

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS
AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE SUPERVISORY
ROLE OF THEIR PRINCIPALS

by

GORDON TOVELL

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

FALL, 1973



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to his thesis advisor Professor R. Brayne for his invaluable guidance and advice in the preparation of this thesis. Gratitude is also expressed to committee members Dr. C. Bjarnason for his professional suggestions and Professor P. Blahey for his assistance in the statistical design and advice regarding the computer program.

Appreciation is expressed to Mr. R. A. MacIntosh, superintendent of the St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2, for supporting and allowing this study to be conducted in the elementary schools of St. James-Assiniboia.

The writer is indebted to Mr. William Jones for his assistance in proof reading and to Mrs. Dorothy Cosgrove for her many hours spent in typing this thesis.

To my wife, Lynne, I say 'thank you' for the excellent job of editing the many drafts of this thesis and for her encouragement and understanding.

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to examine how elementary school teachers perceived the role of their principal as a supervisor and to discover what they expected of the supervisory program. Further, the investigator wished to identify areas of supervision where a discrepancy existed between teacher perceptions and teacher expectations of the supervisory program.

A modified form of the Opinion Inventory of Supervision was used in the data collection. The instrument contained thirty-six items, four items in each of nine categories of supervisory tasks outlined by Harris (1963).

A random sampling of one hundred elementary teachers from the St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2 were selected. Sixty-nine subjects responded and the data they provided were used in the statistical computations.

The measurement procedure followed three basic steps. The first was the testing of the goodness of fit of the observed frequency distribution by using Chi square. The second step was the tabulations of the differences between the individual perception and expectation scores into frequency tables for each of the thirty-six questionnaire items. The third step was the calculation of the mean expectation score from the data.

The major findings of this study indicated that there

were significant differences between teacher perceptions and teacher expectations in thirty-two of the thirty-six questionnaire items. The findings also indicated that elementary teachers perceived themselves to be receiving very little supervision from their principals and the supervision they were receiving was relatively ineffective. Orientation of new staff, development of school-community relations, and evaluation appeared to be three supervisory task areas in which the teachers held high expectations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. A STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Definition of the Problem	7
Importance of the Study	7
Definition of Terms	8
Setting of the Study	9
Design of the Study	9
Delimitations of the Study	10
Limitations of the Study	11
Organization of the Study	12
II. A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	13
A Brief History of Supervision	13
The Need for Effective Supervision	16
Conceptual Framework	21
The Elementary School Principal and Supervision	23
A REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH	27
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES	35
Purpose of the Study	35
The Sample	35
Instrumentation	35
Procedures for Collecting Data	39
Statistical Design	40

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. A PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE	
ANALYSIS	42
The Chi Square Analysis	43
P-E Analysis	48
Ranked Questionnaire Item Analysis	49
Ranked Task Area Analysis	54
Mean Expectation Score Analysis for the	
Total Sample	56
Mean Expectation Score Analysis for Sex,	
Age, Teaching Experience, Tenure Status,	
and Educational Background	56
Sex	59
Age	63
Teaching Experience	63
Tenure Status	65
Educational Background	65
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	70
The Problem Restated	70
Summary of Procedure	70
Summary of Findings	71
Conclusions	75
Implications	79
Recommendations for Further Research	80
Implications for Administrative Inservice	82

	PAGE
BIBLIOGRAPHY	83
APPENDIX A. Introductory Letters, Questionnaires, and Follow-up Letter	89
APPENDIX B. Frequency Distributions	111
APPENDIX C. P-E Values	116

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Description of the Respondents	36
II	Questionnaire Items Related to Supervisory Task Areas	38
III	Chi Square Values Significant at the 1% Level	44
IV	Negative, Zero, and Positive Percentage Values for P-E Frequencies	50
V	Ranked Questionnaire Items	52
VI	Ranked Supervisory Task Areas	55
VII	Mean Perception and Expectation Scores	57
VIII	Questionnaire Items Falling in Mean Expectation Score Ranges for the Total Sample	58
IX	Mean Expectation Scores for Sex, Age, Teaching Experience, Tenure Status, and Educational Background	60
X	Questionnaire Items Falling in Mean Expectation Score Ranges by Sex	62
XI	Questionnaire Items Falling in Mean Expectation Score Ranges by Age	64
XII	Questionnaire Items Falling in Mean Expectation Score Ranges by Experience	66
XIII	Questionnaire Items Falling in Mean Expectation Score Ranges by Tenure	67

TABLE		PAGE
XIV	Questionnaire Items Falling in Mean Expectation Score Ranges by Education	68
XV	Frequency Distribution on a 1-5 Scale for Each Questionnaire Item with the Teachers' Perceptions and Expectations of the Supervisory Role of their Respective Principals	112
XVI	Differences Between Perception and Expectation Scores: P-E Values	117

CHAPTER I

A STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

The question of educational supervision is of primary importance. The responsibility of every school system is to provide proper instruction to its students: what is to be taught, how the material is to be taught, cannot be left to random chance. Direction must be sought and it must be sought intelligently and vigorously. Supervision is the instrument used to provide this necessary direction.

A review of the literature has indicated a substantial amount of confusion about the nature of supervision. Wiles (1967, p.3) states:

Supervision has many different meanings. Each person who reads or hears the word interprets it in terms of his past experiences, his needs, and his purposes. A supervisor may consider it a positive force for program improvement; a teacher may see it as a threat to his individuality; another teacher may think of it as a source of assistance and support.

Furthermore, there is disagreement among professional educators and the public as to what the supervisor is today. One group may see the supervisor as a strictly professional official, highly trained to do a major administrative job. Another group will take the extreme opposite view, visualizing the supervisor as one who is completely divorced

from administrative duties and responsibilities and whose main responsibility is to help teachers meet their problems. A third group may see the supervisor as a teacher of teachers, improving instruction through programs of inservice education. A fourth group centers the emphasis around human relations where the supervisor will have to make effective use of group processes with both teachers and pupils, and a fifth group may see the supervisor's task as one which includes both supervision and curriculum revision (Gwynn, 1964).

Classroom teachers are often confused about the meaning of supervision because they are exposed to many different methods in the supervisors they encounter. It has been traditional for teachers to look upon supervisors as natural enemies because of their rating role which affected the teacher with regard to promotion, demotion, and dismissal (Stoops and Johnson, 1967). Supervision is often dictatorial, prescriptive, or imposed, even in the 1970's. Many teachers find it difficult to accept the democratic supervisor whose goal is to improve the teacher's instructional techniques.

There is also confusion over the use of the term supervisor as to who a 'supervisor' in the school setting actually is. Some educators would include superintendents, divisional supervisors, and principals. Others would

include vice-principals, department heads, and school inspectors. Further confusion arises when one considers whether these people are in a position of line authority or staff authority (Harris, 1963).

Despite an obvious amount of confusion over the exact nature of supervision most authorities appear to agree on two points: (1) that the basic function of supervision is to improve the learning situation for children, and (2) that supervision can be seen realistically only as a part of the total educational operation.

Harris (1963) indicates that there are five functional areas of the educational operation:

- (1) Management
- (2) Special services
- (3) General administration
- (4) Teaching
- (5) Supervision

All of these functions are interrelated and one cannot determine precisely where one function ceases and another begins. However, the teaching function is central to the primary purposes of the school's existence, whereas the other four areas are supplementary.

The management function area is characterized by behaviors that are indirectly related to instruction and remotely related to the pupil. Activities carried out by

such people as superintendents, custodians, and school board members would fall into this category.

The special services function is characterized by behaviors that are highly pupil-related but only indirectly instruction-related. The school nurse, social worker, psychologist, and team coaches would fall into this function.

General administration is characterized by those activities which are neither remotely nor directly related to pupils or instruction but which tend to give unity to the other four functional areas. Superintendents and principals carry out this function with their policy-making, coordinating, and communication activities.

The teaching function is characterized by those behaviors that are directly related to instruction and also directly related to the pupil. This function involves school personnel such as teachers and librarians working with pupils toward instructional goals.

The supervisional function is characterized by behaviors that are highly instruction-related but not directly involving the pupils. It is distinguished from the teaching function by its indirect impact on pupil learning.

Stoops and Johnson (1967, pp. 13-14) cite that:

Supervision is a cooperative, continuous process involving all certified personnel and directed toward the improvement of classroom instruction. Supervision involves an understanding of children, stimulation of professional growth and development of teachers, formulation of educational objective, materials of instruction, methods of teaching, control of physical equipment, and evaluation of instruction.

There are three major areas of concern regarding supervision: (1) the teacher's behavior and its impact on the pupil's behavior, (2) the event or activity occurring in the classroom, and (3) the supplies and resources available and the ways in which they are used. Since the teacher is at the focus of all three areas of concern, it can be stated that the principal objective of supervision is to improve teacher effectiveness.

Harris (1963) states that supervision involves ten fairly distinct major tasks:

- (1) Developing curriculum
- (2) Organizing for instruction
- (3) Staffing
- (4) Providing facilities
- (5) Providing materials
- (6) Arranging for inservice education
- (7) Orienting new staff members
- (8) Relating special services
- (9) Developing public relations
- (10) Evaluating

These ten tasks would include designing or redesigning that which is to be taught, by whom, when, where, and in what pattern; making organizational arrangements to implement the curriculum design; selecting and assigning the appropriate instructional staff members to appropriate

activities in the organization; designing and equipping appropriate facilities for effective use by instructional staff members; identifying, evaluating, selecting, and securing materials for instruction that make for efficient and effective instruction; arranging for activities which will promote the growth of instructional staff members to make them more effective; providing new staff members with necessary information and understanding to maximize their chances of initial success with a minimum of difficulties; relating the special service programs to the major instructional goals of the school; developing relationships with the public concerning instructional matters; and, planning, organizing, and implementing activities for the evaluation of all facets of the educational process directly related to instruction. The supervisor relies on certain processes and skills to achieve these tasks while working with teachers either in groups or individually. Thus the effectiveness of the supervisory program is dependent to a large degree on the supervisor's ability to implement these tasks.

A preliminary survey of the literature on the supervision of teaching showed that the teachers' opinions had seldom been considered in this process. The present study attempted to discover how certain teachers perceived their supervisors and what expectations they had of their supervisors.

II. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

The major purpose of this study was to examine how teachers perceived the role of the supervisors and what they expected of the supervisory program. The hypothesis tested was stated in the form of the null hypothesis:

There will be no significant differences between the expectations and perceptions of teachers regarding the role of their supervisors.

In addition, this study attempted to identify areas of supervision where a discrepancy existed between teacher perceptions and teacher expectations and also to examine the importance placed on various supervisory functions by the following teacher subgroups: sex, age, teaching experience, tenure status, and educational background.

III. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

It was assumed that effective supervisory programs are founded on cooperative efforts between the teacher and supervisor. That is, the supervisor and teacher must have a mutual understanding about what the other is doing. The teacher should be aware of what his supervisor is doing as he carries out the supervisory program. In return the supervisor should be aware of how he is perceived by the teachers and what is expected of him by the teachers. If there is little congruence between the perceptions and expectations held by the teachers, then for all intents

and purposes there has been minimal effective supervision.

First and foremost, the school principal must take the lead with his own staff in the improvement of instruction. The skills and processes he uses to achieve this end will vary from principal to principal because of a variety of factors such as his own personality, his expertise, his own personal philosophy and convictions, and the school division policy. However, if the improvement of instruction requires teachers to change their behavior, then it follows that all principals, in their roles as supervisors, must do something to effect this change. If the teacher is not aware of what the principal is doing, then, as far as the teacher is concerned, there is no effective supervisory program. If this awareness were to be measured, then the principal can at least have an index of the impact of his supervisory program upon his teachers. Also, if the principal knows what the teacher expects of him, he can adjust his supervision program accordingly if he feels it is justified.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study the following definitions were held:

Expectations: How a teacher would prefer to have a particular task carried out.

Perceptions: How a teacher sees a particular task being

carried out.

P-E Score: The difference between a respondent's perception score and his corresponding expectation score on any specific questionnaire item.

Supervision: A major function of the school operation which seeks to facilitate the major instructional goals of the school in direct ways, but without direct influence upon pupils.

V. SETTING OF THE STUDY

The study was carried out in the St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2 in the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba. The school division was suburban, consisting of thirty-six schools, twenty-three of which contained kindergarten to grade six. Several of the schools had been established for a number of years, whereas, others were relatively new owing to the rapid population growth in the area. The school division employed 997 teachers and had a student enrollment of 20,300 pupils.

VI. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A random sample of one hundred teachers was drawn from the list of elementary school teachers employed full time by the St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2.

Two questionnaires, one dealing with perceptions and the other with expectations, were mailed to the

teachers at a three-week interval. The questionnaires were identical except for necessary word changes that pertained to perceptions and expectations respectively. Each questionnaire contained thirty-six test items, four items in each of the nine categories of the tasks of supervision. Sixty-nine pairs of questionnaires were returned and were used in the study.

Upon return of the data, the results were analyzed to test the null hypothesis using the Chi square test of significance. Further analysis was made to discover any discrepancies between teachers' perceptions and expectations.

VII. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The first delimitation was that the study was conducted in one school division, namely St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2. This was a typical Manitoba suburban school division from which the findings of this study could be related to other suburban or city school divisions; however, reservations would have to be made if one were to attempt to relate the findings to rural school divisions.

Another delimitation was that the study pertained to elementary school teachers only. There was no attempt made to relate any of the findings to the secondary school level.

For the purposes of this study the supervisors in

question were the principals of the various schools involved. No attempt was made in this study to examine the supervisory roles of central office supervisors, directors or consultants, or the supervisory role of superintendents or vice-principals.

A further delimitation was in the questionnaire in which thirty-six specific supervisory activities were used. It was realized that this number of supervisory activities represented an incomplete picture of the total supervisory function.

VIII. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

As in any study involving questionnaires, the total number of returns would have an effect on the validity of the study. Because of the anonymity involved there was no way to identify the sixty-nine percent of the teachers who had replied, and consequently no way to assess their reasons for doing so. Similarly there was no way to assess the thirty-one percent of the teachers who had not replied.

A second limitation arose from the nature of the questionnaire itself. The fact that there were two almost identical questionnaires, administered at three-week intervals, might have led to a less discriminatory response when the teachers answered the second questionnaire.

IX. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study has been delineated. Chapter II deals with a brief history of supervision, the need for effective supervision, the conceptual framework for the study, and the relationship between the elementary school principal and the supervision program. The latter half of Chapter II presents a review of the related research. Chapter III contains a description of the sample, the instrumentation used in the study, the procedures used for collecting the data, and the statistical design employed in the inquiry. A presentation of the results of the analysis is contained in Chapter IV. The final chapter presents a summary of the major findings of the study, renders some conclusions, offers some implications, and makes some recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

I. A BRIEF HISTORY OF SUPERVISION

Variations in organizational structures, prevailing social and economic conditions, and differing value systems have contributed to the evolution of various supervisory concepts and practices throughout North America. However, in spite of differing rates of diffusion and considerable overlapping of categories, Parsons (1972) suggests five rather distinct phases of supervision that can be identified.

- (1) Institutional control
- (2) Program definition
- (3) Scientific management
- (4) Human relations and group dynamics
- (5) Institutional growth processes

The institutional control phase of supervision began in North American schools around 1800 with the visits of school committees or board members for inspection purposes (Neagley and Evans, 1970). It is questionable if much assistance in the improvement of instruction resulted from the visits of these lay persons as they were mainly concerned with value judgements about the teacher and whether or not the various subjects were being taught

according to their standards. This type of supervision concerned itself with decision-making at the top, and the emphasis was on regulations and whether or not the teacher was following them properly. When the task became too extensive for the layman, it was assigned to an educator who became known as the inspector. The inspector's role was to make comparisons of the individual teacher to established standards.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century the program definition phase arose. This phase dealt with the establishment and enforcement of the first minimum standards, and a general manipulation of the physical environment and financial resources in a deliberate effort to professionalize the schools (Wilson et al. 1969). During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the supervisor was primarily concerned with quality control with respect to the teaching process. His purpose was to define the objectives, substance, and methods considered by those in authority as most appropriate for learning (MacKenzie 1961). The program definition phase of supervision moved from curriculum design to development of teaching materials and then to testing and evaluation (Wilson et al. 1969).

About 1915 the scientific management phase began to appear and school leaders were proposing the application of organizational principles to school supervision (Lucio and

McNeil,1969). Scientific management was a business philosophy which stressed the achievement of the highest possible rate of production at the lowest possible cost. The impact of business practices and ethics upon education was very strong and influenced the previous two phases of supervision. However, although efficiency principles could be applied with some effect in industry, the movement when applied to education was not totally fruitful.

During the 1920's a reaction against scientific management took place in the form of a human relations theory which stressed feelings, motives, and wants of the individual (Lucio and McNeil,1969). Supervision became associated with the encouragement of participatory formulation of policy through staff, committee, and general group meetings. Development of each staff member's potential was encouraged through the processes of group dynamics. However, in the late 1930's educational expectations were on the upswing: student enrollments, the acknowledgement of varying student abilities, and program diversification were rapidly increasing. Supervisors were faced with more and more changes, and to meet these demands they reverted to the earlier phases of supervision (Parsons,1972).

During the 1950's a theory of supervision was conspicuously absent. This was a period which saw three kinds of supervision: (1) autocratic supervision in which the super-

visor assumed responsibility for all decisions which were to be made, (2) laissez-faire supervision where a reliance was placed on the autonomous characteristics of the group to such an extent that the supervisor did not intervene, and (3) democratic supervision which was a process of helping others to help themselves in the aims which had become intrinsic to them. The sixties finally found educators looking for conceptual models which developed into the institutional growth phase of supervision (Wilson et al. 1969). The chief aim of the institutional growth phase of supervision was the planning of an environment suitable for teaching and learning by examining, analyzing, and changing "what is" to "what ought to be". This phase differed from the previous four in that the process of determining purposes, planning programs, and restructuring roles required that the needs of pupils, teachers, and administrators be continuously examined. In such an emergent role for supervision, the responsibility of developing and implementing educational change for the improvement of instruction depended to a large degree on the supervisor.

II. THE NEED FOR EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION

The North American society in the 1970's is making excessive demands upon the public schools. The vast amount of knowledge available to man forces increasing intellectual and vocational specialization in a highly complex society.

Man must be able to coordinate his various experiences into something meaningful if he is to lead a productive life (Neagley and Evans, 1970). Ideally the school curriculum represents a significant portion of man's important experiences, ideals, attitudes, and hopes. Because of the above, the educational institution demands more careful study and decision-making today than ever before. There is a pressing need in every school system to decide what to teach and how to teach it (Neagley and Evans, 1970).

Thus, supervision seems destined to play an essential role in deciding the nature and content of the curriculum, in selecting the school organizational patterns, and learning materials to facilitate teaching, and in evaluating the entire educational process. Nationally, supervisory positions were reported to be increasing in number at a rate well beyond increases in pupil populations and teaching staffs during the period 1965-1968 with some levelling off in recent years (Harris, 1972).

In summarizing supervisory practices in Canada, MacKay (1969) arrived at several conclusions, namely: (1) there is no theory of supervision as such, (2) teachers tend to be ambivalent about supervision, (3) supervision exists because of a number of essential organizational and social needs, (4) modern writers have tended to emphasize some of these needs only, and (5) modern expectations for

supervision are diverse and complex.

Saxe (1972) stated that a survey of elementary school teachers across the United States showed that most of them received no supervision at all and reports by their principals invariably showed that they actually spent little time on supervision even though they felt that they should devote more time to this task. Saxe felt that the present type of supervision being carried out in the schools was constraining rather than liberating. He also believed that changes in teaching techniques were not keeping up with changes in society and that this was the responsibility of the supervisors.

Three inferior types of supervision that are commonly carried out in the schools are mentioned by Saxe: (1) the teacher who prepares the "set lesson" in advance, (2) the "Merry Pop In's" where the principal drops in for a few minutes on the pretense of delivering supplies or messages, and (3) staff meeting supervision, in which the principal gives out information while the staff listens passively. Saxe felt supervision to date has been ineffective for three reasons: (1) because of supervision programs such as those listed above, (2) because supervision is a threatening situation to teachers, and (3) because supervision is misunderstood by the supervisors themselves. However, he firmly believes that good supervision is needed to improve

present teaching techniques.

Munnelly (1970) supported Saxe's reasons for the ineffectiveness of supervisory practices to date by citing two areas of conflict on supervision issues: (1) supervisors are committed to changing what teachers are doing, and (2) teachers view the supervisor's activities as questioning their professional integrity. Munnelly cited a report by Neville which concluded, after an extensive review of research on teacher attitudes toward supervisors, that: (1) teachers do not see supervisors as focusing on improvement of instruction, (2) teachers do not see supervisors as having a strong "human relations" base, and (3) teachers do not see supervisors as being prepared to help them in the study of teaching.

MacKay (1969), referring to a Nova Scotia study indicated that school principals felt they should be devoting more time to supervisory activities. Assistance to teachers and a set of activities labelled as instructional leadership were seen as the areas of greatest need.

MacKay (1969), citing an Ontario study on the needs of beginning teachers, found that classroom and teaching problems were seen by teachers as the most serious items of concern. A need was seen for increased supervisory assistance in improving teaching methods, understanding adolescents, and gaining knowledge of pupils' backgrounds.

Krecsy and Brayne (1972) reported that one of the primary functions of the supervisor is to effect changes in teacher behaviors. Such changes will result, hopefully, in improved instructional skills. Unfortunately the supervisors may have some unintended but rather negative effects upon teacher attitudes and behaviors. The problems arising from such effects can harm the relationship between the teacher and supervisor and can impede the supervisory goal of improved instruction. They stated three problems related to supervision: (1) a shortage of time for supervision, (2) effective utilization of specific supervisory techniques or tools, and (3) interpersonal relations. Krecsy and Brayne included, under the term "interpersonal relations", the ideas that the specific purpose of supervision is to improve instruction; that teachers too often perceive the supervisor not as a helper but as an evaluator and, perhaps, a threat to personal and professional security; and that there must be mutual trust in the teacher-supervisor relationship.

As evidenced in the above studies, there are apparently many problems associated with the existing methods of supervision in the schools today. However, there appears to be unanimous support for a need for effective supervisory techniques in order to improve instruction in the classroom.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In the historical development of supervision, the weight of evidence appears to be in favor of supervisors helping school personnel to improve the teaching-learning situation creatively. This must be achieved within the framework of the current understanding of supervision by both school people and the lay public (Gwynn, 1964). The supervisor will have to concern himself primarily with the task of helping teachers and other school personnel to solve problems that arise or are concerned with a desirable situation for children.

The present study is based on nine of Harris' (1963) ten tasks of supervision. Harris' classification was chosen for this study because of its general acceptance by most authorities. The following list of tasks and authors indicate the amount of agreement with Harris' ten tasks as evidenced in the literature.

Curriculum development: MacKay (1969), Munnelly (1970), and Stewart (1970) listed curriculum development as a major area of supervision, as did most writers in the field of supervision.

Organization for instruction: Lucio and McNeil (1969), Stewart (1970), and Marks, Stoops and King-Stoops (1972) listed this task as an aspect of supervision

Staffing: MacKay (1969) was emphatic about the need for

supervision in this area. Wiles (1967) also listed staffing as a supervisory responsibility, as did Neagley and Evans (1970).

Providing materials: Munnelly (1970) and Bradfield (1970) specifically included providing materials as an aspect of supervisory work. Jarvis and Pounds (1969), and Marks et al. (1972) also listed provision of materials as a supervisory function.

Providing facilities: This task is not commonly included in lists of supervisory tasks. It was very briefly mentioned by Bowles (1968) and by Marks et al. (1972).

Thus this task is not used in this study as it was felt that it was not applicable to the supervisory tasks of the school division involved in the sample.

Inservice education: This is a second area which many authors such as MacKay (1969), Babin (1970), and Munnelly (1970) seemed unanimous in identifying as the responsibility of the educational supervisor.

Orientation of new staff: Neagley and Evans (1970) included this area, as did MacKay (1969), Bradfield (1970) and Nelson (1971). This aspect of supervision was also mentioned by Jarvis and Pounds (1969) and Marks et al. (1972).

Relating special services: As in the case of providing facilities, this area of supervision was not commonly listed as such in the literature. There was brief mention of this task by Marks et al. (1972), Bowles (1968), Jarvis

and Pounds (1969), and MacKay (1969).

Public relations: Neagley and Evans (1970), Bowles (1968), and Marks et al. (1972) included public relations as a task of supervision. In most instances in which public relations was mentioned, emphasis was given to the interpretation of the school program to the community as a specific type of public relations pertinent to the supervisor's role.

Evaluation: Evaluation constitutes the third area in which most authors are in agreement as a task of the supervisor. MacKay (1969), Munnelly (1970), and Stewart (1970) all listed evaluation as a supervisory function.

Wilson et al. (1972) discussed Harris' ten supervisory tasks and although they appeared to agree with them, they questioned "relating special services" and "public relations" as they felt that these two tasks are more administrative-orientated than supervisory-orientated.

IV. THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AND SUPERVISION

In general, the elementary school principal is responsible for supervision in his school. A research study, sponsored by the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association in 1958, showed that at that time some 71 percent of the principals participating in the study were responsible for instructional

improvement in their schools (Bradfield,1964). Snyder (1968) stated that the elementary principalship is not only the oldest but one of the most essential administrative and supervisory positions in our public schools. According to Jarvis and Pounds (1969), one of the most important changes in the elementary school has been the change in the principal's duties from those of a mere managing head teacher to those of an instructional leader. In this capacity the principal is placed in the responsible position of being the prime supervisor of instruction in the school.

The principal is in a more advantageous position than any other person to perform the supervisory function. Jarvis and Pounds (1969) felt that the principal should be able to devote a major portion of his time to this function and that he should be well qualified by both experience and training to execute such duties. They felt that he should be an expert on the school, its staff, the parents, students, and the community.

Petrescu (1968) concluded that supervision of instruction is a leading problem area and presents the greatest administrative challenge to school principals. Bradfield (1964) noted that in 1962 Brackett found that elementary school principals in Colorado recognized instructional leadership as their primary responsibility. In another study cited by Bradfield (1964), in the state of Connecticut,

it was found that the principals assumed and executed the responsibility for all supervisory practices. However, as noted previously, Saxe (1972) stated that many teachers received no supervision at all, and principals admitted that they actually did very little supervision, although most agreed that this was one of their tasks.

Coleman (1972) disagreed with Jarvis' and Pounds' (1969) belief that the principal's role is changing from "a mere managing head teacher to that of an instructional leader". Coleman stated that as teachers become more competent and more professionalized the notion of the principal as instructional leader becomes less and less viable. He claimed that as more and more principals are trained as administrators, the notion of instructional leadership will be replaced by the notion of administrative leadership. It is interesting to note that he also stated that the strongly expressed preference of Manitoba principals is towards the role of educational leaders and that senior school board members agree.

Coleman (1972) stated that members of the school system who have aspirations to leadership are less than enthusiastic about their work, are primarily motivated by salary, are relatively untrained for their positions, and in many cases would prefer an entirely different role within the school. He cited a study on the role of the elementary

school principal which concluded that amongst the behaviors rarely exhibited by principals were control, staff improvement, delegation, and coordination. Coleman believes that the supervisory role is becoming more difficult for the principal because more and more teachers are obtaining university degrees and that "teachers with a university degree collectively exhibit more professionalism than those without degrees". In his opinion increased competence is associated with increased professionalism and specialization, which are characteristics unrelated to the acceptance of line authority.

Coleman also cited a recent empirical study (Gorton, 1971) of expertise in instructional leadership which concluded: (1) perceived expertise is the main variable determining whether or not a teacher will seek help from another individual, (2) given four sources of assistance--department heads, principals, teacher colleagues, and central office staff--the principal is perceived as having the least expertise, and (3) the department head is perceived as possessing significantly more expertise than any other source of instructional assistance identified in the study.

Eash (1969) and Foster (1969) both reported findings similar to Coleman's but both felt that there is still a strong need for supervision. Foster felt that although supervision to date has generally been ineffective, there is

a need for supervision to improve instructional techniques, and that the responsibility for implementing the necessary supervisory practices rests with the school principal. Crosby (1969) stated that there is a strong need for supervision in our schools today. However, she felt that the principals themselves must first define their role as a supervisor relevant to the present curriculum. Ryan (1973) stated that principals must remember that change is an on-going process and that the principal must be change-orientated if he is to improve the learning situation in his school. Staff morale is highest when the teachers believe that their program and methodology have been consciously selected to serve the particular pupils they encounter each day.

A REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH

Bradfield (1964) reported a study conducted by Bail in 1947 which sought to find answers to two questions: (1) What types of supervision do teachers desire? and (2) What types of supervision do teachers receive? The results showed that teachers most frequently desired supervision which provided constructive criticism, new techniques, and methods, demonstration teaching, and suggested materials. The study also pointed out that teachers did not receive the services they desired from

their principals. Three years later, in another study concerning what help teachers wanted from their supervisors, Replogle found similar results.

Donald (1963) carried out a study to determine the position of the supervising elementary principals of Winnipeg with respect to the standard recommended by recognized authorities in educational administration. His findings showed that Winnipeg principals had accepted supervision as a major responsibility, had acknowledged their obligations to perform this duty, and had shown familiarity with the most respected methods of implementing a supervisory program. He indicated that there was ample evidence to indicate that they were fully aware of and deeply committed to their responsibility for the quality and the improvement of the instructional programs of their schools. However, Donald did state that improvement was needed in this area as the majority of supervisors suffered from a lack of training. Although the philosophy held by the principals encompassed the responsibility for supervision, the performance of the duties in this area was not generally supported by adequate knowledge or skills in handling the mechanics of the procedures.

Cardenas (1966) presented a dissertation dealing with the role expectations for instructional supervision as expressed by selected supervisors. The purpose of his

study was to provide more concrete evidence of the disparity of viewpoints on the role of the supervisor, on the tasks which a supervisor should perform, and on the manner of performing those tasks. He also wanted to provide evidence that a significant lack of agreement existed between supervisors, administrators, and teachers as to the role expectations for the supervisor. Cardenas based his study on Harris' (1963) ten supervisory tasks. His findings showed consensus in role expectations within the three groups although he pointed out that supervisors showed a lesser amount of within group disagreement than did administrators and teachers. Between groups, the study showed general agreement between supervisors and administrators and between administrators and teachers; however, there was a lack of agreement between supervisors and teachers. For example, teachers rated "curriculum development" high as a supervisory task, whereas supervisors rated the same task low. The reverse held true for "relating special services" and "evaluation".

Geis (1967) completed a study dealing with five major problem areas of the teacher-supervisor relationship. The five problem areas she studied were: (1) classroom observations, (2) teacher-supervisor conferences, (3) evaluation, (4) teacher intervisitations, and (5) the beginning teacher. With regard to classroom observations, Geis

stated that the supervisor must be competent, responsible, and familiar with teaching, subject matter, child behavior, and human relations. She also stated that success depends upon a cooperative enterprise with the ultimate aim to improve instruction. To help alleviate any problems arising from the teacher-supervisor conferences, Geis suggested that the supervisor must be highly adept in counseling and guidance. Her findings with regard to supervisory evaluation of instruction indicated the need for the establishment of more suitable criteria for evaluating instruction. She also questioned the effectiveness of self-evaluation. She felt that teacher visitations are a valuable device for improving instruction provided that they are carefully planned by the supervisor and that the new or inexperienced teachers will benefit most from this experience. First, some close supervision and assistance are needed to give beginning teachers the assurance and sense of belonging, necessary to dispel any apprehensiveness they may have. Second, a comprehensive orientation period for beginning teachers is a necessity.

Marquit (1968) presented a paper to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association dealing with perceptions of the supervisory behavior of secondary school principals. The major objective of his study was to examine how teachers and secondary school

principals perceived supervisory stimuli. To gather data, he designed an instrument based on the various supervisory tasks outlined by Harris (1963). That questionnaire was titled the Opinion Inventory of Supervision (O.I.S.) and is the one used in the present study. Analysis of his data showed that principals scored themselves significantly and consistently higher than did teachers on effectiveness in supervision. The findings also pointed out that older teachers tended to regard principals as more effective supervisors than younger teachers did and that teachers in larger schools and with more training regarded principals as more effective supervisors. The study also showed that principals were rated higher by male than by female teachers as far as providing supervisory stimuli was concerned.

Several Canadian studies related to the field of supervision have been conducted. Morin (1964), in an Alberta study of principals' self-perceptions of their supervisory role, found that principals placed a heavy emphasis upon their role in curriculum development at the school level. These same principals also stressed their own involvement in activities concerned with staff selection and placement. Supervision activities considered least desirable included classroom visitations, demonstration teaching, and evaluation of teacher performance. Wetter (1965), in a similar study in Alberta, supported Morin's findings.

Uhlman (1966) in a Nova Scotia study found that supervising principals were seen by school board members as playing an important role as advisory instructional leaders. In a British Columbia study McLoughlin (1966) found that persons engaged in supervisory activities in elementary schools showed that they were expected to provide assistance to teachers, which in turn would help meet the individual needs of their pupils. He also indicated that inter-visitation among teachers and the use of demonstration lessons were highly favored.

Stewart (1970) reported that there have been attempts to define the functions of supervision in terms of expected behaviors, skills, and competencies. Studies have emphasized the perceptions of teachers and have revealed evidence which suggests that teachers do not perceive supervisors as performing effectively in certain dimensions of supervisory responsibility. Stewart's findings showed that there was basic agreement among response patterns of teachers, supervisors, and principals as they responded to the relative importance of items describing supervisory behavior, and that supervisors and principals consistently recorded higher perception levels of actual use of supervisory practices than did teachers. He pointed out that the major difference in the perception of the supervisory role is in the degree of effectiveness in the performance of tasks rather than in

the types of activities performed.

An interesting study was reported by Parson (1971). His study was designed to determine teacher perception of the styles and behavior of supervisors which contribute to the effectiveness of the various supervisory positions in school systems. To gather his data he used 556 elementary school teachers in West Central Ontario. His findings showed that the principal was rated the most influential in affecting the behavior of teachers with respect to the content, processes, and outcomes of their teaching, and that the principal was also rated significantly higher on effectiveness than any other supervisory position. The study recommended that supervisors should provide professional leadership and social support, and involve staff members in areas within their professional competence.

Harris and Hartgraves (1972) in a research resume reported: (1) supervisors are highly valued when teachers have close contact with them in project or other task-oriented situations, (2) changes in teacher behavior seem to result under skillful supervisory planning of inservice activities closely associated with working situations, and (3) supervisors are effective in improving instruction when they serve in a counseling or consultative capacity to individual teachers if these consultations are task-oriented and are part of a larger program of activity for

change.

The review of the related research appears to emphasize several areas of concern with regard to the supervision program. Teachers, especially beginning teachers, have felt a need for supervisory help but perceive themselves not receiving the type of supervision they desire. Principals, who, teachers agree, are the key to a good supervision program, are aware of the need for supervision but do not appear to be carrying out their supervisory role effectively. It appears to be generally felt that any good supervision program requires cooperation from both teachers and supervisors if the program is to be a success.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The study was undertaken to examine elementary teachers' perceptions and expectations of the supervisory role of their principals. The hypothesis was stated in the null form:

There will be no significant differences between the expectations and perceptions of teachers regarding the role of their supervisors.

Further, the writer attempted to establish areas of supervision where a discrepancy existed between the teachers' perceptions and expectations of their principal's supervisory function.

II. THE SAMPLE

A random sampling of one hundred elementary teachers from the St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2 was selected to be used to collect data for the study. Sixty-nine responses were received and were used in the statistical computations. Table I presents a description of the respondents.

III. INSTRUMENTATION

A modified form of the Opinion Inventory of Super-

TABLE I

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

		Age		Experience			Tenure		Education						
		Under 30	30-39	Over 39	Under 3	3-6	7-10	Over 10	Prob.	On tenure	Teach. 1 yr. train.	1 yr. univ.	2 yrs. univ.	1 deg.	2+ deg.
N															
Male	9	4	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	6	0	0	4	1	4
Female	60	41	10	9	13	25	6	16	13	47	9	13	14	19	5
Totals	69	45	13	11	15	27	9	18	16	53	9	13	18	20	9

vision (O.I.S.), developed by Marquit (1968), was used in the data collection. The items on the instrument were based on the various supervisory tasks outlined by Harris (1963). The O.I.S. contains thirty-six items, four items in each of the following nine categories of supervisory tasks.

- (1) Curriculum development
- (2) Instructional organization
- (3) Staffing
- (4) Providing instructional aids
- (5) Orientation of new instructional staff
- (6) Providing inservice education and professional growth
- (7) Coordinating special services
- (8) Developing school-community relations
- (9) Evaluating

Marquit (1968) conducted a pilot study to refine the O.I.S. A reliability test of internal consistency revealed an r of .88. A panel of nine educators rated the content validity of the O.I.S. as "high". Marquit used this instrument to study principal and teacher perceptions of the supervisory behavior of secondary school principals in the state of Illinois.

In the present study, six educators were asked to validate the assignment of four questionnaire items to each of the nine task areas. Five of these people agreed with the arrangement in Table II, while the sixth, the

TABLE II

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS RELATED TO
SUPERVISORY TASK AREAS

Task Number	Task Area	Questionnaire Items			
1	Curriculum development	10	12	29	32*
2	Instructional organization	15	24	28	33
3	Staffing	3	18	22	35
4	Providing instructional aids	6	16	19	34
5	Orientation of new staff	5	11	17	23
6	Providing inservice education and professional growth	7	9	20	27
7	Coordinating special services	4	14	26	30
8	Developing school-community relations	1	13	21	36
9	Evaluating	2	8	25	31

*The four questionnaire items are examples of specific supervisory activities related to each of Harris' nine task areas of supervision.

secondary principal, reversed the placement of items seven and thirty-two. The six people involved were a school psychologist, an elementary principal, an elementary vice-principal, a graduate student, a secondary principal, and a school superintendent.

It was necessary to change some wording in the O.I.S. in order to adapt it to the Canadian scene. These changes were minimal and should have no significant effect on the reliability or validity of the instrument.

Other than the minor changes mentioned, Form P was identical to the original Form T of the O.I.S. This questionnaire was used to examine the perceptions the teachers had of their principals' supervisory behaviors.

Form E required further changes. This form was used to study teacher expectations of the supervisory function. It was necessary to alter the introduction and the directions with wording related to expectations rather than perceptions. Similarly the body of the questionnaire had to be altered for the same reasons.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA

Data for this study were provided by sixty-nine elementary teachers in the St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2. The information was obtained from their responses to the two different forms of the O.I.S. The two forms, Form P and Form E, consisted of thirty-six items

each: four items for each of the nine tasks of supervision. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the items on a five-point scale. Values from one to five were assigned to the five points on the scale to facilitate scoring. "Always, or almost always", was scored as 5; "often" was worth 4; "sometimes" was 3; "rarely or seldom" was scored 2; and "never, or almost never", was given a value of 1.

Form P was mailed to the randomly selected teachers early in 1973. The teachers were asked to complete the form and return it within a two-week period. Approximately three weeks after mailing Form P, Form E was mailed requesting a reply within two weeks. A follow-up letter was sent out about two weeks after the mailing of Form E. Copies of Form P and Form E, with the introductory letters and follow-up letter, can be found in Appendix A.

V. STATISTICAL DESIGN

The measurement procedure followed three basic steps. The first was the testing of the goodness of fit of the observed frequency distribution by using Chi square. In order to carry out this step, the raw data received from the sixty-nine respondents were tabulated into a frequency distribution as presented in Appendix B. The number of respondents who scored a specific questionnaire item as either 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 on the five point scale, were

tallied. This procedure was used for all thirty-six questionnaire items found in both Form P and Form E of the questionnaire. The Chi square test was then applied on the respective frequency distributions between each corresponding item on the two questionnaires. The critical value at the one percent level was required to either accept or reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant differences between the expectations and perceptions of teachers regarding the supervisory role of their principal.

The second major step in the statistical design was the tabulations of the differences between the individual perception (P) and expectation (E) scores into frequency tables for each of the thirty-six questionnaire items. These frequencies are referred to as P-E values and fall into numerical categories of -4 to +4. The tables were then inspected in order to establish any discrepancies between perceptions and expectations.

The third step was the calculation of the mean expectation scores, on the five point scale, from the raw data obtained from Form E. These means were computed for each of the thirty-six items for the total sample and also for the subgroupings of sex, age, experience, tenure status, and educational background. The means were inspected to establish items where the total sample and each of the subgroups held high or low expectations with regard to the supervisory program.

CHAPTER IV

A PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS

OF THE ANALYSIS

Prior to presenting the results of the analysis, a resume of the purpose of this study is presented below.

The study was undertaken to examine how elementary teachers perceived the supervisory role of their principals and to examine their expectations of the supervisory program. The hypothesis was stated in the null form:

There will be no significant differences between the expectations and perceptions of teachers regarding the role of their supervisors.

In addition, the study attempted to identify areas of discrepancy between the teachers' perceptions and expectations of their principal's supervisory function. The study also attempted to establish the importance placed on various supervisory activities by the following teacher subgroups: sex, age, teaching experience, tenure status, and educational background.

Nine of Harris' (1963) ten tasks of supervision were used as the theoretical framework for the study:

- (1) Developing curriculum
- (2) Organizing for instruction
- (3) Staffing
- (4) Providing materials

- (5) Arranging for inservice education
- (6) Orienting new staff members
- (7) Relating special services
- (8) Developing public relations
- (9) Evaluating

The questionnaire, appearing in Appendix A, was made up of thirty-six items, four items associated with each of the nine tasks of supervision.

The analysis is presented in six parts: Chi square analysis, analysis of the discrepancy between the perceptions and expectations, ranked questionnaire item analysis based on the magnitude of the discrepancy between the perceptions and expectations, ranked task area analysis based on the magnitude of the discrepancy between the perceptions and expectations, mean expectation score analysis for the total sample, and mean expectation score analysis for sex, age, teaching experience, tenure status, and educational background.

The Chi Square Analysis. The purpose of the first analysis was to test the main hypothesis that there were no significant differences between teacher expectations and teacher perceptions on each of the thirty-six questionnaire items. A Chi square value was computed between the expectation and perception scores for each item of the questionnaire. The results of the Chi square analysis are illustrated in Table III. The discrepancy between the perceptions and

TABLE III

CHI SQUARE VALUES SIGNIFICANT
AT THE 1% LEVEL

Item Number	Item*	Chi Square Value
1	... emphasises the role of teachers when discussing the instructional program with members of the community.	11.13
2	... succeeds in evaluating my teaching accurately.	15.11
3	... has a lot of influence in hiring new teachers.	30.59
4	... encourages me to include the special services personnel of the division in my lessons or instructional program.	19.17
5	... plays a major role in orienting new teachers with the community.	40.96
6	... arranges for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts, etc.	2.81**
7	... gives demonstration lessons.	72.71
8	... observes my teaching in the classroom.	37.21
9	... provides me with opportunities for inservice conferences and workshops.	11.69
10	... works with me to improve the scope and sequence of my curriculum.	47.38
11	... shows new teachers how to operate the audio-visual equipment and/or familiarizes them with the library and other instructional facilities of the school.	41.76

TABLE III (continued)

Item Number	Item	Chi Square Value
12	... gives me special time to plan and develop curriculum revisions.	62.46
13	... encourages me to join community organizations (Scouts, Service Clubs, etc.).	19.15
14	... coordinates the special services of my building, as by arranging guidance or audio-visual schedules to make them available to me.	15.53
15	... consults me before organizing the students into different classes or sections for the coming year.	15.26
16	... helps me to evaluate the instructional aids which I use in my classroom.	51.32
17	... "spells out" the duties and responsibilities to new teachers, even though this information is available from the faculty handbook or other sources.	22.91
18	... capitalizes on my special abilities, especially when deciding committee assignments.	25.82
19	... encourages me to select necessary audio-visual and other instructional materials with his advice.	27.43
20	... advises me to read a particular book or take a certain course if he feels that I have a lack in an area of professional knowledge.	55.56
21	... devotes a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations.	7.21**

TABLE III (continued)

Item Number	Item	Chi Square Value
22	... provides me with an opportunity to meet new professional candidates who seek a position in this school.	20.66
23	... plays a major role in orienting new teachers with the existing school staff.	32.94
24	... organizes my schedule in such a way that things like team instruction and team planning or individual planning are facilitated.	35.36
25	... discusses his evaluations of my instruction with me.	45.43
26	... helps me to use the special services of our division as by arranging for field trip transportation or arranging student referrals to the appropriate staff (psychologist, nurse, reading teachers, etc.).	13.34
27	... makes it easy for me to get out of my class to visit another class in action.	28.82
28	... helps me organize my instructional program as by suggesting how much time to spend in each content area of the curriculum.	15.19
29	... comments or remarks to me about my lesson plans meeting the goals of the curriculum.	52.19
30	... emphasises the contributions which the special services personnel can make in my instructional program.	20.69

TABLE III (continued)

Item Number	Item	Chi Square Value
31	... sends me a prompt report of his evaluations of my teaching.	38.25
32	... helps me in establishing curriculum goals and academic standards for my class.	35.26
33	... helps me organize special class groups, committees, and other areas of instructional organization.	48.63
34	... permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, papers, etc.) in my room.	0.20**
35	... emphasized the advantages of working here when I was interviewed, or before I was hired.	7.76**
36	... explains our instructional program to parents and other members of the community.	15.15

*To read each item correctly, each statement should be preceded by "My principal".

**Not significant.

expectations was found to be significant at the one percent level for thirty-two of the thirty-six items. The null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between teacher expectations and teacher perceptions was rejected for these thirty-two items. Only four items, "... arranges for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts, etc."; "... devotes a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations"; "... permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, papers, etc.) in my room"; and "... emphasized the advantages of working here when I was interviewed, or before I was hired", were found to be not significant.

P-E Analysis. This analysis was carried out to establish discrepancies between teachers' perceptions and teachers' expectations of the supervisory functions of their principal. Each respondent's expectation (E) score for each of the thirty-six questionnaire items was subtracted from his respective perception (P) score. These scores are referred to in the study as P-E values and have a numerical value of -4 to +4 depending on the perception and expectation scores recorded. The frequency counts of these P-E values for each of the thirty-six questionnaire items were calculated for all P-E frequency counts and placed into three columns: (1) the total frequency counts to the left or negative side

of the zero column, (2) the frequency counts in the zero column, and (3) the total frequency counts to the right or positive side of the zero column. These percentages were calculated for each of the thirty-six questionnaire items and are presented as Table IV.

In this study thirty-two of the thirty-six questionnaire items had a high percentage of P-E values in the negative column, three items: "... arranges for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts, etc.", "... devotes a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations", and "... emphasized the advantages of working here when I was interviewed, or before I was hired", had fairly even distributions of P-E values and one item, number 34, "... permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, etc.) in my room", had a high percentage of P-E values falling in the zero column. Further analysis showed that item number 34 was the only item that had a higher percentage of P-E values in the positive value column than in the negative value column. However, it should be noted that 60.9% of the teachers had P-E values falling in the zero column for item number 34.

Ranked Questionnaire Item Analysis. Since thirty-two of the thirty-six questionnaire items had high percentages

TABLE IV

NEGATIVE, ZERO, AND POSITIVE PERCENTAGE
VALUES FOR P-E FREQUENCIES

Item* Number	Negative Percentage Values	Zero Percentage Values	Positive Percentage Values
1	49.3	31.9	18.8
2	55.1	31.9	13.0
3	63.8	24.6	11.5
4	53.6	34.8	11.5
5	75.4	14.5	10.1
6	34.8	37.7	27.5
7	79.7	13.0	7.2
8	60.9	26.1	13.0
9	46.4	36.2	17.4
10	72.5	18.8	8.6
11	73.9	23.2	2.8
12	81.2	8.7	10.1
13	44.9	43.5	11.5
14	56.5	29.0	14.3
15	47.8	46.4	5.7
16	75.4	17.4	7.2
17	60.9	26.1	13.0
18	60.9	30.4	8.6
19	65.2	18.8	15.8
20	78.3	17.4	4.3
21	39.1	34.8	26.0
22	65.2	18.8	15.8
23	63.8	26.1	10.0
24	69.6	18.8	11.5
25	69.6	27.5	2.9
26	53.6	29.0	17.3
27	62.3	24.6	13.0
28	46.4	34.8	18.8
29	72.5	18.8	8.6
30	56.5	26.1	17.4
31	63.8	24.6	11.6
32	63.8	24.6	11.6
33	71.0	20.3	8.6
34	15.9	60.9	23.1
35	46.4	31.9	21.7
36	53.6	31.9	14.5

*For a description of the items see Table III, p.44.

of P-E values falling in the negative column, the fourth analysis was carried out to rank order the thirty-six items on the basis of these percentage values. The thirty-six items were ranked from the highest percentage values to the lowest percentage values in the negative column. When two or more items had the same percentage value in the negative column, the zero column was then inspected. A higher zero value percentage was considered to indicate greater acceptance of the null hypothesis, and therefore that item was placed in a higher ranking order. Thirteen items were ranked using this procedure. When the percentages were identical in all three columns, the rank order of the items involved remained at a tie. Nine items were tied in ranking because of this situation. The rank order for the thirty-six questionnaire items can be found in Table V.

The lowest ranked item was "... gives me special time to plan and develop curriculum revisions", and the highest ranked item was "... permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, papers, etc.) in my room". Three of the four non-significant items, "... devotes a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations", "... arranges for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts, etc.", and "... permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes,

TABLE V

RANKED QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Rank*	Item** Number	Negative Percentage Values	Zero Percentage Values	Positive Percentage Values	Task Area
1	12	81.2	8.7	10.1	1
2	7	79.7	13.0	7.2	6
3	20	78.3	17.4	4.3	6
4	5	75.4	14.5	10.1	5
5	16	75.4	17.4	7.2	4
6	11	73.9	23.2	2.8	5
7	{ 10 29	72.5	18.8	8.6	{ 1 1
9	33	71.0	20.3	8.6	2
10	24	69.6	18.8	11.5	2
11	25	69.6	27.5	2.9	9
12	{ 19 22	65.2	18.8	15.8	{ 4 3
14	{ 3 31 32	63.8	24.6	11.6	{ 3 9 9
17	23	63.8	26.1	10.0	5
18	27	62.3	24.6	13.0	6
19	{ 8 17	60.9	26.1	13.0	{ 9 9
21	18	60.9	30.4	8.6	3
22	30	56.5	26.1	17.4	7
23	14	56.5	29.0	14.3	7
24	2	55.1	31.9	13.0	9
25	26	53.6	29.0	17.3	7
26	36	53.6	31.9	14.5	8
27	4	53.6	34.8	11.5	7
28	1	49.3	31.9	18.8	8
29	15	47.8	46.4	5.7	2
30	35***	46.4	31.9	21.7	3

TABLE V (continued)

Rank	Item Number	Negative Percentage Values	Zero Percentage Values	Positive Percentage Values	Task Area
31	28	46.4	34.8	18.8	2
32	9	46.4	36.2	17.4	6
33	13	44.9	43.5	11.5	8
34	21***	39.1	34.8	26.0	8
35	6***	34.8	37.7	27.5	4
36	34***	15.9	60.9	23.1	4

*The thirty-six questionnaire items are ranked from the largest negative percentage value to the smallest negative percentage value.

**For a description of the questionnaire items see Table III, p.44.

***Not significant.

boxes of chalk, pencils, etc.) in my room", were ranked thirty-fourth, thirty-fifth, and thirty-sixth respectively. The fourth non-significant item, "... emphasized the advantages of working here when I was interviewed, or before I was hired" ranked thirtieth.

Ranked Task Area Analysis. This analysis was carried out to determine how Harris' (1963) nine task areas ranked with respect to the percentage values in the negative P-E value column. The aggregate P-E frequency values for the four questionnaire items related to each task area, as outlined in Table II, p.38, were calculated to give a P-E frequency table of numbers ranging from -4 to +4 for each of the nine supervisory tasks. Percentages were then calculated, as in the P-E analysis, for the negative column, the zero column, and the positive column. The nine task areas were then ranked from the highest percentage values in the negative column to the lowest percentage values found in the same column. The rank order of the nine supervisory task areas can be found in Table VI.

The lowest ranked task area was curriculum development, in which 72.5 percent of the negative P-E values fell. Orientation of new staff, providing inservice education, evaluation, staffing, instructional organization, and coordinating special services were then ranked respectively with negative value percentages ranging from 68.5% to 55.1%.

TABLE VI

RANKED SUPERVISORY TASK AREAS

Rank*	Task Number	Task Area	Negative Percentage Values	Zero Percentage Values	Positive Percentage Values
1	1	Curriculum development	72.5	17.7	9.8
2	5	Orientation of new staff	68.5	22.4	9.0
3	6	Providing inser- vice education and professional growth	65.6	23.2	11.2
4	9	Evaluating	62.3	27.5	10.1
5	3	Staffing	59.0	26.5	14.5
6	2	Instructional organization	58.7	30.1	11.2
7	7	Coordinating special services	55.1	29.7	15.2
8	4	Providing in- structional aids	47.8	33.7	18.5
9	8	Developing school-community relations	46.7	35.5	17.7

*The nine supervisory task areas are ranked from the largest negative percentage value to the smallest negative percentage value.

Providing instructional materials and developing school-community relations were ranked eighth and ninth respectively with negative value percentages of 47.8% and 46.7%.

Mean Expectation Score Analysis for the Total Sample.

The purpose of this analysis was to ascertain the importance that the teachers placed on the various supervisory activities defined by the thirty-six questionnaire items. The mean expectation scores in Table VII were used in this analysis. Mean scores greater than 4.5 were used to indicate those items that teachers felt their principals should "almost always" be doing. Mean expectation scores between 3.9 and 4.6 indicated that teachers felt that their principals should "often" carry out these supervisory activities. Questionnaire items with means falling between 3.4 and 4.0 indicated that teachers felt these activities should be carried out "occasionally" or more regularly than "sometimes" but slightly less than "often". Any item which had a mean below 2.0 was considered to fall into the "rarely" category.

The data for this analysis are presented in Table VIII. Two items had expectation means in the highest range, eleven questionnaire items fell into the "often" range, and nine items had means between 3.4 and 4.0. The "rarely" category contained only one item.

Mean Expectation Score Analysis for Sex, Age, Teaching Experience, Tenure Status, and Educational Background. The

TABLE VII

MEAN PERCEPTION AND EXPECTATION SCORES*

Item** Number	Mean Perception Score	Mean Expectation Score	Item Number	Mean Perception Score	Mean Expectation Score
1	3.5	4.2	19	2.0	2.9
2	3.5	4.2	20	1.7	3.2
3	2.6	3.9	21	3.3	3.6
4	2.9	3.7	22	2.2	3.3
5	2.2	3.6	23	3.1	4.4
6	2.9	3.1	24	2.6	4.1
7	1.4	3.0	25	2.7	4.6
8	2.4	3.2	26	3.4	4.3
9	3.4	3.9	27	2.7	3.6
10	2.0	3.4	28	2.6	3.2
11	2.8	4.3	29	1.8	3.2
12	1.8	3.6	30	2.6	3.4
13	1.4	1.8	31	2.5	4.4
14	2.8	3.7	32	2.2	3.3
15	3.7	4.6	33	1.8	3.2
16	1.6	2.9	34	4.3	4.3
17	2.9	4.1	35	3.2	3.8
18	2.9	4.1	36	3.5	4.3

*Means are based on a five-point scale ranging from 1 - never, or almost never, to 5 - always, or almost always.

**For a description of the questionnaire items see Table III, p.44.

TABLE VIII

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FALLING IN MEAN EXPECTATION
SCORE RANGES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

Expectation	Mean Expectation Range	Items*
Almost always	4.6 - 5.0	15, 25
Often	4.0 - 4.5	1, 2, 11, 17, 18, 23, 24, 26, 31, 34, 36
Occasionally	3.5 - 3.9	3, 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 21, 27, 35
Rarely	1.0 - 2.0	13

*For a description of the questionnaire items see
Table III, p.44.

purpose of this final analysis was to discover the importance placed on the thirty-six questionnaire items by each of the following teacher subgroups: sex, age, teaching experience, tenure status, and educational background. As in the previous mean expectation score analysis for the total sample, scores of 4.6+ indicated which items the teachers felt their principals should "almost always" be doing. Scores falling between 3.9 and 4.6 indicated items that the teachers felt their principals should "often" be doing. Scores falling between 3.4 and 4.0 indicated that those activities should be carried out "occasionally" or more regularly than "sometimes" but less than "often". The mean expectation scores for all subgroups are presented in Table IX.

(a) Sex. Both the male and female teachers rated one common item, number twenty-five, a mean expectation of 4.6; five items were included in the 4.5 range; and five items in the 3.5 to 3.9 range. In addition, the male teachers had six items in the 4.6+ expectation range, four items in the 4.0 - 4.5 range, and two items in the 3.5 - 3.9 range. The female teachers did not rate any items above 4.5; they rated seven items in the 4.0 - 4.5 range, and four items in the 3.5 - 3.9 range. The questionnaire items falling in these three mean expectation score ranges are presented in Table X. Of the total thirty-six questionnaire items, the female teachers scored higher means on only six of the items.

TABLE IX

MEAN EXPECTATION SCORES FOR SEX, AGE, TEACHING EXPERIENCE,
TENURE STATUS, AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

No.*	Sex		Age		Experience			Tenure		Education						
	Male	Female	Under 30	30-39	Over 39	Under 3	3-6	7-10	Over 10	Prob.	On tenure	Teach. train.	1 yr. univ.	2 yrs. univ.	1 deg.	2+ deg.
1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.3	3.9	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.2
2	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.7	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.7	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.2
3	4.4	3.8	3.9	3.6	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.6	4.1
4	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.0
5	4.3	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.5	4.4
6	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.1	2.9	2.6	4.0	3.6	3.1	3.1	4.1	2.8	3.1	2.7	3.3
7	3.0	3.2	2.9	3.2	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.8	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.1
8	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.4	2.8
9	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.0	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.6	4.1
10	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.1	3.6	3.3	4.0	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.1
11	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.8	4.7	4.0	4.2	4.3
12	3.8	3.6	3.6	4.2	3.2	3.7	3.5	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.3	4.2	3.7	3.4	3.8
13	1.6	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.5	2.1	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.6	1.7	2.0
14	3.9	3.7	3.7	4.2	3.4	3.9	3.4	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.2	4.1	3.7	3.7
15	4.9	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.1	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.4
16	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.3	2.5	3.2	2.7	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.7	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.7
17	4.7	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.1	3.9	4.5	4.1	4.0	3.9
18	4.4	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.2	3.7	4.4
19	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.4	2.7	2.5	2.9	3.3	2.8	2.4	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.0	2.7	2.8
20	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.7	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	2.7	3.4	3.6	3.0	3.3

TABLE IX (continued)

No.	Sex		Age		Experience			Tenure		Education						
	Male	Female	Under 30	30-39	Over 39	Under 3	3-6	7-10	Over 10	Prob.	On tenure	Teach. train.	1 yr. univ.	2 yrs. univ.	1 deg.	2+ deg.
21	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.9	3.5	3.8
22	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.0	2.8	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.1	3.7
23	4.7	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.6
24	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.6	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.6	4.3	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.3
25	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.1
26	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.7	4.5	4.1	4.0	4.7	4.7	4.1	4.3	4.7	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.0
27	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.1	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.8
28	2.8	3.3	3.1	3.6	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.1	2.9	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.4	2.9	2.8
29	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.7	3.6	2.8	2.8
30	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.1	3.4	3.3	4.1	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.6	3.2	3.3
31	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1
32	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.1	4.0	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2
33	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.5	2.5	3.5	3.1	3.4	2.9	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.2
34	4.7	4.3	4.4	4.5	3.9	4.6	4.4	3.8	4.3	4.4	4.3	3.8	4.8	3.9	4.4	4.9
35	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.6	3.2	4.3	3.8	4.0	3.3	4.3	3.6	3.4	4.6	3.5	3.8	3.6
36	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.3	3.8	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.1
N	9	60	45	13	11	15	27	9	18	16	53	9	13	18	20	9

*For a description of the questionnaire items see Table III, p.44.

TABLE X

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FALLING IN MEAN
EXPECTATION SCORE RANGES BY SEX

Sex	Questionnaire Items*		
	Occasionally 3.5 - 3.9	Often 4.0 - 4.5	Almost Always 4.6 - 5.0
Males and females	4, 9, 12, 14, 27	1, 18, 24, 26, 36	25
Males only	2, 30	3, 5, 21, 35	11, 15, 17, 23, 31, 34
Females only	3, 5, 21, 35	2, 11, 15, 17, 23, 31, 34	

*For a description of the questionnaire items see
Table III, p.44.

(b) Age. All age subgroups had six common items in the 4.0 - 4.5 range of means, and one item, in the 3.5 - 3.9 range. Those teachers under thirty years of age had additional items in the 4.6+ range, seven items in the 4.0 - 4.5 range, and six items in the 3.5 - 3.9 range; as outlined in Table XI. The teachers in the 30 - 39 year age range rated five items above 4.5, four items in the 4.0 - 4.5 range, and fifteen items in the lower mean range. Those teachers over thirty-nine years of age had one item, item eleven, in the 4.6+ range category, five items in the 4.0 - 4.5 range, and three items in the 3.5 - 3.9 range. Of the thirty-six items, the middle age group scored twenty-seven items as high or higher than the expected means of the other two groups. The oldest age group scored lower expectation means than the other two subgroups in twenty-six items.

(c) Teaching Experience. The four subgroups involved had common agreement on only four items: two in the 4.0 - 4.5 range, and two in the 3.5 - 3.9 range. Those teachers with less than three years experience had means of 4.6+ on two items, means of 4.0 - 4.5 on nine items, and means of 3.5 - 3.9 on nine items. The teachers with 3 to 6 years of teaching experience also had two items with means of 4.6+. In addition this subgroup had ten items falling into the 3.5 - 3.9 range. Those teachers with 7 to 10 years of experience indicated six questionnaire items with means in

TABLE XI

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FALLING IN MEAN
EXPECTATION SCORE RANGES BY AGE

Age	Questionnaire Items*		
	Occasionally 3.5 - 3.9	Often 4.0 - 4.5	Almost Always 4.6 - 5.0
All groups	5	1, 2, 17, 18, 23, 36	
Under 30	3, 4, 12, 14, 22, 27	9, 11, 24, 26, 31, 34, 35	15, 25
30 - 39	3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35	11, 12, 14, 34	15, 24, 25, 26, 31
Over 39	9, 24, 34	3, 15, 25, 26, 31	11

*For a description of the questionnaire items see Table III, p.44.

the 4.6 - 5.0 range, nine items in the middle range, and nine items in the mean range of 3.5 - 3.9. The over-ten years of experience subgroup placed two items in the 4.6+ range, nine items in the middle range, and five items in the lower mean range. The placement of questionnaire items can be found in Table XII. The 7 to 10 years of teaching experience subgroup scored means as high as or higher than the other three subgroups on nineteen items, while the more experienced teachers, those in the over ten years subgroup, scored means as low as or lower than the other subgroups on eighteen items.

(d) Tenure Status. Both the probationary teachers and the tenured teachers had common agreement on one item, number twenty-five, with a mean score in the 4.6+ range. The two subgroups had seven items in the 4.0 - 4.5 category and six items in the 3.5 - 3.9 range. The probationary teachers had two items with means in the 4.0 - 4.5 range and four items in the lower mean range. Those teachers who had tenure had one item, number fifteen, in the 4.6+ range, four items in the 4.0 - 4.5 range, and three items in the 3.5 - 3.9 range. The tenured subgroup of teachers had means equal to or higher on twenty-five items. Table XIII illustrates the placement of the various questionnaire items in the three mean expectation ranges.

(e) Educational Background. As displayed by Table XIV all five subgroups had common agreement on only two items

TABLE XII

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FALLING
IN MEAN EXPECTATION SCORE
RANGES BY EXPERIENCE

Experience	Questionnaire Items*		
	Occasionally 3.5 - 3.9	Often 4.0 - 4.5	Almost Always 4.6 - 5.0
All groups	5, 21	23, 36	
Under 3 years	2, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 24, 27, 33	1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 15, 26, 31, 35	25, 34
3 - 6 years	3, 4, 12, 22, 27, 35	1, 2, 9, 11, 17, 18, 24, 26, 31, 34	15, 25
7 - 10 years	1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 27, 29, 30, 34	6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 32, 35	2, 15, 24, 25, 26, 31
Over 10 years	3, 6, 9, 12, 14	1, 2, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 31, 34	11, 26

*For a description of the questionnaire items see Table III, p.44.

TABLE XIII

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FALLING IN
MEAN EXPECTATION SCORE
RANGES BY TENURE

Tenure	Questionnaire Items*		
	Occasionally 3.5 - 3.9	Often 4.0 - 4.5	Almost Always 4.6 - 5.0
Both groups	3, 4, 9, 12, 14, 21	11, 18, 23, 26, 31, 34, 36	25
Probationary teachers	1, 2, 4, 7	15, 35	
Tenured teachers	5, 27, 35	1, 2, 17, 24	15

*For a description of the questionnaire items see Table III, p.44.

TABLE XIV

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FALLING IN
MEAN EXPECTATION SCORE
RANGES BY EDUCATION

Education	Questionnaire Items*		
	Occasionally 3.5 - 3.9	Often 4.0 - 4.5	Almost Always 4.6 - 5.0
All groups		1, 24	
Teacher training	3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 17, 18, 34, 36	6, 15, 31	2, 11, 23, 25, 26
1 year university	4, 5, 10, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30	2, 3, 9, 12, 15, 17, 18, 23, 26, 36	11, 25, 31, 34, 35
2 years university	3, 4, 12, 20, 21, 27, 29, 30, 34, 35	2, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18, 23, 26, 31	15, 25, 36
1 degree	3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 18, 21, 35	2, 11, 17, 23, 26, 31, 34, 36	15, 25
2 or more degrees	12, 14, 17, 21, 22, 27, 35	2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 15, 18, 25, 26, 31, 36	23, 34

*For a description of the questionnaire items see Table III, p.44.

which fell in the 4.0 - 4.5 mean expectation range. The teachers who had teacher training only had means of 4.6+ on five items, as did those teachers with one year university background. The former subgroup placed three items in the 4.0 - 4.5 range, while the latter placed ten items in that same mean range. The teacher-training group had nine items in the 3.5 - 3.9 range, and those teachers with one year university placed eight items in the lower category. Those teachers with two years university training placed three items in the 4.6+ category, nine items in the 4.0 - 4.5 category, and ten items in the 3.5 - 3.9 category. All teachers with one or more degrees placed two items each in the mean range of 4.6+. The teachers with one degree had eight items fall into the 4.0 - 4.5 range, and nine items fall into the 3.5 - 3.9 range. Those teachers with two or more degrees had means in the 4.0 - 4.5 range on twelve items and means in the 3.5 - 3.9 range on seven items. Those teachers with one year university training had eighteen items with means as high as or higher than the other four subgroups. The teachers with one degree rated eleven of the thirty-six items as low as or lower than the other subgroups.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. THE PROBLEM RESTATED

The present study was undertaken for the purpose of determining how elementary teachers perceive the supervisory role of their principals and of discovering what these same teachers expect of the supervisory program. Further, the writer wished to establish whether significant differences existed between the teachers' expectations and perceptions of their principal's supervisory function.

The sample in the study was drawn from the elementary teachers of St. James-Assiniboia School Division No.2.

II. SUMMARY OF PROCEDURE

In the review of the literature most authorities agreed that supervision involves ten fairly distinct major tasks as outlined by Harris (1963). The theoretical framework employed in this investigation was based on nine of these tasks of supervision. The nine tasks used were:

- (1) Developing curriculum
- (2) Organizing for instruction
- (3) Staffing
- (4) Providing materials
- (5) Arranging for inservice education

- (6) Orienting new staff members
- (7) Relating special services
- (8) Developing public relations
- (9) Evaluating

A modification of the Opinion Inventory of Supervision (O.I.S.), developed by Marquit (1968), was used. This questionnaire contained thirty-six items, four items in each of the nine tasks of supervision. The data from the modified forms of the O.I.S., one dealing with perceptions and the other dealing with expectations, were analyzed for statistical significance.

The Chi square test was used to establish the goodness of fit between individual items on the two questionnaires. The differences between perception and expectation scores, P-E values, were examined to identify areas of supervision where a discrepancy existed between teacher perceptions and teacher expectations. The mean expectation scores for the thirty-six items were used to establish the importance placed on each of the items by the teachers as a whole as well as by the following teacher subgroups: sex, age, teaching experience, tenure status, and educational background.

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant

differences between the expectations and perceptions of teachers regarding the role of their supervisors on thirty-two of the thirty-six questionnaire items was rejected on the basis of the Chi square test. The differences between teacher perceptions and teacher expectations on these items were found to be significant at the one percent level. The thirty-six questionnaire items were then ranked according to the P-E values.

The nine supervisory task areas were ranked as follows, according to the percentage values of the P-E values, beginning with the highest percentage value in the negative column to the lowest percentage value in the same column:

- (1) Curriculum development
- (2) Orientation of new staff
- (3) Providing inservice education and professional growth
- (4) Evaluating
- (5) Staffing
- (6) Instructional organization
- (7) Coordinating special services
- (8) Providing instructional aids
- (9) Developing school-community relations

The total sample identified several questionnaire items which should be further examined. The following two supervisory activities were identified as items which should "almost always" be conducted by the principal:

- (1) ... consult me before organizing the students into different classes or sections for the coming year,
- (2) ... discuss his evaluations of my instruction with me.

The following eleven supervisory activities were identified as items which should "often" be carried out by the principal:

- (1) ... emphasize the role of teachers when discussing the instructional program with members of the community,
- (2) ... succeed in evaluating my teaching accurately,
- (3) ... show new teachers how to operate the audio-visual equipment and/or familiarize them with the library and other instructional facilities of the school,
- (4) ... "spell out" the duties and responsibilities to new teachers, even though this information is available from the faculty handbook or other sources,
- (5) ... capitalize on my special abilities, especially when deciding committee assignments,
- (6) ... play a major role in orienting new teachers with the existing school staff,
- (7) ... organize my schedule in such a way that things like team instruction and team planning or individual planning are facilitated,
- (8) ... help me to use the special services of our division as by arranging student referrals to the appropriate staff (psychologist, nurse, reading teachers, etc.),
- (9) ... send me a prompt report of his evaluations of my teaching,
- (10)... permit me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, paper, etc.) in my room,
- (11)... explain our instructional program to parents and other members of the community.

There appeared to be high supervisory expectations in three task areas:

- (1) Orientation of new staff,
- (2) Developing school-community relations,
- (3) Evaluating.

The questionnaire item, "... encourages me to join community organizations (Scouts, Service Clubs, etc.)", was identified as an activity which should rarely be carried out by the principal.

In general, the subgroupings by sex, age, teaching experience, tenure status, and educational background supported the results obtained from the sample as a whole. However, in the analysis, several interesting points arose:

(1) Male teachers had higher mean expectation scores than female teachers.

(2) The thirty to thirty-nine year old age group had the highest mean expectation scores in the age classification, whereas the forty and over age group had the lowest mean expectation scores.

(3) In the teaching experience category, those teachers with seven to ten years experience had the highest mean expectation scores, while the teachers with more than ten years experience had the lowest.

(4) The tenured teachers had higher mean expectation scores than those teachers still on probation.

(5) In the educational background category, the teachers with one year university training had the highest mean expectation scores, whereas those with one degree had the lowest scores.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The assumption was made that effective supervisory programs are founded on cooperative efforts between the teacher and his supervisor. That is, the supervisor and teacher must have a mutual understanding about what the other is doing. The teacher should be aware of what his supervisor is doing as he carries out the supervisory program, and the teacher's perceptions of the program should be congruent with his expectations.

The findings of this study indicate that there were significant differences between teacher perceptions and teacher expectations in thirty-two of the thirty-six supervisory activities contained in the questionnaire. Since there was little congruence between the perceptions and expectations held by the teachers on these items, it is postulated that there has been minimal effective supervision occurring in these areas. However, Stewart (1970) found that the degree of effectiveness in the supervisors' performance of supervisory tasks was the teachers' major concern rather than the type of supervisory activities performed per se. If this is the case, then Stewart's findings lessen the delimitation that the thirty-six questionnaire items used in this study may represent an incomplete picture of the total supervisory function. The present results would then suggest that there has been minimal effective supervision

in the elementary schools of St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2.

Furthermore, the findings of this study support those of Bradfield (1964), Munnelly (1970), Stewart (1970), and Saxe (1972) in that elementary teachers receive very little supervision from their principal. In this study it was concluded that P-E values falling to the left or negative side of zero indicated that the teachers felt that their principal was not carrying out supervisory activities to the extent that they felt he should be doing them. P-E values falling in the zero column indicated that teacher perceptions and expectations were congruent and that teachers were satisfied with the amount of supervision taking place. Those P-E values falling to the right of zero, on the positive side of the table, showed that the principal was doing more supervisory work than was required of him. The results presented by Table V, p.52, indicated that teachers were being undersupervised in a large majority of the thirty-six questionnaire supervisory items. It is even more significant that the results presented by Table VI, p.55, showed that teachers were not receiving enough supervision from their principals in all nine supervisory task areas. Thus it is concluded, within the limitations and delimitations of this study, that elementary school teachers perceive there is very little supervision being conducted by their principals,

and that the supervision that is being carried out is relatively ineffective.

The review of the related literature and research presented in Chapter II indicated that elementary school principals view their role as changing from that of a mere managing head teacher to that of an instructional leader. However, Coleman (1972) was opposed to this point of view. He felt that the role of the principal should be moving in the opposite direction, from an educational leadership position toward a managerial or administrative leadership position. MacKay (1969) and Saxe (1972) both felt that the principal should be an educational leader; yet they both cited findings that the principal actually spends very little of his time in a supervisory role. The present study supports their findings that elementary school principals provide minimal effective supervision as an instructional leader. It is interesting to note that two of the questionnaire items where the teachers' perceptions and expectations were congruent, "... arranges for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts, etc.", and, "... permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, papers, etc.) in my room", tend to be managerial in nature. It may be that the elementary school principals of St. James-Assiniboia are assuming a managerial role, whereas the

teachers expect their principal to fill the role of an instructional leader.

It has previously been stated in Chapter I that the elementary school principal must take the lead with his own staff in the improvement of instruction. Bradfield (1964), Jarvis and Pounds (1969), and Parsons (1971) support this premise in their findings. The present study appears to indicate that this is not the case in the elementary schools today.

Both Geis (1967) and MacKay (1969) found that new teachers need special supervisory attention. In this study teacher expectations were found to be very high in the task area of orientation of new staff members, yet the findings also showed that this particular task area ranked extremely low with respect to the amount of supervision being carried out by the principal. This task area, the orienting of new staff members, appears to be a very critical area in the existing supervisory program and one which requires immediate attention.

Only one questionnaire item, "... encourages me to join community organizations (Scouts, Service Clubs, etc.)", fell into the category with which teachers "rarely" expected their principal to become involved. This expectation was held by the total population sample as well as the five subgroups. It could be that this particular supervisory activity would be more relevant in a rural setting.

V. IMPLICATIONS

The findings of the present study suggest the following implications for the supervisory role of the elementary school principal.

(1) There is very little congruence between the perceptions and expectations held by the teachers regarding the role of their supervisor. On the basis of this fact it is postulated that the supervision being conducted by the elementary principals in the elementary schools of St. James-Assiniboia is ineffective as far as thirty-two of the thirty-six questionnaire items are concerned. It appears obvious that the elementary principal needs to place more emphasis on almost all supervisory areas in his school in an attempt to rectify this situation.

(2) Elementary principals should be aware of the areas of high expectations held by their teachers. The principal must be fully aware of the supervisory activities the teachers expect of him in order that he can either make effective adjustments in his supervision program or educate the teachers on the role of a supervisor.

(3) If administrators wish to improve their supervisory programs, they can make use of the ranking of the nine supervisory tasks as a model. Areas such as curriculum development and orientation of new teachers appear to hold a high priority for immediate attention.

(4) The findings and conclusions of this study are derived from elementary teachers' perceptions and expectations of their principal's supervisory role. The possibility exists that the teachers' perceptions and/or expectations are actually unrealistic. If this is the case it is paramount that the teachers be educated on the role of their supervisor for effective supervision to occur.

(5) A study of the various subgrouping of teachers will give principals some insight as to how different groups of teachers on their staffs might generally feel and/or react toward various aspects of supervision. In this study, for example, male teachers have higher expectations than female teachers. It also appears evident that older and more experienced teachers are more conservative in their outlook towards supervision, whereas teachers in their thirties and with seven to ten years teaching experience appear to be more demanding of the supervisory program.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This thesis provides a foundation for further study in the field of supervision. The results of this investigation point towards a number of possible inquiries.

(1) Research to determine the elementary school principals' expectations and perceptions of their own role in the supervisory program. In this study it has been assumed that the most effective supervisory programs occur when both

teacher and principal have a healthy, mutual working relationship. This situation can occur only if both the principal and teacher agree on what the role of a supervisor is. The present investigation suggests that elementary school principals may be assuming a managerial role, whereas the teachers expect their principal to fill the role of an instructional leader. A study of principals' perceptions and expectations could help to clarify further how they themselves view the role of a supervisor.

(2) Research as to the emphasis which should be placed on supervisory activities. There is evidence from the related literature and research that the principals are undecided about this emphasis. The research indicates that supervisors should involve a large portion of their duties toward supervision, yet the study suggests the opposite to be the practice. The question arises as to whether this ineffective supervision is due to a lack of training of the principals in this area or a matter of priority in their everyday workload.

(3) Research of a similar design to this study, which would investigate the role of the supervisor at the secondary level would help to give a more complete picture for the public school system.

(4) Research of teachers' perceptions and expectations of their supervisors and of the supervisory program in a rural setting.

VII. IMPLICATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INSERVICE

There appears to be a great deal of room for administrative inservice in the area of supervision. This study suggests, within the limitations of the theoretical framework used, that the elementary teachers generally feel both under-supervised and ineffectively supervised by their principal. The people responsible for the planning and implementing of administrative inservice sessions can make use of the ranking of the nine supervisory tasks as a list of priorities in planning their programs. The organizers can also make use of the supervisory expectations held by the teachers in this study. By making principals aware of what the teachers expect of them, they can adjust their supervisory program accordingly if they feel the teachers' expectations are justified.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Babin, Patrick. "Supervisors Look at Themselves," McGill Journal of Education, 5 (Fall 1970), pp. 173-177.
- Born, Warren C. "Supervision and the Teacher: The Odd Couple," Papers presented at the New York State Association of Foreign Language Teachers' Colloquium (May 7, 1971), College of St. Rose, Albany, New York. Eric 064995.
- Bowles, D. Richard. Effective Elementary School Administration. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.
- Bradfield, Luther E. and Kraft, Leonard E. editors, The Elementary School Principal in Action, (Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1970).
- Bradfield, Luther E. Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964).
- Bunyan, L. W. "Anxiety, Self-Concept, and Supervision," The Canadian Administrator, 10 (December 1970) pp. 11-14.
- Cardenas, Jose Angel. "Role expectations for instructional supervisors as expressed by selected supervisors, administrators, and teachers." A dissertation for Doctor of Education degree, (May 1966), University of Texas. Mfilm 38.
- Coleman, Peter. "The Future Role of the School Administrator," Interchange, 3, 1972.
- Cook, J. Marvin. "Behavioral Objectives and the Supervisor," Presented at the Supervision of Instruction Symposium I, November 11, 1971, Cuyahoga County Instructional Supervision Study, Garfield Heights, Ohio, 44125. Eric 066825.
- Curtin, James. Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan Canada, Ltd., 1964.
- Donald, William. "An Evaluation of the Role of the Supervising Principals in the Elementary Schools in Winnipeg," A major thesis presented to the Faculty of Education, (September 1963), University of Manitoba.
- Eash, Maurice J. "Toward A More Viable System of Supervision," New York State English Council, Oswego, (October 1969), Eric 039223.

- Faber, Charles F. and Shearron, Gilbert F. Elementary School Administration: Theory and Practice. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Geis, Thelma D. "Five Major Problem Areas of the Teacher-Supervisor Relationship," An applied project presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Education Specialist, (May 1967), Arizona State University.
- Goldhammer, Dean K. "Characteristics of Effective Elementary Principals," Alberta Teachers' Association, 52 (January-February 1972), pp. 20-21.
- Goldman, Harvey. "Evaluation of Administrative Behavior at the Building Level," NASSP 54 (September 1970), pp. 70-79.
- Guss, Carolyn. "How Is Supervision Perceived?" Educational Leadership, 19, (November 1961), pp. 99-102.
- Gwynn, J. Minor. Theory and Practice of Supervision. Toronto: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1964.
- Hamilton, W. L. "An Analysis of North American Ideas on School Supervision," The CSA Bulletin, April 1966.
- Harris, Ben M. Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- _____. "Need for Research on Instructional Supervision," Educational Leadership, 21 (November 1963) pp. 129-136.
- Harris, Ben M. and Hartgraves, William R. "Supervisor Effectiveness? A Research Resume," Educational Leadership, 30 (October 1972), pp. 73-79.
- Hemphill, H. David. "What is Leadership?" The Canadian Administrator, 8 (November 1968), pp. 5-8.
- Hicks, William V. and Jameson, Marshall C. The Elementary School Principal at Work. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.
- Jarvis, Oscar T. editor, Elementary School Administration. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1969.
- Jarvis, Oscar T. and Pounds, Haskin R. Organizing Supervising, and Administering the Elementary School. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.

- Jordan, William C. Elementary School Leadership. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Kimbrough, Ralph B. Administering Elementary Schools -- Concepts and Practices. London: Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1968.
- Koran, John J. Jr. "Supervision: An Attempt to Modify Behavior," Educational Leadership, 26 (May 1969) pp. 754-757.
- Krecsy, J. Patrick and Brayne, Robin C. "What Do I Do: An Approach to Supervision," Manitoba Journal of Education, 8 (November 1972), pp. 31-38.
- Leeper, Robert R. editor, "Changing Supervision for Changing Times," Addresses for the Twenty-fourth Annual Conference (March 16-20, 1969), Chicago, Illinois. Eric 041353.
- Leeper, Robert R. editor, Supervision: Emerging Profession. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969.
- Lucio, William H. and McNeil, John D. Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action, second edition. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company 1969.
- MacKay, D. A. "Canadian Supervisory Practices," The Canadian Administrator, 9 (December 1969), pp. 9-14.
- Mackenzie, Gordon N. "Role of the Supervisor," Educational Leadership, 19 (November 1961) pp. 86-90.
- Malone, Charles F. How To Become A More Competent Elementary School Principal. Prairie Village, Kansas: The Squire Publishers, 1969.
- Marks, James R., Stoops, Emery, and King-Stoops, Joyce. Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.
- Marquit, Lawrence J. "Perceptions of the Supervisory Behavior of Secondary School Principals," Paper presented at the 1968 annual meeting of the American Research Association, (February 1968), Chicago. Eric 020579.
- McKague, T. R. "Leadership in Schools," The Canadian Administrator, 7 (May 1968) pp. 31-34.

- Mink, Oscar G. "Supervision and Performance Objectives," Presented at the Supervision of Instruction Symposium I, (November 11, 1971), Cuyahoga County Instructional Supervision Study, Garfield Heights, Ohio, 44125. Eric 064798.
- Munnelly, Robert J. "Teacher-Supervisor Conflicts and the Issue of Academic Freedom," Educational Leadership, 27 (April 1970) pp. 673-677.
- National Education Association. The Elementary School Principalship in 1968. Washington: Department of Elementary School Principals, N.E.A. 1968.
- Neagley, Ross L. and Evans, N. Dean. Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction, second edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Nelson, John. "A Survey of the Adequacy of Orientation Given to 1970 Graduates of the University of Manitoba Education I Secondary Course and their Classroom Effectiveness," A major thesis presented to the Faculty of Education, (December 1971), University of Manitoba.
- Neville, Richard F. "The Supervisor We Need," Educational Leadership, 23 (May 1966) pp. 634-640.
- Nicholls, Glenn. "Organizational Climate and Principal Personality: A Study in Relationships," A major thesis presented to the Faculty of Education, (1969), University of Manitoba.
- Parsons, George L. "Stages in the Evolution of Educational Supervision," Newfoundland Teachers' Association Journal, 63 (Spring 1972) pp. 30-35.
- Parsons, G. Llewellyn. "Teacher Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness," The Canadian Administrator, 11 (November 1971) pp. 1-4.
- Petrescu, George J. "Supervision of Instruction--Principal's Biggest Task," School Administration, (April 1968), pp. 40-43.
- Phillips, Alfred T. "The Role of the Secondary School Vice-Principal with Special Reference to Winnipeg Junior High Schools," A minor thesis presented to the Faculty of Education, (May 1964), University of Manitoba.

- Saxe, Richard. "Elementary Supervision Revisited," Phi Delta Kappan, 53 (June 1972), pp. 652-654.
- Scholl, Robert Lee. "Secondary Student Teachers' Perceptions of Effective and Ineffective Supervisory Behavior of the College Supervisor," Ann Arbor, University Microfilms, 1967. Mfilm 141.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "What Kind of Objectives for Supervision?" Presented at the Supervision of Instruction Symposium I (November 11, 1971) Cuyahoga County Instructional Supervision Study, Garfield Heights, Ohio, 44125. Eric 066817.
- Snyder, Fred A. and Peterson, R. Duane. Dynamics of Elementary School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Spencer, Ted. "The Supervisory Activities of School Principals in Rural Saskatchewan," A thesis presented to the Faculty of Education, (1937), University of Manitoba.
- Stewart, Bob R. "Supervisory Behavior," Educational Leadership, 27 (February 1970), pp. 521-525.
- Stoops, Emery and Johnson, Russell E. Elementary School Administration. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. Third edition, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Wilson, L. Craig, Byar, T. Madison, Shapiro, Arthur S. and Schell, Shirley H. Sociology of Supervision. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.
- Ziolkowski, E. H. "Practices in the Supervision of Instruction," The Canadian Administrator, 5 (October 1965) pp. 1-4.

APPENDIX A
INTRODUCTORY LETTERS, QUESTIONNAIRES
AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER

St. James-Assiniboia, Manitoba
R

March 14, 1973.

Dear

Enclosed please find envelopes addressed to teachers on your staff. These envelopes contain a questionnaire concerning the supervision practices of the elementary school principal. The major purpose of this study will be to examine how teachers perceive the supervisory role of their principal and what they expect of the supervisory program.

This study is conducted for a master's thesis at the University of Manitoba. The source of all information will be kept in strict confidence. No teacher, principal, or school will be identified in the results of the study.

I would be grateful to you if you would pass these envelopes out to your teachers who are involved and if you would encourage them to complete them and return them to me.

A second questionnaire will be sent to the same teachers about three weeks from now.

Sincerely

Gordon Tovell

Winnipeg, Manitoba
March 14, 1973

Dear Teacher,

This letter is a request for your participation as an elementary teacher in a consensus study concerning the supervision practices of your principal. The major purpose of this study will be to examine how teachers perceive the supervisory role of their principal and what they expect of the supervisory program. Hopefully, results from this study will give the principal an index of the impact of his supervisory program upon his teachers and provide information on areas which can be improved.

This study is conducted for a master's thesis at the University of Manitoba. A copy of the thesis abstract will be sent to each elementary school principal in the division and will be available to you through him. The source of all information will be kept in strict confidence. No teacher, principal, or school will be identified in the results of the study. Do not sign your name.

If you can spare about fifteen minutes in your busy schedule, your cooperation will be gratefully appreciated. You will receive two questionnaires. One is enclosed with this letter and the other will follow in about three weeks time. Please (1) read the instructions for the enclosed questionnaire very carefully, (2) complete the questionnaire, and (3) return it in the self-addressed envelope.

I regret imposing on you at this busy time of the year. However, in order that the study be as meaningful as possible it is very important that your response to the questionnaire be included in this survey. Therefore, I shall be very grateful to you if you will return this completed questionnaire before March 28, 1973. You will receive the second questionnaire about a week later.

Sincerely,

Gordon C. Tovell
Master of Education Student
University of Manitoba

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FORM P

Introduction

We all know that the duties and responsibilities of school principals can vary greatly from one school division to another. We also know that no two principals behave exactly alike even in the same school division. We do not know, however, precisely how much difference there is in these behavior. It is the purpose of this study to find out just how much variance there is among principals as they perform their supervisory duties.

In the accompanying questionnaire you will find several statements which ask you to express your opinion as to how much supervision your principal provides. Since we are interested only in opinions there naturally can be no right or wrong answers. So please react to each statement in terms of how you feel about it.

You may rest assured that no one but this reseacher will see your answer sheet. We are interested in grouped data only and therefore do not wish you to place your name on the answer sheet.

Thank you for your cooperation. Your assistance is most appreciated.

Directions

Please put your answers on the answer sheets only.

Please read each item carefully.

Do not put your name on this Inventory.

Identification marks of any kind will not be found on this Inventory.

You may use pen or pencil.

Please answer all questions--incomplete Inventories cannot be used.

After reading each statement, determine whether you feel:

The statement describes an event or instance which, as far as you know, is:

1- never, or almost never, the case

2- rarely or seldom the case

3- sometimes the case

4- often the case

5- always, or almost always, the case

When you have decided on your response, place a check or an X in the appropriate space on your first answer sheet.

Please turn page

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes
4-often 5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal"

- 1 ... emphasises the role of teachers when discussing the instructional program with members of the community.
- 2 ... succeeds in evaluating my teaching accurately.
- 3 ... has a lot of influence in hiring new teachers.
- 4 ... encourages me to include the special services personnel of the division in my lessons or instructional program.
- 5 ... plays a major role in orienting new teachers with the community.
- 6 ... arranges for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts etc.
- 7 ... gives demonstrations lessons.
- 8 ... observes my teaching in the classroom.
- 9 ... provides me with opportunities for in-service conferences and workshops.
- 10... works with me to improve the scope and sequence of my curriculum.
- 11... shows new teachers how to operate the audio visual equipment and/or familiarizes them with the library and other instructional facilities of the school.

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes
4-often 5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal"

12... gives me special time to plan and develop curriculum revisions.

13... encourages me to join community organizations
(Scouts, Service Clubs, etc.)

14... coordinates the special services of my building
as by arranging guidance or audio-visual schedules to make
them available to me

15... consults me before organizing the students into
different classes or sections for the coming year.

16... helps me to evaluate the instructional aids which
I use in my classroom.

17... "spells out" the duties and responsibilities to
new teachers, even though this information is avail-
able from the faculty handbook or other sources.

18... capitalizes on my special abilities, especially
when deciding committee assignments.

19... encourages me to select necessary audio-visual,
and other instructional materials with his advice.

20... advises me to read a particular book or take a
certain course if he feels that I have a lack in an area
of professional knowledge.

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes
4-often 5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal"

21... devotes a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations.

22... provides me with an opportunity to meet new professional candidates who seek a position in this school

23... plays a major role in orienting new teachers with the existing school staff.

24... organizes my schedule in such a way that things like team instruction and team planning or individual planning are facilitated.

25... discusses his evaluations of my instruction with me.

26... helps me to use the special service of our division as by arranging for field trip transportation or arranging student referrals to the appropriate staff (psychologist, nurse, reading teachers, etc.)

27... makes it easy for me to get out of my class to visit another class in action.

28... helps me organize my instructional program as by suggesting how much time to spend in each content area of the curriculum.

29... comments or remarks to me about my lesson plans meeting the goals of the curriculum.

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes
4-often 5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal"

30... emphasises the contributions which the special services personnel can make in my instructional program.

31... sends me a prompt report of his evaluations of my teaching.

32... helps me in establishing curriculum goals and academic standards for my class.

33... helps me organize special class groups, commitees, and other areas of instructional organization.

34... permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, paper, etc.) in my room.

35... emphasized the advantages of working here when I was interviewed, or before I was hired. (If present principal was not here when you were hired, to what extent do you feel that the present principal would do this?)

36... explains our instructional program to parents and other members of the community.

Please be sure to see your Second Answer Sheet

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FIRST ANSWER SHEET

1	2	3	4	5	19.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	20.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	21.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	22.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	23.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	24.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	25.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	26.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	27.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	28.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	29.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	30.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	31.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	32.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	33.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	34.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	35.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	36.	1	2	3	4	5

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FORM P

SECOND ANSWER SHEET

37. Please indicate your sex: Male ____ Female ____
38. Please indicate your age group:
(1) Under 30 ____ (2) 30-39 ____ (3) 40-49 ____
(4) 50-59 ____ (5) 60+ ____
39. Please indicate your birth date: Day ____ Month ____ Year ____
40. Please indicate your years of teaching experience
(include this year as one);
(1) Under 3 ____ (2) 3-6 ____ (3) 7-10 ____ (4) 10+ ____
41. Please indicate your tenure status in this school:
(1) Not on tenure (probationary) ____ (2) On tenure ____
42. Please indicate your educational background to date:
0 ____ Teacher training only 1 ____ 1 year University
2 ____ 2 years University 3 ____ Bachelor's Degree (B.A. BSc etc.)
4 ____ Bachelor of Education 5 ____ Master's (M.A., MSc, MEd, etc.)
6 ____ Doctorate

Thank you very much for your cooperation

St. James-Assiniboia, Manitoba
R

April 4, 1973.

Dear

As mentioned in my letter of March 14 you will find the second set of questionnaires enclosed. This questionnaire pertains to the teacher's expectations of the principal's supervisory role whereas the first pertained to their perceptions of that role.

Once again I will be grateful to you if you will pass these envelopes out to your teachers who are involved and if you will encourage them to complete and return the forms to me.

At the writing of this letter I have received 67/100 of the first questionnaires completed. Would you mind reminding those teachers selected on your staff to complete their first questionnaire if they have not already done so. Again I reassure you that no teachers, principal or school will be identified in the results of the study. Finally, in about two weeks time a follow-up letter will be sent to the same teachers. Again I will be indebted to you if you will distribute these.

If you have any questions pertaining to this study please feel free to contact me. If you would be interested in having a copy of the questionnaire, I have a limited supply of extra copies on hand which I will be pleased to send you upon request.

Sincerely

Gordon Tovell

Winnipeg, Manitoba
April 4, 1973

Dear Teacher,

About three weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire on the supervisory practices of principals. At that time I indicated to you that you would receive a second questionnaire, which you will find enclosed with this letter. I thank you for taking time out to complete the first questionnaire and for mailing it back to me. If you have not done so, could you please complete it before answering the second questionnaire.

Once again I am asking you to spare another fifteen minutes in your busy schedule. Would you kindly (1) read the instructions for the enclosed questionnaire carefully, (2) complete the questionnaire, and (3) return it in the self-addressed envelope before April 18, 1973. Again I assure you that strict anonymity will be maintained.

Thank you again for the assistance you have already given and for your anticipated response to this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Gordon C. Tovell
Master of Education Student
University of Manitoba

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FORM E

INTRODUCTION

We all know that the duties and responsibilities of school principals can vary greatly from one school division to another. We also know that no two principals behave exactly alike even in the same school division. We do not know, however, precisely how much difference there is in this behavior. It is the purpose of this study to find out just how much variance there is among principals as they perform their supervisory duties.

In the accompanying questionnaire you will find several statements which ask you to express your opinion as to how much supervision you would like to see your principal provide. Since we are only interested in opinions there naturally can be no right or wrong answers. So please react to each statement in terms of how you feel about it.

You may rest assured that no one but this researcher will see your answer sheet. We are interested in grouped data only and therefore do not wish you to place your name on the answer sheet.

Thank you for your cooperation. Your assistance is most appreciated.

Directions

Please put your answers on the answer sheet only.

Please read each item carefully.

Do not put your name on this Inventory.

Identification marks of any kind will not be found on this Inventory.

You may use pen or pencil.

Please answer all questions--incomplete Inventories cannot be used.

After reading each statement, determine whether you feel:

The statement describes an event or instance which as far as you are concerned, should:

- 1- never, or almost never, be the case
- 2- rarely or seldom be the case
- 3- sometimes be the case
- 4- often be the case
- 5- always or almost, be the case

When you have decided on your response, place a check or an X in the appropriate space on your first answer sheet.

Please turn the Page

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes
4-often 5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal should"

- 1 ... emphasise the role of teachers when discussing the instructional program with members of the community.
- 2 ... succeed in evaluating my teaching accurately.
- 3 ... have a lot of influence in hiring new teachers.
- 4 ... encourage me to include the special services personnel of the division in my lessons or instructional program.
- 5 ... play a major role in orienting new teachers with the community.
- 6 ... arrange for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts etc.
- 7 ... give demonstration lessons.
- 8 ... observe my teaching in the classroom.
- 9 ... provide me with opportunities for in-service conferences and workshops.
- 10... work with me to improve the scope and sequence of my curriculum.
- 11... show new teachers how to operate the audio visual equipment and/or familiarize them with the library and other instructional facilities of the school.

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes
4-often 5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal should"

12... give special time to plan and develop curriculum revisions.

13... encourage me to join community organizations (Scouts, Service Clubs etc.)

14... coordinate the special services of my building as by arranging guidance or audio-visual schedules to make them available to me.

15... consult me before organizing the students into different classes or sections for the coming year.

16... help me to evaluate the instructional aids which I use in my classroom.

17... "spell out" the duties and responsibilities to new teachers, even though this information is available from the faculty hand book or other sources.

18... capitalize on my special abilities, especially when deciding committee assignments.

19... encourage me to select necessary audio-visual, and other instructional materials with his advise.

20... advise me to read a particular book or take a certain course if he feels that I have a lack in an area of professional knowledge.

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes
4-often 5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal should"

- 21... devote a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations.
- 22... provide me with an opportunity to meet new professional candidates who seek a position in this school.
- 23... play a major role in orienting new teachers with the existing school staff.
- 24... organize my schedule in such a way that things like team instructions and team planning or individual planning are facilitated.
- 25... discuss his evaluations of my instruction with me.
- 26... help me to use the special service of our division as by arranging for field trip transportation or arranging student referrals to the appropriate staff (psychologist, nurse, reading teachers ect.)
- 27... make it easy for me to get out of my class to visit another class in action.
- 28... help me organize my instructional program as by suggesting how much time to spend in each content area of the curriculum.

Key: 1-never, or almost never 2-rarely 3-sometimes
4-often 5-always, or almost always

Please precede each statement with "My principal should"

29... comment or remark to me about my lesson plans meeting the goals of the curriculum.

30... emphasise the contributions which the special services personnel can make in my instructional program.

31... send me a prompt report of his evaluations of my teaching.

32... help me in establishing curriculum goals and academic standards for my class.

33... help me to organize special class groups, committees, and other areas of instructional organization.

34... permit me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, paper, etc.) in my room.

35... ephasise the advantages of working here when I am interviewed, or before I am hired.

36... explain our instructional program to parents and other members of the community.

Please be sure to See Your Second Answer Sheet.

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FIRST ANSWER SHEET

FORM E

1. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	19. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
2. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	20. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
3. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	21. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
4. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	22. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
5. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	23. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
6. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	24. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
7. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	25. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
8. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	26. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
9. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	27. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
10. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	28. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
11. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	29. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
12. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	30. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
13. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	31. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
14. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	32. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
15. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	33. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
16. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	34. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
17. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	35. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___
18. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___	36. 1	___	2	___	3	___	4	___	5	___

THE OPINION INVENTORY OF SUPERVISION

FORM E

SECOND ANSWER SHEET

37. Please indicate your sex: Male ____ Female ____
38. Please indicate your age group:
(1) Under 30 ____ (2) 30-39 ____ (3) 40-49 ____
(4) 50-59 ____ (5) 60+ ____
39. Please indicate your birth date: Day ____ Month ____ Year ____
40. Please indicate your years of teaching experience
(include this year as one):
(1) Under 3 ____ (2) 3-6 ____ (3) 7-10 ____ (4) 10+ ____
41. Please indicate your tenure status in this school:
(1) Not on tenure (probationary) ____ (2) On tenure ____
42. Please indicate your educational background to date:
0 ____ Teacher training only 1 ____ 1 year University
2 ____ 2 years University 3 ____ Bachelor's Degree (B.A., BSc, etc.)
4 ____ Bachelor of Education 5 ____ Master's (M.A., MSc., Med, etc.)
6 ____ Doctorate

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Winnipeg, Manitoba
April 18, 1973

Dear Teacher,

This letter comes as a friendly reminder. About five weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire followed by a second questionnaire about two weeks ago. If you have already mailed the questionnaires, I thank you. If you have not done so, I urge you to take time out to complete them at this time.

I am sure you are interested in participating in the survey as the findings of the study should prove significant to both you and your principal.

To make the results valid it is very important that every questionnaire be returned on time to be included in the study. If I receive yours within a few days, I shall still be able to include your answers.

I thank you sincerely for your anticipated response.

Sincerely,

Gordon C. Tovell
Master of Education Student
University of Manitoba

APPENDIX B
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

TABLE XV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON A 1-5 SCALE FOR EACH
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM WITH THE TEACHERS'
PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE
SUPERVISORY ROLE OF THEIR
RESPECTIVE PRINCIPALS

N=69

Item No.	1					2					3					4				
	1	2	3	4	5*	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Perceptions	7	4	19	25	14	4	8	21	23	13	15	16	21	14	3	12	18	17	11	11
Expectations	1	1	11	27	29	0	1	13	25	30	2	4	19	18	25	0	6	25	20	18
Item No.	5					6					7					8				
Perceptions	22	27	11	4	5	23	9	9	10	18	55	5	5	2	2	11	31	18	6	3
Expectations	1	10	23	16	19	15	10	16	10	18	4	15	35	10	5	1	5	45	13	5

TABLE XV (continued)

Item No.	9					10					11					12				
	1	2	3	4	5*	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Perceptions	3	8	28	16	14	32	19	8	6	4	18	12	16	15	8	40	14	5	8	2
Expectations	0	1	21	31	16	4	5	28	23	9	4	1	6	15	43	1	7	24	21	16
Item No.	13					14					15					16				
	56	8	1	0	4	15	13	21	11	9	6	8	17	11	27	41	17	8	1	2
Perceptions	56	8	1	0	4	15	13	21	11	9	6	8	17	11	27	41	17	8	1	2
Expectations	29	26	12	1	0	4	4	19	22	20	0	0	12	6	51	4	15	37	10	3
Item No.	17					18					19					20				
	16	15	13	11	14	15	6	27	11	10	30	20	12	4	3	39	15	11	4	0
Perceptions	16	15	13	11	14	15	6	27	11	10	30	20	12	4	3	39	15	11	4	0
Expectations	2	4	11	21	31	0	3	15	26	25	4	20	29	12	4	1	13	32	15	8

TABLE XV (continued)

Item No.	21					22					23					24				
	1	2	3	4	5*	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Perceptions	3	14	20	20	12	28	15	12	10	4	11	13	16	19	10	19	17	11	15	7
Expectations	1	4	25	29	10	6	10	22	16	13	0	4	5	22	38	1	6	7	23	32
Item No.	25					26					27					28				
Perceptions	23	14	10	5	17	11	12	9	14	23	18	17	13	13	8	20	14	12	9	14
Expectations	2	2	3	7	55	1	4	7	21	36	1	4	31	19	14	3	17	25	10	14
Item No.	29					30					31					32				
Perceptions	38	18	7	3	3	17	14	17	16	3	31	7	9	6	16	27	17	13	10	2
Expectations	2	14	29	16	8	1	8	31	18	11	3	1	6	13	44	1	10	29	24	5

TABLE XV (continued)

Item No.	33					34					35					36				
	1	2	3	4	5*	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Perceptions	39	12	12	4	2	4	2	6	11	46	16	8	9	18	18	6	7	19	21	16
Expectations	3	8	37	14	7	3	2	7	14	43	5	6	15	15	28	0	0	10	29	30

*1 - never, or almost never, 2 - rarely, 3 - sometimes, 4 - often,
5 - always, or almost always.

APPENDIX C

P-E VALUES

TABLE XVI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTION AND
EXPECTATION SCORES: P-E VALUES

Question #1 - My principal (should emphasise) emphasises the role of teachers when discussing the instructional program with members of the community.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	2	3	18	11	22	10	2	1		69
Sex:										
Male		1	4	1	1	1		1		9
Female	2	2	14	10	21	9	2			60
Age:										
Under 30	1	3	10	8	18	4		1		45
30 - 39			5	1	2	3	2			13
40 - 59	1		3	2	2	3				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		1	1	3	6	4				15
3 - 6 years	1	1	8	5	10		1	1		27
7 - 10 years		1	3		3	1	1			9
10+ years	1		6	3	3	5				18
Tenure:										
Probation			2	2	6	4	1	1		16
On tenure	2	3	16	9	16	6	1			53
Education:										
Teacher training	1		2	2	3	1				9
1 year university			3	1	6	3				13
2 years university	1	1	5	2	4	3	1	1		18
Bachelor		2	3	5	7	2	1			20
B. Ed.+			5	1	2	1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #2 - My principal (should succeed) succeeds in evaluating my teaching accurately.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	1	6	9	22	22	7	2			69
Sex:										
Male		1	2	2	4					9
Female	1	5	7	20	18	7	2			60
Age:										
Under 30		6	6	14	14	5				45
30 - 39				6	5	1	1			13
40 - 59	1		3	2	3	1	1			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		1		5	6	3				15
3 - 6 years		3	4	11	7	2				27
7 - 10 years		2	3	1	2	1				9
10+ years	1		2	5	7	1	2			18
Tenure:										
Probation		1	1	5	6	2	1			16
On tenure	1	5	8	17	16	5	1			53
Education:										
Teacher training	1		3	1	4					9
1 year university		1	2	4	3	2	1			13
2 years university		2	1	7	5	3				18
Bachelor		3	1	6	7	2	1			20
B. Ed.+			2	4	3					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #3 - My principal (should have) has a lot of influence in hiring new teachers.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	5	8	18	13	17	7		1		69
Sex:										
Male	3	1	2	2	1					9
Female	2	7	16	11	16	7		1		60
Age:										
Under 30	2	5	13	7	14	3		1		45
30 - 39	1	2	3	2	2	3				13
40 - 59	2	1	2	4	1	1				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		2	6	3	2	2				15
3 - 6 years	2	2	7	4	10	1		1		27
7 - 10 years	1	1	3		3	1				9
10+ years	2	3	2	6	2	3				18
Tenure:										
Probation		2	5	3	4	2				16
On tenure	5	6	13	10	13	5		1		53
Education:										
Teacher training			3	2	3	1				9
1 year university		1	5	1	4	2				13
2 years university	1	3	4	4	4	2				18
Bachelor	2	3	3	5	4	2		1		20
B. Ed.+	2	1	3	1	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #4 - My principal (should encourage) encourages me to include the special services personnel of the division in my lessons or instructional program.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	4	4	16	13	24	3	4	1		69
Sex:										
Male	2	1	2	2	2					9
Female	2	3	14	11	22	3	4	1		60
Age:										
Under 30	1	3	13	9	18	1				45
30 - 39	3		2	1	4	1	2			13
40 - 59		1	1	3	2	1	2	1		11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		2	5	2	5	1				15
3 - 6 years	2	1	7	5	12					27
7 - 10 years	1		1	2	4		1			9
10+ years	1	1	3	4	3	2	3	1		18
Tenure:										
Probation		1	4	4	5	1	1			16
On tenure	4	3	12	9	19	2	3	1		53
Education:										
Teacher training		1	2	3	1	1	1			9
1 year university			5	3	4		1			13
2 years university	2	1	2	3	7	1	2			18
Bachelor		1	4	2	11	1		1		20
B. Ed.+	2	1	3	2	1					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #5 - My principal (should play) plays a major role in orienting new teachers with the community.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	9	8	17	18	10	3	2	2		69
Sex:										
Male	3	3		3						9
Female	6	5	17	15	10	3	2	2		60
Age:										
Under 30	5	8	12	12	7		1			45
30 - 39	2		2	3	3	1	1	1		13
40 - 59	2		3	3		2		1		11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	3	4	3	4					15
3 - 6 years	6	2	7	7	3	1	1			27
7 - 10 years	1	3	1	3						9
10+ years	1		5	5	3	2	1	1		18
Tenure:										
Probation	1	3	3	4	4	1				16
On tenure	8	5	14	14	6	2	2	2		53
Education:										
Teacher training		2	3	3		1				9
1 year university	2		3	7	1					13
2 years university	3	2	2	4	2	1	2	2		18
Bachelor	1	2	8	3	5	1				20
B. Ed.+	3	2	1	1	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #6 - My principal (should arrange) arranges for my requisitions for instructional materials that I use, such as film strips, records, charts etc.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	7	1	5	11	26	10	4	1	4	69
Sex:										
Male	1		1	1	4	2				9
Female	6	1	4	10	22	8	4	1	4	60
Age:										
Under 30	3	1	3	10	17	7	2	1	1	45
30 - 39	4		1		6	1			1	13
40 - 59			1	1	3	2	2		2	11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	1	1	3	5	3		1		15
3 - 6 years	2		1	5	11	4	2		2	27
7 - 10 years	1		1	2	4				1	9
10+ years	3		2	1	6	3	2		1	18
Tenure:										
Probation	2			3	8	3				16
On tenure	5	1	5	8	18	7	4	1	4	53
Education:										
Teacher training	1		1	1	4	1	1			9
1 year university	2		1	1	3	3	1		2	13
2 years university	3	1	1	2	5	4	1		1	18
Bachelor			1	6	11	1			1	20
B. Ed.+	1		1	1	3	1	1	1		9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #7 - My principal (should give) gives demonstration lessons.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	4	8	30	13	9	3	2			69
Sex:										
Male	1	1	3	3		1				9
Female	3	7	27	10	9	2	2			60
Age:										
Under 30	2	7	20	9	7					45
30 - 39	1	1	5	3	1	2				13
40 - 59	1		5	1	1	1	2			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	1	5	5	3					15
3 - 6 years	1	3	13	5	4		1			27
7 - 10 years	1	4	3			1				9
10+ years	1		9	3	2	2	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation	1	1	6	6	2					16
On tenure	3	7	24	7	7	3	2			53
Education:										
Teacher training	1	2	3	3						9
1 year university		1	6	2	2	1	1			13
2 years university		2	9	4	1	1	1			18
Bachelor	1	2	11	2	4					20
B. Ed.+	2	1	1	2	2	1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #8 - My principal (should observe) observes my teaching in the classroom.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	1	4	16	21	18	6	3			69
Sex:										
Male			5	3	1					9
Female	1	4	11	18	17	6	3			60
Age:										
Under 30		2	10	15	14	4				45
30 - 39	1	1	4	4	2		1			13
40 - 59		1	2	2	2	2	2			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years			1	6	7	1				15
3 - 6 years	1	2	9	5	6	3	1			27
7 - 10 years			2	5	1		1			9
10+ years		2	4	5	4	2	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation	1		3	4	6	2				16
On tenure		4	13	17	12	4	3			53
Education:										
Teacher training		1	1	4	2	1				9
1 year university		1	2	3	4	2	1			13
2 years university		1	6	4	4	1	2			18
Bachelor	1	1	4	8	4	2				20
B. Ed.+			3	2	4					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #9 - My principal (should provide) provides me with opportunities for in-service conferences and workshops.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	2	1	8	21	25	8	4			69
Sex:										
Male			1	5	3					9
Female	2	1	7	16	22	8	4			60
Age:										
Under 30	1	1	7	15	16	3	2			45
30 - 39			1	5	4	3				13
40 - 59	1			1	5	2	2			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1		1	5	6	1	1			15
3 - 6 years	1		5	10	8	2	1			27
7 - 10 years		1	1	4	3					9
10+ years			1	2	8	5	2			18
Tenure:										
Probation			2	7	5	1	1			16
On tenure	2	1	6	14	20	7	3			53
Education:										
Teacher training		1	3	2	1	1	1			9
1 year university	1		3	1	4	3	1			13
2 years university	1		1	6	8	2				18
Bachelor				7	9	2	2			20
B. Ed.+			1	5	3					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #10 - My principal (should work) works with me to improve the scope and sequence of my curriculum.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	4	11	20	15	13	5	1			69
Sex:										
Male	1	2	4		2					9
Female	3	9	16	15	11	5	1			60
Age:										
Under 30	3	9	14	9	9	1				45
30 - 39	1	1	5	3	2	1				13
40 - 59		1	1	3	2	3	1			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	5	2	3	3	1				15
3 - 6 years	2	3	10	5	7					27
7 - 10 years	1	2	4	1	1					9
10+ years		1	4	6	2	4	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation	1	2	7	2	4					16
On tenure	3	9	13	13	9	5	1			53
Education:										
Teacher training			4	5						9
1 year university		2	3	4	3	1				13
2 years university	2	3	4	2	4	3				18
Bachelor	2	4	5	3	4	1	1			20
B. Ed.+		2	4	1	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #11 - My principal (should show) shows new teachers how to operate the audio-visual equipment and/or familiarizes them with the library and other instructional facilities of the school.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	11	7	16	17	16	1			1	69
Sex:										
Male	3	1	1	3	1					9
Female	8	6	15	14	15	1			1	60
Age:										
Under 30	9	5	8	9	13	1				45
30 - 39	1	1	4	5	1				1	13
40 - 59	1	1	4	3	2					11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	2	2	4	3	4					15
3 - 6 years	5	3	4	5	9	1				27
7 - 10 years	2	1	2	3					1	9
10+ years	2	1	6	6	3					18
Tenure:										
Probation	3	2	4	2	5					16
On tenure	8	5	12	15	11	1			1	53
Education:										
Teacher training	2	2	3	2						9
1 year university	2		2	4	5					13
2 years university	2	3	5	1	5	1			1	18
Bachelor	3	1	5	6	5					20
B. Ed.+	2	1	1	4	1					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #12 - My principal (should give) gives me special time to plan and develop curriculum revisions.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	9	15	21	11	6	6	1			69
Sex:										
Male	2	3	2	1		1				9
Female	7	12	19	10	6	5	1			60
Age:										
Under 30	4	13	14	9	3	2				45
30 - 39	5	1	3	1	2	1				13
40 - 59		1	4	1	1	3	1			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	3	5	3	2		2				15
3 - 6 years		7	9	7	4					27
7 - 10 years	2	2	4			1				9
10+ years	4	1	5	2	2	3	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation	3	4	4	2	1	2				16
On tenure	6	11	17	9	5	4	1			53
Education:										
Teacher training	1	2	4			1	1			9
1 year university	2	2	4	1	4					13
2 years university	1	6	3	6	1	1				18
Bachelor	3	2	8	3	1	3				20
B. Ed.+	2	3	2	1		1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #13 - My principal (should encourage) encourages me to join community organizations (Scouts, Service Clubs, etc.)*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:		1	8	22	30	4	1	3		69
Sex:										
Male			1	3	5					9
Female		1	7	19	25	4	1			60
Age:										
Under 30			8	16	18	2		1		45
30 - 39		1		3	7	1		1		13
40 - 59				3	5	1	1	1		11
Experience:										
Under 3 years			5	4	6					15
3 - 6 years			2	8	14	1				27
7 - 10 years			1	4	2	1		1		9
10+ years		1		6	8	2	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation			3	3	9	1				16
On tenure		1	5	19	21	3	1	3		53
Education:										
Teacher training			1	3	2	2	1			9
1 year university			3	3	5	1		1		13
2 years university			2	3	11			2		18
Bachelor		1		9	9	1				20
B. Ed.+			2	4	3					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #14 - My principal (should coordinate) coordinates the special services of my building as by arranging guidance or audio-visual schedules to make them available to me.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	4	7	15	13	20	7	1	1	1	69
Sex:										
Male		2	3	2	2					9
Female	4	5	12	11	18	7	1	1	1	60
Age:										
Under 30	3	5	11	12	8	5		1		45
30 - 39	1	2	1	1	7	1				13
40 - 59			3		5	1	1		1	11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	2	6	3	1	2				15
3 - 6 years	1	3	4	7	7	3		1	1	27
7 - 10 years	1	1	1	3	3					9
10+ years	1	1	4		9	2	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation	2	3	4	4	1	2				16
On tenure	2	4	11	9	19	5	1	1	1	53
Education:										
Teacher training	1	1	3		2	1	1			9
1 year university	2		2	2	2	3		1	1	13
2 years university	1	4	2	4	6	1				18
Bachelor		1	5	5	8	1				20
B. Ed.+		1	3	2	2	1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #15 - My principal (should consult) consults me before organizing the students into different classes or sections for the coming year.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	5	6	8	14	32	3	1			69
Sex:										
Male	2	2	1	2	2					9
Female	3	4	7	12	30	3	1			60
Age:										
Under 30	2	5	5	9	22	2				45
30 - 39	2	1	1	4	5					13
40 - 59	1		2	1	5	1	1			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	2	3	1	4	5					15
3 - 6 years	1	2	3	4	15	2				27
7 - 10 years			1	4	4					9
10+ years	2	1	3	2	8	1	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation	1	4	1	3	7					16
On tenure	4	2	7	11	25	3	1			53
Education:										
Teacher training			1	1	6	1				9
1 year university		3	1	1	7	1				13
2 years university	1	2		4	10		1			18
Bachelor	2		4	6	8					20
B. Ed.+	2	1	2	2	1	1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #16 - My principal (should help) helps me to
evaluate the instructional aids which I use in my classroom.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	1	5	28	18	12	4	1			69
Sex:										
Male		1	5	2	1					9
Female	1	4	23	16	11	4	1			60
Age:										
Under 30	1	5	17	12	9	1				45
30 - 39			7	3	1	2				13
40 - 59			4	3	2	1	1			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		3	7	4	1					15
3 - 6 years	1	1	10	6	8	1				27
7 - 10 years		1	3	3	1	1				9
10+ years			8	5	2	2	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation		2	6	5	2	1				16
On tenure	1	3	22	13	10	3	1			53
Education:										
Teacher training			3	5	1					9
1 year university		1	6	3	2	1				13
2 years university		1	7	4	4	2				18
Bachelor	1	2	8	4	4		1			20
B. Ed.+		1	4	2	1	1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #17 - My principal (should "spell out") "spells out" the duties and responsibilities to new teachers, even though this information is available from the faculty handbook or other sources.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	10	7	12	13	18	4	4	1		69
Sex:										
Male	4	1	1	1	2					9
Female	6	6	11	12	16	4	4	1		60
Age:										
Under 30	7	5	7	6	14	2	3	1		45
30 - 39	2	1	3	5	1	1				13
40 - 59	1	1	2	2	3	1	1			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	2	3	2	2	5		1			15
3 - 6 years	6		4	3	9	3	2			27
7 - 10 years	1	3	1	1	2			1		9
10+ years	1	1	5	7	2	1	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation	3	1	3	2	4	1	1	1		16
On tenure	7	6	9	11	14	3	3			53
Education:										
Teacher training		1	2	3	2			1		9
1 year university	1		3	4	4	1				13
2 years university	4	2	2	1	6	1	2			18
Bachelor	2	3	4	3	4	2	2			20
B. Ed.+	3	1	1	2	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #18 - My principal (should capitalize) capitalizes on my special abilities, especially when deciding committee assignments.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	6	6	13	17	21	5	1			69
Sex:										
Male	3	1		2	2	1				9
Female	3	5	13	15	19	4	1			60
Age:										
Under 30	3	4	9	13	13	3				45
30 - 39	2	1	4	1	3	1	1			13
40 - 59	1	1		3	5	1				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	2	1	3	6	2				15
3 - 6 years	4	2	7	6	7	1				27
7 - 10 years	1		2	4	1	1				9
10+ years		2	3	4	7	1	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation	1	2	3	4	4	2				16
On tenure	5	4	10	13	17	3	1			53
Education:										
Teacher training			4	3	2					9
1 year university	1	2	2	5	3					13
2 years university	4	2	2	3	5	2				18
Bachelor		1	4	4	7	3	1			20
B. Ed.+	1	1	1	2	4					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #19 - My principal (should encourage) encourages me to select necessary audio-visual, and other instructional materials with his advice.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	2	8	11	24	13	7	3	1		69
Sex:										
Male		2		5		2				9
Female	2	6	11	19	13	5	3	1		60
Age:										
Under 30		5	10	17	9	4				45
30 - 39	1	3	1	5	1	1		1		13
40 - 59	1			2	3	2	3			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		1	2	7	4	1				15
3 - 6 years	1	6	4	9	5	2				27
7 - 10 years		1	4	2		1		1		9
10+ years	1		1	6	4	3	3			18
Tenure:										
Probation		2	1	6	4	3				16
On tenure	2	6	10	18	9	4	3	1		53
Education:										
Teacher training			3	1	3	2				9
1 year university	1	1	1	7	2	1				13
2 years university	1	4	3	3	3	2	1	1		18
Bachelor		3	2	7	4	2	2			20
B. Ed.+			2	6	1					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #20 - My principal (should advise) advises me to read a particular book or take a certain course if he feels that I have a lack in an area of professional knowledge.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	5	9	21	19	12	3				69
Sex:										
Male		1	4	3	1					9
Female	5	8	17	16	11	3				60
Age:										
Under 30	2	6	14	13	10					45
30 - 39	2	3	6	1	1					13
40 - 59	1		1	5	1	3				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1		6	6	2					15
3 - 6 years	2	7	7	4	7					27
7 - 10 years			4	3	2					9
10+ years	2	2	4	6	1	3				18
Tenure:										
Probation	1		4	8	3					16
On tenure	4	9	17	11	9	3				53
Education:										
Teacher training			4	3		2				9
1 year university	2	3	2	5	1					13
2 years university	2	3	6	2	4	1				18
Bachelor		2	5	7	6					20
B. Ed.+	1	1	4	2	1					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #21 - My principal (should devote) devotes a sufficient amount of time to the development of school-community relations.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:		4	9	14	24	12	5	1		69
Sex:										
Male		1	3	2	3					9
Female		3	6	12	21	12	5	1		60
Age:										
Under 30		1	6	13	15	8	2			45
30 - 39		2	1	1	4	3	2			13
40 - 59		1	2		5	1	1	1		11
Experience:										
Under 3 years			2	3	4	4	2			15
3 - 6 years		2	3	7	9	5		1		27
7 - 10 years			1	4	4					9
10+ years		2	3		7	3	3			18
Tenure:										
Probation		1	2	4	3	4	2			16
On tenure		3	7	10	21	8	3	1		53
Education:										
Teacher training			1	3	3		2			9
1 year university		1		4	2	2	3	1		13
2 years university		1	3	5	4	5				18
Bachelor		2	2		11	5				20
B. Ed.+			3	2	4					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #22 - My principal (should provide) provides me with an opportunity to meet new professional candidates who seek a position in this school.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	3	7	19	16	13	7	1	2	1	69
Sex:										
Male		2	3	1	3					9
Female	3	5	16	15	10	7	1	2	1	60
Age:										
Under 30	3	5	15	10	7	3	1		1	45
30 - 39		2	3	3	1	2		2		13
40 - 59			1	3	5	2				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	3	4	3	1	2			1	15
3 - 6 years	2	2	8	5	6	2	1	1		27
7 - 10 years		1	3	3	1			1		9
10+ years		1	4	5	5	3				18
Tenure:										
Probation	1	1	5	3	1	3		1	1	16
On tenure	2	6	14	13	12	4	1	1		53
Education:										
Teacher training			3	5	1					9
1 year university		2	2	4		5				13
2 years university	1	1	7	2	5			1	1	18
Bachelor	2	1	4	4	5	2	1	1		20
B. Ed.+		3	3	1	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #23 - My principal (should play) plays a major role in orienting new teachers with the existing school staff.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	7	11	13	13	18	5	1	1		69
Sex:										
Male	2	1	3	1	2					9
Female	5	10	10	12	16	5	1	1		60
Age:										
Under 30	5	9	8	9	8	5	1			45
30 - 39	2	1	2	3	4			1		13
40 - 59		1	3	1	6					11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	1	4	3	4	1	1			15
3 - 6 years	4	6	4	6	3	4				27
7 - 10 years	1	3	1	1	2			1		9
10+ years	1	1	4	3	9					18
Tenure:										
Probation	2	2	4	3	3	1	1			16
On tenure	5	9	9	10	15	4		1		53
Education:										
Teacher training	1	3	3		2					9
1 year university		2	2	5	3	1				13
2 years university	3	2	1	2	6	3		1		18
Bachelor	2	2	5	4	5	1	1			20
B. Ed.+	1	2	2	2	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #24 - My principal (should organize) organizes my schedule in such a way that things like team instruction and team planning or individual planning are facilitated.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	9	15	9	15	13	7	1			69
Sex:										
Male	3	2	1	2	1					9
Female	6	13	8	13	12	7	1			60
Age:										
Under 30	5	11	6	9	8	5	1			45
30 - 39	3	2	1	3	3	1				13
40 - 59	1	2	2	3	2	1				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	2	2	1	4	3	2	1			15
3 - 6 years	3	6	5	4	6	3				27
7 - 10 years	1	4	1	2	1					9
10+ years	3	3	2	5	3	2				18
Tenure:										
Probation	2	4	1	2	3	3	1			16
On tenure	7	11	8	13	10	4				53
Education:										
Teacher training	1	3		3	1	1				9
1 year university		5	3	1	2	2				13
2 years university	2	4	2	3	5	2				18
Bachelor	2	3	3	4	5	2	1			20
B. Ed.+	4		1	4						9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #25 - My principal (should discuss) discusses his evaluations of my instruction with me.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	19	8	13	8	19	2				69
Sex:										
Male	3	1	2	2	1					9
Female	16	7	11	6	18	2				60
Age:										
Under 30	10	6	7	4	17	1				45
30 - 39	6	1	3	2	1					13
40 - 59	3	1	3	2	1	1				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	3	1	1	2	7	1				15
3 - 6 years	9	3	4	2	9					27
7 - 10 years	1	2	4	1	1					9
10+ years	6	2	4	3	2	1				18
Tenure:										
Probation	4		4	2	6					16
On tenure	15	8	9	6	13	2				53
Education:										
Teacher training	1	2	3		2	1				9
1 year university	5		1	3	4					13
2 years university	6	1	3	2	6					18
Bachelor	4	4	5	1	5	1				20
B. Ed.+	3	1	1	2	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #26 - My principal (should help) helps me to use the special service of our division as by arranging for field trip transportation or arranging student referrals to the appropriate staff (psychologist, nurse, reading teachers, etc.)*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	6	6	9	16	20	9	3			69
Sex:										
Male	2	2	3		2					9
Female	4	4	6	16	18	9	3			60
Age:										
Under 30	4	4	6	12	11	6	2			45
30 - 39	1	1	1	2	7	1				13
40 - 59	1	1	2	2	2	2	1			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	3	1	1	2	4	3	1			15
3 - 6 years		4	3	10	7	1	2			27
7 - 10 years	1		3		3	2				9
10+ years	2	1	2	4	6	3				18
Tenure:										
Probation	3	1	3	2	3	3	1			16
On tenure	3	5	6	14	17	6	2			53
Education:										
Teacher training			2	3	1	3				9
1 year university	1			7	3	1	1			13
2 years university		3	2	2	9	1	1			18
Bachelor	4	2	2	2	6	3	1			20
B. Ed.+	1	1	3	2	1	1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #27 - My principal (should make) makes it easy for me to get out of my class to visit another class in action.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	3	6	13	21	17	6	3			69
Sex:										
Male		1	2	2	3	1				9
Female	3	5	11	19	14	5	3			60
Age:										
Under 30	3	4	7	13	15	2	1			45
30 - 39		2	4	3	2	2				13
40 - 59			2	5		2	2			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		1	2	4	6	1	1			15
3 - 6 years	3	1	6	9	7	1				27
7 - 10 years		3	1	1	4					9
10+ years		1	4	7		4	2			18
Tenure:										
Probation		1	2	5	5	2	1			16
On tenure	3	5	11	16	12	4	2			53
Education:										
Teacher training		1	1	4	1	2				9
1 year university	1	2	4	3	1	1	1			13
2 years university	2	1	3	4	6	1	1			18
Bachelor		2	3	7	6	1	1			20
B. Ed+			2	3	3	1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #28 - My principal (should help) helps me organize my instructional program as by suggesting how much time to spend in each content area of the curriculum.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	1	3	10	18	24	8	4	1		69
Sex:										
Male			3	3	2	1				9
Female	1	3	7	15	22	7	4	1		60
Age:										
Under 30	1	2	7	9	17	7	2			45
30 - 39		1	3	5	3	1				13
40 - 59				4	4		2	1		11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1		2	4	5	3				15
3 - 6 years		3	4	4	11	4	1			27
7 - 10 years			2	2	3	1	1			9
10+ years			2	8	5		2	1		18
Tenure:										
Probation		2	1	4	6	3				16
On tenure	1	1	9	14	18	5	4	1		53
Education:										
Teacher training			1	2	4		1	1		9
1 year university		2	4	4	2	1				13
2 years university	1		2	2	11	1	1			18
Bachelor		1	1	6	6	4	2			20
B. Ed.+			2	4	1	2				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #29 - My principal (should comment) comments or remarks to me about my lesson plans meeting the goals of the curriculum.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	6	10	18	16	13	5	1			69
Sex:										
Male	1	1	3	3	1					9
Female	5	9	15	13	12	5	1			60
Age:										
Under 30	3	8	10	11	9	4				45
30 - 39	2	2	6	2	1					13
40 - 59	1		2	3	3	1				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	1	3	5	3	2				15
3 - 6 years	2	5	8	4	6	2				27
7 - 10 years	2	3	1	3						9
10+ years	1	1	6	4	4	1	1			18
Tenure:										
Probation		1	6	4	2	3				16
On tenure	6	9	12	12	11	2	1			53
Education:										
Teacher training	1	1	2	3	2					9
1 year university	1	2	7	2		1				13
2 years university	4	3	2	2	5	1	1			18
Bachelor		3	5	5	4	3				20
B. Ed.+		1	2	4	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #30 - My principal (should emphasise) emphasises the contributions which the special services personnel can make in my instructional program.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	4	6	11	18	18	12				69
Sex:										
Male		2	2	3	2					9
Female	4	4	9	15	16	12				60
Age:										
Under 30	2	5	8	13	12	5				45
30 - 39	2	1	2	3	2	3				13
40 - 59			1	2	4	4				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		2	2	5	5	1				15
3 - 6 years	2	3	5	4	9	4				27
7 - 10 years		1	2	5		1				9
10+ years	2		2	4	4	6				18
Tenure:										
Probation		2	4	1	8	1				16
On tenure	4	4	7	17	10	11				53
Education:										
Teacher training			1	4	1	3				9
1 year university	1	2	3	2	3	2				13
2 years university	1	2	2	3	6	4				18
Bachelor	2	1	4	3	8	2				20
B. Ed.+		1	1	6		1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #31 - My principal (should send) sends me a prompt report of his evaluations of my teaching.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	22	7	10	5	17	5	1	1	1	69
Sex:										
Male	4	2	1	1	1					9
Female	18	5	9	4	16	5	1	1	1	60
Age:										
Under 30	13	4	5	3	14	4	1	1		45
30 - 39	5	3	2	1	2					13
40 - 59	4		3	1	1	1			1	11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	2	2		1	8	2				15
3 - 6 years	9	2	5	2	6	2		1		27
7 - 10 years	4	2	2				1			9
10+ years	7	1	3	2	3	1			1	18
Tenure:										
Probation	5	1	1		8	1				16
On tenure	17	6	9	5	9	4	1	1	1	53
Education:										
Teacher training	2	2	1		1	1	1		1	9
1 year university	4		2	3	3	1				13
2 years university	6	3	2		6			1		18
Bachelor	7	2	3	1	4	3				20
B. Ed.+	3		2	1	3					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #32 - My principal (should help) helps me in establishing curriculum goals and academic standards for my class.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	1	11	20	12	17	6	2			69
Sex:										
Male	1	3	1	1	1	1	1			9
Female		8	19	11	16	5	1			60
Age:										
Under 30	1	7	12	8	13	2	2			45
30 - 39		4	3	3	1	2				13
40 - 59			5	1	3	2				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1		4	3	4	1	2			15
3 - 6 years		5	6	6	9	1				27
7 - 10 years		5	3			1				9
10+ years		1	7	3	4	3				18
Tenure:										
Probation	1	1	5		6	1	2			16
On tenure		10	15	12	11	5				53
Education:										
Teacher training		1	4	1	3					9
1 year university		1	5	4	2	1				13
2 years university		4	3	3	5	2	1			18
Bachelor		3	6	3	7		1			20
B. Ed.+	1	2	2	1		3				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #33 - My principal (should help) helps me organize special class groups, committees, and other areas of instructional organization.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	5	8	24	12	14	5		1		69
Sex:										
Male	1	2	3	2		1				9
Female	4	6	21	10	14	4		1		60
Age:										
Under 30	4	6	12	9	12	2				45
30 - 39	1	2	8			1		1		13
40 - 59			4	3	2	2				11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		4	3	1	5	2				15
3 - 6 years	3	1	9	7	7					27
7 - 10 years	2	1	4	1				1		9
10+ years		2	8	3	2	3				18
Tenure:										
Probation		3	6	1	3	3				16
On tenure	5	5	18	11	11	2		1		53
Education:										
Teacher training	1		6	1	1					9
1 year university		2	5	2	3	1				13
2 years university	3	1	4	5	2	2		1		18
Bachelor	1	2	7	2	6	2				20
B. Ed.+		3	2	2	2					9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #34 - My principal (should permit) permits me to accumulate classroom materials and supplies (tapes, boxes of chalk, pencils, paper, etc.) in my room.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	2	1	3	5	42	13		2	1	69
Sex:										
Male	1		1		5	2				9
Female	1	1	2	5	37	11		2	1	60
Age:										
Under 30	2	1	1	3	29	8		1		45
30 - 39			1	2	7	2			1	13
40 - 59			1		6	3		1		11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	2				9	4				15
3 - 6 years			1	3	18	5				27
7 - 10 years		1	1		5			1	1	9
10+ years			1	2	10	4		1		18
Tenure:										
Probation	1			1	8	5		1		16
On tenure	1	1	3	4	34	8		1	1	53
Education:										
Teacher training					6	2		1		9
1 year university			1	1	9	2				13
2 years university			1	1	10	5			1	18
Bachelor		1	1	2	12	3	1			20
B. Ed.+	2			1	5	1				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #35 - My principal (should emphasise) emphasises the advantages of working here when I was interviewed, or before I was hired.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	3	6	12	11	22	8	6		1	69
Sex:										
Male			5		4					9
Female	3	6	7	11	18	8	6		1	60
Age:										
Under 30	3	6	9	6	16	3	2			45
30 - 39			2	2	2	5	1		1	13
40 - 59			1	3	4		3			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years	1	4	3	2	4		1			15
3 - 6 years	2	1	5	5	10	3	1			27
7 - 10 years		1	3		4				1	9
10+ years			1	4	4	5	4			18
Tenure:										
Probation	1	2	2	2	6	2	1			16
On tenure	2	4	10	9	16	6	5		1	53
Education:										
Teacher training			3		3	1	2			9
1 year university	2		3	2	3	3				13
2 years university	1	1	2	3	8	2			1	18
Bachelor		4		5	7		4			20
B. Ed.+		1	4	1	1	2				9

TABLE XVI (continued)

Question #36 - My principal (should explain) explains our instructional program to parents and other members of the community.*

	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	N
Population:	2	5	14	16	22	8	2			69
Sex:										
Male	1	2	3	1	2					9
Female	1	3	11	15	20	8	2			60
Age:										
Under 30	2	4	10	12	13	4				45
30 - 39		1	2	2	6	2				13
40 - 59			2	2	3	2	2			11
Experience:										
Under 3 years		2	5	1	3	4				15
3 - 6 years	1	3	3	8	12					27
7 - 10 years	1		3	4		1				9
10+ years			3	3	7	3	2			18
Tenure										
Probation		1	4	4	3	4				16
On tenure	2	4	10	12	19	4	2			53
Education:										
Teacher training			1	4	2	1	1			9
1 year university			1	4	5	3				13
2 years university	1	2	3	4	5	3				18
Bachelor	1	1	6	3	7	1	1			20
B. Ed.+		2	3	1	3					9

*The present tense refers to the perception questionnaire and the present subjunctive tense (should ...) refers to the expectation questionnaire.