiel (51:4) have aptly summarized the purpose of the supervisory programs of that era, ". . . upgrading the work of the teacher became a recognized function."

Since the colonial period, school organizations have appointed an administrative head who was responsible for programs of supervision. In the earlier schools, he was called the schoolmaster or head teacher,

and in later schools a teaching or supervising principal. Although the principals possessed backgrounds of experience in common with those of other members of the instructional staff, early attempts at supervision by professional educators reflected the influences of the previous programs which had been developed by religious and community leaders. For several decades after the turn of the century, school principals continued programs of supervision that were concerned primarily with raising teacher performance to a level of acceptance and insuring that the "best" methods of instruction were being used. The supervision was based upon the belief that there were known and fixed methods of instruction which had been identified and which could be judged through observation of a teacher's work. It was also based upon the assumption that inspection would stimulate the teacher to do better work.

During the late 1800's, additional subjects such as music, art, home economics, and manual training were added to the school curriculum. A new type of supervision, "specialized supervision", resulted when it was recognized that neither classroom instructors nor school administrators possessed the qualifications required to be expert in the new curriculum offerings. When instruction could not be offered by specialized teachers, specialized supervisors offered assistance and instruction to the regular classroom instructors. The programs of specialized supervision were supplemented by the supervisory attempts of administrators who continued serving as instructional experts. The

assumption that school administrators are qualified instructional supervisors has persisted. Many school organizations currently rely upon supervisory programs performed by school administrators and depend upon programs of supervision that could be called "administrative supervision" (Ayer, 4:9-13).

By the year 1900, a marked change could be identified in programs of elementary supervision. Until that time, it had been common practice to improve instruction through critical selection and retention of teachers. After the turn of the century, however, attention was shifted toward the improvement and critical selection of approved instructional procedures. Within this new approach to supervision, teachers were regarded as instruments of education that could be instructed and supervised to ensure that they followed methods of instruction which had been determined by administrators and supervisors to be most effective. Scientific management, a prominent approach to supervision during the first three decades of this century, proposed that the best methods of instruction were to be found by supervisors and their use was to be enforced on teachers. Within this philosophy, teacher qualifications were specified, scientific measurements were used to assess results, data were gathered and analyzed, and specific scientific methods of instruction were encouraged. Basic to this philosophy was the expectation that administrators and supervisors be skilled in the most effective teaching procedures and that they keep

teachers informed with detailed instructions, provide the appliances and materials necessary, and assist teachers in the practice of proved instructional practices. Supervisors accepted the responsibility for the discovery of the best methods and processes of teaching, and teachers were expected to use those best methods. Complete and detailed courses of study for each curriculum area were often a result, and in some cases they were produced at the state level for distribution to teachers for use as guidelines and course content outlines.

School administrators, influenced by the scientific management approach to supervision, pointed with pride to the efficient and economical operation of their schools and to the scientifically proved results which had been achieved. Professional writers of the time, in describing efficient supervisory programs, devoted entire chapters to such topics as observational devices, tests, rating scales for teachers, and improvement of courses of study (Barr, 6:1-762). Within the philosophy of scientific management, the human side of man was minimized and emphasis was placed upon making education an efficient process through scientific study.

Although the traditional inspection and scientific management methods of supervision have not disappeared, autocratic methods of supervision came into serious criticism during the 1930's. During the second quarter of the current century, more democratic methods of supervision emerged and programs for the improvement of instruction

came to be seen as practices in human relations. This view endowed teachers with feelings and motives, and recognized faculty morale and social and mental welfare of teachers as being vital and essential to programs of quality education (Lucio, 51:3). Within the context of the human relations approach to supervision, the administrator or supervisor has attempted to operate as a cooperating instructional leader rather than as a director. Teacher cooperation and participation have been sought in problem solving, and greater respect for the teacher as an individual resulted. Creativity among teachers was encouraged, as they were assisted in the discovery of their own best approaches to instruction.

The most apparent change in professional writings in regard to programs of supervision has been the transition in emphasis from descriptions of mechanics of supervision to that of participation in group processes. The shift of emphasis from mechanics of supervision to processes of group activities in human relations programs is best seen in the current Encyclopedia of Educational Research. The entire supervision section of this authoritative publication offers impressive evidence that the study of supervisory programs has found a new approach within recent years. Methods and practices of individualized supervision have been omitted in the summary of recent research. Instead, the entire section on supervision is devoted to the topic of effective leadership. Authors have directed themselves to the subject of effective

group leadership situations and relations. The importance of human relations and individual participation in group processes is emphasized throughout the report. One paragraph aptly summarized the new approach to the study of supervisory programs,

These studies lead to the conclusion that the supervisor who hopes to be successful in promoting curriculum improvement will follow a procedure which involves the staff in the decision-making process (Harris, 37:1442-5).

The recent view of supervision has also been succinctly summarized by Taylor and McPherson (73:337) who described the change as one from telling teachers what to do and how to do it, to one of working cooperatively with teachers to solve those problems which confront them in their teaching.

The Emerging Supervisory Role of the Elementary Principal

An effective program of supervision has traditionally been considered an essential part of American education. Changes and the development of various supervisory programs have been identified at all periods throughout the history of American education. Before the turn of the century, supervisory programs were administered by lay individuals, members of the clergy, the school clerk, or the school superintendent. Programs of supervision have shown transitions through types administered by specialists, through those imposing results of research by scientific methods, through democratic human relations, and into programs that involve large group processes.

The principal as a supervisory member of the educational staff, however, is a relative newcomer. Because of clerical and instructional duties, the supervisory role of the elementary principal lagged far behind that of the superintendent and did not become well known until the twentieth century (Lucio and McNiel, 51:5). The elementary principal, then, has not been considered an accepted member of the supervisory staff until comparatively modern times.

Although many authors have aptly described the development of the supervisory role of the elementary school principal, the succinct summary offered by Cramer and Domain seems most appropriate for this writer's purpose:

1. One-teacher Stage: Chief Duty Teaching. One-teacher stage began with the first public schools. Because the school had only one teacher, there was no need for a principal. Later, as schools grew in size, one of the most successful teachers in each building was given some authority, but continued as a full-time teacher.

2. The Head Teacher Stage: Chief Duty Teaching. After the 1840's, the head teacher was called upon to assume certain building duties, and was paid additionally for the increased assignment. This stage represented the beginning of the idea that administrative duties in an elementary school deserve extra compensation. This stage of development still exists in many smaller elementary schools.

3. Teaching Principal Stage: Chief Duty Teaching. School superintendents found various problems in elementary schools that needed skillful and prompt attention, so the administrative responsibilities of the teaching principal were increased. To enable teaching principals to accept the additional responsibilities, superintendents gave partial relief from teaching duties.

4. Building Principal Stage: Chief Duty Administration. Resulted when school officials accepted the premise that it was desirable to have the principal devote his full energies to administrative

duties. This type of principalship did not become common until about 1880. Important responsibilities were those of overseeing janitors and their work, attendance, conduct and health of students, order and distribution of supplies, and inventories of stock rooms.

5. Supervising Principal Stage: Chief Duty Supervision and Educational Leadership. Since approximately 1920, the elementary principal has increasingly come to be recognized as the supervisory head of the classroom, the school, and the community. Has become the key person in the development of an effective school and community relationship (Cramer and Domain, 12:360-4).

Many authors agree that the elementary principalship is now generally recognized and accepted as a supervisory position. Harold Spears (68:187) writes that, "In those elementary schools where principals are freed of instructional duties, direct classroom supervision has been commonly established." He continues with the note that elementary principals in San Francisco, California, commonly spend from one-third to one-half of their school days in classroom supervision. Jacobson, Reavis, and Logsdon (42:20-1) agree that school boards and superintendents have encouraged elementary principals to accept the supervisory responsibility, and comment that, "Authorities in school administration for years have stressed the importance of the principal's devoting much time to the supervision of instruction." McKean and Mills (52:127) agree that the principal typically carries the supervisory load, but the summary statement by Curtin (13:207) is an apt expression of the professional opinion of many authors,

Of all those who have responsibility for improvement of instruction, the elementary school principal holds a unique position . . . perhaps more than any other supervisory personnel, he is involved in the ongoing day-to-day work of the school.

The supervisory role of the elementary school principal appears firmly established, but it has not become stable. During an era of change--in society, in education, and in programs of supervision--it is imperative that elementary principals accept the supervisory responsibility which has been offered, and continue the search for those supervisory practices which will result in the most effective instructional programs. Within his own school, the principal is expected to supervise the programs under his direction. How he views his supervisor role can have a direct influence upon his success with this activity (Goldman, 27:48). Mr. Ernest H. Hofmann (58:1), immediate past president of the Montana Department of Elementary School Principals, hinted at the ramifications involved when he wrote in his letter of welcome in November of 1969, "The concept of the elementary principal has experienced quite a change in the past ten or fifteen years. No longer is the position a keeper of books, a counter of lunch money, or merely a title." His statement clearly implies that currently successful elementary principals are concerned primarily with effective leadership practices rather than with managerial tasks. In Montana, a state with only two recognized metropolitan areas, the supervisory role of the elementary school principal is particularly important. In typically smaller school districts which cannot provide the services of central office supervisory personnel, the elementary principal is obligated to assume the leadership role for the improvement of instruction. The principal's

obligation to a program of supervision has been recognized by various organizations and individuals. The Standards for Accreditation of Montana Elementary Schools, printed by the office of the state superintendent of public instruction in March of 1970 (60:4), specifically states that:

Schools employing eight to twelve teachers shall be administered by a qualified, certified, elementary principal who devotes at least one-half of each school day to supervision and for whom adequate clerical assistance is provided.

When speaking in Helena in 1964, Dr. Robert J. Alfonso (1:1-2) stressed the supervisory importance of the Montana elementary principalship in his address to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development;

From what I have been able to find out, one way in which Montana differs from numerous other states is that you do not have a large number of personnel specifically designated as "supervisors". On the contrary, the supervision done in Montana (if done at all) is the responsibility of an administrator most often a building principal.

Although the Montana elementary principal has only recently come to be recognized as an administrator who is responsible for programs in elementary supervision, current evidence reflects his general acceptance as a member of the supervisory team, and also suggests that he must be prepared to offer the instructional leadership essential to effective programs of instruction. The increased responsibility of the elementary principal is consistent with the prediction of authors who anticipate larger elementary school systems with increased stress

upon the role of the principal as the supervisor of instruction. They predict that clerical assistance will be increased so that those routine duties which are presently being performed by principals will be handled by school clerks (Stoops and Marks, 72:88).

Although supervisory responsibility for the elementary principal has been tardy in general acceptance, a future of continued and increased responsibility appears assured.

Current Status of the Elementary Principal

Although the purpose for programs of supervision has always been the improvement of instruction, a history of American education includes various types of programs of supervision and shows a transition in the recognized responsibilities of the elementary principal. Initially, he was considered responsible for the evaluation of teachers but later came to be recognized as a curriculum and instructional expert who explained and prescribed instructional procedures and materials for classroom teachers. The supervisory program consisted primarily of the classroom visitation which was followed by a conference in which the expert principal told the teacher how her performance could be improved. Programs of supervision in which the principal assumed the role of expert have not disappeared from American education, but the expert approach to supervisory programs has been severely criticized during the past four decades.

Since the recent advent of larger school districts, the improved

professional preparation of teachers, and the increased knowledge concerning learning processes, more and more educators have come to recognize that supervisors and building principals are unable to master teaching competencies which exceed those combined abilities of the teachers with whom they associate. Evidence exists that the staffs of the schools today have an increasingly high level of preparation and a deepening desire as professionals to participate in decision making. It is not unusual to discover members of a teaching staff who have as much--or more--professional preparation than the principal of their school (Taylor and McPherson, 73:31).

Erickson (18:60) has written a humorous but critical description of the current elementary principal who continues to pose as an instructional expert,

He is expected to sally in and out of classrooms like some charismatic general, dropping a suggestion here, correcting a foible there, using the magic of his pedagogic know-how to spur the flagging spirits of his troops.

Erickson concluded his article by stating his belief that teachers will respect supervising principals so long as they demonstrate competence, but that the principals alienate their staffs when giving directions in areas where they are unable to perform proficiently. He suggested that the expert principal is outmoded, and predicted that authority of position will be replaced by a collegial authority of competence among teachers. The modern elementary principal, Erickson suggested, will become a strategist who works with the human components

of the school to combine their abilities to construct an efficiently functioning unit.

Various programs of supervision have been categorized according to their various approaches to the improvement of instruction. Two recent classifications reflect the increased regard shown teachers as members of the supervisory staff and merit mention here. Lucio and McNeil (51:13-17) have placed the recent humanistic approaches to supervision in two categories: (1) the Method of Reason, and (2) the Method of Practical Intelligence. The first rests on the belief that knowledge is best obtained through a system which guides actions, and the second suggests that faith in the capacities of professional people is an effective method of inquiry.

Both approaches are noteworthy for the value that they place upon teacher competence and illustrate the gradual transition which has occurred within programs of supervision. Throughout its development supervision has gradually moved from individual programs for the improvement of instruction to the group process approach to the improvement of learning.

Need for the Study

In keeping with a society recently characterized by very rapid changes, American education has experienced considerable change within the past two decades. Labor group pressure upon educational organizations, consolidation of districts into fewer but larger administrative

units, governmental participation in various educational programs, and increased and advanced preparation of classroom teachers all have had a marked influence upon public education.

Larger and more active organizations of teachers within the enlarged educational units have employed collective activity to obtain roles in administrative activities that long have been considered the responsibility of the superintendent. Strengthened professional organizations of teachers no longer limit their collective activity to the determination of salaries, but now have extended their influence to include many decision-making areas of the educational program.

Morton Godine (17:33) has suggested that as teachers become more active in the decision-making process, they will become concerned with such questions as summer programs, in-service programs, opportunities for appointment, classroom size, discipline, and academic freedom.

The successful elementary principal has long been the one whose philosophy of education was consistent with those of the district superintendent and the board of trustees. The superintendent, with the prerogative of appointing principals, has generally been able to appoint those who share his educational views. The importance of agreement in basic beliefs is indicated on page 7 of the Montana Department of Elementary School Principals Tentative Handbook (59:7): "The principal is responsible for establishing school atmosphere and attitudes in keeping with his own philosophy and that of the superintendent."

Increased professional activity and improved professional preparation, however, have recently required that classroom teacher expectations also be considered. The philosophy of the school and the program of supervision no longer rely entirely upon the school administrators, but recently have come to include the planning and participation of classroom instructors. Lloyd Taylor (73:83) described the importance of the recently altered working relationship when he wrote: "The superintendent looks to the principal for supervision and evaluation. Most important, however, he expects the principal to develop ways of involving teachers in the process."

"Teacher militancy" is a term often used to describe recent pressures from the instructional personnel to share in the many administrative decisions formerly considered to be the unilateral responsibility of the school board and the district superintendent. Some principals are reluctant to accept the change, and Luvern Cunningham has reported that many principals expect their professional obligations to become more difficult as principal-teacher relationships change (Elam and others, 17:299). But regardless of terminology, it appears evident that major change in professional relationships is eminent.

Muriel Crosby (Leeper, 46:47) has expressed concern for the transitional role of the supervisor, and described the altered position of the supervisor in the changing educational organization by stating,

The current revolution, with its tremendous impact upon the schools and upon education, the rising militancy of teachers and

of the American public have created what might be legitimately described as a crisis situation for supervisors.

Lucio and McNeil (51:28) agree that the role of the supervisor has changed and suggest that the success of the contemporary supervisor is now dependent upon the extent to which he meets the expectations of his teachers. Because members of teaching faculties are better prepared and because teachers have come to share increasingly in the administrative process, it appears imperative that supervisors understand teacher expectations of supervisory programs. It seems no longer sufficient that the educational philosophies of the elementary principal agree only with those of the superintendent. Instead, it has become increasingly essential that programs of elementary supervision be consistent with the expectations of the school board, the superintendent, and particularly the members of the teaching staff.

In order to identify the attitudes and expectations of Montana educators toward programs of elementary supervision, it seemed necessary that an opportunity for expression be provided. This study provided an opportunity for district superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers to associate the elementary principalship with programs of supervision and to suggest their professional expectations for change. It was felt by this writer that a professional concensus of programs of elementary supervision could provide a contribution of some value in planning and improving supervisory programs for the elementary schools of Montana.

Delimitations

Within the limitations outlined below, this study was conducted as an attempt to identify the supervisory role of the Montana elementary school principal:

1. The study was limited in time to the academic school year, 1969-1970.
2. The study was constructed to consider only programs of elementary supervision and to consider only the elementary school principal as elementary supervisor.
3. Only those educators employed as elementary teachers, elementary principals, and district superintendents were considered as those involved in programs of elementary supervision.
4. School districts selected for participation in the study were only those which, according to the 1969-1970 Montana Education Directory, contained elementary schools of twelve or more full-time classroom instructors (70:121).
5. From those school districts selected for participation, two population groups were included: (1) the district superintendents, and (2) elementary principals responsible for school buildings of twelve or more classroom teachers.
6. Through the use of a replacement sampling procedure, teacher participants for the study were selected on the following basis:
 - a. One participant selected from elementary schools of

twelve to seventeen classroom teachers.

- b. Two participants selected from elementary schools with eighteen or more classroom teachers.

7. The thirty-seven item list of most commonly used supervisory techniques, as provided by Eye and Netzer (20:290-92) was arbitrarily limited to those twenty determined by the writer to be those most appropriate to a study of professional human relationships.

8. In the statistical comparison of response among the three educator groups, the .05 level of confidence was selected for use in the determination of Chi Square levels of significant difference.

Within these limitations, the study was conducted in an attempt to identify the perceptions that elementary teachers, elementary principals, and district superintendents held for the elementary principalship as it related to the list of twenty specified supervisory practices.

Procedures

In an attempt to relate twenty designated supervisory techniques with the perceptions that Montana educators held for the supervisory role of the elementary school principal, the following procedures and materials were used:

1. Through professional literature and personal experience and interest, the problem was selected and defined.
2. To summarize the results of similar studies and to place the study in proper perspective, related literature was examined. The

survey of literature included an examination of the Educational Research Informational Center (E.R.I.C.) materials. The related studies, recorded in the years 1956-1969, appear in the bibliography, and their contributions to the subject appear within the context of this study.

3. Two survey instruments were constructed for use in the survey:

- a. A history sheet for use in the identification and classification of participants and their responses (See Appendix B, page 173).
- b. A closed-response survey form, constructed primarily from a list of commonly-used supervisory techniques suggested by Eye and Netzer (20:290-92) (See Appendix C, page 174).

4. Experimental survey instruments were then tested for clarity and for their ability to obtain the desired types of responses. Revisions were made as required.

5. Supervising elementary principals in Montana were designated by the accreditation standards of the Department of Public Instruction which specify that schools of twelve or more teachers, ". . . shall be administered by a full-time qualified, certified, elementary principal for whom adequate clerical assistance is provided (60:4)."

6. Montana elementary schools of twelve or more full-time classroom teachers were identified in the 1969-70 Montana Education Directory

(70:1-139) and their school districts were selected to be included in the survey.

7. Letters of transmittal were mailed to district superintendents (see Appendix A, page 172). Within the letter, the purpose and nature of the study were explained, samples of the survey forms were provided, and district superintendents were asked to provide written permission for the distribution of materials to principals and teachers within the districts.

8. Upon receipt of written permission from the district superintendents, letters of transmittal and survey forms were distributed to elementary principals throughout the State. No sampling procedures were used in the selection of superintendents and principals. Instead, those selected represented populations of administrators considered to be participants in programs of elementary supervision.

9. To satisfy the conditions of random sampling in a strictly mathematical sense, the replacement sampling procedure, suggested by J. P. Guilford (33:142), was used. From a complete list provided by the Montana State Department of Public Instruction, 4,796 public elementary school teachers were identified by name, county, school district, and school building. Names of teachers from each school were numbered in the order in which they appeared on the State list, and numbered tabs were prepared and used in the drawing which selected elementary teachers for inclusion in the study. One tab was drawn for elementary

schools of twelve to seventeen teachers, and two were drawn for schools of eighteen or more teachers. As names were drawn for participation, they were returned in order to maintain mathematical consistency.

Through the drawings, provision was made to include all Montana elementary public schools of twelve or more teachers in the study.

10. Upon receipt of superintendent's permission, letters of transmittal and survey forms were mailed to those elementary teachers selected.

11. As needed, follow-up letters and telephone calls were used to encourage all qualifying districts to participate in the survey.

12. Because of clerical error (see Appendix C, page 174), Item number 17 on the survey form, "Individual Counseling for Personal or Professional Problems", was not included in the analyses.

13. The responses of the three educator groups were recorded, studied, and statistically analyzed to test the stated null hypotheses that (H_0) no differences existed among the ways in which elementary teachers, elementary principals, and district superintendents perceived the supervisory role of the elementary principal and (H_0) that no differences existed among the predictions for change in that responsibility.

14. Abstract summaries were mailed to those school district superintendents who had expressed an interest in the study results.

Statement of the Problem

The problem considered by this study was that of investigating perceptions which Montana educators held for the supervisory role of the elementary school principal. An attempt was made to identify contrasts and similarities that Montana educators held for that position. Members of three educator groups (elementary teachers, elementary principals, and district superintendents) were selected to represent those educators who were participants in programs of elementary supervision. Through the use of a twenty-item list of commonly used techniques of supervision, an attempt was made to compare the manner in which the groups related the elementary principal to the program of instructional improvement.

As consolidation has increased the size of Montana school organizations, elementary principals have come to assume increased responsibility for the supervision of instructional programs. Recently, however, roles of educators have been altered by innovation in educational programs and by the increased activity of professional organizations. The changes in district size and in educator roles have presented the question: Do Montana elementary teachers, elementary principals, and district superintendents hold similar expectations of the supervisory responsibility of the elementary school principal? The question, in turn, led to the statement of the two null hypotheses with which the study was concerned: (H_0) There are no significant differences in the

perceptions that Montana educators hold for the supervisory role of the elementary school principal; and (H_0) on the basis of prediction-type responses, the future supervisory role of the Montana elementary school principal is not perceived differently by Montana elementary teachers, district superintendents, and elementary principals. The study was prepared and completed as a test of the two stated hypotheses.

Summary

Within this first chapter, the historical development of the elementary principalship has been briefly summarized and increased responsibilities in human relations and group processes have been suggested. Terms used in the study were defined, the problem was stated, and the hypotheses presented. In addition, the need for the study was shown in several areas:

1. In an era of change, education is changing. A need for the re-definition of professional roles exists.
2. Criticisms of traditional supervisory programs suggest that supervision will also be influenced by change.
3. Increased administrative participation by teachers provides new value to their views of supervision.
4. A similar study has not been completed recently in the State of Montana.
5. There is a need to stimulate the investigation of current and suggested programs of elementary supervision.

As indicated by the outline of procedures, this study proposed to identify the perceptions that Montana educators held for the supervisory role of the elementary principal. It also proposed to identify changes anticipated by those who participated in the study.

Montana and its educational programs have been influenced by a period of rapid change. The need for effective programs of elementary supervision is greater today than ever before. During this time when professional organizations and relationships are being altered, it appears appropriate that the professional role of the supervising elementary principal be re-examined.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

An examination of professional literature has shown recent and increased concern for programs of elementary supervision. Many authors agree that programs of supervision will experience change in the future, and also agree that classroom teachers will be important agents of change and active participants in future supervisory programs.

The examination of professional writing provided evidence that authors predict increased importance for group approaches to supervision, and also suggested that many effective supervisory programs of the future will be those in which all educator participants generally agree upon objectives and procedures of supervision.

Professional literature which provided a contribution to the subject of the study has been briefly summarized within this chapter.

Teacher-Principal-Superintendent Relationships

"Supervision in the school setting is seen in various ways by teachers, administrators, supervisors, and laymen (Harris, 37:5)." This statement by Harris, if accurate, could predict potential problems for the cooperative, group-process approaches to programs of supervision that are presently being advocated by various writers. Recent changes in programs of supervision have extended responsibility to an enlarged

number of educators, and one might expect that in an effective program the supervisory team members hold common instructional goals and generally agree upon procedures which will best achieve them.

In his writing concerning supervisory behavior, Stewart (71:525) cites professional literature to support the premise that supervisory success is dependent upon the perceptions of subordinates. Effective supervisory behavior, Stewart believes, is that supervision which teachers perceive to be effective. The real challenge of the supervisor, he concludes, is to provide supervisory programs that enable peer, subordinate, and superordinate members of the supervisory team to perceive the supervisory program as being effective in the achievement of instructional goals.

Turner (48:217), in his writings concerning role-taking, offers support to the belief that the most effective group processes are those in which team members hold similar views and generally agree upon the methods through which they can offer the greatest contribution toward the group goals. Turner states: ". . . a person . . . must act in the perspective supplied in part by his relationship to others whose actions reflect roles that he must identify." It may be reasonable to conclude that the most effective programs of supervision are those in which democratic processes are used to involve large numbers of professional team members, and which employ those processes in which superintendents, classroom teachers, and supervising principals hold similar views.

Also, objectives and materials would necessarily be those which had been accepted by the members of the supervisory team. Similarly, one might conclude that superintendents, teachers, and principals, to be effective team members, should hold similar views of their respective supervisory responsibilities.

Lucio and McNeil (51:28) support the premise that successful supervisory team members are those whose performance meets the expectations of their professional associates. In summarizing the findings of studies concerned with teacher-supervisor relationships, the authors report that:

The satisfaction of teachers with the school system has been found to depend upon the extent to which they perceive that the roles of their supervisors meet their expectations. Conversely, those higher in the school's hierarchy judge teachers in terms of how well they conform to personal expectations of the teacher's role.

Because classroom instructors and supervising principals work face-to-face in the day-to-day performance of their instructional responsibilities, it appears particularly important that those professional staff members hold similar views of individual responsibilities and concepts of what constitutes an effective program for the improvement of instruction. Mutual professional respect among supervisory team members appears to be equally important, and is a premise basic to this study. The material assembled by this study may provide valuable information concerning the views that Montana educators hold for existing programs of elementary supervision.

Turner (48:223), concerned with individual motivation and success within group processes, has written that, "Role validation is also anchored in the membership of recognized groups and the occupancy of formalized positions."

Another author, Herman (41:41), appears to agree and has devoted an entire chapter of his writings to the problems of instructional techniques and the consideration that principals must show for the teacher whenever approaches to instructional problems are suggested. Herman has stated the suggestion thus, "What is done should be done in a way that will enable the teacher in question to retain his confidence and positive self-concept."

Lucio and McNiel (51:28) report that the satisfaction of teachers with the school system has been found to depend upon the extent to which they perceive that the roles of their supervisors meet their own expectations. Reciprocal advantages in performance and self-confidence apparently are realized in the converse arrangement, for Gross (31:7-8) has determined that the expected performance of classroom teachers reinforces the position of the principal when his performance is consistent with their expectations. Here is his summarizing statement:

Whether or not teachers have a strong sense of personal loyalty to the principal, if they are satisfied with him as their administrative leader, his risks are reduced because he can count on them even when his own actions might affect their interests adversely.

Gross (31:7-25) concludes his writing with the interesting report that school principals, supported by the approval of their teachers,

tend to conform closely to the performance expectations of the teaching staff. Most authors seem generally agreed that the supervisory success of the elementary principal is dependent upon the acceptance and support his efforts receive from the instructional staff. Success may be limited, however, when a problem is viewed from varying positions. What appears to be desirable from the principal's perspective may not necessarily appear that way to teachers, since they occupy different positions within the school and have somewhat different interests and problems (Gross, 31:2-6).

Some evidence reveals that educators associate at times in an atmosphere which lacks mutual respect and professional confidence. One Montana elementary teacher, responding to survey materials distributed by this study, offered this evaluation of the role of the elementary principal,

I think the role of the elementary principal is over-inflated. The classroom teacher has always carried the load and has always run a building. Most principals, if they do anything, become little dictators and a teacher either gives in or becomes a hard-nosed brown-noser to keep his or her position.

Professional discussions occasionally reflect a lack of consensus concerning the program of supervision and the working relationship of the supervising elementary principal and classroom teachers. During the October, 1969, Montana Education Association convention held in Billings, a panel discussion considered such topics as: playground supervision, discipline, lesson plan requirements, and written.

evaluations of teachers. The topic selected for the discussion had been, "What do the classroom teacher and the principal expect from each other in order to make school more efficient and productive?" Although the topic clearly made reference to the program of supervision of instruction, the various topics which emerged suggested a lack of consensus within the discussion group.

Gross (31:16) has identified the difficulties posed when various persons, concerned with a single problem, may represent contrasting or even conflicting points of view. He aptly described the dilemma of such a situation when he wrote:

A principal, in short, occupies a position that brings him into contact with some people whose perspectives represent in part system-wide interests and problems and others whose perspectives derive in part from problems internal to the school and from the specific district served.

The very nature of the administration and supervision of American public schools requires that much interaction take place between the supervisory and instructional staffs. Teachers, however, do not consistently enjoy the advantage. They are somewhat isolated from their administrators at times, and their interactions tend to be only with other teachers. Without interaction between administrators, supervisors, and teaching faculty, common understandings are difficult to achieve.

Authors clearly point to the importance of professional consensus, agreement, and inter-role support within effective programs of instructional improvement, and some evidence reveals situations in which

these essential, cooperative attitudes are lacking.

Because he is the executive officer of the school board and represents the highest office in the school district, the superintendent, as head of the educational staff, is directly involved in the program of supervision. In small school organizations, he may actively participate in supervisory functions, while in larger organizations he becomes involved through his appointment of and association with administrative and supervisory staff members. By securing the best qualified personnel available, by creating good working conditions, and through selection and retention of personnel, the superintendent assumes a major responsibility for determining the quality of the supervisory program. His performance, as administrative head of the district and leader of the instructional staff, will in large measure determine the professional relationships shared by members of the staff. As teachers and principals find professional encouragement and support in shared expectations, the position of the district superintendent is similarly reinforced when his performance is consistent with the expectations shared by other members of the certified staff. Neagley and Evans (63:73) have summarized this point of view:

If the superintendent is to be effective in his role as an instructional leader, there must be a similarity between the role which the staff members believe the superintendent should assume and the one which they think he is carrying out.

The Tentative Handbook for Elementary Principals (59:7) prepared by members of the Montana Department of Elementary School

Principals, succinctly described the relationship of the elementary principal and the district superintendent: "The principal is responsible for establishing school atmosphere and attitudes in keeping with his own philosophy and that of the superintendent." The superintendent is generally recognized as the chief executive officer of the school district, and the elementary principal as the representative of the superintendent within the individual school. The relationship between the superintendent and elementary principal is therefore one of superordinate to subordinate. Typically, the superintendent requires that individual school building supervisory practices conform with general supervisory practices of the district, and that departures from standard procedure have prior approval from the central office. Briefly, the elementary principal is responsible for carrying out the policies which have been established by the superintendent and the board of trustees. He is, as Jacobsen, Reavis, and Logsdon (43:41) have stated, the direct appointee of the superintendent who has the responsibility of actively and publicly supporting those policies which have been adopted.

Gross (31:6-19) has written concerning a facet of the principal-superintendent relationship which is seldom discussed openly. He pointedly suggested that principals are dependent upon school districts for the pursuit of their professional careers in education, and that the superintendents, as their superordinates, have considerable influence in determining those aspiring principals who will be promoted or passed

over. Because principals are dependent upon their superiors for promotion, Gross stated that deviating too far from administrative policies or failing to conform to expectations could involve considerable risk for principals. The successful principals, it may be concluded, are frequently those who are aware of and conform to the interpretations that the superintendent has for school programs and policies.

Elementary principals, however, frequently have a background of teaching experience and a close identification with the classroom teachers. The principal finds himself in a position that requires that he serve the administrative role of carrying out school board policies, and also of serving as an administrator or supervisor who relates closely with teachers. The principal, then, has the responsibility for maintaining the professional morale of the classroom teachers while carrying out the line decisions that have been made by the superintendent. His professional performance, ideally, must meet with the approval of both levels within the educational hierarchy (Heald and Moore, 40:129).

The amount of autonomy given elementary principals varies among school districts, but some writers report trends toward greater autonomy in the management of the individual school (Jarvis, 43:23). Because too much central authority may tend to interfere with the operation of the individual school and too much autonomy may divide the district, it has been suggested that the relations between building principals and the central administration be clearly defined. Toward this end, it has

become common practice for superintendents to meet periodically with building principals to discuss policies and to explain programs and give instructions. Through an exchange of ideas, principals share in decision-making at the district level and superintendents gain the enthusiastic support of the administrative staff. Taylor and McPherson (73:83) write that the superintendent looks to the principal for leadership in programs of supervision, and expects the principal to develop ways of involving teachers in the supervisory and evaluative processes.

The superintendent-teacher-principal relationship should be one in which each compliments the contribution of the others for the educational growth of boys and girls. The degree to which each of these instructional positions supports the others in Montana programs of elementary supervision has not been assessed. Curtin (13:224) has clearly stated the need: "Within the context of a supervisory program, it is crucial that everyone who is concerned with the program clearly understands the role he is to play."

Lack of Professional Concensus

Although professional writers generally agree that supervisory programs of inspection and teacher evaluation are outmoded, few agree entirely upon the mechanics of an up-to-date and effective program of elementary supervision. While speaking to a conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (A.S.C.D.) in Helena, Montana, in 1964, Alfonso (1:1) stated the problem with clarity: "The

whole professional area of supervisors and curriculum workers is filled with overlapping and ill-defined or undefined responsibilities."

Gwinn (34:19-20) adds that there is disagreement among educators and the public as to what supervision is. He suggests four common definitions presently being proposed for the supervisor: (1) one who is trained to do an administrative job, (2) one whose main responsibility is that of helping teachers, (3) one who teaches teachers to improve instruction, and (4) one who deals in human relations by working with teacher and pupil groups.

Similarly, disagreement concerning the use of the classroom visitation as an effective supervisory practice has been noted. The Tentative Handbook for Elementary Principals recommends that Montana principals of elementary schools spend one-third of their time in classroom observation (51:23). In apparent support of this view, accreditation standards provided by the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Helena, Montana, ask that principals of schools with eight to twelve teachers devote one-half of each school day to supervision (60:4). Curtin (13:59), a strong advocate of democratic, group-oriented supervisory programs, has written that: "There is no substitute for classroom observation for only by this means can supervisors gain the first-hand knowledge and experience necessary to participate in improvement programs."

Eye and Netzer (20:292), while recognizing the value of the

classroom visit, feel that the supervisory practice may be overrated in importance. Their comment is: "It is unfortunate that supervision has been narrowed progressively in concept until it is perceived almost exclusively as classroom visitation." Writing for The National Elementary Principal in 1968, McNally (53:86) expressed his feeling that the program of classroom visits by elementary principals has been overdone. He feels that such a supervision-centered conception of the principalship has become inappropriate and outdated, particularly in larger school districts. McNally's prediction is that:

Unless a conception more appropriate to our needs and consistent with reality becomes prevalent in the near future, the building principal may well be relegated to the role of managerial caretaker, who is given little part in the decision-making process on important professional matters.

Other writers have suggested that the era of the supervising elementary principal may be past. Thurman's (75:739-48) article, "The Principal Must be Replaced", argues that the elementary principal is no longer able to offer the instructional leadership that teachers require. Principals, he contends, have been trained primarily in the managerial tasks of administration, and they devote the greater portion of their time to those areas. His suggestion is offered that the principal be replaced by a coordinator of learning who would not concern himself with matters of administration, but who would devote all of his energies to the task of assisting teachers in the improvement of the teaching-learning process. Eye and Netzer (20:290) also suggest that the school

principal, as an individual supervisor, may occupy a professional role that is inappropriate to current programs of supervision. Their comment, offered in support of group procedures, suggests that:

An awareness of the marked increase in the group attack in supervision over the past several years is frightening evidence that the day of individual supervision, as formerly conceived, is practically gone.

Some principals have expressed concern that collective activity by professional organizations poses a threat to the supervisory responsibility of administrators. Teachers, they report, have employed collective activity to gain a role in administrative activities that have long been considered the responsibility of school administrators. The strengthened professional organizations of teachers no longer confine their collective activity to the determination of salaries, but now have extended their influence to include negotiation of many additional decision-making areas of the educational program. Godine (17:33) has suggested that as teachers become more active in these decision-making processes, they will become concerned with such matters as summer programs, in-service programs, opportunities for appointment and promotion, classroom size, discipline, and academic freedom. Cunningham (17:299) has reported that through interviews, principals have expressed growing concern that teachers may eventually assume many prerogatives of building administrators. Epstein (17:188) and Hazard (39:6) offer no solace for traditional principals, for their suggestions are offered that principals should have no role in the negotiations carried on by teacher

groups, and that the opportunity for administrators to perform in the role of change agents for the schools probably has already passed.

There is impressive evidence to support the belief that programs of elementary supervision have experienced change to involve increased numbers of educators. In spite of the progress already shown, Mitzel (57:434) professor of educational psychology at Pennsylvania State University, predicts even greater and more rapid change for the future. Writing in the April, 1970, issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, he suggested that the last three decades of the Twentieth Century will witness change so drastic that historians, making reference to changes in education during that period, ". . . will have no difficulty in agreeing that it was a revolution."

Epstein (17:186) hints that rapid change may present problems for programs in supervision. He reports that within change that has already taken place there is evidence of immature, awkward, but rapidly emergent new patterns of relationships between teachers, administrators, and supervisors. Alfonso (1:8), speaking to Montanans in 1964, also described potential problems with his comment that, "It's quite possible, and even probable that the role expectations that a teacher holds for a supervisor may be at direct variance with the role that the supervisor sees for himself." Lindesmith and Strauss (49:279) identify the seriousness of the problem by pointing to the requirement that effective groups succeed only when individuals within groups and organizations

can associate effectively only because of their capacity to negotiate among themselves so as to accomplish group as well as individual ends. Their statement tends to support the trend toward group processes in supervision as does that of Turner (48:269) who explained that conflicts in perspectives are often resolved by broadening the perspective through group activities. In his statement, Turner has identified an important advantage to be found in viewing the program of supervision through the eyes of the group rather than the eyes of the individual supervisor. Group goals, he feels, are best identified and accomplished by group processes.

In an industrial nation of instant mass communication, Montana will not be isolated from supervisory changes that are now in evidence in various locations throughout the nation. Classroom teachers have historically been the object of supervisory programs, but recent trends promise their increased participation in programs for instructional improvement. This State, formerly characterized by small school organizations dependent upon the elementary principal for the supervision of instruction, should find advantage in the identification of present and anticipated programs of elementary supervision within the State. Because evidence predicts change for Montana's school programs, descriptions of existing programs and suggestions for change which will be assembled by this study may provide important information essential to planning for the future. At a time when change is anticipated and positions of

educators need definition, it seems appropriate that the supervisory role of the Montana elementary principal be determined.

Influences for Change

Within recent years, the United States and the entire world have been characterized by a period of rapid change. American footsteps on the moon in July and November of 1969 marked an important milestone in technological progress, and reflected the era of progress and change being experienced by our American society.

Public education in the United States has not been immune to the influences of rapid change. Influences of labor organizations, improved professional preparation of teachers, school district consolidation, urban growth of metropolitan areas, the population explosion, civil rights movements, the war on poverty, and governmental aid to education have contributed to educationally innovative programs such as Head Start, the migrant workers program, language laboratories, programmed instruction, teaching machines, pre-kindergarten programs, phonetic alphabets, and non-graded schools.

Formerly the duties of the elementary principal have largely been those of various clerical and managerial duties related to supplies, materials, and the disciplining of uncooperative students. Within the past several decades and during the current period of rapid change, however, the role of the elementary principal has assumed a new and greatly expanded leadership function.

Education at all levels has recently become more intricate and complex. As research, innovation, and experimentation have proceeded at rates never before experienced in the public schools, adequate programs of supervision have become more necessary in each school system. It appears to be impossible, in these days of rapid change in schools, for practitioners to keep up-to-date on what is happening in their profession without the expert technical assistance that could be made available through an effective program of supervision (Misner, Schneider and Keith, 56:183). The elementary principal, held to be responsible for programs of supervision and instructional leadership, has recognized this area of need. Harris (47:2), writing for the A.S.C.D. in 1967, discussed the changing role of the elementary principal as an instructional leader:

Until recently, the school principal generally has scorned direct involvement in instructional improvement activities or curriculum development programs. Strides are now being made toward involving school principals in supervision and curriculum development, and this new involvement has made more urgent the need for clarification of roles and responsibilities.

It may be assumed that the elementary principal, in response to rapid change, has become involved in programs of instruction as well as administrative duties.

An additional change that has taken place within the growing environment of educational change is the increasing acceptance and recognition of the elementary principalship position. As conditions for supervision are improved through provision for adequate clerical,

custodial, nursing, and resource help, the principal will find that more and more time has become available for effective supervision and that school superintendents and school patrons expect more instructional and supervisory leadership from him. As administrative and clerical duties are delegated to assistants or custodial personnel, the elementary principal can expect to devote more time to the direct improvement of instruction. Romine, in his article, "Current Influences Changing the Principal's Role", has recognized the altered role of the elementary principal and has suggested that the principal must develop abilities which will provide effective leadership in democratic, group processes. Romine (67:187) advises principals that recent changes indicate a future for educators in which decision-making will be a group process. His suggestion is that, "The school principal should recognize the change and should become a part of it." These educational and supervisory changes appear to be in harmony with a rapidly changing American society. Without doubt, Montana schools will be influenced by the tendency toward change.

Dissatisfaction with Traditional Supervisory Programs

In spite of recent experimentation and innovation in education and the increasing evidence for impending change, some traditional programs of supervision persist. Many classroom teachers, increasingly aware of recent and more democratic approaches to supervision, have

become dissatisfied with traditional programs that see them as objects of supervision rather than participants in programs for instructional improvement. One traditional practice, the conference which follows the classroom observation, has received recent criticism.

The classic principal-teacher conference has recently been compared with the physician-patient conference. Rather than discuss the process of teaching, the interview, by its very nature, suggests that discussion involve criticism of the teacher, and also suggests that only the teacher can benefit from the conference. It frequently appears that the conference is concerned more with the teacher than with teaching. Amidon, Kies, and Palisi (3:54) reflected the dissatisfaction expressed by some teachers in their statement, "Many feel that an atmosphere of mutual contribution is preferred, and that the atmosphere is achieved in group conferences."

"Let's Quit Playing Boss-Employee and Become Co-Workers", is an article written by Roberts (66:25), who supplies evidence that classroom teachers are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with traditional supervisory programs. Roberts criticizes classroom observations followed by conferences as being traditional and ineffective, and suggests that the practices are not consistent with the altered role of the elementary principal. He reports that teachers are becoming more involved and more motivated by supervision that employs cooperative and democratic processes, and expresses his belief that sensitive and perceptive adminis-

trators are those who have adopted methods of open and free communication which produce improved instructional programs through teacher involvement as equals in the programs of supervision.

In spite of the reluctance shown by some educational administrators, local collective activity among public school teachers is clearly increasing. Through their professional organizations, classroom teachers have sought roles in the decision-making processes, many of which have traditionally been considered the unilateral responsibility of school boards and administrators (Elam, Leiberman, and Moskow, 17:85). Administrators who have welcomed classroom instructors as members of the supervisory team have received recognition from the authors.

In his writings, Bridges (9:1-12) has assembled research information which supports his position that the effective elementary principal is the one who invites teachers to participate in the decision-making processes when the area of concern is one that the teachers feel is relevant to them. Bridges has concluded that the best cooperative supervisory results are achieved when the principal chooses interested teachers who have a contribution to make to the problem.

Some authors describe a bleak future for school principals who would retain traditional programs of supervision. Writing in 1969, Cronin predicted that as a result of increasing teacher group negotiations, the principal will turn toward instructional leadership or will waste away as a building manager who takes charge of keys, custodians,

and students who are in trouble. He reported that results of negotiations in some sections of the nation have already placed the principal in a position so low that, ". . . the proposal to elect principals from the tenured members of the school faculty now receives serious consideration (43:169)."

Hawkins (38:169-173) has agreed and has written that outmoded supervisory practices are rapidly being replaced. He predicted that teachers may be instrumental in replacing the building principal of the future. His suggestion is made that two positions--the building administrator and the principal-educator--will replace the school principal. In describing teacher expectations for change, Hawkins offers this comment:

It appears that teachers in their increased demands for participation in policy matters will not settle for less than an active and realistic role utilizing the professional input that they are capable of providing. Many teachers believe that this new kind of involvement requires a radical departure from existing organizational patterns.

Crosby (46:47) has suggested that the American public, the rising militancy of teachers, and the current acceleration of change have created what might be legitimately described as a "crisis-situation for supervisors".

To be effective, elementary principals must offer programs of supervision which classroom teachers can enthusiastically support. Professional literature suggests that improved supervisory practices offer classroom instructors opportunities for participation. To

determine those improved supervisory programs which Montana teachers can endorse, it is essential that teacher perceptions of existing practices be identified. Such is the intent of this study. As Curtin (13:4) has written,

Despite the fact that the broad purpose of supervision has remained unchanged, certain dramatic developments have taken place in the field of elementary education with the result that improvement programs today bear only a remote resemblance to those of earlier days.

Results of this study, through the identification of classroom teacher perceptions and predictions, may suggest preliminary steps for the implementation of the suggested programs of supervision.

Related Studies

Available literature suggests that one of the most extensive and most completely reported studies concerning the role expectations of educators was done by Neal Gross in Massachusetts in 1952. Half of the superintendents in the state were selected for participation in the study, and during a nine-month period interviews were held with each of them. Interviews of eight hours were reported as being common. Personal interviews with 515 school board members from the selected school districts were also held. The study was begun at Harvard University in 1952 and had as its purpose the study of problems of concensus on role definition, conformity to expectations, and role conflict resolution.

The author concluded that empirical examples of responses

obtained during the interviews did not fit neatly into the usual treatment of social control, and reported that some superintendents failed to conform to role expectations of their school board members even when aware of the expectations that the board members held. Gross (32:232) also concluded that role expectations affect job satisfaction and worry about tenure. The most important single consequence of role expectation consensus was shown by Gross to be that of job satisfaction. Although programs of elementary supervision were not specifically considered in the Harvard University study, the conclusions suggested that consensus among superintendents, teachers, and principals can also have an important influence upon performance satisfaction in programs of supervision.

Foskett (23:99) made a study of the role of the elementary school principal in a West Coast community. He included 367 teachers, 22 principals, seven school board members, 602 citizens of the community and 207 patrons of the schools. Conclusions drawn from the role inventories which were completed by the participants indicated the greatest differences in role perceptions between principals and superintendents. Next greatest was that between principals and school board members, but greatest agreement was found between principals and teachers. Topics of the role inventories included in the survey instrument were those of teacher evaluation, supervision, discipline, and PTA participation.

Foskett (24:61) also used the material gathered in the West Coast study to write another summary which analyzed roles as perceived

by the elementary teacher. The basic conclusion drawn was that the greatest role norm agreement was found between principals and teachers, and the greatest differences were found between teachers and superintendents.

Francke (25:207) conducted a study which included thirty-one school systems of one-hundred to seven hundred teachers that were within 150 miles of Madison, Wisconsin. His survey instrument listed twenty-five decision-making situations and asked respondents to identify the title of the educator whom they felt to be responsible for making each particular decision. One of his conclusions reached in the study stated that, "The more teachers were in agreement on the locus of responsibility for regulatory decisions, the better was the quality of the curricular plans which they produced." Other conclusions drawn by Francke's study suggested that school districts with teacher-initiated change had a greater tendency toward change, and that teacher expectations were raised when they felt that they had an opportunity to participate in the leadership role.

Leipold completed a study in 1940 which attempted to determine how elementary principals actually were associated with their superintendents. Districts included in the study were those in cities of 50,000 to 1,000,000 inhabitants. The study, completed at the University of Minnesota, found various principal-superintendent relationships which were reported by Cramer and Domain (12:379):

In some schools, the principal is regarded as the responsible head to whom is delegated the power to interpret and to execute school policies. In other schools, he is principal in name only, being dependent on the central office for the interpretation of policies and instructions pertinent to the performance of his duties. Between these two extremes, a wide variety of practices exist, influenced by prevailing local conceptions of the status of the principal by the personalities of officials concerned.

Sixty elementary schools participated in the study which was done by Gentry and Kenney (26:62-67) at the University of Georgia. Elementary teachers and principals were asked to evaluate the performance of elementary principals in forty-six selected administrative activities. The study found that the two groups differed significantly in their evaluation of twenty-two of the forty-six practices; in that elementary principals tended to rate their own performances as being more satisfactory than did their teachers. Although the study examined administrative rather than supervisory practices, it has value for our purposes in its identification of differences in principal-teacher role success perceptions.

Gross and Herriott, in reporting on the National Principalship Study, summarized the attempt that was made to identify circumstances in which principals conform to the leadership definition of their position. Principals of 175 schools were selected to represent all elementary and secondary principals in school districts serving communities of more than 50,000 people during the 1960-61 school year. To determine the Executive Professional Leadership (E.P.L.) of principals, teachers were asked to report how frequently their principals conformed to their

leadership expectations in twelve situations. The study examined the teacher-principal and principal-superintendent relationships and found that those principals whose superiors endorsed their efforts exerted greater E.P.L. than those with superintendents who did not. The study also found that the more egalitarian a principal's relationships with his teachers, the greater his E.P.L. (43:55-65).

In an attempt to relate administrative success with teacher acceptance of administrative behavior, Haralock (35:45) conducted his study in Georgia in 1962. This author made an attempt to demonstrate that there are behavioral norms that are constructed within any organization, and that successful democratic leadership is dependent upon and related to the extent to which leadership behavior conforms to the role expectation norms that have been established by the subordinates within the organization. The summary of Haralock's study concludes that democratic behavior that conforms to teacher expectation norms protects the teacher positions in the internal organizational structure, protects teachers from the arbitrary use of power by the principal, and insures teacher rights in making their views known.

The A.S.C.D. has long recognized the problem of tensions that can develop between supervisors and teachers. Summarizing the conclusions reached in the study completed by their own commission in 1962, the A.S.C.D. reported that, "Good human relations were built by a supervisor who gave the teacher a feeling of importance, of being one of the

team, and of making valuable contributions (Greer, 29:22)."

Six studies were completed in 1954-56 by doctoral candidates at the University of Georgia, and Cooper has written the summary of the six studies. Included in the respondent groups of the study were: principals, teachers, pupils, instructional supervisors, visiting teachers, school board members, and college instructors. The studies attempted the identification of effective and ineffective principal behaviors, and concluded that in total general behavior, principals were 61 percent effective, but that in the area of personal characteristics they were 64 percent ineffective. The conclusion was drawn that attention is needed in the areas of screening processes, the pre-service preparation, and the in-service preparation programs for principals (Jarvis, 44:67-74).

The National Department of Elementary School Principals (15:78) has reported the results of a nationwide survey that was conducted by their organization in 1968. The report indicated that most elementary principals consider the program of supervision of instruction to be one of their primary responsibilities. The D.E.S.P. report stated that, "Seventy-five in one hundred in the total sample believe that they have primary (emphasis in the original) responsibility for supervision and the improvement of instruction within their schools."

Some administrators consider teacher observation and evaluation to be part of the supervisory program, and the National Education

Association has published the results of their study which was conducted to determine evaluative responsibility that is assumed by the principal. In their report, published in October of 1969, the National Education Association stated that in over half of the 235 school systems responding, the principals are solely responsible for the evaluation of teachers. The summary included the report that 97 percent of the principals responding felt that the purpose of evaluation was the improvement of teaching competence. It was interesting to note the quote that, "All the respondents in school systems with fewer than 25,000 pupils believe the principal should evaluate teachers (19:71)." This report of the National Education Association would appear to support the expressed teacher fear that too often they are the object of rather than the partner in programs for the improvement of instruction.

Another study by Watkins (76:106) included forty-eight schools in its sample group and attempted to gain insight into the interaction between the school principal and his professional staff. Briefly, the study concluded that teachers and principals may have varying perceptions of conditions for change, and reported a finding that, "The principals and the staffs differed significantly in their perceptions of the organizational climates of their schools."

Gross (30:3-13) has reported the results of an extensive study completed by the Research Staff of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University. The report, written in 1965, stated that 501

principals, 3,367 teachers, and 128 higher school administrators participated in a study that encompassed forty-one large American cities, and attempted to identify problems that principals most frequently encountered as a result of role expectation differences. Forty problem areas were included in the study, and results indicated that twenty-six of the forty areas most frequently presented conflicts. General conclusions of the study reported that men have more teacher-principal conflict, that elementary principals had fewer role conflicts than secondary principals, and that,

The teachers are probably the most important group that affects the principal's behavior. Although the teachers are subordinate to the principal in the organization, they wield powerful sanctions. A principal who fails to meet the expectations of a majority of his teachers may find his authority severely undermined, if not openly flouted.

Fearing (21:31), in an attempt to determine the value that is placed upon principal behavior, presented a thirty-two item instrument to the principals and teachers of six schools. In the analysis of responses, Fearing found that the two groups held dissimilar views on two-thirds of the items, and he concluded that the elementary school has potential for increased effectiveness through the improvement of accuracy in interpersonal perceptions.

Dayton (14:42), in his study which was completed in 1955, made an attempt to identify behavioral expectations that classroom teachers held for elementary principals. Within his conclusions, Dayton listed the practices of assistance that teachers expect. In their order of

reported importance, the first three expectations were:

1. That the principal participate in the classroom activities as a helper to the teacher and did not interrupt.
2. That the principal teach class occasionally to relieve the teacher for other duties, respecting plans made by the teacher.
3. That the principal build teacher confidence by demonstrating his knowledge of teaching procedures.

The Flanagan Critical Incident Technique for interviewing was used by Medsker (55:1-90) in his attempt to determine teacher expectations of the elementary principals in the Oakland, California, schools. The study, done in 1954, classified 3,300 performance incidents of elementary principals reported by teachers as being either effective or ineffective. The study included ninety teachers and thirty elementary principals, and included the following among the major conclusions:

1. The most critical responsibility of the elementary principal is that of providing leadership for teachers.
2. Building of teacher morale and unity is also an important expectation of teachers.
3. Teachers also expected constructive assistance from the principal in classroom performance.
4. Teachers expected an opportunity to share in the decisions affecting building responsibilities.

In his study conducted within the elementary schools of Indianapolis, Indiana, in 1954, Palmer (65:1-150) interviewed educators from forty-one of the elementary schools in the district. Participants in the study included seventy-nine elementary teachers, forty-one elementary

principals, and fourteen general elementary supervisors. Interviews were conducted with the participants in an attempt to determine the expectations that the teachers, principals, and consultants had for the program of supervision. Through a combination interview-questionnaire survey technique, the author asked the educators to express their views concerning preferred programs of supervision. A partial list of findings is provided here:

1. 91 percent of the teachers were happy in their professions.
2. 92 percent of the teachers and 95 percent of the consultants preferred constructive, democratic techniques of supervision.
3. 87 percent of the teachers reported existing programs of supervision to be democratic.
4. 44 percent of the teachers offered the free response that supervision requires good human relations.
5. 93 percent of the teachers felt that the principal and supervisor should share in supervisory responsibility.
6. 75 percent of the teachers wanted opportunities to visit other classrooms.
7. 47 percent wanted opportunities to observe demonstration teaching.
8. Only 14 percent of the teachers wanted more classroom visits, but 65 percent of the supervisors wanted more of that type of supervisory service.
9. Teachers generally expressed the desire to share in the supervisory program.
10. The conclusions was drawn that supervisory programs should be flexible and adapted to teacher needs.

The professional literature related to the supervisory role of the elementary principal and with the professional relationships of teachers, principals, and superintendents has indicated various important aspects. The material that was reviewed provided evidence that various role expectation variances do exist among the groups of educators, and that concensus within the role expectations is important to the instructional program and to the working atmosphere within the school.

It appeared appropriate and timely to investigate the role expectations that Montana educators had for the elementary principal, and to solicit the responses of elementary classroom teachers. Valuable information may be obtained from their responses, for, as Blome (8:16) has written, "It's encouraging . . . that teachers seem to know what they need and want in supervisors."

In spite of increased evidence that elementary supervision cannot be performed as "trouble-shooting", some professional writing persists in directing attention toward the mechanical aspects of instructional improvement. Although traditional programs of inspectional and expert supervision have generally fallen into disfavor, some current authors continue their discussion of methods and techniques of supervisory programs. While some professional literature of the past has dealt primarily with mechanics of supervision, most contemporary authors have come to suggest that the successful elementary school administrator no longer can depend upon technical knowledge about administrative practices.

Instead, professional writers have come increasingly to acknowledge the importance of personal and leadership abilities among promising and successful elementary principals. Many suggest that traditional practices of supervision are being replaced by techniques that are positively received by co-workers and that invite more participation by teachers. Connelly (11:38), a school superintendent, wrote in 1967 of the important and necessary qualities and professional preparation of an aspiring and promising elementary principal. In his writing, Connelly made little mention of the mechanical or scholastic abilities of potential principals, but did suggest that,

"In this connection, it is usually more productive to think in terms of ideas, concepts, skills, and attitudes to be learned in readiness for proper action as relevant situations develop than to prescribe specific courses to be passed.

This superintendent, reflecting the changed expectations held for elementary principals, has recognized the increased importance being placed on the professional abilities in deliberation, cooperation, group leadership, and long-range planning.

In the preface to his recent book, Administering Elementary Schools, Kimbrough (45:vii) lends his support to the human behavior approach to administration and supervision. His opinion is that, "What is needed in the principalship today, as well as in other administrative positions, is a mode of thinking about human behavior that is fused with knowledge of operational management."

Other authors tend to agree that the elementary principal's success in his role as instructional leader is reflected in his overall effectiveness as a school principal and group leader, rather than upon his ability to offer immediate solutions to isolated problems. They suggest that training sessions and classroom visitations are being replaced by such supervisory practices as educational workshops, research, experimentation, faculty meetings that offer problem-solving activities, teacher observation programs of inter-visitations, teacher opportunities to visit and observe classrooms, conferences and institutes, participation in professional and civic activities, and sensitivity training techniques in human relations (Kimbrough, 45:133-40). To be successful in his instructional leadership role, the elementary principal must possess the ability to establish a healthy working relationship with his co-workers by approaching problems on a democratic, cooperative basis (Kimbrough, 45:84).

The increased size of school districts and the clerical help being provided elementary principals have produced supervisory change in which the building principal is perceived as an instructional leader rather than an administrative figure. Stoops and Marks (72:84), in recognition of this altered professional relationship, advise that important supervisory time can be used to greatest advantage when the classroom teachers become an essential part of the instructional program and also plan the program of supervision. With the change in concept, they

suggest, it appears that classroom teachers and building principals will come to regard one another more as fellow educators. When the principal and the teaching staff see themselves in these terms, the educational program will be improved by the resultant cooperative efforts for supervision that are planned with teachers to give a more definite purpose to practices of supervision. These authors summarize their point of view by stating that, "The principal should strive to enhance each individual's position on the staff by delegating responsibility for instructional improvement to members of the certificated staff."

Curtin (13:280), a strong advocate of teacher participation in programs of supervision, agrees with the position stated by Stoops and Marks, and adds the recommendation that programs of supervision be evaluated by classroom teachers. Curtin states that it is impossible to discuss or evaluate programs of supervision without making reference to the teaching staff, and comments that, ". . . the active participation of teachers in the evaluation of supervision is so crucial to its success that no evaluation can be made properly without it."

Summary

The evidence has suggested that the "head teacher" of the past has progressed through various levels of transition to the present. The changes appear to have neither narrowed nor limited the realm of responsibility of the elementary principal as an acknowledged administrator and supervisor. Instead, his recently acquired leadership role appears

to be more challenging and complex than that of his predecessors who have concerned themselves with managerial tasks of accounting and inspection. Within his present position of recognized responsibility, the contemporary elementary principal has assumed responsibility for effective instructional programs, change, and experimentation.

In writing of the growing complexities of the elementary principalship, Onofrio (63:22) suggested that increasing demands are being made of the position, and that, "This is his role whether he wants to recognize it or not because of the expectations held of him which have grown out of staff, organizational, community, and nationwide conditions." Onofrio reported that the increased complexities are the result of the transition from administration to leadership responsibilities, and concluded by calling upon principals to use their personal abilities and foresightedness to create a more realistic climate for the improvement of instruction by providing supervisory programs that involve all members of the teaching team.

Chapter 3

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF TEACHER RESPONSE

Two hundred nineteen elementary teachers were selected to represent the 4,796 public elementary school teachers in the State of Montana. Those selected represented 156 Montana public elementary schools in sixty-eight school districts.

Of the 219 teachers selected for inclusion in the study, one was deceased, one had resigned and left the State, and thirty-eight failed to respond. Survey materials were completed and returned by 179 teachers for a total response of 82.5 percent. Within the tabulations which follow, total responses did not consistently equal 100 percent. Several explanations for the apparent inconsistencies are offered:

1. Computer analyses had been rounded to the nearest whole percent.
2. Some study participants failed to respond to all survey items.
3. In some instances, it was possible for a single respondent to reply in more than one category.

The completed history sheets provided personal information concerning the teachers who responded. When asked how many years they had served in their present teaching positions, the teachers provided the following responses.

Table 1

Number of Years Elementary Teachers Have Served
In Their Present Positions

Number of years	Number	Percent *
1. Less than 3 years	55	30%
2. 3 - 6 years	54	30%
3. 7 - 10 years	22	12%
4. 11 - 14 years	19	10%
5. 15 - 18 years	9	5%
6. More than 18 years	18	10%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100% .

Two elementary classroom teachers (representing 1 percent of the total) did not respond to the question, but the responses of 109 teachers in the first two categories provided some evidence that most responding educators had served less than seven years in their present teaching positions.

The second question on the history sheet requested that the respondents report their background of teaching experience. They were asked to indicate, on an eight-point scale, the positions in education in which they had previously served. The following information in Table 2, page 68, is a brief analysis of the responses.

Table 2

Previous Teaching Experience of Elementary Teachers

Previous positions held	Number	Percent *
1. Elementary Teacher	155	86%
2. Elementary Principal	7	3%
3. Junior High School Teacher	22	12%
4. Junior High School Principal	1	0%
5. High School Teacher	11	6%
6. High School Principal	1	0%
7. Superintendent	1	0%
8. Other	15	8%

* Categories are not mutually exclusive

It was noted that although 86 percent of the elementary teachers reported previous experience in elementary education, only 18 percent specifically reported previous experience in junior and senior high schools.

When asked to report total years of professional service, the elementary teachers provided responses which offered the information listed in Table 3, page 69.

Responses of the elementary teachers provided some evidence that nearly one-third had total professional experience of less than five years, and more than half of the responding teachers had a total

Table 3

Total Professional Service of Elementary Teachers

Years of service	Number	Percent *
1. Less than 5 years	56	31%
2. 5 - 10 years	46	25%
3. 11 - 16 years	25	13%
4. 17 - 21 years	18	10%
5. More than 21 years	33	18%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100 % professional experience of less than eleven years.

Of the 179 elementary teachers who responded to the survey, nine held no college degree and one held the Specialist Degree. Detailed information concerning the formal education of participants is shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Highest Degree Held by Elementary Teachers

Degree	Number	Percent *
1. None	9	5%
2. BA or BS	149	83%
3. MA or MS	17	9%
4. Specialist	1	0%
5. Doctorate	0	0%
6. Other	3	1%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

Although no explanation of "other" was obtained, it seemed important to note that the vast majority of Montana elementary teachers (83 percent) appeared to hold Bachelor degrees and that 9 percent of the responding elementary teachers had earned the Masters degree.

All Montana school districts that included elementary schools of twelve or more classroom teachers were invited to participate in this study. The information provided in Table 5 is a summary of community size of the sixty districts that responded.

Table 5

Population of Communities Served by Responding Teachers

Population	Number	Percent *
1. Less than 5,000	49	27%
2. 5,000 - 10,000	21	11%
3. 10,000 - 15,000	13	7%
4. 15,000 - 20,000	3	1%
5. 20,000 - 25,000	7	3%
6. Over 25,000	84	46%

* Categories have been rounded, and do not consistently total 100%

Although two participating elementary teachers failed to respond to the item, it was interesting to note that large representations were reported from Montana communities of less than 10,000 population and nearly half of the responding elementary teachers were serving Montana

cities with populations greater than 25,000. It seemed reasonable to assume that many elementary schools of twelve or more classroom teachers are located in larger Montana cities.

When asked if they would choose a career in education again, seven elementary teachers (3 percent) offered a negative response. Affirmative responses were offered by 171 teachers, and one did not respond to the item.

The final request of the history sheet asked elementary teachers to indicate their present age, and results showed that nearly half (49 percent) of the responding teachers were under the age of thirty-five years. A detailed tabulation of response results is provided in Table 6.

Table 6

Age Categories of Responding Elementary Teachers

Age Categories	Number	Percent *
1. Under 25	26	14%
2. 25 - 30	40	22%
3. 30 - 35	21	11%
4. 35 - 40	16	8%
5. 40 - 45	5	2%
6. 45 - 50	22	12%
7. 50 - 55	23	12%
8. Over 55	26	14%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

Montana State Accreditation Standards ask that elementary schools of twelve or more teachers be provided a full-time principal who has adequate clerical help. Based upon this State recommendation, the arbitrary assumption was made that elementary teachers employed in buildings of at least twelve teachers would be involved in a program of instructional supervision. On the basis of the assumption, nineteen commonly used supervisory practices were listed and teachers were asked to estimate the responsibility of the elementary principal for each. Estimations were indicated by the use of a five-point interval scale, with "1" indicating greatest responsibility for the elementary principal and "5" indicating the least. Within the following table, Table 7, on pages 73 and 74, teacher responses are shown. Columns provide number of responses within each category, the percent of response represented, and the mean response score for each of the supervisory practice items. Because of serious stenographic error which has previously been explained, statistical analyses are offered for only nineteen of the supervisory techniques.

An attempt has been made to illustrate the supervisory responsibility that classroom teachers ascribed to the elementary principal. Based upon the mean scores of teacher response, nineteen of the twenty supervision practices have been arranged in rank order, with the item to which teachers indicated greatest responsibility listed first:

1. Orientation Meetings

Table 7

Teacher Estimation of Principal Responsibility
For Selected Supervisory Practices

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Classroom Visitations	69	38	38	21	56	31	08	04	06	03	2.118
2. Orientation Meetings	91	50	40	22	28	15	08	04	10	05	1.904
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	84	46	38	21	33	18	08	04	12	06	2.006
4. Workshops	18	10	28	15	61	34	36	20	34	18	3.226
5. Institutes	14	07	17	09	62	34	27	15	52	29	3.500
6. Large-group Meetings	38	21	28	15	47	26	32	17	30	16	2.931
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	89	49	24	13	24	13	12	06	27	15	2.227
8. Study Groups and Seminars	14	07	30	16	50	27	34	18	45	25	3.381
9. Committee Work	21	11	41	22	63	35	30	16	18	10	2.901

Table 7 (continued)

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
10. Bulletins	81	45	37	20	33	18	12	06	12	06	2.069
11. Resource Materials	40	22	47	26	52	29	22	12	15	08	2.573
12. Travel or Visiting Days	22	12	32	17	60	33	28	15	26	14	3.024
13. Experiments with materials, techniques, processes	41	22	46	25	50	27	15	08	22	12	2.603
14. Group Counseling	52	23	28	15	54	30	29	16	19	10	2.738
15. Demonstration Teaching	27	15	25	13	33	18	32	17	56	31	3.376
16. Individual Conferences	78	43	42	23	31	17	10	05	15	08	2.102
17. Study Councils	14	07	37	20	64	35	23	12	30	16	3.107
18. Interviews	48	26	39	21	44	24	17	09	23	12	2.579
19. Curriculum Guides	41	22	40	22	60	33	13	07	21	11	2.617

2. Pre-term Planning Meetings
3. Bulletins
4. Individual Conferences
5. Classroom Visitations
6. Whole-faculty Meetings
7. Resource Materials
8. Interviews
9. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes
10. Curriculum Guides
11. Group Counseling
12. Committee Work
13. Large-group Meetings
14. Travel or Visiting Days
15. Study Councils
16. Workshops
17. Study Groups and Seminars
18. Demonstration Teaching
19. Institutes

Using the nineteen supervisory techniques, elementary teachers were asked to predict future change in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. To facilitate computer programming, the original three-item scale (A = prediction of increased responsibility, B = no change in responsibility, and C = predicted decrease in supervi-

sory responsibility) was changed to a 1-2-3 scale of response. The tabulation in Table 8, page 77, represents the computer analysis of teacher response.

Based upon the mean score of teacher response, results appear consistent with professional literature which suggests that the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal will be increased in the future. Of the nineteen supervisory practices analyzed, teachers predicted increased responsibility for eighteen. Only for a single item (Large group Meetings) did the participating teachers predict a decreased responsibility. The data appeared to support the position that classroom teachers recognize the elementary school principal as an important member of the supervisory staff, and also predict that his supervisory responsibility will be increased in the future.

The final request of the survey instrument asked participating teachers to predict future changes in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. Using a three-point scale (A = increased responsibility, B = no change, and C = decreased responsibility) the participants offered predictions for change for each of the nineteen listed supervisory techniques.

To facilitate computer programming, the A-B-C scale was changed to a 1-2-3 scale. It was then arbitrarily determined that the numerical score of response could offer some evidence of predicted change, with small scores suggesting increased responsibility, a score of 2

Table 8

Teacher Estimation of Principal Responsibility

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Classroom Visitations	65	36	101	56	11	06	1.695
2. Orientation Meetings	58	32	109	60	10	05	1.729
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	71	39	96	53	08	04	1.640
4. Workshops	75	41	79	44	22	12	1.699
5. Institutes	41	22	98	54	30	16	1.935
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	31	17	106	59	36	20	2.029
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	34	18	115	64	26	14	1.954
8. Study Groups and Seminars	70	39	69	38	30	16	1.776
9. Committee Work	46	25	96	53	29	16	1.901
10. Bulletins	34	18	130	72	11	06	1.886
11. Resource Materials	81	45	74	41	19	10	1.644
12. Travel or Visiting Days	44	24	101	56	22	12	1.868
13. Experiments with materials, techniques, etc.	98	54	54	30	20	11	1.561
14. Group Counseling	78	43	67	37	27	15	1.703
15. Demonstration Teaching	65	36	78	43	31	17	1.805
16. Individual Conferences	79	44	81	45	15	08	1.648
17. Study Councils	43	24	102	56	32	11	1.880
18. Interviews	62	34	98	54	21	05	1.686
19. Curriculum Guides	71	39	82	45	09	11	1.718

predicting decreased responsibility for the elementary principal. On the basis of these presumptions, mean scores of response were determined and interpreted to provide a general analysis of response. In an attempt to graphically summarize elementary teacher response, the nineteen supervisory practices have been listed in ascending numerical order of mean response:

Supervisory Practices Ranked by Prediction for Increased
Responsibility

1. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, Processes (1.561)
2. Pre-term Planning Meetings (1.640)
3. Resource Materials (1.644)
4. Individual Conferences (1.647)
5. Interviews (1.686)
6. Classroom Visitations (1.695)
7. Workshops (1.699)
8. Group Counseling (1.704)
9. Curriculum Guides (1.718)
10. Orientation Meetings (1.729)
11. Study Groups and Seminars (1.776)
12. Demonstration Teaching (1.805)
13. Study Councils (1.880)
14. Travel or Visiting Days (1.868)
15. Bulletins (1.886)
16. Committee Work (1.901)

17. Institutes (1.935)
18. Whole-faculty Meetings (1.954)
19. Large-group Teacher Meetings (2.030)

The overall classroom teacher mean response of 1.775 provided some evidence that elementary teachers predicted a general increase in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. Analysis of mean response scores suggested a teacher prediction of decreased responsibility for only one supervisory technique--Large-group Meetings---and also suggested greatest prediction of increased responsibility for the areas of Experiments with Materials, Pre-term Planning Meetings, and Resource Materials.

Summary

After public elementary schools of twelve or more teachers had been identified in the 1969-70 Montana Education Directory, a method of random replacement sampling was used to select 219 classroom teachers for participation in the study. Responses were received from 179 of the teachers, and represented a total return of 82.5 percent.

Assembled information compiled from history sheet responses provided some evidence that the typical respondent in the study was employed in an elementary school of more than twelve teachers, had previous teaching experience of between five and sixteen years, had served in the present teaching position for between three and ten years, and was between the ages of thirty-five and forty-five years. The

compiled responses also provided evidence that the typical respondent had no professional experience in either junior or senior high schools, would choose a career in teaching again, had an earned bachelor's degree, taught in a community of between 10,000 and 20,000 persons, and generally felt that the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal would be increased in the future.

When asked to estimate the responsibility of the elementary principal for twenty specified supervisory practices, the responding teachers provided information which suggested that elementary teachers consider the elementary principal to be a responsible supervisor of instruction.

One of the suggested supervisory practices was omitted because of clerical error, and teacher response indicated important supervisory responsibility for the elementary school principal for thirteen of the remaining nineteen practices. The response indicated greatest estimated responsibility for Institutes, Demonstration Teaching, Study Groups and Seminars, and Workshops. Less supervisory responsibility was estimated for Orientation Meetings, Pre-term Planning Meetings, and Bulletins.

When asked to predict changes in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal, participating classroom teachers generally indicated an increased responsibility on eighteen of the nineteen supervisory techniques. Only on one item, Large-group Meetings, could teacher response be interpreted to predict decreased future responsibility.

Analysis of classroom teacher response appears to permit the general assumption that the elementary principal is considered an important member of the supervisory team, and that elementary teachers anticipate an increase in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal in the future.

Chapter 4

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF PRINCIPAL RESPONSE

The "Standards for Accreditation of Montana Elementary Schools", distributed by the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (60:4) in March, 1970, recommends that:

1. Schools employing eight to twelve teachers shall be administered by a qualified, certified, elementary principal who devotes at least one-half of each school day to supervision and for whom adequate clerical assistance is provided (emphasis added).
2. Schools employing more than twelve and fewer than twenty-one teachers shall be administered by a full-time qualified, certified, elementary principal for whom adequate clerical assistance is provided (emphasis added).

Upon the basis of these recommendations, the writer arbitrarily determined Montana elementary schools with programs of supervision to be those of twelve or more classroom teachers. Public elementary schools of that size were identified in the 1969-1970 Montana Education Directory and those schools were selected for inclusion in this study. Upon receipt of written permission from superintendents of the districts selected, letters of explanation and survey materials were sent to the elementary principals of each Montana public elementary school of twelve or more classroom teachers. Because the entire population of principals was included in the study, no sampling procedure was used. Of the 156 elementary principals who received the survey materials, six were later omitted because they also served as district superintendent, eight

failed to respond, and 143 completed and returned the materials. Total response for elementary principals was 91.7 percent.

As explained earlier, totaled tabulations did not consistently equal 100 percent because of rounded percent reports, omitted responses, and the possibility of multiple responses by single respondents.

The first items of the history sheet asked elementary principals to indicate the length of time they had served in their present positions. Analysis of the principal response is provided in Table 9.

Table 9
Length of Service in Present Position
Elementary Principal Responses

Categories	Number	Percent *
1. Less than 3 years	39	27%
2. 3 - 6 years	32	22%
3. 7 - 10 years	25	17%
4. 11 - 14 years	15	10%
5. 15 - 18 years	17	11%
6. Over 18 years	15	10%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

The writer noted that the largest response from the elementary principals was in the category which reported less than three years, and that the majority of responding principals had served in their

present positions less than eleven years. It was also noted that nearly one-third of the responding principals had served more than ten years in their school positions.

When asked to report those education positions in which they had previously served, the responding elementary principals provided the following information:

Table 10
Previous Education Positions Held By
Elementary Principals

Previous Positions	Number	Percent *
1. Elementary Teacher	122	85%
2. Elementary Principal	98	68%
3. Junior High School Teacher	78	54%
4. Junior High School Principal	25	17%
5. High School Teacher	48	33%
6. High School Principal	15	10%
7. Superintendent	19	13%
8. Other	15	10%

* Categories are not mutually exclusive

Although only 18 percent of the elementary teachers participating in the study had reported any previous experience in secondary schools, elementary principals supplied information which provided

evidence that a total of 54 percent of those responding had previously served as junior high school teachers, 33 percent had previously been high school teachers, and 13 percent were ex-superintendents. Most of those principals who responded, however, did report previous experience as elementary teachers.

Elementary principals were next asked to report their total years of professional service. Although two elementary principals reported total professional service of less than five years, the majority of responding principals (57 percent) reported more than sixteen years of service in education. A detailed analysis of response is provided in the following table.

Table 11
Total Years of Professional Service
of Elementary Principals

Total Years	Number	Percent *
1. Less than 5 years	2	1%
2. 5 - 10 years	19	13%
3. 11 - 16 years	39	27%
4. 17 - 21 years	33	23%
5. More than 21 years	50	34%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

When asked to report their backgrounds of formal professional

preparation, all responding elementary principals indicated that they had earned college degrees. When asked to report the highest earned degree, the principals provided the following responses.

Table 12
Highest Degree Held by Elementary Principals

Highest Degree	Number	Percent *
1. None	0	0%
2. BA or BS	9	6%
3. MS or MA	129	90%
4. Specialist	3	2%
5. Doctorate	1	0%
6. Other	1	0%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

It was noted that the vast majority (90 percent) of the responding elementary principals had earned Masters degrees, that only nine had not met Montana requirements for the administrator's certificate, and that only five elementary principals had earned degrees beyond the Masters degree.

When asked to report the size of the community being served by their school building, elementary principals provided the responses which have been tabulated in Table 13, page 87.

Table 13

Populations of Communities Served by
Reporting Elementary Principals

Community Size	Number	Percent *
1. Less than 5,000	40	27%
2. 5,000 - 10,000	21	14%
3. 10,000 - 15,000	11	7%
4. 15,000 - 20,000	4	2%
5. 20,000 - 25,000	3	2%
6. Over 25,000	64	44%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

The 1970-71 Montana Education Directory states that more than half of the operating public elementary schools in the State employ more than three classroom teachers (70:10). The responses of elementary principals, indicating that nearly half of their number (44 percent) serve communities with populations in excess of 25,000, was considered consistent with the Montana Education Directory and was also considered to suggest that many Montana elementary schools of twelve or more classroom teachers are situated in larger cities of the State.

Although 122 of the responding elementary principals indicated their willingness to choose a career in education again, their positive response (85 percent) was below the positive response level of classroom

teachers (95 percent). Six principals failed to respond to the item, and fifteen (10 percent) offered a negative response.

The final request asked the elementary principals to indicate their present age. No principals reported their ages to be under twenty-five years, and the largest group indicated their ages to be between fifty and fifty-five years. Analysis of the principal responses tends to suggest that elementary principals are slightly older than the elementary classroom teachers. Tabulations of principal response follow.

Table 14
Reported Ages of Responding Elementary Principals

Age Categories	Number	Percent *
1. Under 25 years	0	0%
2. 25 - 30 years	6	4%
3. 30 - 35 years	16	11%
4. 35 - 40 years	23	16%
5. 40 - 45 years	26	18%
6. 45 - 50 years	17	11%
7. 50 - 55 years	33	23%
8. Over 55 years	22	15%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

Upon receipt of permission by the school district superintendent, all elementary principals of schools containing twelve or more classroom teachers were sent survey materials identical to those provided superintendents and elementary classroom teachers. After the history sheet had been completed, each elementary principal was asked to complete the survey form which asked that the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal be estimated for nineteen selected supervisory practices. Using a five-point scale for each of the practices (1 = greatest, 5 = least responsibility), the principals provided the responses which have been tabulated in Table 15, pages 90 and 91.

Mean scores of elementary principal response indicated that various levels of responsibility were reported for the supervisory practices provided by the survey form. The mean score of 1.683 suggested that elementary principals considered classroom visitations to be a primary responsibility for their position. The mean score of 3.496 for institutes suggested, on the other hand, that of the twenty suggested techniques, elementary principals felt least responsible for that supervisory practice.

To illustrate the relative supervisory responsibility that the elementary principals identified for their positions, the nineteen supervisory practices have been listed in their order of mean scores. Beginning with classroom visitations, the technique for which elementary principals felt the greatest responsibility, the supervisory practices

Table 15

Analysis of Elementary Principal Estimates
of Supervisory Responsibility

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Classroom Visitations	93	65	18	12	20	13	05	03	06	04	1.683
2. Orientation Meetings	41	28	49	34	33	23	15	10	04	02	2.239
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	52	36	39	27	37	25	09	06	06	04	2.147
4. Workshops	16	11	28	19	49	34	35	24	12	08	2.993
5. Institutes	08	05	19	13	41	28	35	24	34	23	3.496
6. Large-group Meetings	10	06	26	18	48	33	36	25	20	13	3.214
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	45	31	30	20	37	25	19	13	10	06	2.426
8. Study Groups and Seminars	13	09	36	25	50	34	27	18	14	09	2.950
9. Committee Work	17	11	52	36	47	32	16	11	08	05	2.614

Table 15 (continued)

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
10. Bulletins	43	30	43	30	31	21	16	11	08	05	2.312
11. Resource Materials	40	27	50	34	34	23	14	09	03	02	2.220
12. Travel or Visiting Days	28	19	37	25	41	28	18	12	15	10	2.676
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, Processes	42	29	46	32	38	26	12	08	03	02	2.206
14. Group Counseling	17	11	37	25	47	32	24	16	13	09	2.885
15. Demonstration Teaching	12	08	36	25	53	37	17	11	22	15	3.007
16. Individual Conferences	71	49	44	30	13	09	09	06	05	03	1.860
17. Study Councils	12	08	30	20	50	34	26	18	21	14	3.101
18. Interviews	32	22	35	24	35	24	15	10	24	16	2.745
19. Curriculum Guides	28	19	39	27	43	30	19	13	12	08	2.631

have been ranked according to principal response:

1. Classroom visitations
2. Individual Conferences
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings
4. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes
5. Resource Materials
6. Orientation Meetings
7. Bulletins
8. Whole-faculty Meetings
9. Committee Work
10. Curriculum Guides
11. Travel or Visiting Days
12. Interviews
13. Group Counseling
14. Study Groups and Seminars
15. Workshops
16. Demonstration Teaching
17. Study Councils
18. Large-Group Meetings
19. Institutes

Using the nineteen-item list of suggested supervisory techniques, elementary principals were finally asked to predict future changes in supervisory responsibility. A three-point scale (A = increased

responsibility, B = no change, and C = decreased responsibility) was used to gather information, but was then transformed to a 1-2-3 numerical scale to facilitate computer programming.

Table 16, page 94, provided analyses of elementary principal response.

It was then arbitrarily determined that mean scores of response could provide some information concerning principal prediction of change in supervisory responsibility. Because 2.0 was established as the middle position indicating a prediction of no change, it was determined that mean scores smaller than 2.0 could be interpreted to suggest a prediction of increased responsibility; similarly, mean scores greater than 2.0 were interpreted to suggest a prediction of decreased supervisory responsibility for the elementary principal.

Based upon the mean scores of response shown in the right column of Table 16, the following interpretations were made: (1) mean scores smaller than 2.0 identify those supervisory practices for which elementary principals predicted increased responsibility, (2) mean scores greater than 2.0 identify the supervisory practices for which the principals predicted decreased supervisory responsibility, and (3) because eighteen of the nineteen mean scores were smaller than 2.0, it was determined that elementary principals generally provided evidence suggesting a prediction of increased supervisory responsibility for the elementary school principal.

Table 16

Elementary Principal Prediction of Future
Supervisory Responsibility

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Classroom Visitations	57	39	56	39	25	17	1.768
2. Orientation Meetings	47	32	86	60	05	03	1.696
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	75	52	57	39	07	04	1.510
4. Workshops	69	48	56	39	12	08	1.584
5. Institutes	41	28	71	49	23	16	1.867
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	22	15	83	58	33	23	2.080
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	23	16	96	67	19	13	1.971
8. Study Groups and Seminars	54	37	61	42	22	15	1.766
9. Committee Work	51	35	65	45	21	14	1.781
10. Bulletins	30	20	94	65	14	09	1.884
11. Resource Materials	77	53	45	31	15	10	1.547
12. Travel or Visiting Days	72	50	57	39	07	04	1.522
13. Experiments, with Materials, Processes	92	64	39	27	07	04	1.384
14. Group Counseling	41	28	68	47	28	19	1.905
15. Demonstration Teaching	45	31	54	37	38	26	1.949
16. Individual Conferences	71	49	64	44	04	02	1.518
17. Study Councils	42	29	81	56	13	09	1.787
18. Interviews	65	45	66	46	06	04	1.569
19. Curriculum Guides	61	42	54	37	21	14	1.706

For only one supervisory practice, Large-group Teacher Meetings, did a mean response score greater than 2.0 provide evidence of predicted decrease in responsibility. It was, therefore, presumed that the responses provided by the 143 participating elementary principals tended to support the belief that elementary principals will continue to be considered important members of the supervisory school staff.

On the basis of those presumptions, the nineteen supervisory techniques have been listed in an ascending numerical order of predicted change:

1. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, Processes (1.384)
2. Pre-term Planning Meetings (1.511)
3. Individual Conferences (1.518)
4. Travel or Visiting Days (1.522)
5. Resource Materials (1.547)
6. Interviews (1.569)
7. Workshops (1.584)
8. Orientation Meetings (1.696)
9. Curriculum Guides (1.706)
10. Study Groups and Seminars (1.766)
11. Classroom Visitations (1.768)
12. Committee Work (1.781)
13. Study Councils (1.787)
14. Institutes (1.867)

15. Bullétins (1.884)
16. Group Counseling (1.905)
17. Demonstration Teaching (1.949)
18. Whole-faculty Meetings (1.971)
19. Large-group Teacher Meetings (2.080)

The evidence presented, based upon the assumption that mean scores are indicative of predicted change, suggested that elementary principals anticipated the greatest increase in responsibility for: Experiments with Materials, Pre-term Planning Meetings, Individual Conferences, and Travel or Visiting Days. Smallest increase was predicted for: Group Counseling, Demonstration Teaching, and Whole-faculty Meetings. A small decrease in responsibility was predicted for Large-group Teacher Meetings.

The average response score for elementary principals (1.722) was interpreted to provide some evidence that elementary principals predicted generally increased supervisory responsibility in the future.

Summary

From the 1969-70 Montana Education Directory, 156 Montana elementary principals serving schools of twelve or more teachers were identified and asked to participate in the study of elementary supervision. The principal response of 91.7 percent indicated encouraging interest and cooperation from the principal group. The information gathered by the history sheet form provided evidence to suggest that many Montana

elementary principals had served in their present positions for more than three years, had previously taught as an elementary and junior high school teacher, had an earned Masters degree, and had more than ten years of total professional service. Most responding elementary principals served communities of less than 5,000 or more than 25,000 people, would willingly choose a career in education again, and were between the ages of forty and fifty years.

When responding to the request that they estimate the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal for nineteen selected supervisory practices, principals generally indicated important responsibility for their position. On a five-point scale, principals estimated the supervisory responsibility to be beyond the midpoint for sixteen of the supervisory practices. For only four of the nineteen items did elementary principals estimate responsibility lower than the middle point on the scale.

Interpretation of principal response suggested that greatest supervisory responsibility was recognized for: Classroom Visits, Individual Conferences, and Pre-term Planning Meetings. Principal response reflected less recognized responsibility for Institutes, Large-group Meetings, and Study Councils.

Chapter 5

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF SUPERINTENDENT RESPONSE

An examination of the 1969-70 Montana Education Directory revealed that all Montana public elementary schools of twelve or more classroom teachers were located within sixty-eight school districts. In April of 1970, permission slips, letters of explanation, and sample survey forms were mailed to the district superintendents of those school districts selected for participation in this study. Telephone conversations and follow-up letters provided written permission from sixty district superintendents to include their schools in this study of elementary principal's supervisory practices. Of the sixty-eight districts included in the initial selection, six failed to respond and two were removed from the study when it was learned that the positions of superintendent and elementary principal were served by single individuals. Total participation of selected school districts was 91 percent.

In order to assemble information which could provide a valid comparison of response among the three educator groups, identical survey materials were distributed to participating teachers, principals, and superintendents. Personal information concerning school district superintendents was assembled from survey forms completed by participating administrators. As explained in earlier chapters, tabulated results could not consistently total 100 percent.

When asked, "How long have you served in your present position?" the district superintendents provided the following responses:

Table 17
Superintendent Report of Years
In Present Position

Year categories	Number	Percent *
1. Less than 3 years	20	33%
2. 3 - 6 years	18	30%
3. 7 - 10 years	6	10%
4. 11 - 14 years	6	10%
5. 15 - 18 years	2	3%
6. More than 18 years	7	11%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

District superintendents appeared to be a mobile group of educators for one-third of their group reported less than three years in their present positions, more than half of the group reported less than seven years, and nearly three-fourths of the superintendent group reported less than eleven years in their present positions.

The second request of the history sheet asked superintendents to indicate educational positions in which they had served previously. Their responses are summarized in Table 18, page 100, which is an analysis of previous professional experience.

Table 18

Previous Educational Positions Held By
Responding District Superintendents

Previous positions	Number	Percent *
1. Elementary Teacher	29	48%
2. Elementary Principal	26	43%
3. Junior High School Teacher	29	48%
4. Junior High School Principal	14	23%
5. High School Teacher	47	78%
6. High School Principal	36	60%
7. Superintendent	47	78%
8. Other	12	20%

* Categories are not mutually exclusive

Of the eight educational positions specified, the responding district superintendents reported smallest amounts of previous experience in the positions of elementary and junior high school principalships. Nearly half of the superintendents reported previous experience as elementary and junior high school teachers, but the largest response (78 percent) reported previous experience as district superintendent or high school teacher.

School superintendents were next asked to report the total number of years that they had served in the education profession. Their responses suggested that superintendents are an experienced group of

educators, for only three reported less than ten years of experience, while 78 percent of those responding reported more than sixteen years of experience in education. The following is a tabulated summary of superintendent responses to the item, "What is the total of your professional service?"

Table 19
Total Professional Service Reported By
Responding Superintendents

Experience categories	Number	Percent *
1. Less than 5 years	0	0%
2. 5 - 10 years	3	5%
3. 11 - 16 years	10	16%
4. 17 - 21 years	21	35%
5. More than 21 years	26	43%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

The chief administrators of the sixty participating school districts were next asked to respond to the question, "What is the highest degree that you hold?" Table 20, page 102, is an analysis of their responses.

Briefly, the results indicated that all district superintendents who participated in the study held at least a Bachelor's degree, 91 percent held earned Masters degrees, 3 percent had received their doctorate,

Table 20

Formal Preparation Reported By
District Superintendents

Highest degree	Number	Percent *
1. None	0	0%
2. BA or BS	1	1%
3. MS or MA	55	91%
4. Specialist	1	1%
5. Doctorate	2	3%
6. Other	1	1%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100% and 1 percent held the Specialist degree.

When asked, "What is the size of your community?", it was noted that the majority of district superintendents (61 percent) reported their community to contain less than 5,000 people. It was also noted that, in contrast to responses of teachers and principals, only 8 percent of the responding superintendents represented communities of more than 25,000 people.

Fifty-one superintendents (85 percent) offered an affirmative response when asked if they would choose a career in education again. Five superintendents (8 percent) said that they would not.

When district superintendents responded to the question, "What

is your present age?", it was noted that only 7 percent of those responding were under thirty-five years of age, that 80 percent were over forty years of age, and that more than half of the superintendents were over forty-five years of age. No superintendents reported an age under twenty-five years. The following is a tabulated summary of ages for responding superintendents.

Table 21

Reported Ages of District Superintendents

Age categories	Number	Percent *
1. Under 25 years of age	0	0%
2. 25 - 30	1	1%
3. 30 - 35	4	6%
4. 35 - 40	6	10%
5. 40 - 45	15	25%
6. 45 - 50	10	16%
7. 50 - 55	6	10%
8. Over 55 years of age	18	30%

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100% .

School district superintendents who participated in the study completed survey instruments identical to those used by the elementary teacher and principal groups. Using a five-point ranking scale (1 = greatest responsibility, 5 = least) superintendents were asked to

estimate the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal for nineteen suggested supervisory techniques. Their responses have been tabulated in Table 22, pages 105 and 106, to provide the following information: (1) supervisory practice, (2) the number of superintendents responding in each of the five categories, (3) percent of superintendents responding in each of the five categories, and (4) mean response score for each of the listed supervisory practices.

Interpretations of superintendent response were based upon the computed mean scores. With 3.0 as the middle point on the five-point response scale, it was determined that a mean response score smaller than 3.0 would identify those supervisory practices for which superintendents felt important responsibility for the elementary principal. A mean response greater than 3.0, on the other hand, was interpreted to identify those supervisory practices for which the superintendents felt the elementary principal to be less responsible. The mean scores of superintendent response indicated that those administrators perceived elementary principals to have greatest responsibility for the supervisory practices of Classroom Visitations and Individual Conferences, but to have least responsibility for the practices of Institutes and Large-group Meetings. Because the mean response of superintendents was smaller than 3.0 for eighteen of the nineteen selected supervisory techniques, it was concluded that district superintendents did recognize elementary principals as important members of a school district supervi-

Table 22

Analysis of District Superintendent Response
Of Perceived Responsibility

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Classroom Visitations	45	75	09	15	03	05	00	00	03	05	1.450
2. Orientation Meetings	15	25	18	30	20	33	04	06	02	03	2.322
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	16	26	19	31	14	23	07	11	03	05	2.356
4. Workshops	07	11	14	23	23	38	11	18	04	06	2.847
5. Institutes	03	05	13	21	19	31	10	16	13	21	3.293
6. Large-group Meetings	05	08	19	31	18	30	07	11	11	18	3.000
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	12	20	16	26	11	18	09	15	11	18	2.847
8. Study groups and seminars	04	06	18	30	22	36	12	20	02	03	2.828
9. Committee work	09	15	16	26	26	43	05	08	03	05	2.610

Table 22 (continued)

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
10. Bulletins	14	23	16	26	16	26	10	16	03	05	2.525
11. Response Materials	17	28	17	28	11	18	11	18	03	05	2.423
12. Travel or Visiting Days	07	11	10	16	31	51	09	15	02	03	2.814
13. Experiments With Materials, Techniques, Processes	18	30	13	21	25	41	02	03	02	03	2.283
14. Group Counseling	05	08	12	20	25	41	10	16	04	06	2.929
15. Demonstration Teaching	10	16	16	26	18	30	10	16	04	06	2.690
16. Individual Conferences	34	56	10	16	08	13	02	03	05	08	1.881
17. Study Councils	07	11	09	15	30	50	07	11	05	08	2.897
18. Interviews	07	11	18	30	20	33	09	15	05	08	2.780
19. Curriculum Guides	15	25	21	35	16	26	06	10	02	03	2.317

sory staff. It seemed reasonable to assume that elementary principals were expected by district superintendents to perform in a supervisory capacity in Montana public elementary schools.

Based upon the analysis of superintendent perceptions, the nineteen supervisory practices were ranked in order of mean response scores. They have been listed here in the order in which superintendents expressed supervisory responsibility for the elementary principal.

1. Classroom Visitations
2. Individual Conferences
3. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes
4. Curriculum Guides
5. Orientation Meetings
6. Pre-term Planning Meetings
7. Resource Materials
8. Bulletins
9. Demonstration Teaching
10. Committee Work
11. Interviews
12. Travel or Visiting Days
13. Study Groups and Seminars
14. Whole-faculty Meetings
15. Workshops
16. Study Councils

17. Group Counseling
18. Large-group Meetings
19. Institutes

Using the same list of nineteen supervisory practices, the district superintendents were finally asked to predict future change in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. On a three-point scale (A = increased responsibility, B = no change, and C = decreased responsibility, the superintendents were asked to predict change. The analysis of response in Table 23, pages 109 and 110, provides frequency distribution, the percent of superintendents who responded in each of the three categories, and the mean response score for each of the nineteen selected supervisory techniques.

Because the middle point on the three-point scale indicated a prediction for no change in supervisory responsibility, mean response scores smaller than 2.0 were used to identify those supervisory practices for which superintendents predicted increased responsibility for the elementary principal. Similarly, mean scores of response greater than 2.0 were used to identify those supervisory techniques for which superintendents predicted decreased responsibility for elementary principals. Analysis of mean scores of superintendent response suggested a prediction of generally increased supervisory responsibility. Greatest responsibility was predicted for the following supervisory practices: Curriculum Guides, Individual Conferences, Classroom Visitations,

Table 23

Supervisory Responsibility Change Predicted by Superintendents

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Classroom Visitations	33	55	25	41	00	00	1.431
2. Orientation Meetings	20	33	37	61	00	00	1.469
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	22	36	34	56	01	01	1.632
4. Workshops	27	45	27	45	03	05	1.579
5. Institutes	15	25	31	51	10	16	1.911
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	11	18	38	63	09	15	1.966
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	10	16	43	71	04	06	1.895
8. Study Groups and Seminars	25	41	27	45	04	06	1.625
9. Committee Work	24	40	30	50	03	05	1.632

Table 23 (continued)

Supervisory practice	1		2		3		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
10. Bulletins	09	15	40	66	08	13	1.982
11. Resource Materials	30	50	24	40	03	05	1.526
12. Travel or Visiting Days	22	36	31	51	04	06	1.684
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	32	53	22	36	04	06	1.517
14. Group Counseling	15	25	34	56	07	11	1.857
15. Demonstration Teaching	21	35	26	43	10	16	1.807
16. Individual Conferences	33	55	24	40	01	01	1.448
17. Study Councils	17	28	35	58	04	06	1.768
18. Interviews	25	41	29	48	02	03	1.589
19. Curriculum Guides	35	58	22	36	01	01	1.414

and Orientation Meetings. Although superintendents predicted increased supervisory responsibility for all of the selected techniques, the smallest evidence of predicted increase was shown for the practices of Institutes, Large-group Meetings, and Bulletins.

It was determined that the analysis of superintendent responses tended to support the belief that the elementary school principal is considered an important member of the school district supervisory staff.

The final request of the survey instruments asked that responding district superintendents predict future change in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. Through use of a three-point scale (A = increased responsibility, B = no change, and C = decreased responsibility), the superintendents predicted changes in supervisory responsibility that elementary principals would have for the nineteen supervision practices listed on the survey form. To facilitate computer programming and to accommodate numerical designations for mean response scores, the A-B-C scale was converted to a 1-2-3 scale.

It was then arbitrarily determined that a mean score of response of 2.0 for a designated supervisory technique would predict no change in responsibility, and that mean scores smaller than 2.0 would provide some evidence of predicted increase in supervisory responsibility. Mean scores larger than 2.0 were interpreted to offer evidence of predicted decrease in responsibility. On the basis of those assumptions, the nineteen supervisory practices were listed in order of predicted change,

from greatest to least. Note that because of identical scores two items have been identically numbered. In order of ascending numerical mean response score, they appear in the following order:

1. Curriculum Guides (1.414)
2. Classroom Visitations (1.431)
3. Individual Conferences (1.448)
4. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes (1.517)
5. Resource Materials (1.526)
6. Workshops (1.579)
7. Interviews (1.589)
8. Study Groups and Seminars (1.625)
9. Committee Work (1.63158)
9. Pre-term Planning Meetings (1.63158)
10. Orientation Meetings (1.649)
11. Travel or Visiting Days (1.68421)
12. Study Councils (1.768)
13. Demonstration Teaching (1.807)
14. Group Counseling (1.857)
15. Whole-faculty Meetings (1.895)
16. Institutes (1.911)
17. Large Group Teacher Meetings (1.966)
18. Bulletins (1.982)

A composite mean score of response for district superintendents (1.679) provided some evidence that these educators generally predicted an increase in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary school principal. Although two items were ranked ninth because of identical mean scores, it was generally concluded that school superintendents provided greatest prediction of responsibility for the supervisory practices of Curriculum Guides, Classroom Visits, and Individual Conferences. Superintendents predicted no decrease in responsibility for any of the listed practices, but anticipated the smallest increases for the practices of Institutes, Large-group Teacher Meetings, and Bulletins. It appeared reasonable to conclude the school superintendents anticipated continued important supervisory responsibility for the elementary principal.

Summary

From the Montana Education Directory, sixty-eight school districts were identified as those containing elementary schools of twelve or more classroom teachers. The superintendents of the those districts were asked to participate in the study and to provide permission to include elementary principals and teachers in the distribution of survey materials. Names of two superintendents were removed because they also served as elementary principals, six failed to respond, and sixty provided permission and participated in the study. Total response of the superintendents represented 91 percent of those selected.

Information provided by the history sheet responses indicated that the typical responding superintendent had served in his present position for less than ten years, had previous experience as a superintendent and secondary school teacher, had total professional experience of more than seventeen years, and held the Masters degree. The typical participating superintendent heading a district serving a community of less than 5,000 people would choose a career in education again and was slightly less than forty-five years of age.

Tabulated results of study responses received from district superintendents indicated that head administrators considered the elementary principals important supervisors for eighteen of the nineteen supervisory practices listed. The superintendents indicated greatest principal responsibility for Classroom Visits and Individual Conferences, and least responsibility for Large-group Meetings and Institutes.

Although the superintendents predicted small increases in the principal responsibility for Institutes, Large-group Teacher Meetings, and Bulletins, mean of response scores generally indicated a prediction of increased responsibility for all of the supervisory techniques listed. It would appear reasonable to assume that the participating superintendents considered a program of supervision to be an obligation of the elementary principal.

Chapter 6

STATISTICAL COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS

Chapters three, four, and five have provided summaries of response of the three educator groups. Chapter six includes results of Chi Square tests of the stated hypotheses and a descriptive comparison of responses of the study participants.

J. P. Guilford (33:143) has stated that sample groups of thirty or more tend to produce mean responses similar to those of populations from which they were drawn. Therefore, participating groups of Montana educators (179 teachers, 143 elementary principals, and 60 district superintendents) were considered large enough to be considered representative of the three groups of Montana educators participating in programs of elementary supervision.

Personal and Professional Information

When requested to indicate the number of years they had been serving in their present professional positions, participants from the three educator groups provided the information in Table 24, page 116.

Within each group, 10 percent reported eleven to fourteen years of service in their present positions, and many study participants reported less than seven years (60 percent of teachers, 49 percent of principals, and 63 percent of the superintendents). Only 15 percent of the teachers, 21 percent of the principals, and 14 percent of the

Table 24

Three-group Comparison of Years In
Present Education Position

Categories	Percent of teachers	Percent of principals	Percent of * superintendents
1. Less than 3 years	30	27	33
2. 3 - 6 years	30	22	30
3. 7 - 10 years	12	17	10
4. 11 - 14 years	10	10	10
5. 15 - 18 years	5	11	3
6. Over 18 years	10	10	11

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100% superintendents reported more than fourteen years of service in their present positions. It appeared reasonable to suggest that slightly less than half of the principals and more than half of the teachers and superintendents participating in the study had served in their present positions for less than seven years.

The Montana educators were then asked to indicate those professional positions in which they had served previously. The tabulation in Table 25, page 117, lists the eight category responses and also the percent of response for each of the three groups.

Table 25

Previous Position Comparison of Three
Educator Groups

Positions	Percent of teachers	Percent of principals	Percent of * Superintendents
1. Elem. Teacher	86	85	48
2. Elem. Principal	3	68	43
3. Jr. H.S. Teacher	12	54	48
4. Jr. H.S. Principal	0	17	23
5. H. S. Teacher	6	33	78
6. H. S. Principal	0	10	60
7. Superintendent	0	13	78
8. Other	8	10	20

* Categories are not mutually exclusive

Although many participants in the study had previous experience as elementary teachers (86 percent of teachers, 85 percent of principals, and 48 percent of superintendents), it was noted that elementary teachers had not shared in secondary education experience as had responding principals and superintendents. Of the responding elementary teachers, only 12 percent had previously served as junior high school teachers and only 6 percent had previously taught in a high school. In contrast, more than half (54 percent) of the elementary principals had been junior high school teachers, 17 percent had been junior high school principals,

and one-third (33 percent) of the elementary principals had previous experience as high school teachers.

The majority of the responding school superintendents reported previous professional service as superintendents (78 percent), as high school principals (60 percent), and as high school teachers (78 percent). It was interesting to note that 43 percent of the superintendents had previously served as elementary principals, and that 85 percent of the elementary principals had previously served as elementary classroom teachers. One encouraging conclusion suggested that elementary principals generally have broad backgrounds of professional experience which should provide advantages in their professional relationships with elementary teachers and school district superintendents.

Of the three educator groups included in the study, superintendents reported the most years of professional experience, followed by elementary principals and classroom teachers. When responses had been tabulated, it was noted that more than half (56 percent) of the elementary teachers who responded reported less than eleven years of experience and that, in contrast, many elementary principals (57 percent) reported more than sixteen years of experience. District superintendents reported largest amounts of experience with nearly half (43 percent) reporting more than twenty-one years. An analysis of responses from the three educator groups is shown in Table 26, page 119.

Table 26

Total Professional Experience Reported By
Three Educator Groups

Experience	Percent of teachers	Percent of principals	Percent of * superintendents
1. Less than 5 years	31	1	0
2. 5 - 10 years	25	13	5
3. 11 - 16 years	13	27	16
4. 17 - 21 years	10	23	35
5. More than 21 years	18	34	43

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

Consistent with years of experience in education and in keeping with Montana certification requirements, it was found that district superintendents and elementary principals reported higher levels of formal preparation than did elementary teachers. Analysis of response is provided in Table 27, page 120.

From the tabulated responses it appeared reasonable to suggest that more than 92 percent of the elementary teachers held Bachelors degrees, more than 92 percent of the elementary principals held Masters degrees, and more than 95 percent of the superintendents held Masters degrees.

The relationship between community size and teacher-principal-superintendent ratio was pointed out by the survey item which asked

Table 27

Highest Degree Held as Reported by Three Educator Groups

Highest degree	Percent of teachers	Percent of principals	Percent of * superintendents
1. None	5	0	0
2. BA or BS	83	6	1
3. MA or MS	9	90	91
4. Specialist	0	2	1
5. Doctorate	0	0	3
6. Other	1	0	1

* Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

participants to indicate the size of the community in which they served. The analysis of response indicated that the largest groups of teachers and principals responded from communities of more than 25,000 people, while the largest group of superintendents reported a community size of less than 5,000 people. Table 28, page 121, provides a summary of responses.

It appeared reasonable to draw two obvious but important conclusions from the tabulated results: (1) participants in the study represented primarily those Montana communities of less than 10,000 or more than 25,000 persons, and that school districts and communities, regardless of size, are served and represented by a single district superintendent; (2) the importance of the superintendent, as a member

Table 28

Community Size of Responding Educators

Community size	Percent of teachers	Percent of principals	Percent of * superintendents
1. Less than 5,000	27	27	61
2. 5,000 - 10,000	11	14	20
3. 10,000 - 15,000	7	7	8
4. 15,000 - 20,000	1	2	1
5. 20,000 - 25,000	3	2	0
6. Over 25,000	46	44	8

*-Categories have been rounded and do not consistently total 100%

of the supervisory staff, is pointedly demonstrated by the evidence that the five superintendents, reporting from communities of more than 25,000 people, were associated professionally with the sixty-four elementary principals and eighty-four elementary classroom teachers who participated in the study.

When asked to indicate whether they would choose a career in education again, the Montana educators provided the responses listed in Table 29, page 122.

Although 10 percent of the elementary principals indicated that they would not choose a career in education again, the overwhelming majority of participants in each of the three groups seemed satisfied in their choice of professional careers.

Table 29

Educators Who Would Choose Education Career Again

Educator groups	Yes	No
1. Elementary Teachers	95%	3%
2. Elementary Principals	85%	10%
3. Superintendents	85%	8%

The final survey item concerning personal information asked the participating educators to indicate their present age on an eight-point scale. The analysis of responses is provided in the following table:

Table 30

Ages Reported by Responding Educators *

Age categories	Percent of teachers	Percent of principals	Percent of superintendents
1. Under 25 years	14	0	0
2. 25 - 30 years	22	4	1
3. 30 - 35 years	11	11	6
4. 35 - 40 years	8	16	10
5. 40 - 45 years	2	18	25
6. 45 - 50 years	12	1	16
7. 50 - 55 years	12	23	10
8. Over 55 years	14	15	30

* Rounded to nearest whole percent

The information concerning the present ages of the three educator groups was consistent with that concerning total professional experience and formal education. Interesting contrasts were noted, however, when present age statistics from the three educator groups were compared. It was interesting and informative to note that nearly one-half (47 percent) of the responding classroom teachers were below the age of thirty-five years, while only 15 percent of the principals and a mere 7 percent of the superintendents were reported in the same age categories. Contrasting age-group representations were found at the opposite range of age categories. It was found, for example, that less than half of the responding elementary teachers (48 percent) were more than thirty-five years of age. In contrast, it was found that 83 percent of the elementary principals and 91 percent of the district superintendents had reached their thirty-fifth birthdays. The general conclusion drawn from the comparison provides evidence that superintendents are followed by elementary principals and teachers in that order in age, education, and amount of professional experience.

On the second survey form, the three groups of educators were asked to estimate the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal for nineteen selected supervisory techniques. Based upon a five-point scale of response (1 = greatest responsibility, 5 = least responsibility) mean score of response was calculated for each of the supervisory practices and used to rank the nineteen practices according

to the estimates of the several educator groups. Within Table 31, page 125, the nineteen supervisory practices are listed in the order in which they appeared on the survey form. The rank positions shown in the educator-group columns indicate, by mean score of response, the supervisory responsibility ascribed to the elementary principal.

Rank placement of the nineteen specified supervisory techniques, as determined by the mean response scores of the three educator groups, provided some evidence of the perceptions held for the supervisory responsibility of the elementary school principal. Responses of elementary teachers provided contrasting rank placements for the practices of Classroom Visitations and Orientation Meetings. Although both superintendents and elementary principals had ranked Classroom Visitations first among the nineteen items, the classroom teachers ranked that particular practice fifth.

Contrasting placement was also shown for Orientation Meetings, which classroom teachers ranked first. The elementary principals and district superintendents had rank placements of sixth and fifth for that supervisory technique. Evidence also suggested that teachers perceived less responsibility for Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes than did the two administrator groups. Their rank placement of ninth contrasted with the fourth and third placements by principals and superintendents.

Although rank placement by elementary principals provided

Table 31

Mean Score Ranking of Responsibility for Nineteen
Supervisory Techniques as Perceived
By Three Educator Groups

Supervisory technique	Ranking by teachers	Ranking by principals	Ranking by superintendents
1. Classroom Visitations	5	1	1
2. Orientation Meetings	1	6	5
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	2	3	6
4. Workshops	16	15	15
5. Institutes	19	19	19
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	13	18	18
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	6	8	14
8. Study Groups and Seminars	17	14	13
9. Committee Work	12	9	10
10. Bulletins	3	7	8
11. Resource Materials	7	5	7
12. Travel or Visiting Days	14	11	12
13. Experiments with Materi- als, Techniques, etc.	9	4	3
14. Group Counseling	11	13	17
15. Demonstration Teaching	18	16	9
16. Individual Conferences	4	2	2
17. Study Councils	15	17	16
18. Interviews	8	12	11
19. Curriculum Guides	10	10	4

evidence of close similarity with one or both educator groups for all of the nineteen supervisory practices, important contrasts were noted when the rank placements by district superintendents were examined. Superintendents appeared to perceive greater supervisory responsibility for the elementary principal for the techniques of Curriculum Guides (fourth as contrasted by tenth position placement by the other two groups) and Individual Conferences (ninth compared to eighteenth and sixteenth placements by teachers and principals).

For Pre-term Planning Meetings and Whole-faculty Meetings, however, district superintendents appeared to ascribe less responsibility for the elementary principal than did the other two groups. Superintendent mean response ranking for the two practices were sixth for Pre-term Planning Meetings (compared to second and third for teacher and principal groups) and fourteenth for Whole-faculty Meetings (as contrasted by sixth and eighth placement positions by teachers and principals).

Important evidence of general agreement among the three educator groups was also provided by the rank placements of the supervisory practices. Based upon the five-position placement comparison, it was found that all three educator groups provided evidence of agreement of perceived responsibility for thirteen of the nineteen items included in the rank arrangement. The thirteen items of general agreement were:

- (1) Classroom Visitations, (2) Pre-term Planning Meetings, (3) Work-

shops, (4) Institutes, (5) Large-group Meetings, (6) Study Groups and Seminars, (7) Committee Work, (8) Bulletins, (9) Resource Materials, (10) Travel or Visiting Days, (11) Individual Conferences, (12) Study Councils, and (13) Interviews.

It was interesting to note that all three educator groups placed the practice of Institutes in the position of least importance (nineteenth) and that similarities and contrasts were found among the perceptions of the three group responses.

STATISTICAL TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG EDUCATOR GROUP PERCEPTIONS

To test the two null hypotheses and to statistically determine the existence of significant differences among the perceptions and predictions of the three educator groups, Chi Square tests of significant differences were used. It has been suggested by Smith (68:121) that that Chi Square analysis is an accepted method of determining whether differences between theoretical and observed frequencies can reasonably be attributed to chance variations in sampling.

It was determined that value would be found in the comparison of educator group pairs, and that important results could be obtained by the computation of six Chi Square comparisons for each of the nineteen listed supervisory practices. Three group pair comparisons (teacher-principal, teacher-superintendent, and principal-superintendent) were made to statistically analyze educator perceptions of principal super-

visory responsibility, and three similar group pair comparisons were completed to compare educator predictions for change.

After identical survey instruments had been completed and returned by participating educators, responses were tabulated and submitted for Chi Square analyses.

Ferguson (22:194-5) has stated that the null hypothesis is rejected when the computed Chi Square value is equal to or greater than the critical value at an accepted significance level at the proper degree of freedom. For the five-point response scale, it was determined that 4 degrees of freedom ($N-1$) be used, and that an obtained Chi Square value as large as 9.488 could occur by random sampling alone less than five times in one hundred (.05 level of confidence).

Based upon the obtained critical value provided by Guilford (33:582), it was considered reasonable to reject, with some degree of confidence, the null hypothesis for those survey items with a computed Chi Square value greater than 9.488. The Chi Square comparisons and computations have been provided in Table 32, page 129; Table 33, page 130; Table 34, page 131; and Table 35, pages 132 and 133.

Examination of the preceding tabulations suggested that for seven of the listed supervisory practices there were no significant differences of perceived responsibility among the three groups of Montana educators. The seven listed items providing no evidence of significant differences were: Workshops, Institutes, Committee Work,

Table 32

Chi Square Statistical Test of Significant Difference
Of Teacher - Principal Response
(.05 Level of Confidence)

Supervisory technique	Computed Chi Square	Significantly different *
1. Classroom Visitations	24.902	Yes
2. Orientation Meetings	21.378	Yes
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	6.677	No
4. Workshops	7.749	No
5. Institutes	6.953	No
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	14.949	Yes
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	23.701	Yes
8. Study Groups and Seminars	14.354	Yes
9. Committee Work	8.774	No
10. Bulletins	9.986	Yes
11. Resource Materials	9.894	Yes
12. Travel or Visiting Days	7.105	No
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	13.108	Yes
14. Group Counseling	10.316	Yes
15. Demonstration Teaching	28.656	Yes
16. Individual Conferences	9.262	No
17. Study Councils	1.651	No
18. Interviews	1.719	No
19. Curriculum Guides	5.249	No

* Based upon obtained Chi Square value of 9.488.

Table 33

Chi Square Statistical Test of Significant Difference
Of Teacher - Superintendent Response
(.05 Level of Confidence)

Supervisory technique	Computed Chi Square	Significantly different *
1. Classroom Visitations	28.820	Yes
2. Orientation Meetings	15.780	Yes
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	10.894	Yes
4. Workshops	6.239	No
5. Institutes	6.873	No
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	11.230	Yes
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	18.675	Yes
8. Study Groups and Seminars	16.028	Yes
9. Committee Work	4.879	No
10. Bulletins	12.660	Yes
11. Resource Materials	4.576	No
12. Travel or Visiting Days	8.465	No
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	8.951	No
14. Group Counseling	8.358	No
15. Demonstration Teaching	17.998	Yes
16. Individual Conferences	3.489	No
17. Study Councils	5.930	No
18. Interviews	8.906	No
19. Curriculum Guides	7.181	No

* Based upon obtained Chi Square value of 9.488.

Table 34

Chi Square Statistical Test of Significant Difference
Of Principal - Superintendent Response
(.05 Level of Confidence)

Supervisory technique	Computed Chi Square	Significantly different *
1. Classroom Visitations	5.955	No
2. Orientation Meetings	2.851	No
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	3.201	No
4. Workshops	1.353	No
5. Institutes	3.267	No
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	7.813	No
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	8.954	No
8. Study Groups and Seminars	2.793	No
9. Committee Work	3.148	No
10. Bulletins	2.326	No
11. Resource materials	4.844	No
12. Travel or Visiting Days	12.091	Yes
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	6.496	No
14. Group Counseling	2.304	No
15. Demonstration Teaching	6.571	No
16. Individual Conferences	7.013	No
17. Study Councils	6.143	No
18. Interviews	7.089	No
19. Curriculum Guides	3.519	No

* Based upon obtained Chi Square value of 9.488.

Table 35

Summary of Statistically Significant Differences Among
Superintendent-Principal-Teacher Responses

Supervisory technique	Teacher- superintendent	Teacher- principal	Superintendent- principal
1. Classroom Visitations	Yes	Yes	No
2. Orientation Meetings	Yes	Yes	No
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	Yes	No	No
4. Workshops	No	No	No
5. Institutes	No	No	No
6. Large-group Meetings	Yes	Yes	No
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	Yes	Yes	No
8. Study Groups and Seminars	Yes	Yes	No
9. Committee Work	No	No	No

Table 35 (continued)

Supervisory technique	Teacher- superintendent	Teacher- principal	Superintendent- principal
10. Bulletins	Yes	Yes	No
11. Resource Materials	No	Yes	No
12. Travel or Visiting Days	No	No	Yes
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	No	Yes	No
14. Group Counseling	No	Yes	No
15. Demonstration Teaching	Yes	Yes	No
16. Individual Conferences	No	No	No
17. Study Councils	No	No	No
18. Interviews	No	No	No
19. Curriculum Guides	No	No	No

Individual Conferences, Study Councils, Interviews, and Curriculum Guides. Results of statistical analysis also suggested that of the nineteen supervisory practices five provided evidence of significant difference between one group pair comparison, seven provided evidence of significant difference in two group pair comparisons, but that there was no evidence of significant difference in three group pair comparisons for any of the listed supervisory techniques.

General analysis of group pair comparisons provided evidence that important and significant differences did exist between the three educator groups. The greatest number of statistically significant differences appeared to exist between elementary classroom teachers and elementary principals, for significant differences were shown for ten of the nineteen listed supervisory practices. Similarly, it was found that significant differences existed between teachers and district superintendents for eight of the nineteen listed items. Important note was made of evidence which suggested significant difference between elementary principals and district superintendents for only one of the nineteen items--Travel or Visiting Days.

Briefly, tabulation of statistically significant differences of response suggested that important differences of perceived supervisory responsibility did exist between elementary teachers and the other two educator groups. Greatest significant differences were shown between the teacher and principal group responses. Finally, it was observed

that important similarities existed among the responses provided by the elementary principals and the school district superintendents.

The final request of the survey instruments asked that the three groups of educators provide a prediction-type response for each of the selected supervisory practices. Based upon a three-point scale (A = increased responsibility, B = no change, and C = decreased responsibility), participants were asked to predict future changes in the supervisory responsibility of elementary school principals. To facilitate computer programming, numerical values (1-2-3) were assigned to the categories of response.

It was then arbitrarily determined by the writer that a mean score of response smaller than 2.0 could be interpreted to suggest a prediction of increased responsibility; a mean response score greater than 2.0 was considered evidence of prediction for decreased responsibility. Based upon those assumptions, the mean scores of response (1.775 for teachers, 1.679 for superintendents, and 1.772 for principals) were considered evidence to suggest that all three groups of educators predicted increased supervisory responsibility for the elementary school principalship. Greatest increase was predicted by superintendents, and smallest increase was predicted by the classroom teachers. In only two instances did mean score responses indicate predicted decrease in responsibility. Classroom teachers and elementary principals provided overall mean scores greater than 2.0 for Large-group Teacher

Meetings.

An attempt was made to graphically compare mean score responses of the several educator groups. In Table 36, pages 137 and 138, the nineteen supervisory practices have been listed in the order in which they originally appeared on the survey instruments. Within the three columns that follow, numerical values have been determined for each technique to illustrate rank placement as determined by mean score of response.

The number "1" was used to identify the supervisory practice with the smallest computed mean score of response, and was interpreted to be that technique with evidence of greatest prediction for increase of responsibility. Conversely, the number "19" was used to identify the technique with the largest computed mean score of response and was interpreted to be that technique with evidence of least prediction for increase in supervisory responsibility.

Analysis of the tabulations provided evidence that the several educator groups held varying predictions for some of the selected supervisory techniques, with greatest variances found for: Travel or Visiting Days (14-4-11), Classroom Visitations (6-11-2), Pre-term Planning Meetings (2-2-9), and Curriculum Guides (9-9-1).

For other supervisory practices, however, evidence of general agreement among the educator groups was seen: Study Councils (13-13-12), Individual Conferences (4-3-3), Workshops (7-7-6), Resource Materials

Table 36

Ranking Comparison of Predicted Increase in Supervisory
Responsibility of Elementary Principals

Supervisory technique	Teacher ranking	Principal ranking	Superintendent ranking
1. Classroom Visitations	6	11	2
2. Orientation Meetings	10	8	10
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	2	2	* 9
4. Workshops	7	7	6
5. Institutes	17	14	16
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	19	19	17
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	18	18	15
8. Study Groups and Seminars	11	10	8
9. Committee Work	16	12	* 9

Table 36 (continued)

Supervisory technique	Teacher ranking	Principal ranking	Superintendent ranking
10. Bulletins	15	15	18
11. Resource Materials	3	5	5
12. Travel or Visiting Days	14	4	11
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	1	1	4
14. Group Counseling	8	16	14
15. Demonstration Teaching	12	17	13
16. Individual Conferences	4	3	3
17. Study Councils	13	13	12
18. Interviews	5	6	7
19. Curriculum Guides	9	9	1

* Two items ranked 9th because of identical mean scores of response

(3-5-5), Large-group Teacher Meetings (19-19-17), Whole-faculty Meetings (18-18-15), and Interviews (5-6-7).

When comparisons were made to determine agreement for predicted increase in supervisory responsibility, it was found that all educator groups predicted significant increase in responsibility for the supervisory practices of Individual Conferences (4-3-3), Resource Materials (3-5-5), Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes (1-1-4), and Interviews (5-6-7). It was also found that smaller prediction for increase in responsibility had been shown by all groups for: Study Councils (13-13-12), Demonstration Teaching (12-17-13), Bulletins (15-15-18), Whole-faculty Meetings (18-18-15), Institutes (17-14-16), and Large-group Teacher Meetings (19-19-17).

Upon the basis of the comparisons, it was concluded that evidence existed to suggest that educator groups predict greater increase in the supervisory responsibility for those techniques requiring leadership in the instructional processes. A smaller increase was suggested for those supervisory techniques required for large-group meetings, councils, and bulletins. Ben M. Harris (47:2) predicted in 1967 that the supervisory responsibility of the elementary school principal would be increased in the areas of instructional improvement activities and curriculum development. It appeared reasonable to conclude that the tabulation of the prediction-type responses of the three educator groups provided some evidence to support his prediction.

When the supervisory practices had been ranked according to mean scores of prediction-type responses and had been tabulated to facilitate comparisons among the three educator groups, it was noted that one group provided contrasting rank placements for four of the supervisory techniques: Classroom Visitations, Pre-term Planning Meetings, Travel or Visiting Days, and Curriculum Guides.

District superintendents appeared to differ in their predictions for five of the supervisory practices. They provided responses which ranked Classroom Visitations second, while principals and teachers provided responses which ranked that supervisory technique twelfth and sixth, respectively. Similarly, superintendent responses ranked Curriculum Guides first, while placement according to teacher and principal responses was ninth and tenth. The tabulations demonstrated one final difference in superintendent prediction of increased responsibility. For the supervisory technique of Pre-term Planning Meetings, the superintendents appeared to predict smaller increase than did the other two groups. Superintendent responses suggested a ranking of tenth, while the other two groups provided responses to suggest placement in the second position.

In only one instance did elementary school principals provide evidence of important difference in prediction of increased responsibility. Principal responses placed Travel or Visiting Days fourth in the ranking order, but the other two educator groups appeared to predict a

smaller increase in responsibility. Based upon their responses, the supervisory practice was ranked twelfth by superintendents and fifteenth by elementary teachers.

On only one of the nineteen supervisory practices did elementary teachers appear to differ seriously from the other two groups in the prediction of increase in supervisory responsibility. For the practice of Group Counseling, the elementary teachers provided responses which suggested important increase. Both principal and superintendent responses suggested a difference in prediction and also suggested that less increase in responsibility was anticipated. Elementary teacher responses had suggested a rank placement of eighth, while the responses of the superintendent and principal groups suggested placements of eighteenth and seventeenth positions.

The ranking and tabulation of the nineteen supervisory techniques appeared to suggest that the several educator groups did provide evidence of difference in prediction for four of the techniques listed

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF PREDICTION- TYPE RESPONSES OF EDUCATOR GROUPS

The Chi Square statistical tests of significant difference of response, as described earlier, were used in the final analysis of educator group response. For the three-point response format, the table of two degrees of freedom and the .05 level of confidence provided an obtained Chi Square value of 5.991 (Guilford, 33:582). The conclusion

was drawn that no more than five times in one hundred would random sampling alone provide computed Chi Square scores greater than 5.991; and, therefore, the null hypothesis of prediction was rejected with some confidence for those survey items for which a computed Chi Square value greater than 5.991 was found.

Within Table 37 (page 143), Table 38 (page 144), Table 39 (page 145), and Table 40 (pages 146 and 147), statistical results of significant differences are shown for the educator group pair comparisons for each of the selected supervisory techniques used in the survey instrument.

With the obtained Chi Square value determined with 2 degrees of freedom at the .05 level of confidence, sixty group pair comparisons were made of prediction-type responses of the three educator groups. Results of the computations provided evidence that significant differences of response existed between teachers and superintendents for four of the supervisory practices. Four significant differences were also shown for teacher-principal responses, with two supervisory techniques (Classroom Visitations and Group Counseling) reflecting significant differences between elementary teachers and the other two educator groups. Three of the listed practices (Classroom Visitations, Pre-term Planning Meetings, and Curriculum Guides) provided evidence that significant differences of response existed between the superintendent and elementary principal groups.

Table 37

Predicted Change in Principal Supervisory Responsibility
 Statistical Test of Teacher - Superintendent Response
 (Chi Square Test - .05 Level of Confidence)

Supervisory Technique	Computed Chi Square	Significantly different *
1. Classroom Visitations	9.455	Yes
2. Orientation Meetings	3.367	No
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	1.098	No
4. Workshops	2.382	No
5. Institutes	.159	No
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	.776	No
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	2.721	No
8. Study Groups and Seminars	3.774	No
9. Committee Work	7.481	Yes
10. Bulletins	3.559	No
11. Resource Materials	1.774	No
12. Travel or Visiting Days	3.819	No
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	1.516	No
14. Group Counseling	8.374	Yes
15. Demonstration Teaching	1.074	No
16. Individual Conferences	4.459	No
17. Study Councils	1.443	No
18. Interviews	1.240	No
19. Curriculum Guides	9.016	Yes

* Based upon obtained Chi Square value of 5.991.

Table 38

Predicted Change in Principal Supervisory Responsibility
 Statistical Test of Teacher - Principal Response
 (Chi Square Test - .05 Level of Confidence)

Supervisory technique	Computed Chi Square	Significantly different *
1. Classroom Visitations	14.257	Yes
2. Orientation Meetings	.714	No
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	6.070	Yes
4. Workshops	2.286	No
5. Institutes	1.454	No
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	.525	No
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	.557	No
8. Study Groups and Seminars	.446	No
9. Committee Work	3.800	No
10. Bulletins	2.050	No
11. Resource Materials	3.283	No
12. Travel or Visiting Days	23.848	Yes
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	5.202	No
14. Group Counseling	7.664	Yes
15. Demonstration Teaching	4.370	No
16. Individual Conferences	4.722	No
17. Study Councils	1.337	No
18. Interviews	3.608	No
19. Curriculum Guides	2.147	No

* Based upon obtained Chi Square value of 5.991.

Table 39

Predicted Change in Principal Supervisory Responsibility
 Statistical Test of Principal - Superintendent Response
 (Chi Square Test - .05 Level of Confidence)

Supervisory technique	Computed Chi Square	Significantly different *
1. Classroom Visitations	12.732	Yes
2. Orientation Meetings	2.121	No
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	6.019	Yes
4. Workshops	1.106	No
5. Institutes	.246	No
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	1.756	No
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	1.772	No
8. Study Groups and Seminars	2.729	No
9. Committee Work	3.765	No
10. Bulletins	1.280	No
11. Resource Materials	2.466	No
12. Travel or Visiting Days	3.314	No
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques and Processes	2.322	No
14. Group Counseling	2.440	No
15. Demonstration Teaching	2.254	No
16. Individual Conferences	.676	No
17. Study Councils	.322	No
18. Interviews	.235	No
19. Curriculum Guides	8.751	Yes

* Based upon obtained Chi Square value of 5.991.

Table 40

Predictions for Change in Supervisory Responsibility of Montana Elementary Principals:
A Summary of Statistically Significant Differences Among Educator Group Responses

Supervisory technique	Teacher- superintendent	Teacher- principal	Superintendent- principal
1. Classroom Visitations	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Orientation Meetings	No	No	No
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	No	Yes	Yes
4. Workshops	No	No	No
5. Institutes	No	No	No
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	No	No	No
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	No	No	No
8. Study Groups and Seminars	No	No	No
9. Committee Work	Yes	No	No

Table 40 (continued)

Supervisory technique	Teacher- superintendent	Teacher- principal	Superintendent- principal
10. Bulletins	No	No	No
11. Resource Materials	No	No	No
12. Travel or Visiting Days	No	Yes	No
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes	No	No	No
14. Group Counseling	Yes	Yes	No
15. Demonstration Teaching	No	No	No
16. Individual Conferences	No	No	No
17. Study Councils	No	No	No
18. Interviews	No	No	No
19. Curriculum Guides	Yes	No	Yes

It was noted that of the sixty Chi Square computations completed, eleven provided evidence of significant difference among the several participating groups. For two of the supervisory practices, single group pair comparisons indicated significant differences. For Group Counseling, Curriculum Guides, and Pre-term Planning Meetings, significant differences were shown for two of the three group pair comparisons; and for one item, Classroom Visitations, significant differences were shown among all three comparisons made.

The Chi Square statistical tests provided no evidence of significant differences for thirteen of the nineteen supervisory techniques listed on the survey instrument.

In a final attempt to graphically compare the responses of the three Montana educator groups, two rank placements for each of the supervisory practices were shown--rank placement as determined by perceived supervisory responsibility compared to rank placement as determined by predicted change. In the tabulated columns which follow, numbers listed first reflect placement determined by perceived responsibility; the numbers listed to the right of the dash reflect ranked placement as determined by prediction for change. (See Table 41, page 149)

Arbitrary interpretation of the comparisons of ranking placements appeared to provide some evidence that elementary classroom teachers predict small increases in the elementary principal's supervisory responsibility for several of the practices which they consider to be

149
Table 41

Comparison of Ranking Placements Perceived Responsibility
Predicted Increase in Responsibility

Supervisory technique	Teachers	Principals	Superintendents
1. Classroom Visitations	5 - 6	1 - 11	1 - 2
2. Orientation Meetings	1 - 10	6 - 8	5 - 10
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	2 - 2	3 - 2	6 - 9*
4. Workshops	16 - 7	15 - 7	15 - 6
5. Institutes	19 - 17	19 - 14	19 - 16
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	13 - 19	18 - 19	18 - 17
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	6 - 18	8 - 18	14 - 15
8. Study Groups and Seminars	17 - 11	14 - 10	13 - 8
9. Committee Work	12 - 16	9 - 12	10 - 9*
10. Bulletins	3 - 15	7 - 15	8 - 18
11. Resource Materials	7 - 3	5 - 5	7 - 5
12. Travel or Visiting Days	14 - 14	11 - 4	12 - 11
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques, etc.	9 - 1	4 - 1	3 - 4
14. Group Counseling	11 - 8	13 - 16	17 - 14
15. Demonstration Teaching	18 - 12	16 - 17	9 - 13
16. Individual Conferences	4 - 4	2 - 3	2 - 3
17. Study Councils	15 - 13	17 - 13	16 - 12
18. Interviews	8 - 5	12 - 6	11 - 7
19. Curriculum Guides	10 - 9	10 - 9	4 - 1

* Because of identical mean scores of response, two supervisory practices have been ranked 9th.

presently important. Orientation Meetings, ranked first by teachers for perceived responsibility, were placed in the tenth position for predicted increase of responsibility. Similarly, lower prediction rank placements were provided by elementary teachers for Whole-faculty Meetings (6-18) and Bulletins (3-15). Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes, on the other hand, had been placed ninth in perceived responsibility by classroom teachers but was placed first in predicted increase in responsibility. Of the nineteen supervisory practices listed, elementary teachers placed ten in raised positions for prediction of increase in responsibility, placed sixth in higher ranked positions of perceived responsibility, and provided identical rank positions for three items in both columns.

Rank positions determined by elementary principal response provided some evidence that Classroom Visitations, Whole-faculty Meetings, and Bulletins would not become increasingly important as supervisory responsibilities. Rank position based upon principal response did provide some evidence that Travel or Visiting Days, Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes, and Interviews may become increasingly important as supervisory responsibilities of the elementary school principal. Of the nineteen listed supervisory techniques, elementary principals provided higher rank placements of prediction for nine items, higher perceived responsibility placement for nine items, and identical rank placements for one item--Resource Materials.

Rank positions determined from district superintendent response provided some evidence that Workshops, Study Groups and Seminars, Interviews, and Curriculum Guides could become increasingly important as supervisory responsibilities of the elementary school principal. For Bulletins, Demonstration Teaching, and Orientation Meetings, contrasting conclusions were drawn from district superintendent response. It was noted that district superintendents provided higher perceived responsibility rankings for eight items and higher prediction positions for eleven.

General analysis of ranked position comparisons provided some evidence that the three groups of Montana educators predict increased importance for Workshops, Institutes, Study Groups and Seminars, Study Councils, Interviews, and Curriculum Guides. Evidence suggested contrasting predictions for Classroom Visitations, Orientation Meetings, Whole-faculty Meetings, and Bulletins. Two educator groups provided evidence to suggest little promise of increased supervisory responsibility for Large-group Meetings, Committee Work, Demonstration Teaching, and Individual Conferences.

A final general analysis of ranked comparison suggested that ten of the listed supervisory practices (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, and 18) are those which employ professional group relationships. Note was made that thirteen comparisons reflected higher perception positions, sixteen reflected higher prediction positions, and one item--Pre-term

Planning Meetings--had identical placements. It was of interest to note that items 6 and 7--Large-group Meetings and Whole-faculty Meetings--dealt with large group relationships and were given unimportant prediction ranking positions.

Although additional interpretations and correlations could have been drawn from the tabulations presented within the context of this chapter, it was determined that suggested patterns of response which have already been identified were adequate for conclusions and recommendations which will be presented in the chapter which follows.

Chapter 7

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

An accepted and continued assignment of educators has been their search for more effective programs of instruction for school children. Similarly, the attempt to improve existing programs of instruction has traditionally been considered a primary obligation of the elementary school principal.

Recent professional literature has provided ample evidence to support the premise that effective programs for the improvement of instruction frequently are those which include the active endorsement and participation of all educators involved. This study of supervisory practices was an attempt to identify the perceptions of educators for the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. It was the purpose of the study to examine those perceptions of Montana elementary teachers, elementary principals, and district superintendents.

From a selected list of nineteen commonly used supervisory practices, Montana educators provided responses which identified their perceptions of and their predictions for the supervisory responsibility of the elementary school principal. Through descriptive and statistical analyses, the two null hypotheses were tested, and it was determined that significant differences did exist among the perceptions and

predictions of the several educator groups.

The following procedures were used during the preparation and completion of the study:

1. An extensive survey of related literature was made.
2. From a suggested list of commonly used supervisory practices provided by Eye and Netzer (20:290-92), nineteen were arbitrarily selected by the writer and determined to be those most directly related to professional interpersonal relationships.
3. Survey instruments were prepared and subjected to testing procedures to insure that practical responses could be acquired by the study.
4. School districts including elementary schools of twelve or more classroom teachers were identified, and permission was sought from district superintendents to survey elementary teachers and principals.
5. Upon receipt of district approval, letters of transmittal and survey forms were distributed to elementary principals and to selected elementary teachers.
6. To facilitate computer programming, responses of the participating educators were transferred to computer cards.
7. Results were tabulated for analysis, and Chi Square tests were completed to determine the existence of statistically significant differences.
8. Based upon recognized patterns of response and Chi Square

test results, conclusions were drawn.

9. Recommendations were offered to suggest methods for the reduction of significant differences of perception and prediction among Montana educators involved in programs of elementary supervision.

The history sheet survey instruments which were completed by the study participants provided valuable information concerning Montana superintendents, elementary teachers, and elementary principals who are participants in programs of supervision. The following summary statements provide personal information concerning the members of the three educator groups:

1. Although elementary principals have backgrounds of professional experience in common with both of the other two educator groups, elementary teachers had not shared in the backgrounds of experience in secondary education typical for the principal and superintendent groups.

2. Elementary school principals had typically served longer in their present professional positions than had either elementary teachers or district superintendents.

3. School district superintendents were older, had achieved higher levels of formal professional preparation, and had greater amounts of professional experience than either of the two groups of elementary educators.

4. An impressive majority of Montana elementary teachers, elementary principals, and district superintendents appeared to be content in their chosen profession.

Conclusions

Based upon an extensive survey of related professional literature, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. In definitions and descriptions of effective programs of supervision, professional writers are not in complete agreement.

2. Recent authors have become increasingly critical of the "expert" approach to programs of supervision in which classroom teachers become objects of, rather than partners in, programs for the improvement of instruction.

3. Professional writers agree, within varying degrees, that effective programs of supervision are those in which classroom teachers, supervisors, and administrators share in the responsibility for the success of the program.

4. Recent professional literature concerning programs of supervision reflects a shift in emphasis from the mechanics of supervision to the increased importance of professional interaction and group leadership ability among supervisors and administrators.

5. Continued and increased change in American education appears imminent, and programs of supervision will be influenced by the emerging and increasing influences for change.

6. Some authors feel that the success of supervisory programs is dependent to a large degree upon its acceptance by the classroom teachers. Similarly, they suggest that the supervisory success of school supervisors and administrators is dependent upon the degree to

which their performance meets the expectations of the classroom teachers.

7. Literature exists to suggest that the elementary school principal is dependent upon professional associates, namely the elementary teachers and the district superintendent, who may have contrasting perceptions of effective supervisory programs.

8. Authors suggest the existence of conflicting positions concerning the importance and effectiveness of the classroom visitation as a part of supervisory programs.

9. The elementary school principal, as an instructional "expert" is being severely challenged. The suggestion is offered that the elementary principal, as a supervisor of instruction, has lost the position of importance in programs of instructions.

10. Increased activity and influence of classroom teachers through their professional organizations is considered by some administrators and supervisors to be a threat to programs of supervision.

11. Good human relations among the members of the professional team are maintained when supervisory programs provide feelings of importance and accomplishment to everyone involved.

12. As school district size is increased, the importance and influence of the district superintendent, as a member of the supervisory team, is also increased.

13. It was also concluded that within the study it was not practical to attempt a correlation of perceptions and predictions of Montana educators with such factors as age, professional position, background of

experience, term in present position, community size, or amount of professional preparation. Although speculation concerning relationships appeared possible, direct correlations did not.

14. When educator perceptions of supervisory responsibility were compared by ranking supervisory practices according to mean response scores, it was found that district superintendents and principals agreed upon the first and second rank placements for Classroom Visitations and Individual Conferences. Elementary teachers, on the other hand, ranked Orientation Meetings and Pre-term Planning Meetings in those positions. Although seven of the nineteen ranked items appeared to provide evidence of important differences, it appeared reasonable to conclude that agreement for ten of the nineteen items provided evidence of general agreement among the three groups, and that greatest agreement was found between the superintendent and principal groups.

15. Analysis of mean scores of response provided evidence that the three educator groups generally predicted increased supervisory responsibility for the elementary principal, with greatest evidence of predicted increase provided by superintendents--and least evidence of increase provided by elementary teachers. Because the three groups placed Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes, Resource Materials, Interviews, and Individual Conferences in important rank positions, it was concluded that Montana educators expect the elementary principal to continue to be regarded as an important instructional

leader with important inter-personal professional responsibilities.

16. When rankings of perceptions were compared with rankings of prediction, it was found that four listed supervisory techniques--Pre-term Planning Meetings, Resource Materials, Experiments with Materials, Techniques, and Processes, and Individual Conferences--were perceived to be presently important and also were predicted to retain that importance. Evidence appeared to predict increased importance for Interviews, and Workshops, and to predict decreased importance for Large-group Meetings and Whole-faculty Meetings. Based upon the comparison, it was concluded that elementary principals will become increasingly responsible for small-group and individual professional relationships and for the provision of materials for and experimentation in instruction.

17. Based upon the results of Chi Square tests for significant differences of response among the educator groups, it was found that significant differences did exist in perceived supervisory responsibility for the elementary school principal. Eight differences were found among the teacher-superintendent comparisons and ten were found among teacher-principal perceptions, but only one was found to exist between the principal-superintendent groups. It was concluded that differences did exist, with greatest differences between the principal-teacher groups and greatest agreement found between the principal-superintendent groups.

18. When the educator group predictions for change of supervisory responsibility were subjected to Chi Square statistical analysis,

evidence of significant differences was found. Of eleven differences found among the three groups, four were found between teachers and superintendents, four between teachers and principals, and three between superintendent and principal groups. The conclusion was drawn that the three groups of Montana educators did vary in their predictions for change in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary school principal.

19. It was finally concluded that, based upon comparisons and analyses of response, significant and important differences of perception and prediction did exist among the three educator groups. Greatest differences were concluded to have existed between elementary classroom teachers and the other two groups.

Material gathered by the study failed to provide evidence to support the statements of the two null hypotheses. The study provided information which supported the position of the authors in the literature, who suggest that educators in various professional positions tend to hold varying perceptions for the supervisory role of the elementary school principal.

Recommendations

Based upon an extensive review of related professional literature, information compiled by the study of elementary supervision in Montana, and conclusions drawn from the analysis of study results, the

following recommendations are offered:

1. That colleges and universities strengthen and broaden administrator and supervisory training programs. That the additional instruction include experience and preparation in professional group procedures and processes. That instruction in group processes, group leadership, social psychology, social change, and human resource development be added to programs planned to prepare school administrators and supervisors.
2. That institutions of higher education build common perceptions among classroom teachers, supervisors, and administrators concerning effective programs of supervision. That such common perceptions and conceptions be developed by including programs in administration and supervision as a part of the teacher preparation programs. That aspiring teachers and administrators be provided similar experiences and experiments to create similar expectations among the several educator groups for programs of supervision.
3. That teacher and administrator training programs include adequate development of the concept that the improvement of instruction is the mutually shared responsibility of teachers, supervisors, and administrators.
4. That training programs for instructional supervisors stress the thought that adequate programs of supervision must include provision for experimentation and change.

5. That preparatory programs for school administrators, supervisors, and classroom teachers provide recognition of the increased emphasis currently placed upon group process approaches to programs of supervision.

6. That colleges and universities provide opportunities for aspiring teachers, supervisors, and administrators to experiment with the group process approach to supervision. That teacher preparation institutions make provision for the identification and encouragement of group leadership abilities.

7. That collegial leadership (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 61: 104-5) among educators be recognized as a preferred method of leadership within programs of supervision. That attempts be made to avoid leadership of authority. That efforts be made to encourage programs of supervision which include collegial or accepted leadership.

8. That teacher training institutions, free from the employer-employee relationships of public schools, conduct research into perceived effectiveness of existing programs in supervision, and provide model programs and guidance for school districts that seek more effective programs for the improvement of instruction.

9. That the student teaching experience include participation in programs of supervision. That the student teachers, also free from employer-employee relationships, be asked to evaluate the effectiveness of commonly-used supervisory practices.

10. That colleges and universities provide the example and the assistance for those school districts that are anxious to experiment with the group process approach to programs of supervision.

11. That institutions of higher learning experiment with innovative procedures in supervision. That experimentation in programs of supervision become a part of the instructional program for aspiring school supervisors and administrators.

12. That experimentation in programs of supervision emphasize the transition from individual to group process approaches to programs for the improvement of instruction.

13. That professional and student group process situations be created on college campuses and within school district organizations in an attempt to identify collegial leadership potential. That persons with apparent collegial leadership be encouraged into training programs which would prepare them for positions of supervisory responsibility.

14. That each school year begin with a faculty discussion and explanation of the supervisory program. That the building principal and faculty agree upon the procedures and objectives of the program of supervision, and also agree upon participation responsibilities of the classroom teachers. It is also recommended that the discussion of the supervisory program become an accepted part of the teacher orientation program.

15. That elementary principals stimulate the participation and

cooperation of classroom teachers by the periodic scheduling of grade-level meetings. That the grade-level meetings, directed to the improvement of instruction, be started early in the school year and include plans for the evaluation of progress at the close of the year.

16. That early in each school year the elementary principal and his staff select those curriculum areas toward which the supervisory program will be directed. That the elementary school staff agree upon an approach to the improvement of instruction in the selected curriculum areas.

17. That elementary principals encourage the participation of individual classroom teachers in programs of supervision. That, by meeting prior to a classroom visit, the teacher be invited to suggest to the principal: (1) an opportune time and date for the visit, (2) the curriculum area which would be observed, (3) the content and type of presentation which had been planned, (4) difficulties which had been experienced by the teacher, and (5) the types of suggestions which would be most appreciated.

18. That through their supervisory performance elementary principals strive to remove classroom teacher fears that programs of supervision are also programs of teacher evaluation. That meetings and conferences concern themselves with student achievement and programs of instruction rather than teacher performance. That emphasis be placed upon the analysis and improvement of the instructional program.

19. That elementary principals request annual teacher evaluations of the supervisory program. That the evaluation by teachers include suggested supervisory goals for the following school term.

20. That attempts be made to relate behavioral objectives and programs of elementary school supervision. That elementary principals attempt experimentation in which some classroom teachers participate in the planning of supervisory programs which state goals in terms of behavioral objectives for students.

21. That within experimentation and innovation in supervision, decision-making processes be broadened to include all participants in the supervisory programs. That students in teacher training programs and classroom teachers within school districts be included as participants in the planning, operation, and evaluation of programs for the improvement of instruction.

22. That school districts evaluate existing programs of supervision. That all participants (classroom teachers, principals, supervisors, and superintendents) be included in the evaluation of supervisory programs and be encouraged to offer recommendations for the improvement of the existing programs of supervision.

23. That school districts provide group processes in which collegial leadership among teachers can be recognized. That school districts encourage classroom teachers with demonstrated leadership ability toward positions of supervisory responsibility.

24. That practices of supervision be accomplished cooperatively. That, as one example, the classroom visit be planned by supervisors and classroom teachers in order that all know what is expected, what will be done, what to watch for, and in which direction plans for the improvement of instruction should be directed.

25. That school districts actively encourage classroom teachers to become responsible participants in programs of supervision, and that, so far as is possible, programs for the improvement of instruction be distinctly separated from those programs of teacher evaluation.

26. That programs of supervision be broadened to include classroom teachers in all stages of planning, preparation, evaluation, and operation of programs of supervision. That teachers, long objects of supervision, become partners in programs for the improvement of instruction.

27. That similar studies of supervision be completed in an attempt to identify those supervisory practices in most common use in Montana. That studies attempt to determine which supervisory practices are considered by teachers, supervisors, and administrators to be most effective.

28. That studies be made to test the effectiveness of the classroom visitation as a prevalent practice in existing programs of supervision.

29. That similar studies be done in the attempt to identify

the expectations that elementary classroom teachers hold for effective programs of supervision. That efforts be made to include those expectations into supervisory programs.

30. That similar studies, broadened to include perceptions of interested community members, be conducted to add valuable information not available from a closed view of professional performance.

31. Finally, that administrators and supervisors, traditionally concerned with programs for the improvement of instruction, become concerned with programs for the improvement of supervision.

Prognosis

Less than a decade ago, educators saw team teaching, modular scheduling, and non-graded instructional programs as examples of recent innovations in education. The recent and rapid rate of change in education has been demonstrated by the shift of attention toward such concepts as differentiated staffing, performance contracts, voucher programs, and teacher accountability. Evidence suggests that influences for change will be continued if not increased in the future. Programs designed to improve instruction will continue to be influenced by change and, if effective, will offer change that is consistent with general trends of change within the profession.

The Montana study provided evidence that important differences in perceptions and predictions for supervisory programs did exist among

Montana district superintendents, elementary teachers, and elementary school principals. A summary of professional literature and conclusions drawn from the study also suggested that changes in programs of supervision will be toward increased use of group process techniques. In addition, The Instructor magazine (74:33) reported an affirmative response of 84.1 percent when selected subscribers were asked if principals should supervise teachers. It appeared reasonable, therefore, to draw several final conclusions: (1) that varied perceptions and predictions concerning programs of supervision do exist among different educator groups, (2) that changes in programs of supervision will be toward the group process approach, and (3) that elementary school principals will continue to perform as supervisors of instruction.

Although the study appeared to provide more questions than answers, it did gather evidence consistent with one major conclusion drawn by the National Education Association (2:321) that the great challenge facing the school administrator of the future is that of building the best possible relationships within the school staff--relationships that will release the great creative power that a harmonious and enthusiastic school staff can generate. When the challenge has been effectively met, education may provide programs of instruction indicative of the school staff potential.

If future programs for the improvement of instruction are to warrant the endorsement and support of all participating educators,

evidence suggests that elementary principals and programs of supervision may be subjected to programs of evaluation. Although supervising principals have traditionally been willing to evaluate the work of their professional colleagues, they have appeared somewhat less enthusiastic in stimulating periodic evaluations of their own performance. Authors, such as Stoops and Marks (72:312); Curtin (13:234), and Ban (5:444) have proposed that classroom teachers frequently attempt to identify weak areas of instruction by permitting their students to evaluate their teaching, and also suggest that one way in which the elementary principal can insure his own effective performance and quality of supervision would be to subject himself to a year-end evaluation of the way he operates the school. Through this method, it may be concluded, the school principal can insure his own effective performance and also maintain stature among his teachers while reflecting his sincere concern for education.

The recent and broadened concept of the elementary principalship, as it has become related to group processes, has placed increased demands upon the abilities of democratic leadership and will require improved professional and personal qualifications. Future elementary principals may be pressed to acquire greater classroom teaching experience at those levels they plan to supervise, may earn advanced degrees to demonstrate their increased professional preparation for their position, and, more importantly, may be required to demonstrate abilities in the group

processes of democratic leadership.

As responsibilities with human values and relationships gain in importance, increased emphasis may be placed upon such supervisory skills as those employed in the formation and motivation of study groups and curriculum committees, those needed for orientation of teachers and substitutes, and those needed to stimulate the use of new programs and materials, methods, and ideas. As teachers become more involved in decision-making processes and in programs of supervision, it will become increasingly essential that the elementary school principal possess those skills necessary to effectively coordinate the efforts of resource people, specialists, administrators, and classroom teachers.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

— *Montana State University* —

Bozeman, Montana 59715

Tel. 406-587-3121

College of Education

April 23, 1970

Mr. Paul O'Hare, Superintendent
Billings School District #2
101 - 10th Street West
Billings, Montana 59101

Dear Mr. O'Hare:

Will you take part in an attempt to improve the preparation of future elementary school principals? Such an attempt is being made through the College of Education at Montana State University, and your participation is needed.

With your permission, survey materials for this study will be sent to the following personnel within your district:

1. The superintendent
2. Elementary principals who supervise 12 or more teachers
3. Elementary teachers (one in buildings of 12 - 17 teachers;
two in buildings of 18 or more teachers)

Participants in the study will be asked to complete a one-page history sheet and a survey form which has them identify responsibility roles of elementary principals. They are also asked to suggest the changes that they predict in the responsibility role. The two survey instruments are enclosed for your examination and completion, should you choose to take part in this study.

Results of the study could provide information that is valuable to you and to Montana State University. A request form has been enclosed for your use.

The success of this study depends upon your participation. May we have your permission to make distribution of the materials within your district?

Your cooperation in this investigation would be greatly appreciated. Will you please complete and return the enclosed forms? Thank you for your consideration and prompt response.

Sincerely yours,

Donald L. Easton
Department of Elementary Education
Room 347, Reid Hall
Montana State University

DLE/ddm

APPENDIX B

HISTORY SHEET

Please write the appropriate number in the blank at the left of each item.

- _____ 1. Your present position: (1) Teacher, (2) Principal,
(3) Teaching Principal, (4) Superintendent
- _____ 2. Years in your present position: (1) Less than 3, (2) 3-6,
(3) 7-10, (4) 11-14, (5) 15-18, (6) Over 18
3. Previous experience: (Please check each blank for those
positions in which you have served one or more years.)
- _____ Elementary Teachers
- _____ Elementary Principal
- _____ Junior High School Teacher
- _____ Junior High School Principal
- _____ High School Teacher
- _____ High School Principal
- _____ Superintendent
- _____ Other
- _____ 4. Total professional service: (1) Less than 5 years, (2) 5-
10 years, (3) 11 - 16 years, (4) 17 - 21 years, (5) More
than 21 years
- _____ 5. Highest degree held: (1) None, (2) BA or BS, (3) MS or
MA, (4) Specialist, (5) Doctorate, (6) Other
- _____ 6. Size of your community: (1) Less than 5,000 people,
(2) 5,000 - 10,000, (3) 10,000 - 15,000, (4) 15,000 to
20,000, (5) 20,000 - 25,000, (6) Over 25,000
- _____ 7. Would you choose a career in education again? (1) Yes,
(2) No
- _____ 8. Present age: (1) Under 25, (2) 25-30, (3) 30-35,
(4) 35-40, (5) 40-45, (6) 45-50, (7) 50-55, (8) Over 55

APPENDIX C

In the blanks provided at the bottom, please make any additions which you feel should be included in the list of commonly used supervisory practices.

In the center column, indicate your estimation of the responsibility that an elementary principal has for each of the supervisory techniques according to the following scale: 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
 greatest ----- least

In the right-hand column, please predict future change in the responsibility of the elementary principal:

A = increased responsibility B = no change
 C = decreased responsibility

	1 - 5	A B C
1. Classroom Visitations	_____	_____
2. Orientation Meetings	_____	_____
3. Pre-term Planning Meetings	_____	_____
4. Workshops	_____	_____
5. Institutes	_____	_____
6. Large-group Teacher Meetings	_____	_____
7. Whole-faculty Meetings	_____	_____
8. Study Groups and Seminars	_____	_____
9. Committee Work	_____	_____
10. Bulletins	_____	_____
11. Resource Materials	_____	_____
12. Resource Materials	_____	_____
13. Experiments with Materials, Techniques and Processes	_____	_____
14. Group Counseling	_____	_____
15. Demonstration Teaching	_____	_____
16. Individual Conferences	_____	_____
17. Individual Counseling for Personal or Personal Problems	_____	_____
18. Study Councils	_____	_____
19. Interviews	_____	_____
20. Curriculum Guides	_____	_____
21. _____	_____	_____
22. _____	_____	_____

College of Education

Dear

As elementary principals, we often wonder how programs of supervision compare among the many elementary schools of Montana. We also wonder what changes are taking place within the various programs. A study, being done at Montana State University, will attempt to answer some of our questions about programs of elementary supervision. Will you take part?

We have obtained the written permission of your superintendent to include your school in the study and are asking that you complete the two survey forms that are enclosed. The first asks primarily for information concerning your background of training and experience. The second form asks you to estimate the responsibility that the elementary principal has for the supervisory practices that have been listed, and also asks you to predict future changes in the responsibility of the elementary principal.

Please complete the personal history sheet by writing the appropriate numbers in the blanks that have been provided on the left side of the page. On the second survey form, responses are placed in the two columns of blanks.

On the survey form twenty common techniques of supervision have been listed at the left-hand side of the page, and blanks have been provided at the bottom for any additions which you feel should be made. After making the additions, you are asked to estimate the responsibility of the elementary principal by writing a number 1 - 5 in the blank following each supervisory practice (1 = the greatest responsibility, 5 = the least).

In the right-hand column, you are asked to predict future change in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. By writing the letters A-B-C in the blank for each of the supervisory techniques, you predict the following: A = an increase in responsibility, B = no change, and C = a decrease in supervisory responsibility.

Because this survey hopes to include all of the supervising elementary principals in Montana, it is vital that your response be included in this study. The results should provide interesting and valuable information for the principals of the State, and could make an important contribution to future programs of supervision.

If you have any reservations concerning this study, your questions would be welcome. May we anticipate your response before May 15th? Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Don Easton
Department of Elementary Education
Room 347, Reid Hall
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715

DE/ddm

— *Montana State University* —

Bozeman, Montana 59715

Tel. 406-587-3121

College of Education

Dear

Have you often wondered how programs for the improvement of instruction compare among the many school districts in Montana? Have you also wondered what changes we can anticipate in our programs of supervision? A study, being done in cooperation with Montana State University, is making an attempt to provide some answers to those questions. Will you take part?

We have obtained the written permission of your superintendent to include your school in the study, and are asking that you complete the two survey forms that are enclosed. An envelope is provided for their return. The first form asks primarily for information concerning your background of training and experience. The second asks you to estimate the responsibility that the elementary principal has for the supervisory practices that have been listed, and also asks you to predict future changes in the responsibility of the elementary principal.

Please complete the personal history sheet by writing the appropriate numbers in the blanks that have been provided on the left side of the page. On the second survey form, responses are placed in the two columns of blanks.

Twenty common techniques of supervision have been listed at the left-hand side of the survey form, and blanks have been provided at the bottom for any additions which you feel should be made. After making the additions, you are asked to estimate the responsibility of the elementary principal by writing a number, 1 - 5, in the blank following each supervisory practice (1 = the greatest responsibility, 5 = the least).

In the right-hand column, you are asked to predict future change in the supervisory responsibility of the elementary principal. By writing the letters, A-B-C, in the blank for each of the supervisory techniques, you predict the following: A = an increase in responsibility, B = no change, and C = a decrease in supervisory responsibility.

Because you have been deliberately selected in a systematic sampling of all Montana elementary teachers, it is vital that your response be included in this study. Programs of assistance to teachers and programs of elementary supervision could be improved by your contribution. May we hear from you before May 15th? Thank you for your interest and your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Don Easton
Room 347, Reid Hall
Department of Elementary Education
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715

DE/ddm

APPENDIX F

Room 347, Reid Hall
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715
May 9, 1970

Dear Mr. _____

Your school district is one of sixty-eight in Montana which has been selected to participate in a State study of elementary supervisory programs and practices. A few days ago, we mailed survey forms for your examination and also asked your permission to survey elementary principals and teachers within your schools. We would greatly appreciate your response.

If you have any reservations concerning this survey, your questions would be welcome. In case the original survey forms and the permission slip have been lost or failed to arrive at your office, duplicates are enclosed for your use.

The close of a school year is a busy time, but we would be grateful if you would take a few minutes to examine and complete the enclosed survey forms. We also ask that you complete the permission slip and return all three forms in the enclosed envelope. Because the study has been limited to sixty-eight districts, it is important that your response be included. May we hear from you?

Sincerely,

Don Easton

APPENDIX G

Room 347, Reid Hall
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715
May 16, 1970

Fellow Educator,

Of the 781 school districts in the State of Montana, sixty-eight have been selected to participate in a State study of elementary supervisory programs. Because educators were selected at random from a list of 4,796 names, it is important that those who were chosen do take part in the survey. A few days ago the survey forms were mailed to you, but they have not been returned as yet. May we hear from you soon? If the original survey forms have been misplaced or failed to arrive, duplicates are enclosed for your use.

Although the close of the school year is an unusually busy time, we hope you will take the few minutes required to complete the two survey forms. A stamped, addressed envelope is provided for mailing them directly to Montana State University in Bozeman.

Because the study has been limited to sixty-eight school districts, it is vital that your contribution be included in this survey. Your response could help in planning supervisory programs of the future. Won't you share in this study? We would greatly appreciate your response.

Sincerely yours,

Don Easton

LITERATURE CITED

LITERATURE CITED

1. Robert J. Alfonso, The role of the administrator in supervision and improvement of instruction, Address in Helena, Montana, on November 13, 1964.
2. American Association of School Administrators, Staff Relations in School Administration, Thirty-third Yearbook, Washington: National Education Association, 1955.
3. Edmund J. Amidon, Kathleen M. Kies, and Anthony T. Palisi, Group supervision: A technique for improving teaching behavior, National Elementary Principal, XLV (April, 1966), pp.54-8.
4. Fred C. Ayer, Fundamentals of Instructional Supervision, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
5. John R. Ban, 25 cardinal principles for the school principal, The Clearing House, XLIV (march, 1970), pp. 441-5.
6. A. S. Barr, William H. Burton, and Leo J. Brueckner, Super Vision, Principles and Practices in the Improvement of Instruction, New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938.
7. Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (es.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
8. Arvin C. Blome, Do you know what's going on in your classrooms?, The American School Board Journal, CLXVI (April, 1969), p. 16.
9. Edwin M. Bridges, A Model for Shared Decision Making in the School Principalship, St. Ann, Missouri: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1967.
10. Irwin D. F. Bross, Design for Decision, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953.
11. George W. Connelly, A district superintendent looks at the principal, The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (February, 1967), pp. 38-40.
12. Roscoe V. Cramer and Otto E. Domain, Administration and Supervision in the Elementary School, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

13. James Curtin, Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools, Toronto: The Macmillan Company, 1969.
14. Benjamin Dayton, Critical behaviors of elementary principals in the improvement of instruction, Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.
15. Department of Elementary School Principals, The Elementary School Principal in 1968. Washington: National Education Association, 1969.
16. Robert W. Eaves, The elementary school principalship since 1950--some observations, The National Elementary Principal, XLVIII (May, 1969), pp. 2-4.
17. Stanley Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael Moskow (eds.), Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, Chicago: Rank McNally and Co., 1967.
18. Donald A. Erickson, Forces for change in the principalship, The Elementary School Journal, LXV (November, 1964), pp. 57-112.
19. Evaluation of teaching competence, National Education Association Research Bulletin, XLVII (October, 1969), p. 67.
20. Glen G. Eye and Lenora A. Netzer, Supervision of Instruction, New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
21. J. L. Fearing, Some perceptions of executive professional leadership, Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1965.
22. George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
23. John M. Foskett, The Normative World of the Elementary School Principal, Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967.
24. _____, The Normative World of the Elementary School Teacher, Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967.

25. Donald C. Francke, Relationship between instructional change and the extent to which school administrators and teachers agree on the location of responsibilities for administrative decisions, Cooperative Research Project of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Madison, Wisconsin, 1966.
26. Harold W. Gentry and James B. Kenney, The performance of elementary school principals as evaluated by principals and teachers, *The Journal of Educational Research*, LX (October, 1966), pp. 50-96.
27. Samuel Goldman, *The School Principal*, New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
28. Carter V. Good (ed.), *Dictionary of Education*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959.
29. Edith S. Greer, Human relations in supervision, *The Education Digest*, XXVII (April, 1962), pp. 21-23.
30. Neal Gross, Role conflicts of school principals, Unpublished Study by the Research Associates of the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965.
31. _____, The role behavior of school principals, Unpublished study by the Research Staff of the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, August, 1965.
32. Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, *Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
33. J. P. Guilford, *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.
34. Minor J. Gwynn, *Theory and Practice of Supervision*, New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1961.
35. Joy Gold Haralock, Teacher acceptance of administrative action, *The Journal of Experimental Education*, XXXVII (Winter, 1968), pp. 39-47.
36. Ben M. Harris, *Supervisory Behavior in Education*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

37. Chester W. Harris (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, Third Edition, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.
38. Harold L. Hawkins, The next step? Teachers select principals, *The Clearing House*, XLIV (November, 1969), pp. 169-73.
39. William R. Hazard, School administrators as change agents: a role dilemma, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February, 1969.
40. James E. Heald and Samuel A. Moore, *The Teacher and Administrative Relationships in School Systems*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968.
41. Wayne L. Herman, Jr., *The Principal's Guide to Teacher Personnel Problems in the Elementary School*, West Nyack, New York: The Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1967.
42. Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Reavis, and James D. Lodsdon, *Duties of School Principals*, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.
43. _____, *The Effective School Principal*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
44. Oscar T. Jarvis (ed.), *Elementary School Administration: Readings*, Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1969.
45. Ralph B. Kimbrough, *Administering Elementary Schools*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968.
46. Robert R. Leeper (ed.), *Changing Supervision for Changing Times*, Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, March, 1969.
47. _____ (ed.), *Toward Professional Maturity of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers*, Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, March, 1969.
48. Alfred R. Lindesmith and Anselm L. Strauss, *Readings in Social Psychology*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
49. _____, *Social Psychology*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

50. E. F. Lindquist, A First Course in Statistics, Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1942.
51. William H. Lucio and John D. McNiell, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.
52. Robert C. McKean and H. H. Mills, The Supervisor, Washington: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964.
53. Harold J. McNally, The American principal tomorrow, The National Elementary Principal, XLVII (May, 1968), p. 86.
54. Gordon N. MacKinzie, Recent developments in the role of the supervisor, The Education Digest, XXVII (January, 1962), pp. 19-21.
55. Leland Leon Medsker, The job of the elementary school principal as viewed by teachers, Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Stanford University, 1954.
56. Paul J. Misner, Frederick W. Schneider, and Lowell G. Keith, Elementary School Administration, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963.
57. Harold E. Mitzel, The impending instruction revolution, Phi Delta Kappan, LI (April, 1970), p. 434.
58. Montana Department of Elementary School Principals, Correspondence from State president, Mr. Ernest Hofman, written to members of the Montana State DESP Organization.
59. _____, Tentative Handbook for Elementary Principals, State of Montana, Helena: Montana Education Association, 1967.
60. Montana State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Standards for Accreditation of Montana Elementary Schools, Helena, Montana: March, 1970.
61. Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
62. Paul R. Mort, Walter C. Reusser, and John W. Polley, Public School Finance: Its Background, Structure, and Operation, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

63. Ross L. Neagley and N. Dean Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
64. John E. Onofrio, The public school principal in terms of today's leadership role expectations, Paper presented at the Harry M. Bailey Junior High School, West Haven, Connecticut, September, 1968.
65. Wayne Robert Palmer, A study of existing and desired supervisory services in the Indianapolis Public Schools, Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Indiana University, 1954.
66. Launey F. Roberts, Let's quit playing boss-employee and become co-workers, School and Community, LV (April, 1969), p. 25.
67. Stephen A. Romine, Current influences changing the principal's role, The North Central Association Quarterly, XLII (Fall, 1967), pp. 187-191.
68. Harold Spears, Improving the Supervision of Instruction, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.
69. G. Milton Smith, A Simplified Guide to Statistics, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.
70. State Department of Public Instruction, Montana Education Directory, 1969-70.
71. Bob R. Stewart, Supervisory behavior, Educational Leadership, XXVII (February, 1970), pp. 439-536.
72. Emery Stoops and James R. Marks, Elementary School Supervision: Practices and Trends, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
73. Lloyd L. Taylor and Philip Eby McPherson, The superintendent and the principal, The National Elementary Principal, XLVII (May, 1968), pp. 81-3.
74. Teacher opinion poll: what is the role of the principal?, Instructor, LXXX (March, 1971), p. 33.
75. Robert S. Thurman, The principal must be replaced, Educational Leadership, XXVI (May, 1969), pp. 778-83.

76. J. Foster Watkins, The relationship between the principal and his professional staff in the public school, Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Auburn University, 1966.
77. Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.



3 1762 10005438 4

D378
Ea79
cop. 2

Easton, Donald L
The supervisory role
of the elementary
school principal
in Montana.

DATE	ISSUED TO
<i>R</i>	<i>TRV 2000 JP</i>
AUG 5 1979	Burdona Amisk 120 No. G. St. Livingston, MT
AUG 7	D. Vandu Kori 119 th S. Julia Marie
AUG 7	Robert McLean 517 S. 13 th Ave
FEB 78	Mary Boschert Box 182 Big Timber
MAR	" "
JUL 3	Esther Bos
AUG 16	Madala H.
MAR 4 1980	M.F.

D378
Ea79
Cop. 2