

A STUDY OF THE CURRENT PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND
LABRADOR AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND
SUPERVISORS: IMPLICATIONS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

CYRIL JOHN IVANY

27552

Copy 1

388995

A STUDY OF THE CURRENT PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
PRINCIPALS IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR AS PERCEIVED
BY TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORS;
IMPLICATIONS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION

A thesis presented to
the Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Administration
Memorial University of Newfoundland

in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
Cyril John Ivany

ABSTRACT

The influential position of the principal in the teaching-learning process has been well established. Today's elementary principal, moreover, performs his administrative functions amidst a rapidly changing school setting. Preparatory programs alone are, it has been suggested, unable to equip the elementary principal to adequately meet his new responsibilities and the mantle of modern leadership. It has therefore been recommended that principals be provided the opportunity to avail of a continuous inservice education program designed to facilitate the challenge of their position.

The objective of this study was to try and determine the current professional problems of elementary principals in the province. The present status of the elementary principal further suggested that the inservice education views of elementary principals and their professional associates, teachers and supervisors, be solicited. Consequently, elementary principals, their teachers, and supervisors with whom principals work, were requested to rate commonly performed functions of the principal on a four point scale ranging in level of difficulty from none to extreme. A 'not applicable' option was included to provide a profile of those duties which were either not at all or in limited numbers a part of the administrative responsibilities of principals in the province. Further analysis sought to assess the relationship between the respondents' ratings and the following personal and professional variables: school size, sex, principal's age, administrative experience, teaching experience, professional preparation, and grade taught. Inservice education considerations concentrated

on ascertaining the approach and direction toward which respondents felt proposed inservice education programs should proceed.

Although no strikingly perceptual patterns of agreement were observed among all three groups of respondents, analysis revealed that Supervision of Instruction functions were widely considered as being the most difficult tasks for the elementary principal. School-Community Relations emerged as an area of some concern because of the apparent absence of significant principal involvement in this vital facet of the school's role in society. Specific functions within other task areas were singled out by combinations of the respondent groups as administrative practices deserving additional help and consideration. Significant differences between the responses of principals, teachers, and supervisors classified on the basis of personal and professional variables were most evident on sex, grade taught, and professional preparation. Inservice education views of respondents while supporting some of the activities presently available to elementary principals, cited additional activities which respondents felt should be incorporated into future inservice programs. Such programs would be conducted in an atmosphere created by careful planning and guided in large measure by the felt needs of participants.

The implications of this study strongly suggest that the immediate concern of those responsible for the advancement of elementary education is to initiate a more facilitating role for the principal in Supervision of Instruction responsibilities. Secondly, steps should be taken to ensure future principal involvement in those areas where to present he has played a minor role. These objectives can be realized if boards of education and principals themselves are willing to exert a concentrated effort to improve and extend existing inservice education programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. James Jesse who provided a valuable service during the initial stages of this study and to Dr. David Kirby, thesis supervisor, for his guidance and constructive criticism throughout the work. To Dr. Ken Wallace, Dr. Philip Warren, and Dr. Robert Fisher, a sincere thank-you for advice rendered and example shown.

I would like also to express my appreciation and gratitude to the staff of the Education Library for their cooperation and ready accessibility during the course of this program.

My fellow students in the Department of Educational Administration, through the give and take of comradeship, took this work beyond the level of an academic exercise.

To Mrs. Ramona Raske, typist, a sincere thank-you not only for her diligent typing of the material but as well her many helpful suggestions which enhanced greatly the technical presentation of this study.

Finally, to my wife, Pauline, heartfelt gratitude, for the encouragement and prodding, which was vitally necessary to get this work underway again.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. THE PROBLEM.	1
INTRODUCTION	1
IMPORTANCE OF AND NEED FOR THE STUDY	4
General Considerations	4
Provincial Considerations.	7
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY	10
The Problem.	10
The Purposes	10
QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED	11
DEFINITION OF TERMS.	12
ASSUMPTIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	13
Assumptions.	13
Delimitations.	13
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	14
Problems of Perception	14
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY.	15
II. SURVEY OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE.	17
INTRODUCTION	17
ROLE PERCEPTION STUDIES OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALSHIP.	18

Principal's Administrative Performance Viewed by Principals and Teachers	18
The Principal's Effectiveness as Perceived by Experienced School Teachers.	19
The Principal's Role: What it is Perceived to be -- the Skills Needed to Facilitate this Role.	19
Agreement Existing Between Principals and Their Reference Groups Relative to the Tasks of the Elementary Principalship	22
Summary of Section I	23
STUDIES OF PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.	24
Problems and Problem Areas of Elementary School Principals	24
Personnel Services Felt by Principals and Teachers to be in Greatest and Least Need of Improvement.	27
Problems of Beginning Elementary School Principals	28
Section II Summary	30
INSERVICE EDUCATION STUDIES OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALSHIP.	31
Guidelines to be Considered in the Implementation of an Inservice Education Program.	32
Inservice Education Needs of the Elementary Principalship as Identified by Elementary Principals, Teachers and Superintendents	36
Section III Summary.	37
SUMMARY.	38
III. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN.	40
INTRODUCTION	40
The Locale of the Study.	40
The Population of the Study.	40
The Sample Selection	42

Distribution of the Sample on the Basis of Selected Variables	43
Method of Data Collection.	48
Construction and Nature of the Instrument.	50
Treatment of the Data.	53
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.	55
INTRODUCTION	55
SECTION I.	56
The Five Most Important Problems of the Elementary Principal as Perceived by Elementary Principals, Teachers and Supervisors in Each of the Five Major Task Areas of the Elementary Principalship and the Degree of Agreement Existing Between Their Selections	57
The Five Least Important Problems of the Elementary Principal as Perceived by Elementary Principals, Teachers and Supervisors in Each of the Five Major Task Areas of the Elementary Principalship and the Degree of Agreement Existing Between Their Selections	68
Question 1 Summary.	72
The Degree of Agreement Between Principals, Teachers and Supervisors on Each of the Five Task Areas of the Elementary Principalship as Shown by Rank Order Correlation.	78
Minor, Moderate, and Major Ratings in Each of the Five Task Areas of the Elementary Principalship.	78
Duties of the Elementary Principal Rated Not Applicable by One-Fifth or More of the Total of Either Group.	81
Summary; Section I.	86
SECTION II	87
Classification of Principals on the Basis of School Staff Size and Selected Personal and Professional Characteristics.	88

CHAPTER

Page

Classification of Teachers on the Basis of School Staff Size and Selected Personal and Professional Characteristics.	99
Supervisors' Perceptions of the Relationship Between Personal and Professional Characteristics of Elementary Principals and Their Effectiveness in the Principalship	111
Summary: Section II.	113
SECTION III.	113
Five Most Pressing Problems Facing Elementary School Principals Today	114
Inservice Education Activities Presently Available to the Elementary Principal	116
Inservice Education Activities Rated Highest by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors.	119
Personnel to Teach the Inservice Education Program	120
Location of Inservice Program.	123
Length of Inservice Program.	125
Time of Inservice Education Program.	125
Summary: Section III.	128
CHAPTER SUMMARY.	129
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	130
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	130
Statement of the Problem	130
Procedure.	130
MAJOR FINDINGS AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	131
Section I -- Difficulty of the Elementary Principal's Duties as Rated by the Total Sample of Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors	131
Section II -- Responses of Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors as They Vary with School Staff Size and Selected Personal and Professional Characteristics.	136

CHAPTER

Page

Section III -- Inservice Education Considerations (Program: Activities, Personnel, Location, etc.) for the Elementary Principal	138
---	-----

RECOMMENDATIONS	140
---------------------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	144
------------------------	-----

APPENDIX

A. CORRESPONDENCE WITH PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS.	148
--	-----

B. THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS	152
---------------------------------------	-----

C. MEANS FOR PRINCIPALS CLASSIFIED ON THE BASIS OF SELECTED VARIABLES	173
--	-----

D. MEANS FOR TEACHERS CLASSIFIED ON THE BASIS OF SELECTED VARIABLES	178
--	-----

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Population and Sample Distribution of Principals by Administrative-Teaching Staff Size	42
2. Distribution of Principals and Teachers by Administrative-Teaching Staff Size.	45
3. Distribution of Principals and Teachers by Sex, Teaching Experience and Years of Professional Preparation	46
4. Distribution of Principals by Years Spent as a Principal.	47
5. Distribution of Principals by Age.	49
6. Distribution of Teachers by Grade Taught	49
7. Response Rates for Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors.	50
8. Top 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for General Administration Functions.	59
9. Top 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for Supervision of Instruction Functions.	60
10. Top 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for Administration of Staff Personnel Functions.	63
11. Average Mean Scores for Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors on Each of the Five Major Task Areas of the Elementary Principalship	64
12. Top 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for Administration of Pupil Personnel Functions.	66
13. Top 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for School-Community Relations Functions.	67

TABLE

Page

14. Lowest 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for General Administration Functions.	69
15. Lowest 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for Supervision of Instruction Functions.	70
16. Lowest 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for Administration of Staff Personnel Functions.	73
17. Lowest 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for Administration of Pupil Personnel Functions.	74
18. Lowest 5 Ranks and Mean Scores Given by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors for School-Community Relations Functions.	75
19. Rank Order Difference Between Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors on Task Areas of the Elementary Principal.	79
20. Percent of Duties Within Each Task Area Receiving a Minor, Moderate or Major Degree of Difficulty Rating by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors Respectively.	82
21. Percent of the Elementary Principal Duties Rated "Not Applicable" to the Province's Elementary Principals by One-Fifth or More of Principals, Teachers and/or Supervisors.	84
22. Mean Scores and t Test Results of Items Showing Significant Differences for Principals (Classified on the Basis of School Size).	89
23. Mean Scores and t Test Results of Items Showing Significant Differences for Principals (Classified on the Basis of Professional Preparation)	91
24. Mean Scores and t Test Results of Items Showing Significant Differences for Principals (Classified on the Basis of Experience as a Principal).	92
25. Mean Scores and t Test Results of Items Showing Significant Differences for Principals (Classified by Age of Principal).	94
26. Average Mean Scores of Principals Classified by School Staff Size, Professional Preparation, Administrative Experience, Age, Years of Teaching Experience and Sex.	95

TABLE

Page

27. Mean Scores and t Test Results of Items Showing Significant Differences for Principals (Classified by Sex)	97
28. Mean Scores and t Test Results of Items Showing Significant Differences for Teachers (Classified by School Size)	100
29. Mean Scores and t Test Results of Items Showing Significant Differences for Teachers (Classified by Professional Preparation)	101
30. Mean Scores and t Test Results of Items Showing Significant Differences for Teachers (Classified by Grade Taught)	102
31. Average Mean Scores of Teachers Classified by School Staff Size, Professional Preparation, Grade Taught, Teaching Experience, and Sex	105
32. Mean Scores and t Test Results Showing Significant Differences for Teachers (Classified by Teaching Experience)	107
33. Mean Scores and t Test Results Showing Significant Differences for Teachers (Classified by Sex)	109
34. Degree of Relationship Between Principal's Age, Sex, Academic-Professional Qualifications, and Teaching Experience and Effectiveness in the Elementary Principalship as Perceived by Supervisors (n=22)	112
35. Importance of Task Areas for Inservice Education as Ranked by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors	115
36. Rank Order of Inservice Education Activities Presently Available to the Elementary Principal as Reported by Principals (n=39) and Supervisors (n=22)	117
37. The Five Inservice Education Activities Perceived to be of Greatest Benefit to Elementary Principals, by Elementary Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors	121
38. Percent of Principals (n=39) and Supervisors (n=22) Recommending Various Personnel to Teach the Inservice Education Program	122
39. Percent of Principals and Supervisors Recommending Various Locations for the Inservice Education Program	124

TABLEs

40. Percent of Principals and Supervisors Recommending
Various Time Lengths for the Inservice Education
Program. 126
41. Percent of Principals and Supervisors Recommending
Various Meeting Times for the Inservice Education
Program. 127

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

The modern elementary school principal is in an opportune position to directly influence the type and quality of educational experiences received by students under his leadership. Few administrative positions relate so directly to the central functions of the school -- teaching and learning. Improvement of teacher standards and performance in teaching can be realized by the principal who has an opportunity to influence his staff. He can maximize the different skills of his teachers and help them develop their competencies. The elementary principal, in short, can¹ enjoy substantial opportunities to provide a high order of staff relationship.² According to Goodlad, in order for the elementary principal to be able to perform role expectations as perceived by teachers and other school personnel with whom he works; in order for him to go beyond mere survival as an elementary principal and in order for him to be a self-renewing person and to build a self-renewing school, at least three things are required:

¹ The brackets are those of the writer.

² Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, "The EPL of Elementary Principals: A Study of Executive Professional Leadership," The National Elementary Principal, XLV (April, 1966); p. 66.

(1) an awareness of major forces and ideas influencing the school setting, (2) an understanding of the major forces and recommendations in education being made for coping with these forces, and (3) an educational environment in which both new and old ideas are continually appraised and tested.³

The need for a greater awareness of forces and issues affecting performance in the modern elementary principalship has been greatly accentuated by a rapidly changing school setting. The modern elementary principal finds himself having to work with an increasing array of educational specialists; meeting an increasing array of student needs; having to coordinate a better trained, more professional teaching staff and overseeing a school lunch program, student health and safety programs, preschool clinics, teacher in-service education, and school-community relations.

Jenson et al elaborate on some of these issues and describe additional stresses on the elementary principalship.

"... among the powerful forces sparking innovations and new approaches is the vast amount of knowledge accumulated about children and how they learn. Trends such as individualized reading, independent study, programmed instruction, ungraded primary units, programs for the gifted and talented, individualization, guidance, flexibility of programs and the like, appear to be pointing the way. Other basic units under study in many school situations are bound to have an impact on future elementary schools. A few of these are: variations in grouping and individual instruction schemes, teacher assistants, experiments, imaginative use of teacher talents, the use of a wide variety of teaching aids, both automated and animated; curricular changes, the employment of technological aids, the extension of the classroom to include an ever widening environment, new school and community cooperative efforts, intensified school and home relationships, and experiments with extended exposures to learning experiences -- the school day and the school year.⁴

³John I. Goodlad, "Beyond Survival for the Elementary Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (September, 1966), pp. 10-15.

⁴Theodore J. Jenson et al., Elementary School Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967), p. 507.

Following their study of administrative behaviour, Hemphill et al wrote that:

The elementary school principalship is a highly strategic position. The principal is faced with a host of problems. . . . The problems that he sees and what he does about them influence the quality of education received by every child in his school.⁵

If these statements and opinions are true, they raise a serious question. What recommendations can be made which will help provide an educational environment suited to cope with the forces and issues confronting the modern elementary principalship?

Shuster and Wetzler, co-authors of Leadership in Elementary School Administration and Supervision, have expressed the opinion that:

It is unrealistic to assume certification requirements, university preparation programs, and "local hiring" plans will guarantee superior leadership for all elementary schools. Although appointments to the position can be made more wisely if these plans are in effect, there will be many individuals who will be deficient in some areas. Therefore, there will always be a need for growth and skill development for the person already on-the-job. Even as an in-service program has been emphasized for faculty members, it is especially important that consideration be given to the in-service needs of the principal. He must be provided opportunities for learning new skills and keeping abreast of changing conditions.⁶

Pharis has stressed the urgency of the in-service challenge in this manner.

. . . it has become increasingly obvious that in the principalship, as in other professions, pre-service preparations simply prepare one to learn to practice his profession. . . . One learns to be a principal only after one becomes a principal. Today, as

⁵ John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen, Administrative Performance and Personality (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1962), p. 352.

⁶ W. Shuster and W. Wetzler, Leadership in Elementary School Administration and Supervision (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1959), p. 476.

4

never before, mastery of professional responsibility is a continuous life-long process. It is part of the job and should be clearly recognized as part of the job.⁷

At the district level, George W. Connelly, a Superintendent in the Chicago public school system, has called for the involvement of boards of education in the in-service program.

A continuous program of activity is important if the principal is to develop the increased competence on the job. On the one hand, there should be a program of professional growth for principals, sponsored by boards of education. This program should be structured around the problems which principals meet daily in their work.⁸

It was within the context of these questions and issues that the present study concerning current professional problems and in-service education needs of elementary school principals in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador was conducted.

IMPORTANCE OF AND NEED FOR THE STUDY

General Considerations

The literature of recent years makes numerous references to the inadequacy of current programs and methods for training school administrators. It is frequently stated that programs of preparation have isolated themselves from the practicing world of work and have lost contact with reality; that present programs too often fail to orient themselves to current problems facing school administrators.

⁷William L. Pharis, "In-service Education for Elementary School Principals," (Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, 1966), p. 8.

⁸George W. Connelly, "District Superintendent Looks at the Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (February, 1967), pp. 38-40.

Hemphill et al. wrote as a result of their study on administrative performance of elementary principals:

There is reason to question how much the elementary principal is learning today from either experience in graduate training or on the job. The study reveals little or no substantial relationship of years of academic preparation or administrative experience with any measure of performance in the simulated school situation. This state of affairs strongly suggests that those who are practicing school administrators as well as those who teach it, are in need of better concepts by which to analyze, evaluate, understand, and improve performance.⁹

Elsbree, McNally and Wynn emphasize the importance of in-service education to meet the needs of elementary principals, left vacant, in part, by programs of preparation. Even if it had been possible to offer an excellent preparatory program, a person

... is prepared only to learn the principal's job. The accelerated change in education, as in our entire society, is proceeding at an almost frightening tempo. The principal who must depend throughout his career on his original preservice preparation can no longer survive the challenge of this rapid change. Indeed, the principal whose education is not continuous throughout his lifetime will become increasingly ineffective. The typical military officer spends on the average approximately one-fifth of his salaried working time going to school to keep his professional knowledge up-to-date. Industrial executives also spend much of their time in continued professional development, usually at company expense. School systems must make increasing provision for a lifelong education of their administrators by granting to their school administrators salaried leave and expenses for advanced graduate study, workshops, institutes, professional conferences, travel, writing, and independent research. Indeed, a strong relationship exists between the quality of a school and the extent to which its administrators develop in-service. Colleges and universities, professional associations and school systems themselves must extend the resources for the continued education of school administrators.¹⁰

⁹ Hemphill et al., p. 352.

¹⁰ Willard S. Elsbree, Harold J. McNally, and Richard Wynn, Elementary School Administration and Supervision (New York: American Book Company, 1967), p. 68.

The essential question which we need to ask ourselves regarding in-service education is: have present programs, consisting for the most part of some professional reading, lectures, workshops, and seminars, become mere routine?

Otto and Sanders expressed the opinion that most principals engage in some type of professional development, but they questioned the value of the usual approaches. They stressed the need for "well-planned programs designed to meet the needs of a rapidly changing society."¹¹

In studying the in-service education needs of the Little Rock, Arkansas, Elementary Principalship, Thornton stated, "If elementary school principals are to meet the increasing demands of school and society, school systems must provide effective in-service programs to meet specific needs."¹² He further recommended that problems affecting the schools, and problems of personal interest should be carefully stated and considered for in-service work.¹³

Miel, in an article written for The National Elementary Principal, stated that:

Intelligent planning of (in-service education) requires critical assessment of the personnel to be educated, of the type

¹¹ Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1964), p. 395.

¹² C. M. Wilson, "Problems of Elementary School Principals in Arkansas with Implications for In-service Training" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969), p. 4, citing J. T. Thornton, "An In-Service Training Program for Elementary School Administrators" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1964), p. 36.

¹³ J. T. Thornton, "An In-service Training Program for Elementary School Administrators," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (September, 1966), p. 642.

of performance desired of that personnel, and of means and methods of providing on-the-job education appropriate to the performance sought.¹⁴

Theilman,¹⁵ outlining the characteristics of an effective in-service program, noted that if in-service programs are to be successful (appropriate), they must come from felt needs on the part of the participants.

One of the principal means to identify the needs of the elementary principal is to have him reveal the problems which he is experiencing in the performance of his duties. However, before the elementary principalship can reach its maximum potential, it seems apparent that two other significant groups of the principal's role-set, teachers and supervisors, must be in close agreement as to the problems of the elementary principalship and the techniques and practices that are seen to be most effective in alleviating these problems. Once their perceptions have been identified (although they may not always be in agreement, each should be cognizant of how the other perceives the elementary principalship) principals, teachers, and supervisors will have a starting point on which to base a program for the cooperative improvement of the elementary principalship, and subsequently, the total school environment.

Provincial Considerations

It is only in recent years that the elementary school principal has come to be recognized as a central figure in the teaching-learning

¹⁴ Alice Miel, "In-service Education Re-examined," The National Elementary Principal, XLV (February, 1962), p. 7.

¹⁵ Giles Theilman, "What Are the Characteristics of an Effective In-service Program?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (March, 1952), pp. 361-366.

process. Recognition of his changing role, however, has not been substantiated by any detailed effort to facilitate his increasing and varying responsibility.

Several factors have been operative in the province of late which emphasize the need for a study of the current professional problems and in-service education needs of practicing elementary school principals.

(a) Increase in school size. A provincial survey of existing school facilities completed in 1972 revealed that elementary schools (grades K - 6) comprised 30% of all schools in the province. (n = 893)¹⁶ Of the 267 elementary schools, 110 contained 6 or more rooms. The 1973 edition of The Newfoundland and Labrador Schools Directory lists 122 schools subject to the conditions above (K - 6 with 6 or more rooms), an increase of 12 schools.¹⁷ While this increase may not be significant enough to warrant this study, it does indicate a trend toward centralization of our elementary schools. It is the writer's belief that such a trend will continue, and that this is an opportune time to try to ascertain and suggest possible solutions to the problems of practicing elementary school principals that are associated with the move toward increase in school size.

(b) Educated teacher force and general societal demands. The authoritative position of the principal is now being seriously questioned

¹⁶ Robert D. Fisher and Philip J. Warren, Schools in Newfoundland and Labrador: A Survey of Existing Facilities (St. John's: Department of Educational Administration, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1972), p. 136.

¹⁷ Department of Education, The Newfoundland and Labrador Schools Directory, 1972-73 (St. John's: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1973).

by teachers, particularly in the task area of curriculum and instruction. The trend toward 'teacher militancy' has been paralleled by the rapid increase in teacher qualifications over the past few years. Coupled with a changing teacher force, principals in the province are faced with general societal demands, exemplified by the knowledge explosion, which have contributed to an increased rate of change, cultural, social and technological. Faber and Shearron comment that:

The elementary school principal of today administers a larger school that is part of a larger school system; he relates to a larger more specialized central office staff and to a better trained more professionally oriented teaching staff; and he strives to help his school accomplish more tasks with a higher degree of proficiency, while being watched more carefully by a public with greater expectations for his performance. This is the challenge and the opportunity in becoming an elementary school principal today.¹⁸

Recognition of the increasing and varied tasks of the elementary principal have been manifested in several ways. The Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's operated a twice-monthly practicum for its school administrators during the months January-May, 1973. In central Newfoundland, the Exploits Valley Integrated School Board undertook a similar, less involved venture during late March and early April of the same year. Other school superintendents in the province, notably Cecil Smith of Avalon North Integrated and Nathan Cutler of Bay D'Espoir Integrated, have recognized the need for some form of in-service education for their practicing school administrators. Both have asked the Department of Educational Administration at Memorial University, either in writing or through oral communication, for help in this area. Phil Warren, speaking at the

¹⁸ Charles F. Faber and Gilbert F. Shearron, Elementary School Administration: Theory and Practice (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), p. 340.

Administrator's Practicum for principals of the Roman Catholic School Board, St. John's, stated that, "A planned systematic and continuous in-service education program is basic to the solutions of the critical problems facing the school principal today."¹⁹

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The Problem

The problem to which the study addresses itself is as follows.

When elementary school principals, and the teachers and supervisors with whom they work, are asked to identify the current professional problems and in-service education needs of the elementary principalship:

(1) Which problems are perceived by each group as being most critical with respect to degree of difficulty in performing duties of the elementary principal?

(2) What implications for in-service education of elementary principals are revealed through these perceptions?

The Purposes

The purposes of this study are:

(1) To identify the critical professional problems of elementary principals in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador as perceived by elementary principals, their teachers, and the supervisors with whom they work.

(2) To examine relationships between size of schools and perceived

¹⁹ Philip J. Warren, "Developing an In-service Education Program," (Address to the Administrator's Practicum, Roman Catholic School Board, St. John's, Newfoundland, 1973), p. 1.

problems.

(3) To examine relationships between personal and professional characteristics of elementary principals and perceived problems.

(4) To examine relationships between personal and professional characteristics of elementary teachers and perceived problems.

(5) To examine relationships between personal and professional characteristics of elementary principals and their effectiveness in the elementary principalship as perceived by supervisors with whom they work.

(6) To review the problems identified by elementary school principals, teachers, and supervisors together with their suggestions for an in-service education program.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

In accordance with the purpose of this study, answers to the following questions will be sought:

(1) Do elementary principals, teachers, and supervisors agree as to the problems faced by elementary school principals and as to the degree of difficulty which these problems present?

(2) Do relationships exist between the size of schools and the problems perceived by principals, teachers, and supervisors?

(3) Do relationships exist between personal and professional characteristics of principals and the problems which they perceive?

(4) Do relationships exist between personal and professional characteristics of teachers and the problems which they perceive for their elementary principals?

(5) Do relationships exist between personal and professional characteristics of elementary principals and their effectiveness in the

elementary principalship as perceived by supervisors with whom they work.

(6) What approach and direction to inservice education is suggested for elementary school principals in the province by principals, teachers, and supervisors?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Elementary School

A school having the grade classification K-6 and an administrative-teaching staff of six or more persons.

Elementary School Principal

That member of the administrative-teaching staff formally designated "principal" who is charged with the overall responsibility for the daily operation of a specific elementary school, K-6.

Elementary School Teacher

A teacher who has been assigned the regular classroom duties of a particular grade or combination of grades in an elementary school as defined.

Generalist Supervisor

Generalist supervisor refers to personnel hired pursuant to Section 29 (1) of the Newfoundland and Labrador Schools Act, Number 68, 1969. The generalist supervisor as opposed to the board specialist who is responsible for a specific subject area, is responsible for general improvement in instruction throughout the district in which he is employed.

Inservice Education

Further educational activities (for example, professional reading,

light

participating in educational workshops, conferences, visiting other school systems, seminars) which contribute to the professional growth of the principal while under contract to a school district.

ASSUMPTIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Assumptions

(1) Each sample of elementary school principals, teachers, and supervisors is capable of identifying and rating problems faced by elementary school principals. It is further assumed that differences in perceptions will occur among these three groups.

(2) The tasks listed on the rating instrument actually are performed by the vast majority of elementary principals.

(3) The survey technique used represents an adequate basis for determining the problems encountered by elementary principals.

(4) The sample of principals, teachers, and supervisors is adequate to reflect the opinions of the respective populations.

(5) Members of each sample will respond accurately and honestly to all questions and will rate each task objectively.

Delimitations

This study is delimited to:

(1) The Integrated and Roman Catholic School Districts which meet both of the following stipulations: (a) have at least one school in the K-6 grade classification with an administrative-teaching staff of six or more persons, and (b) have appointed at least one generalist supervisor as defined in Section 20 (1) of the Newfoundland and Labrador Schools Act, Number 68, 1969.

tiger

(2) An analysis of the responses regarding the degree of difficulty which certain tasks present to elementary principals from (a) stratified random sample of elementary school principals based on school size, (b) a random sample of elementary school teachers, (c) generalist supervisors responsible for elementary education, and (d) the total population of schools with 21 or more administrative-teaching staff.

All of (a), (b), (c), and (d) shall be subject to the requirements stipulated in 1 (a) and (b).

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Problems of Perception

Zalkind and Costello reviewed the research on perception and its implications for the study of administration. They summarized the nature of the perceptual process as follows:

(1) A person may be influenced by considerations he may not be able to identify, and may respond to ones that are below the threshold of his awareness.

(2) When required to form perceptual judgments, he may respond to irrelevant cues to arrive at the judgment.

(3) In making abstract or intellectual judgments he may be influenced by emotional factors; what is liked is often perceived as correct.

(4) He will weigh perceptual evidence coming from respected sources more heavily than that coming from other sources.

(5) He may not be able to identify all the factors on which his judgments are based. Even if he is aware of these factors he is not likely

to realize how much weight he gives to them.²⁰

After conducting a research review similar to Zalkind and Costello, Ennis stated, "The difficulty of avoiding distortion in perception has been stressed . . . and the probability of different members in an organization perceiving the same event or behaviour differently has been implied."²¹

It should be noted that the preceding implications drawn from research on perception stressed that certain limitations may be operative in the perceptual process. For purposes of analysis this study has assumed that members of each sample will respond accurately and honestly to all questions and will rate each task objectively. In either event, the essential point to consider is that respondents will have identified areas of concern which they feel need additional help and direction. This is the initial and vital information we need upon which to base a program for the cooperative improvement of the elementary principalship. It would be highly impractical and undesirable to suggest that before soliciting the views of respondents we place some form of control on them to diminish any influence which may result from the vagaries of human nature.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study of the current professional problems and inservice education needs of the elementary principalship in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador has been organized into five chapters. A brief

²⁰ S. S. Zalkind and T. W. Costello, "Perception: Some Recent Research and Implications for Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, VII (September, 1963), pp. 218-35.

²¹ F. Ennis, "Perception in the Study of Administration," The Canadian Administrator, V (March, 1966), p. 25.

summary of the content of each chapter follows.

Chapter I sets the background to the problem, establishes the need for and importance of the study, and presents a statement of the problem and the questions to be answered in accordance with the purposes. Definitions of terms used in the study were included to avoid any misinterpretation that might otherwise occur. The chapter concluded with a list of assumptions, delimitations, and limitations under which the study would be conducted.

Chapter II presents a review of selected related literature and provides a background to the study.

The design and methodology of the study are included in Chapter III. This chapter presents a description of the methods used in selecting the sample, the instrument used, and the methods used in collecting and classifying the data.

Chapter IV is concerned with the presentation and analysis of responses received from principals, teachers, and supervisors involved in the study.

A summary of the study, findings of the study, conclusions drawn from the findings and recommendations are to be found in the final chapter, Chapter V.

light

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of literature relevant to further understanding of the elementary principalship and the present study. The chapter has been divided into three sections:

(a) Section I reviews a number of studies which have centered on role perceptions of the elementary principalship. The studies reveal a role definition of the elementary principalship as perceived by certain members of the principal's role-set. In that these studies focus on perception of task areas identified by writers in the field of elementary education, this research is very pertinent for a greater awareness of role problem performance for elementary school principals.

(b) Section II, because it deals specifically with problems of elementary school principals, will serve to illustrate the kind of and degree of difficulty experienced by principals in the performance of their role. Secondly, it will serve as a basis for drawing comparisons and conclusions in the present study.

(c) The final section will include several studies which have dealt with inservice education programs. While it is not the central concern of this study to detail an inservice education program, it is expected that an identification of the problems of practicing school administrators will have some implications for this form of professional growth. The concluding

section then will provide valuable insight upon which to make and base suggestions for further inservice education of elementary school principals in the province.

SECTION I

ROLE PERCEPTION STUDIES OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALSHIP

The elementary principalship has been the subject of considerable research. Early studies dealt with the duties of the elementary principal, while many of the recent studies have been concerned with perceptions of the principal's job as viewed by various groups of individuals with whom he associates professionally.

Principal's Administrative Performance Viewed by Principals and Teachers

Included in a 1968 study by Wayne Ludlow at Memorial University of Newfoundland was an examination of the possible divergencies between the way the elementary school principal views his performance in carrying out specific administrative practices in his school, and the manner in which his performance is viewed by teachers.¹ Ludlow concluded that

... there is a general lack of consensus between teachers and principals in their description of the principal's administrative performance. The analysis revealed that the principals saw their performance more satisfactory than did their teachers.²

¹Wayne Everett Ludlow, "The Administrative Performance of Elementary School Principals in the Province of Newfoundland" (unpublished Master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1968).

²Ibid., p. 150.

The Principal's Effectiveness as Perceived
by Experienced School Teachers

In 1967, Symanski undertook a study at New York University to ascertain the effectiveness of the elementary school principal as perceived by experienced school teachers.³ Efforts were also made in this study to determine possible relationships between the teachers' personal and professional backgrounds and their perception of the elementary school principals' effectiveness. Further efforts were made to determine possible relationships between the elementary school principals' effectiveness as perceived, and the morale of the respondents.

Symanski's conclusions were:

1. Experienced elementary school teachers perceived the elementary school principals' behaviour as being very effective.
2. There was a positive correlation between teacher perceptions of the elementary principals' behaviour and the teachers' morale.
3. The experienced teacher placed particular emphasis on the principal's skill at teacher conferences when the principal is working with and helping teachers.
4. Men were less positive than women in their perceptions of the principal's behaviour.
5. The principals' professional behaviour evoked very positive perceptions.⁴

The Principal's Role: What it is Perceived to be --
the Skills Needed to Facilitate this Role

Research conducted by England to analyze the role expectation of the school principal as it affects the professional growth of the teachers

³Gregory G. Symanski, "The Elementary School Principal as Perceived by Experienced School Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3953 - A, April, 1968.

⁴Ibid., p. 3953.

and principals in the Clayton County, Georgia, School System indicated that 94 percent of the principals and 90 percent of the teachers accepted improvement of instruction as the major role of the principal.⁵

Similar findings were reported by Herbert Johnson after a study of teacher perception of duties of elementary school principals.⁶ The study revealed a major area of responsibility to be that of supervision and curriculum development. Pupil personnel evolved as the second major area of responsibility.

Calvin Frazier investigated some of the role expectations held for the elementary principalship by principals, their superiors, and their subordinates.⁷ The expectations considered in the study involved the attributes of the principal and his behaviour in the area of general school management, staff relationships, and community and professional activities.

Twenty-seven differences were noted among the ratings made by superintendents, principals, and teachers. Superintendent-teacher divergencies accounted for fourteen of these. Some rating differences were found in each of the attributes and behaviour areas but the most dissimilarities occurred on school management expectations.⁸

⁵ Clifford N. England, "Analysis of the Role Expectations of the Principal as it Affects the Professional Growth in a Selected School System," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3922-A, April, 1968.

⁶ Herbert Raymond Johnson, Jr., "A Study of Perceptions of Duties of Elementary School Principals," Dissertation Abstracts, 26:1592-A, December, 1966.

⁷ Calvin Morton Frazier, "Role Expectations of the Elementary Principal as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals and Teachers" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964).

⁸ Ibid., pp. 218-220.

Two studies made a decade apart and in different parts of the country investigated role perception of principals -- what they thought their roles actually were and what they thought they should be.⁹ Close agreement was found between a 1958 Michigan study and a 1968 California study, despite differences in geographical location, industrial and commercial involvement, and political views. Some of the implications reported from these studies were:

For school and superintendents. School board support is needed to promote, recognize, and develop the creativity of the principal in translating his ideals into integral parts of the school program.

For professional organizations. The implied task ahead is to remove their competition for principal attention (demands on his time) and search cooperatively for means by which professional organizations can function in a supportive capacity that is ready to offer immediate help to the individual and the local school system.

For higher education. Principals cooperating in these studies reflected a variety of needs. Help was requested in the areas of curriculum development, child growth and development theory, business administration, and personnel evaluation. Workshops and seminars were recommended as possible means of providing knowledge in human relations, group processes, community involvement, and guidance. Over 90 per cent of the principals asked for an internship program, and many suggested that administrative aspirants and in-service principals be able to plan their formal training in terms of their individual and job-related needs.

School-community relations. Principals in the study did not like what they were doing in school-community relations, and they were confused about what they should be doing.

For the individual principal. The problem of principal time allotment has been established and reiterated. . . . Among the needed skills that were implied in the findings of the reported studies were:

1. Group leadership skills

⁹ Joseph Melton, "Role Perceptions of the Elementary Principalship," The National Elementary Principal, L (February, 1972).

light

2. Skills in involving the community in meaningful school experiences
3. Skills in employing social-psychological understandings about value agreements
4. The willingness and skills to engage in the self-evaluation process
5. Skills in curriculum development and revision
6. Skills in delegation of clerical duties
7. Skills in selecting courses and planning advanced training.¹⁰

Agreement Existing Between Principals and Their
Reference Groups Relative to the Tasks of
the Elementary Principalship

A study conducted by Reid at the University of Oregon focused on the degree of agreement which exists between the views of elementary principals and their reference groups regarding the relative importance of the elementary principal's tasks.¹¹

In a comparison of the rank ordering of the tasks of the elementary principal by the principals and superintendents, a significantly high correlation was found. There was also similarity of opinion between principals and teachers regarding the relative importance of the tasks.¹²

Ted Shoaf reached conclusions at variance to those of Reid.¹³

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 40-43.

¹¹ John Ephraim Reid, "Task Expectations of the Elementary Principal as Perceived by Principals, Superintendents, Teachers, School Boards and the Public" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1967).

¹² Ibid., pp. 142-145.

¹³ Ted Byron Shoaf, "A Study of the Relative Importance of the Tasks of the Elementary School Principalship as Seen by Elementary School Prin-

1. The tasks of the elementary school principal have not been seen with high degrees of similarity when considered according to their relative importance by elementary school teachers, their principals, their superintendents, and by professors of educational administration.
2. The professors of educational administration and the teachers saw the relative importance of the tasks of the elementary school principalship with more significant dissimilarities than any other two groups in the study.¹⁴

Summary of Section I

The studies reported in this section gave a brief outline of the role and role expectations which the elementary principal and his role-set members perceive to be characteristic of the elementary principalship.

These studies seem to show that:

- 1) There is less than complete agreement on
 - a) what the principal's proper role is
 - b) how well the principal is performing.
- 2) In spite of the differences which are seen to occur, common emphasis was placed on the importance of the principal's role in
 - a) supervision and curriculum development
 - b) school-community relations
 - c) developing interpersonal relationships.

cipals, Teachers, their Superintendents, and Professors of Educational Administration" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1967).

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 124-125.

SECTION II

STUDIES OF PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Only a few studies have been conducted which were concerned directly with the professional problems of elementary school principals. Therefore, reference is made in this section to some studies which only indirectly concern themselves with the professional problems of elementary school principals.

Problems and Problem Areas of Elementary
School Principals

In 1960, the United States Office of Education published the results of a nationwide survey of current practices and trends in the organization and administration of public elementary schools.¹⁵ A questionnaire was sent to school administrators in 4,307 urban school districts. One section of the questionnaire was concerned with the problems of the elementary school principal. A check list of seventeen categories was presented, and superintendents were asked to check the problems which they believed their elementary school principals were experiencing. The results showed that supervision of instruction was considered the main problem facing the elementary school principal. The nine categories of problems identified as most pressing by the superintendents were: (1) supervision of instruction, (2) provision for the exceptional child, (3) programs of

¹⁵ C. M. Wilson, "Problems of Elementary School Principals in Arkansas With Implications for In-service Training" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969), p. 15, citing Stuart E. Dean, Elementary School Administration and Organization (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1960).

special education, (4) recruitment of teachers, (5) school-community relations, (6) staff relationships, (7) pupil promotional policies, (8) school lunch programs, and (9) reporting pupil progress.¹⁶

Issues and Problems in Elementary School Administration, by Gerald Becker et al., published in 1970, was a study of the elementary principal in fifty states of the United States.¹⁷ Information was obtained from teacher training institutions, state departments of education and regional educational laboratories, as well as from elementary principals themselves. Several critical issues confronting the elementary school principal were identified, and placed under two major headings: (a) the ambiguous role of the principal, and (b) the inadequacy of pre-service programs for the elementary school principal.

According to Becker et al. the most critical problem facing the modern elementary principal is the general ambiguity of this position within the school system. There is no viable, systematic rationale which provides a basis upon which the elementary school principal can determine both expectations for his performance and criteria through which his performance can be measured.

The principal feels that it is essential he be given the opportunity to convey the needs in his individual school to the central administration. He is concerned that he has little or no opportunity to participate in district decision-making processes. He deeply resents being thought of as a second class administrator and attributes much of the frustration as an elementary school principal to this discriminating situation.¹⁸

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁷ Gerald Becker, et al., Issues and Problems in Elementary School Administration (Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, 1970).

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 141-142.

The inadequacy of preparation programs for elementary school principals was also a source of concern, especially in the areas of human relations, supervisory practices, implementing educational change, and planning instructional programs.

After reviewing the data presented in the study, Becker et al. concluded that the causes of what they considered to be a leadership crisis in elementary administration are both public and professional, and that the elementary school principals in the United States were calling for assistance to improve their ability to adapt educational practices to the pressing needs of our times.¹⁹

C. M. Wilson tried to determine the professional problems of elementary school principals in Arkansas and their implications for inservice training.²⁰ He reported that

Superintendents rated principals' problems slightly higher than did principals or teachers. Principals rated their own problems slightly higher than did teachers. . . . slightly higher agreement was found between principals and teachers as to the degree of difficulty which problems presented. There was, however, more agreement among superintendents, principals, and teachers as to which problems were the most difficult for elementary principals. Of those problems which were rated above the mean for each category, 64 per cent were commonly agreed upon by superintendents, principals, and teachers.²¹

To summarize, Wilson found that superintendents, principals, and teachers held similar points of view as to which problems faced by principals were the most critical. He concluded that the problems identified

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 152-153.

²⁰ C. M. Wilson, "Problems of Elementary School Principals in Arkansas: Implications for In-Service Training" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969).

²¹ Ibid., p. 109.

constituted the most difficult functions of the elementary principalship and therefore, represented the areas of greatest need for in-service training of elementary principals in Arkansas.²²

Personnel Services Felt by Principals and
Teachers to be in Greatest and Least
Need of Improvement

Robert Means studied principal and teacher perceptions of selected personnel services in a large urban school system, and attempted to relate these perceptions to morale and teacher turnover.²³ One portion of the study concerned the identification of those personnel services felt by both principals and teachers to be in greatest and least need of improvement. Means found that services concerned with clerical aid, relief from pupil contact, lighter teaching loads for beginning teachers, teacher influence on the curriculum, convenience of supply and audio-visual storerooms, equipment and supplies, and salary were felt by both teachers and principals as being in greatest need of improvement. Teachers and principals also agreed that there was the least need for improvement on those personnel services concerned with academic freedom, dismissal policies, sick and emergency leave policies, written personnel policies, and administrative support and confidence in teachers. Computation of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient revealed a significant relationship of .90 between principal and teacher rating of the 31 personnel services.²⁴

²² Ibid., p. 113.

²³ Robert Samuel Means, "A Study of Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Selected Personnel Services," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:2953, February, 1968.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 2953.

Problems of Beginning Elementary School Principals

In a doctoral study completed at Florida State University, Ben Horton investigated the problems of thirty beginning principals who received their Master's degree from Appalachian State Teachers College, Boone, South Carolina.²⁵

2,042 problems were identified by the principals, their teachers, their superintendents, and Horton; and then classified into the following eight categories, ranked according to frequency of mention:

1. Personnel (staff)
2. Organization and structure
3. Personnel (pupils)
4. Public Relations
5. Curriculum and instruction
6. School plant
7. Transportation
8. Finance²⁶

Graves and Stoller studied twelve inexperienced elementary school principals.²⁷ Utilizing bi-weekly reports, a list of problems was

²⁵C. M. Wilson, "Problems of Elementary School Principals in Arkansas: Implications for In-service Training" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969), p. 16, citing Ben H. Horton, "A Study of the Problems of Beginning Principals as a Basis for Improving the Program for the Education of Principals at Appalachian State Teachers College" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1958), p. 42.

²⁶Ibid., p. 16.

²⁷William J. Graves and Nathan Stoller, "Reports of Selected Elementary Principals on Their Professional Problems" (New York: APEA-MRA Digest Series, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954).

developed, and the results showed that most problems were in the 'personnel' area. The most difficult problems reported concerned (1) staff, (2) pupils, and (3) community relations, in that order. This study also reported that sixty-seven percent of the elementary principal's time was spent in face-to-face communication with various people. The authors concluded that this showed communications problems to be common for school administrators.²⁸

A doctoral study conducted by David Moberely concentrated on the problems of beginning elementary school principals and the implications of such problems for on-the-job training.²⁹ One hundred and thirty-five principals and sixty-seven superintendents from Ohio city school districts were asked by means of a questionnaire to rate sixty-six tasks of elementary principals on a five point 'difficulty' scale. The sixty-six tasks were grouped into five major categories: (1) general administration, (2) instructional leadership, (3) administration of staff personnel, (4) administration of pupil personnel, and (5) school-community relations. The principals were categorized on the basis of whether or not there was an organized pre-service training program for prospective elementary principals in their local school district.

On the basis of group means, principals with on-the-job training rated their difficulties slightly lower than principals without such training. Superintendents of schools with on-the-job training programs

²⁸ Ibid., p. 19.

²⁹ David L. Moberely, "Problems of Beginning Elementary School Principals with Implications for on-the-job Training Programs" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1965).

rated the difficulties of beginning principals significantly lower on tasks such as communicating with central office, developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified staff members, and helping teachers develop and understand the system for reporting pupil progress. The superintendents rated the problems of principals on all sixty-six tasks higher than the principals rated themselves.³⁰

Section II Summary

Identification of the problems which confront the elementary principal in the administration of his duties formed the focal point of section II.

After taking into consideration the findings specifically related to individual studies, the following problems emerged as major and common areas of concern:

- 1) Helping teachers identify and provide for individual differences.
- 2) Having sufficient knowledge in elementary education.
- 3) Demands on the principal's time.
- 4) Establishing and maintaining good relations with the staff.
- 5) Developing a more effective liaison between the school and the community.

The studies reviewed generally considered inadequacy of pre-service training programs to be a significant contributing factor to the principal's difficulties in performing most of these functions.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 226.

SECTION III

INSERVICE EDUCATION STUDIES OF THE ELEMENTARY
PRINCIPALSHIP

A concise comprehensive assessment of the modern elementary principalship and a fitting introduction to any proposed review of in-service education for elementary school principals is provided by Elsbree and McNally. They summarized the high expectations of the position in this way:

A principal must be a versatile individual to fulfill all the responsibilities demanded of him. He must be skilful in the realm of personnel management; he must understand the school plant and how to operate and maintain it efficiently; he must be conversant with modern school business practices; he must know how to work with the public and he must be able to give leadership to his staff in curriculum development. These combined functions constitute a tremendous challenge to the elementary principal; they demand a higher and more professional type of leadership than ever before, and offer him a great opportunity to serve the children of his district.³¹

Obviously, the high expectations with which the elementary principal has to contend taxes his ability to meet consistently and adequately the responsibilities of the principalship. Literature reviewed in the previous two sections and in Chapter I of the present study outlines some of the difficulties which elementary principals presently are experiencing.

Section III takes a closer look at suggestions to lighten the burden of the elementary principal by involving him in a continuous program of in-service education activities.

³¹Willard J. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Elementary School Administration and Supervision (New York: American Book Company, 1959), pp. 13-14.

Guidelines to be Considered in the
Implementation of an Inservice
Education Program

The purpose of a study conducted by John Thornton was to establish cooperatively with the administrative personnel of the Little Rock, Arkansas, Public School System, recommendations for an in-service training program for elementary school principals.³² Thornton made the following general recommendations:

1. The scope of in-service education should include more than an effort to keep abreast of new concepts and practices in education. It should foster continuing growth in intellectual curiosity, in creativity and imagination, and in willingness to explore the unknown.
2. A handbook should be prepared to serve as a guide in establishing and/or improving in-service education, and the following guidelines should be followed:
 - a. The goals and objectives of the in-service program should be determined cooperatively and democratically by all participants.
 - b. In order for the participants to achieve noticeable and satisfying results in a relatively short time, short-range as well as long-range goals should be planned.
 - c. The participants and the school system should cooperatively determine the type of in-service program. The school system should maintain the right to limit the types of experiences it accepts as in-service work, but at the same time, it should be realized that a variety of activities are necessary to meet the needs of all principals.
 - d. An effective in-service program involves more than appointment of committees and scheduling of periodic principal's meetings. It requires leadership, cooperative attitudes, and mutual confidence on the part of all participants. An in-service program can take a

³² John Thomas Thornton, "A Survey of the Little Rock Elementary Principalship With Recommendations for In-service Education" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1966).

variety of forms such as: a planned time for professional reading, released time for prospective principals to participate in an internship under an experienced principal, action research projects, workshops, visits to other schools, attendance at professional conferences, use of consultants, planned programs of travel, and small group work on problems, only to mention a few of the many approaches to in-service education.

- e. The in-service program should be centered around local school problems or some aspect of the local educational program.
- f. Participation in the in-service program should be on a voluntary basis. The program should be so planned as to encourage participation.
- g. The participants should determine the time the in-service program should be held and should help in the selection of needed resource personnel.³³

William Grant developed a model for the inservice education of school administrators in the state of New South Wales, Australia.³⁴

Employing a study which was both descriptive and comparative in design, Grant's final model is most directly applicable to the state of New South Wales, Australia. Apart from the specifics, however, each of the elements considered contains material with general applicability.

In translating the conceptual model into a viable inservice program leading to improved educational practices, Grant feels the following nine factors should be considered:³⁵

- 1) Flexibility: Courses should reflect current and changing needs

³³ Ibid., pp. 126-127.

³⁴ William Watson Grant, "A Model for the In-Service Education of School Administrators Within the State of New South Wales, Australia" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, 1970).

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 201-204.

both in content and in activity. Provision is required for lecturers and participants to vary sessions as special needs and alternatives arise. The overall structure of programs should remain simple so that modifications can be made quickly in response to changing requirements. Regular evaluation of courses while in progress and at their conclusion should be an integral feature.

2) Readiness: The model presents a sequence of courses, which should reflect the growing skill and knowledge of the participants. Care must be taken to ensure that each individual clearly recognizes the value of the course and that involvement takes place in an atmosphere which imposes no more than minimum personal threat.

3) Democratic organization: The maintenance of democratic organization requires that each participant shares responsibilities with his fellows, feels free to contribute to the extent of his knowledge and ability, and is respected for his contribution. Status differences should be minimized in an atmosphere of cooperative group action.

4) Active participation: The inclusion of meaningful activities leading to the application of knowledge in real or simulated situations of high experience impact provides a key to effective learning. Each course should provide some opportunities for participant response.

5) Physical conditions: Special attention should be given to the provision of adequate physical facilities. Pleasant and appropriate surroundings help to promote an atmosphere which is conducive to more effective communication, interaction and learning outcomes. For longer courses, a fully maintained residential center, with conference and seminar rooms, is recommended. Such a facility established in or near the state capital city, would provide a venue for state and area conferences, for

metropolitan directorate staff and for the advanced courses recommended for principals and inspectors.

6) Individualization: Courses should be structured to meet the genuine needs of participants. Group size should be determined by the type of activity proposed. The ability, training, experience, and aspirations of each participant should be recognized and provided for through activities either individually designed or prepared to enable each to develop his own appropriate response.

7) Leadership: Much of the ultimate success of the program depends upon the quality and ability of course coordinators, resource personnel, and lecturers. Every effort must be made to secure personnel who are competent in their fields and capable of dynamic leadership. This requires not only special care in selection but also adequate finance to secure the services of highly qualified individuals.

8) Motivation: Stimulating and challenging course work provides intrinsic motivation for administrators seeking professional growth experiences. However, plans should be made to develop an award system which, in the form of a certificate, would signify satisfactory completion of courses. As a further stimulus, in-service experiences should be included among the criteria to determine promotion. It is not recommended, at least until the model has been validated through implementation and evaluation, that courses be made obligatory for every officer.

9) Application: Learning, as a result of in-service experiences, is reinforced through application. Preparation for this is necessary when courses are being developed to ensure that personnel with appropriate authority from within the system are involved or available to determine limits and suggest alternatives during problem-solving or decision-making

tyler

sessions. Such a maneuver makes it possible for decisions to be reached which have system support. Further application should come from planned follow-up procedures upon the return of the participant to his position and by the utilization of early experience in other courses within the integrated model sequence.

Inservice Education Needs of the Elementary
Principalship as Identified by Elementary
Principals, Teachers and Superintendents

William Paulo, in his Doctoral dissertation, sought (1) to discover the inservice education needs of elementary school principals identified by principals themselves, by elementary school classroom teachers, and by superintendents of school districts containing elementary schools; (2) to find those needs considered to be significant by all three groups, and (3) to discover areas of disagreement among the three groups regarding the further needs of elementary principals.³⁶ As a result of his study, he presented the following findings:

1. When the principals selected in-service needs, the largest percentage was in the area defined as curriculum development, followed closely by supervision and to lesser extents, pupil personnel and community relations. They saw the fewest needs in the area of administration.
2. A tabulation of the returns submitted by the principals revealed the five highest priority in-service needs were skills in the selection, evaluation and dismissal of personnel; techniques for encouraging experimentation by teachers in newer curriculum practices; a knowledge of the issues of education, phonics vs. look-say, et cetera; skills in organizing their time to minimize less essential activities; and knowledge of how to assist teachers in providing for individual differences among pupils.

³⁶William Eugene Paulo, "In-Service Education Needs of Elementary School Principals" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1965).

3. Elementary principals reacted significantly in a negative direction in four instances: procedures for conducting fire drills; development of schedules for convening, recesses, and dismissal; and helping student publications interpret the purpose and program of the school.
4. When elementary teachers considered the in-service needs of elementary school principals, they gave the highest priority to techniques to help teachers with individual behaviour problems; techniques in counselling with students referred for disciplinary reasons; knowledge of how to assist teachers with diagnosis, remediation, and evaluation in working with pupils; and understandings necessary to confer with parents about the work, behaviour, et cetera, of specific pupils.
5. The superintendents saw thirty-two of the items as significant in-service needs of elementary school principals. In terms of percentage, the largest number was in the area of curriculum development, followed closely by the category identified as supervision. Pupil personnel and community relations came next in order with the area of administration showing the smallest percentage of needs.
6. When district superintendents viewed the in-service needs of elementary school principals, they gave the highest priority to skills in organizing time to minimize less essential activities; skills in the selection, evaluation, and dismissal of personnel; knowledge to assist teachers in providing for individual differences; techniques for observing and holding follow-up critic conferences with teachers; and knowledge of the issues of education, phonics vs. look-say, et cetera.³⁷

Section III Summary

The studies presented in Section III were selected (1) to portray the broader aspects of an inservice education program designed to aid the elementary principal in meeting the high expectations of the principalship and (2) to identify problem areas deserving of inservice activity. Generally, the inservice education studies were aimed at formulating the most-effective guidelines to be followed in implementing the inservice education program. Of basic importance is the need for thorough and exten-

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 171-176.

Tyler

sive planning based upon cooperative and democratic principles. Good organization has to be complimented by competent resource personnel who are capable of giving dynamic leadership. Incorporated in the structure which should result from such careful consideration will be provision for the participants to avail of courses designed to meet individual needs. Toward this goal course content should be flexible -- reflect current and changing needs in both content and activity; motivating -- intrinsic value, possible use of certificates and/or inclusion among criteria to determine promotion; and applicable -- be adaptable to the local school system.

While few of the studies sought to identify specifically the problems which confront the elementary principal, those that did reported a need for inservice activity in the areas of curriculum development and supervision.

More precisely, principals and superintendents felt that inservice needs were warranted in (a) the selection, evaluation, and dismissal of personnel,

(b) knowledge of how to assist teachers in providing for individual differences among pupils, and (c) a knowledge of the issues of education.

Teachers indicated a need for the principal to engage in inservice activities which would improve his techniques for helping them in the daily process of working with students.

SUMMARY

The preceding review of the literature focused on three different avenues to studying the elementary principalship:

(a) Perceptual studies which presented the role expectation views of various reference groups of the elementary principal composed Section I.

(b) Section II included studies which directly or indirectly illustrated the kind and magnitude of problems confronting the elementary prin-

Tyler

cipal.

(c) The final section, Section III, proposed in-service education guidelines, offered in this instance, as a background against which this form of professional growth should be approached.

Those sources cited in the first section strongly suggest that disagreement does exist in the role expectations of various reference groups with respect to some functions of the elementary principalship. Just as clearly established, however, is the consensus of agreement which repeatedly identifies the elementary principal to be involved in supervision and curriculum development, pupil and staff personnel, and school-community relations. Section II clearly demonstrated that these very task areas are primary concerns of the elementary principal because of the difficulties associated with effective performance in each category of responsibility. Carefully planned and systematically developed inservice education programs can be helpful, it was suggested, in Section III, when the elementary principal is trying to meet the differing expectations and resulting problems which characterize his world.

light

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

INTRODUCTION

Chapter III will describe (a) the locale of the study, (b) the population from which the sample was drawn, (c) the sample selection, (d) the distribution of the sample on the basis of selected variables, (e) the method of data collection, (f) the construction and nature of the instrument used, and finally, (g) the treatment of the data to answer the questions developed in accordance with the purposes of the study.

The Locale of the Study

This study deals with the current professional problems of elementary school principals in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador as perceived by elementary principals, their teachers, and generalist supervisors with whom they work. The province is divided into 35 educational districts: 21 Integrated, 12 Roman Catholic, 1 Pentecostal and 1 Seventh Day Adventist. For the latter two boards the whole province serves as the boundary of their jurisdiction.

The Population of the Study

The population of this study consists of all the elementary school principals, elementary school teachers, and generalist supervisors who serve in the Integrated and Roman Catholic School Districts in which: (a) elementary principals administer schools with an administrative-teaching

staff numbering six or more, in the K-6 grade classification, and (b) which have appointed at least one generalist supervisor as defined in Section 20 (1) of the Newfoundland and Labrador Schools Act, Number 68, 1969. Twenty-six of the 33 educational districts comprising the Integrated and Roman Catholic School Boards met these requirements.

(a) Principals. Examination of the Department of Education payroll records for the school year, 1972-73, disclosed that there were 106 elementary school principals employed by the 26 educational districts who administered schools with an administrative-teaching staff numbering six or more. Of these principals, 57 administered schools with an administrative-teaching staff of 6-10, 39 administered schools with an administrative-teaching staff of 11-20, and 10 administered schools with 21 or greater administrative-teaching staff.

(b) Teachers. A similar search of the Department of Education records for the school year, 1972-73, showed a total of 940 regular classroom elementary school teachers to be teaching in the 106 elementary schools of the 26 Integrated and Roman Catholic School Districts.

(c) Supervisors. Since districts follow different procedures in assigning generalist supervisors to each of the divisions, primary, elementary, and high school, no adequate record of the actual number of supervisors solely involved in elementary education were available. Nevertheless, it can be reasonably assumed that, whichever procedure is followed, the generalist supervisor will be closely affiliated with the elementary principalship. For purposes of this study then, it was concluded that the population of supervisors, designated generalist supervisor for elementary education, would number 26.

light

The Sample Selection

(a) Principals.. A random sample of 49 elementary school principals, stratified by size of administrative-teaching staff, was drawn. To ensure that there would be enough cases for statistical analysis, 33 percent of principals who had administrative-teaching staff sizes of 6-10 were chosen, and 50 percent of those having administrative-teaching staff sizes of 11-20 were likewise selected. A table of random numbers was used throughout. A further division, 21 or greater administrative-teaching staff, included, because of the small numbers involved, the entire population. (See Table 1)

TABLE 1

POPULATION AND SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY ADMINISTRATIVE-TEACHING STAFF SIZE

Staff Size	Population (percent)	Sample (percent)
6 - 10	53.8	38.8
11 - 20	36.8	40.8
21 +	9.4	20.4
Total	100.0	100.0
	(n = 106)	(n = 49)

(b) Teachers. Employing a system of random number selection, 282 elementary school teachers were chosen for participation in the research. This number represented 30 percent of the 940 teachers who taught in the 106 elementary schools which had met the qualifications set for the study. Although no attempt was made to subdivide teachers on the basis of school size, that this was evident, is shown by the even distribution of sample

light

returns. (See Table 2)

(c) Supervisors: One supervisor, designated generalist supervisor for elementary education, was selected from each of the 26 Integrated and Roman Catholic School Districts participating in the study. Since no accurate listing of supervisor responsibility per division (primary, elementary, secondary) was available, a questionnaire pack together with a note of explanation (see Appendix B) was forwarded to each of the districts referred to above. It was assumed that the elementary supervisors so chosen were those having the closest working relationship with elementary principals and thus in the most opportune position to accurately assess his job performance.

Distribution of the Sample on the Basis of Selected Variables

When the personal and professional data sheet (page 1 of questionnaire requesting information relative to respondent's age, sex, staff size, teaching experience, etc.) of principals and teachers was tabulated, it became apparent that small numbers for some of the subgroups necessitated that data collected in its original format be collapsed in the manner shown in Tables 2-6. Table 2 contains the distribution of principals and teachers on the variable, staff size. The variables, sex, teaching experience, and years of professional preparation are presented in Table 3. Supervisors were, as previously noted, singly classified as generalist supervisors.

Administrative-Teaching Staff Size. The distribution of principals by administrative-teaching staff size shows that each school size category was represented by 68 percent or more of the sample from which it was taken. Such a high response rate for each school size category was encour-

light

aging to the researcher, since it would lend greater credence to an analysis of the results based on this variable.

The overall response pattern of teachers was low in comparison to the principals' returns. However, tabulation of the responses from the 139 teachers who replied to the questionnaire, revealed that there was no significant difference in the nonresponse of this group of respondents with respect to school size category.

Table 2 also revealed that a high percentage of principals and teachers, 74 and 76 respectively, were concentrated in schools with an administrative-teaching staff of twenty or less.

Sex. From Table 3 it can be seen that male principals and female teachers dominate their respective groups. Seventy-nine percent of principals were male and a comparable 77 percent of teachers were female.

Teaching Experience. Table 3 indicates that the majority of principals (79%) possessed ten or more years of teaching experience. Forty-one percent of these principals had been teaching from ten to nineteen years. Conversely, 41 percent of the sample of teachers had relatively little teaching experience (1-4 years). Approximately 75 percent of the teachers had less than ten years teaching experience.

Professional Preparation. When principals were classified on the the number of years of professional preparation that they have undergone, the tabulations demonstrated that 64 percent had extended their training beyond the normal time limit required to obtain an undergraduate degree (4 years). Teachers classified on the basis of years of professional

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS BY
ADMINISTRATIVE-TEACHING STAFF SIZEPrincipals

Staff Size	Sample Freq.	Sample Return Freq.	Percent of Sample Re Staff Size Returned
6 - 10	19	13	68.4
11 - 20	20	16	80.0
21 +	10	10	100.0
Total	49	39	79.6

Teachers

6 - 10	86	44	51.1
11 - 20	119	62	52.1
21 +	77	33	42.8
Total	282	139	48.9

light

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS BY
SEX, TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND YEARS OF
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

	Principals (n = 39)	Teachers (n = 139)
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	79.5%	23.2%
Female	19.5	76.8
<u>Teaching Experience</u>		
1-9 years	20.5	
10-19 years	41.0	
20 years +	38.5	
1-4 years		42.4
5-9 years		33.1
10 years +		24.5
<u>Years of Professional Preparation</u>		
4 years or less	35.9	
5 years +	64.1	
1-3 years		32.5
4-6 years		47.5

tyler

preparation were almost evenly divided between those who had obtained 1-3 years of professional training (n = 73, 52.5%) and those who had obtained 6 years (n = 66, 47.5%). (Table 3)

Administrative Experience. Years spent as a principal are reported in Table 4. Seventy-one percent of the thirty-eight principals responded that they had been performing in this role for five or more years. The largest number of principals (n = 14, 36.9%) had spent ten or more years in the principalship.

TABLE 4
DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY YEARS SPENT
AS A PRINCIPAL

Years as a Principal	Percent
1 - 4	28.9
5 - 9	34.2
10 +	36.9
Total 100.0	
(n = 38 ^a)	

^aOne respondent failed to check this item.

Principal's Age. The distribution of principals by age is depicted in Table 5. Most of the principals in the sample were under forty-five years of age. Forty-four percent of principals were 34 years of age or under and a further 36 percent were between the ages of 35-44.

light

Grade Taught. Teachers assigned to either a primary (teaching grades K, 1, 2, or 3) or elementary division (teaching grades 4, 5, or 6) represented 52 and 48 percent of the total sample, respectively. (Table 6)

Method of Data Collection

Because of the size of the population and sample involved, it was necessary to collect data by means of a mailed questionnaire (see Appendix). On May 4, 1973, a questionnaire and covering letter explaining the purpose of the study were forwarded to those teachers, principals, and supervisors selected for participation in the research. A self-addressed pre-stamped envelope was included to facilitate questionnaire returns.

Two weeks later, a second questionnaire and follow-up letter were sent, again to all respondents. This was necessary, since no measures had been taken to identify those who had responded to the initial mailing. Complete anonymity was adhered to throughout the study.

At the time of second mailing, 50% of the principals, 22% of the teachers, and 50% of the supervisors had returned a completed questionnaire. By the cutoff date, June 25, 1973, the percentage had risen to 80%, 51%, 89%, for principals, teachers, and supervisors, respectively.

Although teachers showed a high nonresponse rate, the manner in which results were affected is minimal for two reasons. Firstly, the nature of the returns revealed no appreciable differences between the distribution of responses from the various subgroups being considered and their distribution in the sample. Secondly, it should be noted that the 139 teachers who returned a completed questionnaire represent fifteen percent of a total population of 940 regular classroom elementary teachers.

Light

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY AGE

Age	Percent
34	35.9
35 - 44	43.5
45	20.5
Total	100.0
	(n = 39)

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY GRADE TAUGHT

Grade	Percent
K - 3	51.8
4 - 6	48.2
Total	100.0
	(n = 139)

tegr

file normally unacceptable when representing a small population, fifteen percent drawn from a large population, if not entirely desirable, should be representative of the membership from which it was randomly selected.

Table 7 accounts for the total mailed questionnaires for each group of respondents and the resulting percentage of returns which underwent data analysis.

TABLE 7
RESPONSE RATES FOR PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS,
AND SUPERVISORS

	Principals	Teachers	Supervisors
% Completed Questionnaires Returned	79.6	49.3	88.5
% Questionnaires Returned and Unusable, or Returned Undelivered		2.5	
% Questionnaires Not Returned	20.4	48.2	11.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(n = 49)	(n = 282)	(n = 26)

Construction and Nature of the Instrument

The questionnaire used in the present study was designed after that developed by C. M. Wilson for his doctoral dissertation at the University of Arkansas. The original questionnaire was simply entitled, "Problems of Elementary School Principals in Arkansas." It contained a total of ninety-two items describing specific duties or tasks commonly performed by elementary school principals. These items were grouped into five major categories of responsibilities: (1) General Administration, (2) Supervision of Instruction, (3) Administration of Staff Personnel, (4) Administration of

upil Personnel, and (5) School-Community Relations.

The rating scale of the instrument was designed to measure the degree of difficulty experienced by elementary school principals in performing the various tasks and duties listed. A numerical scale ranging from one for "none" to five for "extreme" was assigned to the five degrees of difficulty. Included in the remaining three degrees of difficulty were minor (2), moderate (3), and considerable (4). A "not applicable" (0) column was added to make provision for local job requirements. Responses falling in this column were deleted for purposes of statistical computation.

Dr. Wilson's instrument was adapted to the Newfoundland school situation by employing the following procedures.

The first step undertaken was a review of the questionnaire to eliminate those items which, clearly, were not pertinent to the functions of elementary school principals in the province. This overview, assisted by the thesis supervisor, resulted in the deletion of two of the original items.

Presentation of the original questionnaire (minus the two items selected out in the first overview) at a proposal seminar of the graduate students and faculty of the Department of Educational Administration of Memorial University led to the following steps which resulted in the final draft of the instrument.

- 1) Administration of the questionnaire to the faculty and graduate students in the Department of Educational Administration at Memorial University. Both groups were asked to scrutinize the items paying careful consideration to possible ambiguity in the wording of those tasks which were being performed by elementary principals in the province. Secondly, they were requested to search out further items not applicable to the

light

province's elementary schools and to suggest additional items which did reflect the provincial educational scene.

The critical analysis of the questionnaire by graduates and faculty prompted the researcher to delete four more items and add two new ones. This gave the research instrument 88 items. Of that number, five were, as in the original instrument, numbered spaces for additional items which the respondents in the field might wish to include.

To rate the revised instrument, Wilson's scale was modified to read: none (0), minor (1), moderate (2), considerable (3), extreme (4), and not applicable (5). It was decided to retain the not applicable column for statistical purposes to obtain a profile of those duties and tasks of elementary school principals, identified by research in the literature and by the faculty and students in Educational Administration at Memorial University, which were either not at all or in limited numbers part of the functions of the elementary principalship in the province.

2) Several open-ended questions related to in-service education which had been developed by the researcher were included when the Wilson instrument was administered to the above group. The overriding suggestion by faculty and students was that questions which provided more of a closed response would, in all likelihood, receive greater receptivity on the part of respondents participating in a questionnaire study.

Subsequent to, and as a result of these comments, a modified version of one section of a questionnaire developed by Dr. James Jesse at Ohio State University entitled, "Duties-Problems-Training Needs of Federal Program Developers," was adopted which would be more likely to elicit a favourable number of responses in the survey technique used.

3) A section of the Supervisor's instrument aimed at ascertaining

light

Supervisory perceptions in relation to certain basic characteristics of elementary school principals completed the steps which resulted in the final instrument to be used in the study.

Treatment of the Data

The data collected in this study were primarily analyzed and treated by comparing the mean responses of each selected group to the eighty-three items on the rating instrument. Further comparisons were made within the sample of elementary school principals as to the mean ratings of principals by sex, size of administrative-teaching staff, administrative experience (principal), age, years of teaching experience, and professional preparation. Similar variables were used to make comparisons in the sample of teachers with respect to their perceptions of the elementary school principal's problems. These comparisons were analyzed and treated by a one way analysis of variance and general observation of tabulated data.

Part III of the instrument for each group of respondents dealt with questions related to inservice education for elementary principals (see Appendix B). Since a number of these questions were not scaled, it was decided to use a frequency distribution in percentage to illustrate the trends and central tendencies.

Unlike principals and teachers who, when responding to the questionnaire items, did so specifically relative to principal's personal and professional characteristics and school size, supervisors were less favourably situated to do this. Consequently, Part II of the supervisor's instrument asked them to rate principals by sex, age, years of teaching experience, professional preparation, administrative experience (principal), and size of administrative-teaching staff (see Appendix B). Percentages of

light

sponses were again used to illustrate the direction which this information took. Where applicable, summary form to comments, as requested, were provided for the five questions to this section.

light

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is a presentation and analysis of data collected to answer the following questions:

1. Do elementary principals, teachers, and supervisors agree on the most and least difficult problems faced by elementary school principals?
2. Do relationships exist between the age, sex, professional preparation, teaching experience, and the size of school administered by principals and the problems which they perceive to be important?
3. Do relationships exist between the sex, grade taught, professional preparation, teaching experience, and the size of school in which teachers perform, and the problems which they perceive for their elementary principals?
4. Do relationships exist between the age, sex, professional preparation, administrative experience, and the size of school administered by elementary principals, and the effectiveness of the elementary principalship as perceived by supervisors with whom principals work?
5. What approach and direction to inservice education is suggested for elementary school principals in the province by elementary school principals, teachers, and supervisors?

The chapter is divided into three main sections:

Section I: Difficulty of the elementary principal's duties as rated by the total sample of principals, teachers, and supervisors.

Section II: The relationship between the difficulty of the elementary principal's duties as rated by principals, teachers, and supervisors, and such factors as school size and selected personal and professional characteristics.

Section III: Inservice education considerations (program, activities, personnel, location, etc.) for the elementary principal.

SECTION I

Section I presents an analysis of data relative to question 1: do elementary principals, teachers, and supervisors agree on the problems faced by elementary school principals, and on the degree of difficulty which these problems pose? Specific reference is made to those duties which received a 'not applicable' rating by respondents. Essentially, the considerations involved in Section I are categorized and treated under the following headings:

1. The five most important problems of the elementary principal as perceived by principals, teachers, and supervisors in each of the five major task areas of the elementary principalship, and the degree of agreement which exists between the three respondent groups with respect to these problems.
2. The five least important problems of the elementary principal as perceived by principals, teachers, and supervisors in each of the five major task areas of the elementary principalship, and the degree of agreement which exists between the three respondent

groups with respect to these problems.

3. The degree of agreement between principals, teachers, and supervisors on each of the five task areas of the elementary principalship as indicated by rank order correlation.
4. Minor, moderate, and major mean ratings in each of the following areas: General Administration, Supervision of Instruction, Administration of Staff Personnel, Administration of Pupil Personnel, and School-Community Relations.
5. Duties which received 'not applicable' ratings by one-fifth or more of the responding members of either group.

Five Most Important Problems of the Elementary Principal as
perceived by Elementary Principals, Teachers and Supervisors
in Each of the Five Major Task Areas of the Elementary
Principalship and the Degree of Agreement Existing
Between Their Selections

Each group of respondents was asked to assign to each of the items the rating instrument a number ranging from 0 (no difficulty) to 4 (extreme difficulty). If the respondents felt that the item listed was not part of the functions of the elementary principalship with which they were associated, they were requested to give the item a 'not applicable' rating. In selecting the five most important problems confronting the elementary principal in each major task area, the mean score or the rating was selected as the basis on which to do so. Mean scores were calculated for each item by summing the responses (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) reported by each of principals, teachers, and supervisors respectively, and then dividing by the total number of each respective group. The mean scores were then ranked for each subgroup of respondents. 'Agreement' was considered to have been reached if any three of the top five rankings of principals,

light

thers, and supervisors overlapped. A similar measure was used to denote agreement between any two groups of respondents.

General Administration. The General Administration section of the rating instrument contained fifteen duties or tasks commonly performed by elementary school principals. This discussion, however, will concern itself primarily with those five items receiving the highest mean scores in the respective groups. The remaining mean scores can be seen in Appendix C. Additionally, average mean scores are utilized to reveal trends and patterns which have been established by the respondents' rating. A similar pattern has been followed in presenting the remaining four task areas.

Table 8 presents those items receiving the highest mean scores in General Administration functions. Principals, teachers, and supervisors each placed the tasks of "providing supervision of pupils outside the classroom," "developing an operational budget," and "the acquisition and distribution of supplies and materials" in the top five rated duties. Teachers and supervisors also placed "supervising maintenance of the school plant" in their respective lists of the top five rated duties. Further observation of the highest mean scores indicated that teachers were more likely than either principals or supervisors to assign higher mean scores to General Administration functions (see Table 11).

Supervision of Instruction. When the elementary principal's responsibilities in the Supervision of Instruction task area were arranged for principals, teachers, and supervisors, no common selection by the three groups was found for any of the five duties rated most difficult (Table 9). However, agreement was found between principals and teachers on the item

tyler

Table 8

TOP 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS,
AND SUPERVISORS FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Providing supervision of pupils during recess periods, lunch periods, or before and after school	1	2.07	2	1.93	1	2.05
Developing operational budget	2	1.72	1	2.09	3.5	1.67
Preparation for opening and closing of school year	3	1.64				
Supervising school safety programs	4	1.41				
Requisitioning, accounting for and distributing supplies and materials	5	1.39	3	1.92	5.5	1.55
Communicating with central office			4	1.87		
Supervising maintenance of the school plant			5	1.85	3.5	1.67
Developing written policies and regulations within own building					2	1.73
Establishing and supervising proper accounting procedures for school funds					5.5	1.55

TOP 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS
FOR SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Finding time for classroom visitation	1	2.62			4	3.14
Providing adequate library services	2	2.50				
Planning and organizing programs of instruction for exceptional children	3	2.43				
Helping teachers identify and provide for individual differences within their classrooms	4	2.36	5	2.07		
Planning new school facilities to meet educational needs and fit instructional programs	5	2.24				
Developing policies for the grouping of students for most effective learning			1	2.88		
Helping teachers with individual behaviour problems			2	2.31		
Developing effective procedures for changing people's thinking and performance such as case studies, reading materials, discussion, action research and experimentation			3	2.15		
Assisting teachers in making written lesson plans and formulating objectives, goals, and procedures			4	2.08		

Table 9 (continued)

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Initiating and implementing curriculum revision					1	3.28
Visiting classrooms for the purpose of helping teachers improve instruction					2	3.23
Providing evaluation of the program of instruction in terms of school objectives					3	3.18
Developing more democratic behaviour in both individual and group situations					5	3.09

75

helping teachers identify and provide for individual differences within their classrooms," and between principals and supervisors on the item finding time for classroom visitation."

Overall mean scores were high on functions within the Supervision of Instruction category relative to other functions of the elementary principal. This was particularly evident for supervisors (see Table 11).

Administration of Staff Personnel. The Administration of Staff Personnel section of the rating instrument contained thirteen items representative of the elementary school principal's responsibilities in this area. Table 10 gives the duties which respondents felt were presenting most problems for the elementary principalship. Common agreement was found in only one of the five highest rated problems in the Administration of Staff Personnel category: "building staff morale." Difficulty in building staff morale may be attributed to other problems relevant to staff relationships which the respondents identified: "keeping staff members informed (school board policies)" (principals), "providing means for staff-central office communication concerning requests and complaints" (principals, teachers), "establishing and maintaining professional relations with your staff" (principals, supervisors), and "communicating with staff (general)" (teachers, supervisors). Teachers and supervisors further expressed concern with the principal's role in the "equitable assignment of teachers." While both groups ranked this duty most difficult, principals omitted this task entirely from their five highest rated problems. Generally, principals followed the pattern of assigning lowest mean scores to staff personnel related duties (Table 11).

Administration of Pupil Personnel. None of the duties found in

Table 10

TOP 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS
FOR ADMINISTRATION OF STAFF PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Evaluating and rating teacher effectiveness	1	2.21				
Building staff morale	2	1.76	4	1.96	2	2.71
Keeping staff members informed (school board policies)	3	1.72				
Providing means for staff-central office communication concerning requests and complaints	4	1.67	5	1.91		
Establishing and maintaining professional relations with your staff	5	1.64			3	2.48
Equitable assignment of teachers			1	2.77	1	2.77
Communicating with staff (general)			2	1.99	5	1.96
Evaluating and rating non-certified personnel (janitorial staff, general office, maintenance)			3	1.98		
Participating in the employment of certified personnel (certified to instruct pupil personnel)					4	2.43

Table 11.

AVERAGE MEAN SCORES FOR PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS
ON EACH OF THE FIVE MAJOR TASK AREAS OF
THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALSHIP

Task Area	Average Mean Score		
	Principals	Teachers	Supervisors
General Administration	1.31	1.73	1.46
Supervision of Instruction	1.93	1.82	2.64
Administration of Staff Personnel	1.56	1.62	1.90
Administration of Pupil Personnel	1.68	1.79	1.88
School-Community Relations	1.59	1.44	1.84

he Administration of Pupil Personnel task area were selected as one of the most difficult by all three groups of respondents (Table 12). However, teachers and supervisors both felt that the dual task of "developing summer educational and recreational programs" and "helping and encouraging teachers to use specialized services of the school for the benefit of individual pupils" were problem areas for the elementary principal. "Involving parents in solving problem cases" was the single practice placed commonly by principals and supervisors in the top five ranks. Although both groups of respondents ranked the item similarly, supervisors displayed, as throughout pupil personnel responsibilities, a higher mean score rating (see Table 11).

School-Community Relations. Two of the twelve duties listed in the School-Community Relations section were placed by all 3 groups of respondents within their respective list of five functions rated most difficult (Table 13). Principals, teachers, and supervisors agreed that "interpreting the school program to the community" and "encouraging community participation in day-to-day school-community relations" were of particular concern to the elementary principal. Further agreement was found between principals and supervisors relative to "reporting the needs of the school to teachers, superintendent, parents, and community"; and between teachers and supervisors with respect to "maintaining cooperative relations with press, radio and TV." While principals and supervisors' ranks were again similar, supervisors' perceptions of the principal's problems as revealed through mean scores were less favourable than those perceptions recorded for principals. Teachers in general recorded the lowest mean responses on school-community relations duties (see Table 11).

Table 12

TOP 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS
FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PUPIL PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Providing for a counselling program. Developing skills in the educational and personal guidance of pupils	1	2.32			3.5	2.46
Diagnosing problem cases	2	2.18				
Involving parents in solving problem cases	3	2.03				
Securing effective use of pupil records	4	1.92	5.5	1.88		
Counselling with students referred for disciplinary reasons	5	1.84	2.5	2.12		
Developing summer educational programs			2.5	2.12	1	2.59
Developing summer recreational programs			2.5	2.12	3.5	2.46
Helping and encouraging teachers to use specialized services of the school for the benefit of individual pupils			2.5	2.12	2	2.50
Developing and supervising a system for the maintenance of pupil records			5.5	1.88		
Maintaining discipline					5	2.32

Table 13

TOP 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS
FOR SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Interpreting school program to the community	1	2.11	5	1.74	2	2.50
Involving teachers in school-community relations	2	1.92				
Encouraging community participation in day-to-day school activities	3	1.81	2	1.93	3	2.41
Organizing effective parent-teacher conferences	4	1.69				
Reporting the needs of the school to teachers, superintendent, parents, and community	5	1.67			4.5	2.16
Communicating effectively with parents through school publications			1	2.04		
Preparing news releases for local press			3	1.84		
Maintaining cooperative relations with press, radio and TV			4	1.83	1	2.75
Reconciling controversies between teachers and parents					4.5	2.16

the Five Least Important Problems of the Elementary Principal as Perceived by Elementary Principals, Teachers and Supervisors in Each of the Five Major Task Areas of the Elementary Principalship and the Degree of Agreement Existing Between Their Selections

To ascertain the five least important problems of the elementary principal, the procedures and measures employed in determining the top five ranked problems were again utilized. Overall agreement among all three groups or between any two groups was said to exist within a task area if any three of the five lowest ranks overlapped.

General Administration. Three General Administration duties were commonly selected by the respondents as among the five least difficult: "formulating schedules for convening recesses and dismissals," "supervising bus transportation," and "developing a system of accurate and efficient accounting" (Table 14). A single item, "developing written policies and regulations within own building," was given a low difficulty rating by principals and teachers. The mean scores assigned by teachers to the five least difficult duties of the principal remained, in comparison to the mean scores given by principals and supervisors, relatively high.

Supervision of Instruction. The Supervision of Instruction task area was characterized by no agreement concerning the five least difficult problems (Table 15). Common selection was found between principals and teachers on the item, "establishing practices (procedures) for sharing good practices of teachers" and, between teachers and supervisors on the item, "supervising the development of written philosophy and objectives for own school." Supervisors responded with considerably higher mean scores on four of the five least difficult problems perceived by the respective groups.

Table 14

LOWEST 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND
SUPERVISORS FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Formulating schedules for convening recesses and dismissals	1	0.92	3	1.56	1	0.96
Supervising bus transportation	2.5	1.13	2	1.47		
Communicating with central office	2.5	1.13			5	1.36
Implementing central office directives	4	1.16				
Developing written policies and regulations within own building	6	1.28	5	1.64		
Developing a system of accurate and efficient attendance accounting	6	1.28	1	1.40	4	1.23
Preparing reports for the central office and department	6	1.28				
Supervising school safety programs			4	1.60		
Organizing and supervising general office routine					2	1.10
Preparation for opening and closing of school year					3	1.19

Table 15

LOWEST 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND
SUPERVISORS FOR SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Assisting teachers organize new units of work	1	1.24				
Assisting teachers in making written lesson plans and formulating objectives, goals, and procedures	2	1.26				
Orienting new teachers	3	1.51				
Establishing practices (procedures) for sharing good practices of teachers	4	1.54	3	1.49		
Delegating leadership responsibilities among staff members	5	1.59				
Supervising the development of written educational philosophy and objectives for own school			1	0.07	1	0.00
Helping teachers utilize educational resources of the community			2	1.46		
Planning with teachers for inservice training programs			4	1.51		
Assisting the staff in using research findings to help solve practical problems within the school			5	1.61		

Table 15 (continued)

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Developing effective procedures for changing people's thinking and performance such as case studies, reading materials, discussion, action research and experimentation					2	2.11
Encouraging creativity in teachers					3	2.22
Planning new school facilities to meet educational needs and fit instructional programs					4.5	2.27
Developing adequate pupil testing programs					4.5	2.27

Administration of Staff Personnel. None of the Administration of Staff Personnel duties were commonly rated as one of the 5 least difficult by all three groups of respondents (Table 16). Teachers and supervisors, however, reached overall agreement on three of the functions contained in this category: "evaluating teacher effectiveness," "recommending certified personnel for dismissal" and "keeping staff members informed (school board files)."

Administration of Pupil Personnel. Three problems were commonly rated least difficult by teachers and supervisors (Table 17). They were: "organizing and administering extra-curricular activities," "providing for counselling program," "developing skills in the educational and personal guidance of pupils," and "providing for orientation of new pupils." The latter item was also included in the principal's list of least difficult administration of Pupil Personnel functions.

School-Community Relations. Teachers and supervisors agreed on four least difficult duties in the School-Community Relations task area: "involving teachers in school-community relations," "organizing effective parent-teacher conferences" (Table 18). "Administering the use of school property by outside groups," and "working effectively with parent groups such as the P.T.A." were selected by principals as well.

Question 1 Summary. When the five duties of principals rated most difficult were compared, only in the General Administration task area did respondent subgroups agree on as many as three of the top five ranks. Within this category teachers responded with highest mean scores on two functions (developing an operational budget; requisitioning; accounting

Table 16

LOWEST 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND
SUPERVISORS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF STAFF PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Participating in the employment of non-certified personnel	1	1.07			5	1.56
Developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified personnel	2	1.27	2	1.33		
Participating in the employment of certified personnel (certified to instruct pupil personnel)	3	1.32				
Communicating with staff (general)	4	1.36				
Recommending non-certified personnel for dismissal	5	1.39			3	1.50
Evaluating and rating teacher effectiveness			1	0.06	1	0.38
Establishing and maintaining professional relations with your staff			3	1.42		
Recommending certified personnel for dismissal			4	1.44	2	1.15
Keeping staff members informed (school board policies)			5	1.47	4	1.52

LOWEST 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND
SUPERVISORS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PUPIL PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Developing summer educational programs	1	0.44				
Developing summer recreational programs	2	0.50				
Providing for orientation of new pupils	3	1.28	1	0.04	1	0.00
Helping and encouraging teachers to use the specialized services of the school for the benefit of individual pupils	4	1.49				
Maintaining discipline	5	1.51	4	1.83		
Organizing and administering extra-curricular activities			2	0.86	2	1.30
Diagnosing problem cases			3	1.60		
Providing for a counselling program. Developing skills in the educational and personal guidance of pupils			5	1.85	3.5	1.82
Developing and supervising a system for the maintenance of pupil records					3.5	1.82
Counselling with students referred for disciplinary reasons					5.5	1.91
Securing effective use of pupil records					5.5	1.91

Table 18

LOWEST 5 RANKS AND MEAN SCORES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND
SUPERVISORS FOR SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS

Problem	Principals		Teachers		Supervisors	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Preparing news releases for local press	1	1.04			5	1.86
Maintaining cooperative relations with the press, radio and TV	2	1.12				
Administering the use of school property by outside groups	3	1.30	3	0.84	4	1.40
Working effectively with parent groups such as the PTA	4	1.35	4	0.89	3	1.23
Communicating effectively with parents through school publications	5	1.39				
Involving teachers in school-community relations			1	0.00	1	0.00
Organizing effective parent-teacher conferences			2	0.82	2	1.00
Handling complaints from parents			5	1.39		

and distributing supplies and materials) which directly affected their (teachers) performance. It should be noted that the principal's ability to cope effectively with these duties may be more a question of the allocation of funds by superiors and the availability of sufficient supplies than any shortcoming in the principal's job performance. "Providing supervision of pupils during recess periods, lunch periods or before and after school" emerged as the major area of concern for elementary principals in General Administration. Although the respondents did not agree on any of the items in the Supervision of Instruction category, they did generally assign high mean scores to the duties in this area. That is, they generally felt the problems were difficult and important ones. This was particularly true of supervisors who, in this case, were reporting on the task area most closely linked with their own responsibilities. The item, "initiating and implementing curriculum revision," received the highest difficulty rating from supervisors. Similarly, teachers gave the most difficult ratings for principals in those areas requiring principal assistance to individual teachers. The problems considered most difficult by principals in the Supervision of Instruction task area were created largely by factors beyond their control. "Finding time for classroom visitation" is closely related to the present practice of allocating staff personnel; "providing adequate library services" is linked to finances; and "planning new school facilities to meet educational needs and fit instructional programs" is hampered both by finances and the minor role permitted elementary principals in carrying out this task. The most notable ranks occurring in the Administration of Staff Personnel task area were for the items, "evaluating and rating teacher effectiveness" and "equitable assignment of teachers." Whereas principals ranked the former item first, or most difficult, teachers and supervisors

light

not include this duty within their respective lists of the five most difficult problems. On the other hand, teachers and supervisors gave top priority to the latter item while principals omitted this function from their list of five most difficult problems. Agreement between teachers and supervisors was fairly strong throughout all five task areas as they agreed on three of the top five ranked problems in four of the task areas of the elementary principalship. Two of the five most important problems identified both by teachers and supervisors in the Administration of Pupil Personnel task area were essential functions which hold future promise for active principal involvement: "developing summer educational programs," and "developing summer recreational programs." Although the respondents did not reach agreement on as many as three of the five problems rated most difficult in School-Community Relations, the two items on which there was full agreement, and the agreements between principal-supervisor and teacher-supervisor selections suggest that meaningful liaison with the community through interpretation of the school's program presents a general problem for elementary principals.

Agreement on what constitutes the least important problems of the elementary principal followed a pattern similar to those just reported for the five most important problems. General Administration was the single task area in which respondents agreed on as many as three of the five least important problems of the elementary principal. Between the respondents, the best agreement was again manifested by teachers and supervisors as they agreed on three of the five problems rated least difficult in each area except Supervision of Instruction. Comparisons of the principal's top five ranks and the lowest five ranks of teachers and supervisors revealed that none of the functions rated highest by principals were correspondingly

lowest by teachers and/or supervisors.

Degree of Agreement Between Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors
Each of the Five Task Areas of the Elementary Principalship
Shown by Rank Order Correlation

To supplement the measurement of the degree of perceptual agreement between the respondent groups in the study, rank order correlation coefficients were computed using mean scores (Table 19). Although no complete perceptual agreements were found to exist between any two of the three groups of respondents, teachers and supervisors showed the greatest general agreement. Mean scores for these two groups on General Administration, Administration of Staff Personnel, Administration of Pupil Personnel, and School-Community Relations were correlated .49, .58, and .72 respectively. In the exception of the General Administration category, whose items were correlated positively at the .43 level or above for all respondents, agreement was not generally evident between principals and either teachers or supervisors. Lack of agreement was most notably evident in Administration of Staff Personnel, Administration of Pupil Personnel, and School-Community Relations. It is in these areas where teachers and principals expressed greatest disagreement.

Minor, Moderate, and Major Ratings in Each of the Five Task
Areas of the Elementary Principalship

Table 20 presents in summary form the degree of difficulty rating for each of the five major task areas of the elementary principalship as perceived by the three respondent groups. For purposes of making further comparisons within and between the task areas, mean scores were collapsed into the following categories: (1) minor (mean: 0.00 - 1.49), (2) moderate (mean: 1.50 - 2.50), or (3) major (mean: 2.51 - 4.00).

Table 19

RANK ORDER DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS
ON TASK AREAS OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

Task Area	Respondents		
	Principal - Teacher	Principal - Supervisor	Teacher - Supervisor
General Administration	.63	.43	.49
Supervision of Instruction	.37	.18	.09
Administration of Staff Personnel	-.22	-.11	.58
Administration of Pupil Personnel	-.30	-.32	.67
School-Community Relations	-.23	.02	.72

In the General Administration category closer agreement was found between principals and supervisors than between teachers with either of the two groups. Of the fifteen duties listed in this area of responsibility 75% and 60% were perceived as presenting minor difficulty by principals and supervisors respectively. Agreement was also evident in the "moderate" category, and none of the respondent groups perceived the duties in this category to present major difficulties.

In the Supervision of Instruction task area general agreement is not evident between teachers and principals. Most teachers and principals rated the functions in this task area of moderate difficulty, while almost one-third of the supervisors considered them to be major problems for the elementary principal. Furthermore, these ratings by supervisors constitute 25% of the total number (28) of functions rated as major problems for all task areas combined.

In each of the remaining task areas only slight differences are seen to prevail. Duties are felt by all respondents to present minor or only moderate problems by all respondent subgroups. The only exception to this is the small number of supervisors who considered a few major difficulties in each task area.

In general, respondents considered most duties to present moderate problems or less. Principals were more likely to consider problems minor, and supervisors to consider problems major. However, as mentioned previously, most of this revolved around the Supervision of Instruction task area.

It should be noted that the foregoing analysis has concerned itself only with those duties which were identified by researchers in the literature and by students of educational administration. No attempt has been made

erminate problems which were not specifically mentioned in the questionnaire.

of the Elementary Principal Rated Not Applicable by
Fifth or More of the Total of Either Group

The preceding discussion of the eighty-three items on the research instrument concentrated on ascertaining the mean difficulty rating of principals, teachers, and supervisors for each item. In addition to being asked to select a difficulty rating ranging from none to extreme, each respondent was given the option to assign to the item a 'not applicable' rating.

This was based on the assumption that not all principals were performing all the administrative functions listed in the questionnaire. It was hoped that a profile of these responsibilities could be obtained by giving respondents with an opportunity to identify the duties which were or not at all or only partially part of the function of elementary principals in the province. The percent of items receiving a not applicable rating from one or more of the respondent groups ranged from none to more than fifty percent. Those duties which received a 'not applicable' rating one-fifth or more of the total of any group of respondents have been listed in Table 21.

The duties of elementary principals listed under the School-Community Relations category were most likely to be rated 'not applicable,' particularly by teachers. More than fifty percent of the teachers and supervisors felt that "organizing effective parent-teacher conferences" was not part of the elementary principal's duties. On the other hand, all principals included this function as part of their responsibility in School-Community Relations. One-third of the principals responding indicated no involvement in two duties dealing with the media: "preparing news releases"

Table 20

PERCENT OF DUTIES WITHIN EACH TASK AREA RECEIVING A MINOR, MODERATE
OR MAJOR DEGREE OF DIFFICULTY RATING BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS,
AND SUPERVISORS RESPECTIVELY

Degree of Difficulty (Mean Score Range)	Task Areas					Total
	General Administration	Supervision of Instruction	Administration of Staff Personnel	Administration of Pupil Personnel	School-Community Relations	
<u>Minor</u> (0.00 - 1.49)						
Principals	75%	7%	47%	33%	50%	36%
Teachers	14	10	39	17	42	20
Supervisors	60	3	15	17	33	22
<u>Moderate</u> (1.50 - 2.50)						
Principals	25	87	53	67	50	62
Teachers	86	90	61	83	58	80
Supervisors	40	32	0	66	50	47
<u>Major</u> (2.51 - 4.00)						
Principals	0	6	0	0	0	2
Teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Supervisors	0	65	15	17	17	31

for the local press," and "maintaining cooperative relations with press, radio and TV." Teacher and supervisor responses were more likely to include functions involving the media as part of the principal's responsibility. Teachers and supervisors were also more likely than principals to consider the duty, "working effectively with parent groups such as the PTA," not applicable to the elementary principal. "Handling complaints from parents" was also considered to be not applicable by a small number of teachers and supervisors. Finally about half of the teachers felt that principals were not involved in "administering the use of school property by outside groups." Eighty-five percent of principals and all of the supervisors rated this function applicable to the job performance of elementary principals.

Principals, teachers, and supervisors consistently agreed on only one of the items rated not applicable to the elementary principal in the Administration of Staff Personnel task area. "Recommending certified personnel for dismissal" received not applicable ratings of 21%, 25% and 41% by principals, teachers, and supervisors respectively. Principals reported a similar rating on three other items in this category: "participating in the employment of non-certified personnel," "participating in the employment of certified personnel," and "recommending non-certified personnel for dismissal." Teachers and supervisors generally felt these duties were applicable to the elementary principal. About one-third of the teachers indicated that "developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified personnel" was not the duty of the elementary principal in Newfoundland, and they were supported by twenty-three percent of the supervisors, and 13 percent of the principals themselves.

In the Administration of Pupil Personnel task area slightly more

Table 21

PERCENT OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL DUTIES RATED "NOT APPLICABLE" TO
THE PROVINCE'S ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS BY ONE-FIFTH OR
MORE OF PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS AND/OR SUPERVISORS.

Problem	% of Not Applicable Responses		
	Principals (n=39)	Teachers (n=139)	Supervisors (n=22)
<u>Administration of Staff Personnel</u>	%	%	%
Participating in the employment of non-certified personnel	28	9	18
Participating in the employment of certified personnel (certified to instruct pupil personnel)	21	1	5
Recommending certified personnel for dismissal	21	25	41
Recommending non-certified personnel for dismissal	21	14	9
Establishing and maintaining professional relations with your staff	0	24	9
Developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified personnel	13	31	23
<u>Administration of Pupil Personnel</u>			
Involving parents in solving problem cases	0	22	0
Developing summer educational programs	54	1	0
Developing summer recreational programs	54	1	0
Organizing and administering extra-curricular activities	0	53	55

Table 21 (continued)

Problem	% of Not Applicable Responses		
	Principals (n=39)	Teachers (n=139)	Supervisors (n=22)
<u>School-Community Relations</u>	%	%	%
Organizing effective parent-teacher conferences	0	52	55
Preparing news releases for local press	31	5	0
Maintaining cooperative relations with press, radio and TV	33	6	9
Working effectively with parent groups such as the PTA	13	42	41
Handling complaints from parents	0	24	18
Administering the use of school property by outside groups	15	47	0

than fifty percent of principals rated two items not applicable to their job position: "developing summer educational programs," and "developing summer recreational programs." None of the supervisors and only one percent of teachers agreed that these functions were not applicable to the job performance of elementary principals. Teachers (53%) and supervisors (55%) assigned high not applicable ratings to the item, "organizing and administering extra-curricular activities." All of the principals reported that they were performing this task. Approximately one-fourth of the teachers felt that the principal did not involve parents in solving problem cases. This view was not shared by principals.

None of the items in the General Administration task area or the Supervision of Instruction task area received not applicable ratings by one-fifth or more of the respondents in any of the three groups.

Summary: Section I

When the five highest mean scores of each group of respondents were compared, agreement on the degree of difficulty was found on fewer than half of the problems identified. Agreement on the 5 least problematic duties was evident only within the General Administration task area. Rank order correlations of mean scores indicated that teachers and supervisors shared the strongest overall perceptual agreements. Supervisors were markedly more pronounced in assigning a high difficulty rating to the functions of the elementary principal, but most of this centered around the Supervision of Instruction task area. In other task areas supervisors were similar to both teachers and principals in their perception that few areas presented major problems.

It would appear from the not applicable ratings that a number of

responsibilities pertaining to School-Community Relations and the Administration of Staff and Pupil Personnel are not seen as part of the elementary principal's tasks, both by principals themselves, and the teachers and supervisors with whom they work. Other duties within these categories were singly judged to be not applicable to the administrative practices of the province's elementary principals.

SECTION II

Section II presents an analysis of the responses of principals, teachers, and supervisors as they vary according to age, sex, administrative experience, professional preparation, teaching experience, grade taught, and the size of school administered.

In the treatment of data, response scores for each item were calculated for each group of principals and teachers. A one way analysis of variance was employed to determine significant differences in the mean responses of principal and teacher subgroups (e.g. age, sex, school staff size, etc.). Whenever the F ratio indicated significant differences at or below the .05 level on variables which had been divided into more than two groups, a t test was run to determine where the differences lay. Average mean scores were then utilized to establish trends and patterns which might exist within principal and teacher subgroups. Responses from supervisors were calculated and analyzed on percentage rankings.

Specifically, Section II will look for: (a) those administrative practices which show a significant difference in mean response within principal and teacher subgroups. Reference will be made to those subgroups whose average mean score responses indicate a trend throughout the task areas. (b) supervisors' perceptions of the relationship between selected

personal and professional characteristics (e.g. sex, age, professional preparation, etc.) of elementary principals and the principal's effectiveness in his position.

Classification of Principals on the Basis of School Staff Size and Selected Personal and Professional Characteristics

School Staff Size. Table 22 shows the administrative practices where significant differences occurred between responses of principals who administer schools having the following administrative-teaching staff sizes: 6-10, 11-20, and 21 or greater. The responses of principals did not vary significantly with school size on any of the General Administration, or Administration of Staff Personnel practices. Significant differences were found to exist on the item, "providing adequate library services," in the Supervision of Instruction category. Principals with staffs of 6-10 and 11-20 people indicated that they found it more difficult to make provision for this service than did principals with larger staffs. The Administration of Pupil Personnel category showed only one practice to be significantly different in the mean responses. This occurred between principals in schools with an administrative-teaching staff of 11-20 and those in schools with an administrative-teaching staff of 21 or greater. Once again principals with a smaller administrative-teaching ratio indicated a higher degree of difficulty. "Communicating effectively with parents through school publications" was the single practice in the School-Community Relations category showing a significant difference in the means. Principals who administered schools with an administrative-teaching staff of 21 or greater assigned a higher difficulty rating than principals in the smaller administrative school unit, 11-20. However, neither group perceived it to be a very significant problem, as is indicated by the low

Table 22

MEAN SCORES AND t TEST RESULTS OF ITEMS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES
FOR PRINCIPALS (CLASSIFIED ON THE BASIS OF SCHOOL SIZE)

Item	School Staff Size			t test
	6 - 10	11 - 20	21 +	
<u>Supervision of Instruction</u>				
Providing adequate library services	2.92		1.60	3.13
Providing adequate library services		2.75	1.60	2.77
<u>Administration of Pupil Personnel</u>				
Securing effective use of pupil records		2.44	1.30	3.45
<u>School-Community Relations</u>				
Communicating effectively with parents through school publications	0.70	1.92		-2.91

mean scores of all concerned. Principals who administered the largest elementary schools showed a slight tendency to rate their duties less difficult than principals from smaller schools (see Table 26).

Professional Preparation. Significant differences between responses of principals classified on the basis of years of professional preparation (four years or less vs. five years or more) are shown in Table 23. Two practices, one each from the task areas of Supervision of Instruction and Administration of Pupil Personnel, showed significant mean differences. Both "developing more democratic behaviour in both individual and group situations" and "counselling with students referred for disciplinary reasons" were rated more difficult problems by principals with four years or less of professional preparation than by principals with more advanced professional preparation. This trend was evident throughout the mean score responses as principals with five or more years of professional preparation consistently rated duties less problematic than principals who had undergone four years or less of professional preparation (see Table 26).

Administrative Experience. Principals, when grouped according to years of administrative experience, expressed a significantly different response on only one item (Table 24). The mean response of principals to the item, "providing for orientation of new pupils," showed a significant difference between principals with 1-4 years administrative experience and those possessing 5-9 and greater than 10 years of administrative experience. The latter two groups rated the practice most problematic, although all three subgroups assigned to the item a relatively low difficulty rating.

Principal's Age. Table 25 shows the administrative practices where

Table 23

MEAN SCORES AND t-TEST RESULTS OF ITEMS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT
DIFFERENCES FOR PRINCIPALS (CLASSIFIED ON BASIS
OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION)

Item	Professional Preparation		t test
	4 years or less	5 years plus	
<u>Supervision of Instruction</u>			
Developing more democratic behaviour in both individual and group situa- tions	2.29	1.58	2.13
<u>Administration of Pupil Personnel</u>			
Counselling with students referred for disciplinary reasons	2.33	1.60	2.39

Table 24

MEAN SCORES AND t TEST RESULTS OF ITEMS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT
DIFFERENCES FOR PRINCIPALS (CLASSIFIED ON BASIS OF
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A PRINCIPAL)

Item	Years of Experience as a Principal			t test
	1 - 4	5 - 9	10 +	
<u>Administration of Pupil Personnel</u>				
Providing for orientation of new pupils	0.55	1.69		-3.57
Providing for orientation of new pupils	0.55		1.50	-3.25

significant differences occurred between responses of principals classified by age. The Supervision of Instruction task area revealed two items to be significant in their means: "finding time for classroom visitation," and "helping teachers with individual student behaviour problems." On the latter item the significant difference was between principals who were thirty-four years of age or less and those whose ages ranged between thirty-five to forty-four. "Finding time for classroom visitation" showed a significant difference in means between the age group thirty-four or less and principals forty-five or over. Both items received a higher difficulty rating by the older group of principals.

The single administrative practice in the School-Community Relations task area which showed a significant mean response, "involving teachers in school-community relations," received the highest difficulty rating by the youngest group of principals (34 years old or less).

Years of Teaching Experience. No significant differences were found in the responses of principals when they were classified on the basis of years of teaching experience.

Sex. Table 27 shows those administrative practices where significant mean differences occurred between principals when they were classified on the basis of sex. Ten of the eighty-three practices showed significantly different mean responses between the subgroups, and these were fairly evenly distributed among the five task areas. While several of the items were related directly to supervisory and organizational ability, most duties placed emphasis on the development of good interpersonal relationships. In all cases, female principals felt that the functions were more problematic than did male principals. This trend was noticeable throughout

Table 25

MEAN SCORES AND t TEST RESULTS OF ITEMS SHOWING
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOR PRINCIPALS
(CLASSIFIED BY AGE OF PRINCIPAL)

Item	Age of Principal			t test
	34 years or less	35 - 44	45 years or more	
<u>Supervision of Instruction</u>				
Helping teachers with individual student behaviour problems	1.36	2.41		-3.58
Finding time for classroom visitation	2.14		3.13	-2.43
<u>School-Community Relations</u>				
Involving teachers in school-community relations	2.29	1.47		-2.43

Table 26

AVERAGE MEAN SCORES OF PRINCIPALS CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL STAFF SIZE,
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION, ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE, AGE,
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND SEX

Subgroups	Task Areas				
	General Administration	Supervision of Instruction	Administration of Staff Personnel	Administration of Pupil Personnel	School-Community Relations
<u>School Staff Size</u>					
6 - 10	1.38	1.97	1.48	1.80	1.43
11 - 20	1.49	1.98	1.72	1.56	1.78
21 +	1.13	1.84	1.42	1.48	1.53
<u>Professional Preparation</u>					
4 years or less	1.49	2.02	1.57	1.91	1.72
5 years plus	1.29	1.85	1.55	1.62	1.47
<u>Administrative Experience</u>					
1 - 4 years	1.32	1.99	1.61	1.46	1.33
5 - 9 years	1.27	1.85	1.47	1.59	1.62
10 + years	1.43	1.97	1.52	1.91	1.68

Table 26 (continued)

Subgroups	Task Areas ¹				
	General Administration	Supervision of Instruction	Administration of Staff Personnel	Administration of Pupil Personnel	School-Community Relations
<u>Age</u>					
34 years or less	1.37	1.95	1.52	1.49	1.62
35 - 44	1.35	1.89	1.58	1.69	1.54
45 years or more	1.40	2.04	1.44	1.90	1.49
<u>Teaching Experience</u>					
1 - 9 years	1.64	2.05	1.67	1.60	1.54
10 - 29 years	1.27	1.83	1.48	1.53	1.45
20 + years	1.32	1.99	1.51	1.85	1.70
<u>Sex</u>					
Male	1.27	1.92	1.47	1.66	1.46
Female	1.72	2.18	1.87	1.75	1.92

Table 27

MEAN SCORES AND t TEST RESULTS OF ITEMS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT
DIFFERENCES FOR PRINCIPALS (CLASSIFIED BY SEX)

Item	Sex of Principal		t test
	Male	Female	
<u>General Administration</u>			
Supervising school safety programs	1.23	2.14	2.41
Organizing and supervising general office routine	1.07	2.13	2.34
<u>Supervision of Instruction</u>			
Helping teachers utilize educational resources of the community	1.17	2.63	2.74
Developing more democratic behaviour in both individual and group situations	1.68	2.57	2.18
Coordinating the activities of special teachers (music, art, special reading, phys. ed., etc.)	1.46	2.50	2.63
<u>Administration of Staff Personnel</u>			
Equitable assignment of teachers	1.27	2.25	2.74
Building staff morale	1.60	2.35	
<u>Administration of Pupil Personnel</u>			
Providing for orientation of new pupils	1.10	2.00	2.68

Table 27 (continued)

Item	Sex of Principal		
	Male	Female	t test
<u>School-Community Relations</u>			
Reconciling controversies between teachers and parents	1.17	2.25	3.36
Handling complaints from parents	1.42	2.25	2.29

the duties listed for the elementary principalship (see Table 26).

Classification of Teachers on the Basis of School Staff Size and Selected Personal and Professional Characteristics

School Size. Teacher responses, classified by school staff size, showed a significant difference on the item "developing written policies and regulations within own building" (Table 28). This difference was observed between schools with an administrative-teaching staff of 6-10 and administrative-teaching staffs of 21 or over. Teachers from the larger schools assigned the highest difficulty rating to the item. Average mean scores were moderately inclined in this direction (see Table 26).

Professional Preparation. Table 29 shows the three items which displayed a significant difference between the mean responses of those teachers who had 1-3 years of professional preparation and those who possessed 4-6 years. "Planning new school facilities to meet educational needs and fit instructional programs" in the Supervision of Instruction task area, and "organizing effective parent-teacher conferences" and "administering the use of school property by outside groups" within the School-Community Relations task area received higher mean ratings by teachers with less professional preparation. Average mean scores indicated that teachers with 1-4 years of professional preparation followed this pattern in assessing the principal's difficulty in performing staff personnel and school-community relations duties.

Grade Taught. Teachers were classified either as primary (K-3) or elementary (4-6). When the scores of teachers within these two divisions were compared, nine significant differences emerged (Table 30). The majority of these differences occurred in the Supervision of Instruction

Table 28

MEAN SCORES AND t TEST RESULTS OF ITEMS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT
DIFFERENCES FOR TEACHERS (CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL SIZE)

Item	Administrative-Teaching Staff Size			t test
	6 - 10	11 - 20	21 +	
<u>General Administration</u>				
Developing written policies and regulations within own building	1.20		2.00	-2.95

Table 29

MEAN SCORES AND t TEST RESULTS OF ITEMS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT
DIFFERENCES FOR TEACHERS (CLASSIFIED BY
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION)

Item	Professional Preparation		t test
	1 - 3 years	4 - 6 years	
<u>Supervision of Instruction</u>			
Planning new school facilities to meet educational needs and fit instructional programs	2.33	1.95	1.97
<u>School-Community Relations</u>			
Organizing effective parent-teacher conferences	2.11	1.72	1.97
Administering the use of school property by outside groups	1.82	1.34	2.05

Table 30

MEAN SCORES AND t TEST RESULTS OF ITEMS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOR TEACHERS (CLASSIFIED BY GRADE TAUGHT)

Item	Grade Taught		t test
	K - 3	4 - 6	
<u>Supervision of Instruction</u>			
Assisting teachers in making written lesson plans and formulating objectives, goals, and procedures	1.74	1.23	2.15
Assisting teachers organize new units of work	1.71	1.19	2.31
Assisting the staff in using research findings to help solve practical problems within the school	1.94	1.39	2.40
Visiting classrooms for the purpose of helping teachers improve instruction	2.00	1.39	2.43
Finding time for classroom visitation	2.20	1.61	2.36
Developing adequate pupil testing programs	1.70	2.08	1.98
<u>Administration of Pupil Personnel</u>			
Providing for orientation of new pupils	1.86	1.32	2.73

Table 30 (continued)

Item	Grade Taught		t test
	K - 3	4 - 6	
<u>School-Community Relations</u>			
Reconciling controversies between teachers and parents	2.03	1.64	2.06
Involving teachers in school-community relations	2.07	1.57	2.51

task area and were directly related to the principal's role in assisting teachers in his/her classroom work. On all but the item, "developing adequate pupil testing programs," the primary division teachers assigned higher mean ratings than those personnel teaching at the elementary level. This trend was established over the spectrum of duties comprising the elementary principalship as evidenced by the average mean score responses (see Table 26).

Years of Teaching Experience. Teachers, when classified on the basis of teaching experience, showed significant differences for nine items (Table 32). Five were found in the General Administration task area. All differences except those occurring for the items "providing help and encouragement in the use of audio-visual aids to learning," "equitable assignment of teachers," and "developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified personnel" were between teachers with 1-4 years of teaching experience and those with 5-9 years of teaching experience. In all cases, the teachers with more experience were the ones to rate functions as more problematic.

Sex. When teachers were classified on the basis of sex, significant differences were found in the means of fifteen of the eighty-three items on the rating instrument (Table 33). One-half of the functions were related to the principal's responsibilities in school-community relations. For each of the fifteen items female teachers assigned a higher degree of difficulty rating than did their male counterparts. Female teachers more-over displayed this tendency throughout their mean score responses (see Table 31).

Table 31

AVERAGE MEAN SCORES OF TEACHERS CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL STAFF SIZE,
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION, GRADE TAUGHT, TEACHING
EXPERIENCE, AND SEX

Subgroups	Task Areas				
	General Administration	Supervision of Instruction	Administration of Staff Personnel	Administration of Pupil Personnel	School-Community Relations
<u>School-Staff Size</u>					
6 - 10	1.64	1.73	1.68	1.65	1.70
11 - 20	1.74	1.82	1.75	1.62	1.63
21 +	1.79	1.82	1.82	1.76	1.70
<u>Professional Preparation</u>					
1 - 3 years	1.74	1.84	1.85	1.86	1.72
4 - 6 years	1.70	1.84	1.67	1.82	1.64
<u>Grade Taught</u>					
K - 3	1.74	1.93	1.85	1.94	1.78
4 - 6	1.74	1.75	1.67	1.74	1.55
<u>Teaching Experience</u>					
1 - 4 years	1.53	1.85	1.59	1.73	1.68

Table 31 (continued)

Subgroups	Task Areas				
	General Administration	Supervision of Instruction	Administration of Staff Personnel	Administration of Pupil Personnel	School-Community Relations
5 - 9 years	1.97	2.01	1.95	1.64	1.76
10 + years	1.82	1.70	1.85	1.80	1.68
<u>Sex</u>					
Male	1.65	1.64	1.41	1.50	1.08
Female	1.75	1.83	1.68	1.82	1.55

Table 32

MEAN SCORES AND t TEST RESULTS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES
FOR TEACHERS (CLASSIFIED BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE)

Item	Teaching Experience			t test
	1 - 4 years	5 - 9 years	10 years plus	
<u>General Administration</u>				
Developing a system of accurate and efficient attendance accounting	1.07	1.78		-3.15
Formulating schedules for convening recesses and dismissals	1.22	2.05		-2.98
Implementing central office directives	1.41	2.07		-2.56
Preparing reports for the central office and department	1.50	2.14		-2.55
Supervising school safety programs	1.29	1.95		-3.08
<u>Supervision of Instruction</u>				
Providing help and encouragement in the use of audio-visual aids to learning	1.20	2.00		-3.91
Providing help and encouragement in the use of audio-visual aids to learning	1.20		1.78	-2.58
<u>Administration of Staff Personnel</u>				
Equitable assignment of teachers	1.63	2.23		-2.54

Table 32 (continued)

Item	Teaching Experience			t test
	1 - 4 years	5 - 9 years	10 years plus	
Equitable assignment of teachers	1.63		2.24	-2.47
Developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified personnel	1.13	1.74		-2.51
Developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified personnel	1.13		1.77	-2.78
Organizing and administering extra-curricular activities	1.23	1.98		-3.02

Table 33

MEAN SCORES, AND t TEST RESULTS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT
DIFFERENCES FOR TEACHERS (CLASSIFIED BY SEX)

Item	Sex		t-test
	Male	Female	
<u>General Administration</u>			
Supervising bus transportation	0.96	1.60	2.36
<u>Supervision of Instruction</u>			
Finding time for classroom visitation	1.22	1.85	2.13
Coordinating the activities of special teachers (music, art, special reading, phys. ed., etc)	1.25	1.83	2.30
<u>Administration of Staff Personnel</u>			
Recommending non-certified personnel for dismissal	1.31	1.86	2.14
Providing means for staff-central office communication concerning requests and com- plaints	1.44	2.05	2.47
<u>Administration of Pupil Personnel</u>			
Involving parents in solving problem cases	1.33	1.99	2.07
Developing summer recreational programs	1.72	2.24	2.44

Table 33 (continued)

Item	Sex		t test
	Male	Female	
Helping and encouraging teachers to use specialized services of the school for the benefit of individual pupils	1.63	2.27	3.26
Organizing and administering extra-curricular activities	0.25	1.06	2.08
<u>School-Community Relations</u>			
Reconciling controversies between teachers and parents	1.28	1.99	2.07
Reporting the needs of the school to teachers, superintendent, parents and community	1.09	1.70	2.60
Encouraging community participation in day-to-day school activities	1.53	2.05	2.23
Preparing news releases for local press	1.34	2.00	2.04
Maintaining cooperative relations with press, radio and TV	1.39	1.97	2.45
Handling complaints from parents	0.87	1.54	2.45

Supervisors' Perceptions of the Relationship Between Personal and Professional Characteristics of Elementary Principals and Their Effectiveness in the Principalship

Unlike principals and teachers who could specifically rate the principal's job performance with reference to selected personal and professional characteristics, supervisors were in a less favourable position to do so. Consequently, they were requested to report the relationship (i.e. none, minor, moderate, high, extreme) which they perceived to exist between each of the variables, age, sex, professional preparation, teaching experience and school staff size and the principal's effectiveness in the position. Table 34 summarizes the responses.

Age. The majority of supervisors (77%) felt that the degree of relationship between age and effectiveness in the principalship was at best only moderate and no supervisor gave the relationship an 'extreme' rating.

Sex. While the data indicate that supervisors do consider the sex of the principal to be a factor affecting job performance, 90% considered sex at most a moderately influencing factor.

Academic and Professional Qualifications. Supervisors expressed a firm belief in the influence of academic and professional qualifications on effective performance in the principalship. Ninety-one percent felt the relationship ranged from moderate to extreme and 68% of the group felt that the relationship was high or extreme.

Teaching Experience. Teaching experience was also seen by supervisors as a factor influencing effective performance in the principalship. All supervisors felt that there was at least some relationship between teaching experience and success as an elementary principal and almost two-

Table 34

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPAL'S AGE, SEX, ACADEMIC-PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS, AND TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS IN THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALSHIP AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERVISORS (n=22)

Characteristic	Degree of Relationship					Total
	None	Minor	Moderate	High	Extreme	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Principal's Age	14	27	36	23		100
Principal's Sex ^a	32	37	21	10		100
Academic and Professional Qualifications		9	23	50	18	100
Teaching Experience		4	32	46	18	100

^aThree supervisors reported that they had worked with male principals only.

thirds felt that the relationship was high or extreme.

Summary: Section II

The primary objective of Section II was to try and determine whether or not there was a relationship between selected background characteristics of principals, teachers, and supervisors and the manner in which the elementary principal's duties were perceived by respondents. From an analysis of the data using a one way analysis of variance and observation of the average mean responses the most notable differences revolved around the sex of the respondent. Male principals and male teachers consistently indicated they felt the problems of the elementary principal were less problematic than did female principals and teachers. On the other hand, supervisors felt that sex was not a particularly important factor affecting the principal's effectiveness. More crucial, they felt, were professional preparation and teaching and administrative experience. Teachers' perceptions with respect to professional variables were most outstanding on grades taught. Primary division teachers tended to perceive the principal's role functions as being more difficult than their respective counterpart, teachers working with grades 4-6.

SECTION III.

The purpose of this section is to outline the direction and approach to inservice education suggested by principal, teachers, and supervisors in Part III of the questionnaire.

Part III of the questionnaire was concerned with ascertaining: (a) the five most pressing problems facing elementary principals today in need of inservice education, (b) inservice education activities presently

available to the elementary principal, (c) five activities considered of greatest benefit to inservice education of elementary principals, (d) the best teachers of an inservice program, (e) the best location for an inservice program, (f) the best length of an inservice program, and (g) the most advantageous time of the inservice activity. While principals and supervisors were asked to answer all questions, teachers were requested to answer those related to (a) and (c).

Five Most Pressing Problems Facing Elementary School Principals Today

Each group of respondents was asked to write the five most pressing problems which in their estimation were facing elementary school principals today. If they were unable to be specific, the directions asked them to rank the five task areas (General Administration, Supervision of Instruction, Administration of Staff Personnel, Administration of Pupil Personnel, and School-Community Relations) in order of importance for inservice education. All except five took the second option, and their responses can be seen in Table 35.

General Administration. This task area was generally considered not to need additional inservice education programs. Fifty-six percent, 41%, and 77% of principals, teachers, and supervisors respectively ranked it 4 or 5. Teachers showed the greatest tendency to place general administration high on the need for inservice education. Thirty percent of the teachers placed it first followed by 17% of the teachers for second.

Supervision of Instruction. It was the Supervision of Instruction task area which was clearly identified by all groups of respondents as being in most need of inservice education. More than half of each group

Table 35

IMPORTANCE OF TASK AREAS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION AS RANKED
BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS

Rank	Principals (n=34)					Teachers (n=132)					Supervisors (n=18)				
	General Administration	Supervision of Instruction	Administration of Staff Personnel	Administration of Pupil Personnel	School-Community Relations	General Administration	Supervision of Instruction	Administration of Staff Personnel	Administration of Pupil Personnel	School-Community Relations	General Administration	Supervision of Instruction	Administration of Staff Personnel	Administration of Pupil Personnel	School-Community Relations
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	12	65	6	15	6	30	30	18	12	10	6	88	0	6	0
2	14	17	32	15	17	17	27	24	22	11	6	6	50	11	28
3	18	3	38	26	12	12	19	30	25	14	11	6	33	33	17
4	15	15	21	29	24	14	17	18	33	16	22	0	17	44	17
5	41	0	3	15	41	27	7	10	8	49	55	0	0	6	38
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

ranked it first or second. As might be expected, supervisors were strongest in their assessment, with 88% saying that this task area was a critical area for elementary principals and in most need of inservice education programs.

Administration of Staff Personnel. In the Administration of Staff Personnel task area, all groups tended to cluster their ranking in the intermediate range. No single group felt this was either an overriding problem in need of inservice education, or that no need existed at all. There was a slight tendency for teachers to give it more weight than supervisors or principals.

Administration of Pupil Personnel. In the Administration of Pupil Personnel category, principals, teachers, and supervisors tended to disperse their rankings with slight concentrations occurring on ranks three and four. Again there seems to be agreement that this area does not especially demand inservice education programs; at least not relative to the others.

School-Community Relations. The School-Community Relations task area generally received the lowest rankings from each of the three respondent groups. More than half of each group ranked it 4 or 5.

Inservice Education Activities Presently Available to the Elementary Principal

Principals and supervisors were provided with a list of sixteen inservice activities and asked to check those which were presently available to the elementary principal. Table 36 shows the responses of each group.

Table 36

RANK ORDER OF INSERVICE EDUCATION ACTIVITIES PRESENTLY AVAILABLE TO
THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS (n=39)
AND SUPERVISORS (n=22)

Activity	Principals		Supervisors	
	% Reporting Activity Available	Rank	% Reporting Activity Available	Rank
Workshops provided by central office	97	1	96	2.5
Membership and participation in professional organizations	80	2	96	2.5
Visitations to other schools in your district	77	3	86	5.5
Professional reading (eg.) reading printed accounts of successful ways in which a problem has been met	67	4	77	7.5
Seminars provided by MUN	62	5.5	50	11
Actively working in community service clubs	62	5.5	86	5.5
Participation in work of PTA	56	7	77	7.5
Working as a member of curriculum committees	54	8	100	1
Participating in clinics conducted by central office around one particular problem	51	9	73	9

Table 36 (continued)

Activity	Principals		Supervisors	
	% Reporting Activity Available	Rank	% Reporting Activity Available	Rank
University personnel invited to your system to provide information services	46	10	91	4
Professional writing	44	11	55	10
Visitations to school systems outside your district	33	12	41	13
Public speaking	31	13	27	15.5
Advanced study and research (leave of absence)	23	14	41	13
Pursuit of personal independent research while employed with the board	18	15	41	13
Simulation techniques	10	16	27	15.5
Others (please specify)	3	7	5	17

When the six activities most often checked by elementary principals were compared with the corresponding rank given by supervisors, a fairly high agreement was demonstrated. Apart from workshops provided by central office, however, the remaining three activities commonly selected were more the result of individual principal initiative than any direct involvement from district office. This was largely true of the two activities singly selected by principals. Difference of opinion in the remaining ten activities was most strikingly present with respect to the reported availability of curriculum committees as an inservice education function. Whereas all of the supervisors replied that this service was presently being offered, only fifty percent of principals felt that this was the case. This response would seem to suggest a less than candid report by supervisors or a very negative rating by principals, assuming that the activity is present. A similar less pronounced difference was noted relative to the role of the university in the inservice education program. Most supervisors felt that university personnel were available to provide information services. Less than half of the principals supported this contention. As with the previous reported difference, it would appear that principals are not satisfied with a program that central office considers to be readily accessible.

Inservice Education Activities Rated Highest by Principals,
Teachers, and Supervisors

Principals, teachers, and supervisors were requested to place themselves in a hypothetical situation and assume responsibility for the development of an inservice education program. From a list of sixteen activities (see Table 36) they were to select the five which they felt would be of greatest benefit in carrying out such a program. Provision

was made for additional activities that the respondents might wish to include. The five inservice activities considered most beneficial by each group are reported in Table 37.

Teachers and supervisors were in close agreement on two of the five inservice education activities rated most beneficial by principals: visitations to school systems outside your district and workshops provided by central office. Teachers and supervisors further supported central office direction in the inservice program in the form of clinics conducted around one-particular problem. Both groups expressed a similar support of curriculum committees. Most principals did not endorse the latter two inservice education activities. Their preferences called for more inter school district visitation and a moderate involvement from university personnel. It should be noted that all inservice activities reported in the top five ranks of respondents excepting advanced study and research (leave of absence) (selected by supervisors) and visitations to school systems outside your district were reported available by half or more of principals and supervisors.

Personnel to Teach the Inservice Education Program

Table 38 explores possible sources of instructional personnel for the inservice educational program. The instructional personnel submitted to the respondents (principals and supervisors) are as follows: (a) university consultants who have served as consultants in the area, (b) supervisors from central office, (c) someone from the Department of Education who is sophisticated with the K-6 system, and (d) a combination of these people. Additional responses were also encouraged. Respondents were asked to scale each item using a three point scale: (a) highly recommended, (b) recommended, (c) not recommended. Since some respondents checked both 'highly recom-

Table 37

THE FIVE INSERVICE EDUCATION ACTIVITIES PERCEIVED TO BE OF GREATEST
BENEFIT TO ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS, BY ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS,
TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS

Activity	(n=31) Principals		(n=139) Teachers		(n=21) Supervisors	
	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%
Visitations to school systems outside your district	1	84	1	58	2.5	71
Visitations to other schools in your district	2	65	4	50	9	29
Workshops provided by central office	3	58	2.5	53	2.5	71
Seminars provided by MUN	4	55	8	37	6	38
University personnel invited to your system to provide information services	5	48	6	40	6	38
Participating in clinics conducted by central office around one particular problem	7	36	5	47	4	43
Working as a member of curriculum committees	8.5	32	2.5	53	1	76
Advance study and research (leave of absence)	8.5	32	10	28	6	38

Table 38

PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS (n=39) AND SUPERVISORS (n=22) RECOMMENDING VARIOUS
PERSONNEL TO TEACH THE INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM^a

Personnel	Principals		Supervisors		Total
	Recommended	Not Recommended	Recommended	Not Recommended	
	%	%	%	%	
University personnel who have served as consultants in the area		3	91	9	100
Supervisors from central office		5	91	9	100
Someone from the Department of Education who is sophisticated with the K-6 system			86	14	100
Combination of these people	87		100		100
Others (please specify) (respondents included teachers and principals)	13		28		100

^a Principals and supervisors could recommend more than one type of personnel.

mended' and 'recommended,' it became necessary to collapse the responses into (a) recommended, or (b) not recommended.

A combination of the instructional personnel listed was felt by both principals and supervisors to represent the optimum arrangement. Eighty-seven percent of the thirty-nine principals and all of the supervisors recommended this approach. A small number of respondents recommended that teachers and principals be considered as resource personnel to teach the inservice education program.

Location of Inservice Program

Table 39 focuses on determining locations for conducting the inservice education program for elementary principals.

Three choices were suggested to the respondents, plus an open-ended opportunity to express their preference for other locations. These locations are as follows: (a) at the university, (b) in the individual school, and (c) some central point so that more than one school may benefit from the information. The responses to these items are listed by percentage and analytically treated in order of importance.

Both principals and supervisors indicated that locating the inservice education program at some central point would be the most desirable meeting place. Eighty-five percent of principals and 86% of supervisors recommended this option. Taking the program to the individual school received divided support from principals. Principals expressed a greater reaction to locating the inservice program at the university than did supervisors, although both generally opposed this location. It appears that distribution of the university's resources, both human and material, can be best utilized, it is felt by both groups, if the university comes.

to the school system.

Length of Inservice Program

Table 40 presents data revolving around the most desired time period for conducting the inservice education program.

Three alternatives, plus an open-ended opportunity for additional comment, were given to the respondents in order to solicit their preference of time allocation for the inservice program. These time allocation alternatives are (a) a short-term course (5-6 weeks) meeting once a week for an over-view, (b) a 'crash' program meeting two or three times for an over-view, and (c) flexible-in-time scheduling.

A program flexible in length was recommended by both principals and supervisors to be the best of the alternatives available. Seventy-four percent of the principals and 82% of the supervisors opted for flexible scheduling. A similar agreement was found to exist between the two groups in the rejection of the 'crash' program, although principals showed a slightly higher negative response than supervisors to this option. A short-term course was also considered adequate by more than half the respondents.

Time of Inservice Education Program

Specific meeting times for the inservice education program are identified in Table 41. Four alternatives with provision to make other suggestions were presented to the respondents. The alternatives were: (a) after school or evening, (b) Saturdays, (c) release time from school, and (d) summer sessions.

Release time from school was clearly the most preferable for both groups, while Saturdays seemed to be least acceptable. After school or

Table 39

PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORS RECOMMENDING VARIOUS LOCATIONS
FOR THE INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Location	(n=39) Principals			(n=22) Supervisors		
	Recommended	Not	Total	Recommended	Not	Total
		Recommended			Recommended	
	%	%		%	%	
At the university	18	82	100	32	68	100
In the individual school	56	44	100	68	32	100
Some central point so that more than one school may benefit from the information	85	15	100	86	14	100

Table 40

PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORS RECOMMENDING VARIOUS
TIME LENGTHS FOR THE INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Length of Program	(n=39) Principals			n=22) Supervisors		
	Recommended	Not Recommended	Total	Recommended	Not Recommended	Total
	%	%		%	%	
A short-term course (5-6 weeks meeting once a week	59	41	100	68	32	100
A "crash" program meeting 2 or 3 times for an overview	20	80	100	36	64	100
Flexible-in-Time scheduling	74	26	100	82	18	100

Table 41

PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORS RECOMMENDING VARIOUS
MEETING TIMES FOR THE INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Time	(n=39) Principals			(n=22) Supervisors		
	Recommended	Not Recommended	Total	Recommended	Not Recommended	Total
	%	%		%	%	
After school or evenings ✓	44	56	100	59	41	100
Saturdays	15	85	100	32	68	100
Release time from school	85	15	100	91	9	100
Summer sessions	36	64	100	45	55	100

evenings and summer sessions received mixed support.

Summary: Section III

Part III of the research instrument was aimed at gathering the views of principals, teachers, and supervisors relative to the inservice education needs of elementary school principals, the activities presently available which served an inservice function, the five activities of greatest benefit to an inservice program, and further information with respect to who would teach the program where, when and for how long. Although no group specifically identified inservice education needs, each did respond to a ranking of the task areas for inservice consideration. Principals and supervisors were in general agreement on their selection of the Supervision of Instruction duties as needing attention for additional help and development. Teachers also felt this way but not as strongly as the other two groups. Principals and supervisors again responded similarly to a percentage ranking of the inservice activities presently available to the elementary principal. Most of the activities commonly selected moreover were programs available to elementary principals largely as a result of individual principal initiative. Notable differences were observed relative to the availability of university personnel and curriculum committees as inservice education functions. Principals expressed far less satisfaction that these programs were present than the responses reported by central office would suggest. Principals, teachers, and supervisors agreed that workshops provided by central office and visitation to school systems outside your district were beneficial aspects of an inservice education program for elementary principals. However, whereas the former activity was reported available by a substantial majority of principals

and supervisors, less than fifty percent of either group indicated that this applied to the latter inservice function. In matters relating to personnel, location, time, and length of the program, principals and supervisors took a mediating course in recommending a combination of personnel to teach a program flexible in length at some central meeting place during release time from school.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

In trying to assess the mean difficulty scores and ratings of principals, teachers, and supervisors on the eighty-three items contained in the research instrument, it became apparent that agreements about the most difficult or important problems were limited to a relatively small number. Each group tended to consider most important or difficult that area with which they have been traditionally concerned, e.g. supervisors and Supervision of Instruction. Although some responses did vary significantly with such factors as the respondent's sex, no meaningful pattern could be discerned. Supervisors and principals did generally agree about the inservice activities presently available to the elementary principal, although supervisors, in comparison to principals, strongly supported the presence of curriculum committees as an inservice function. Generally, the respondents advocated a flexible inservice education program which would embrace workshops provided by central office and visitations both within and without the school system supplemented by a moderate involvement of university personnel.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary statement of the problem which was investigated, the methodology employed, and the major findings. General conclusions emerging from an analysis of the six questions are discussed, and finally, some recommendations based on the findings are proposed.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

The present study was undertaken in an attempt to identify the current professional problems of elementary school principals who administer schools with an administrative-teaching staff size of six or more persons. Suggestions for possible solutions supplied by principals, teachers, and supervisors formed an integral part of the study.

Procedure

The sample consisted of the following people: forty-nine randomly selected elementary school principals in the province from schools with administrative-teaching staffs of six or more; 282 teachers randomly selected from the 106 elementary schools which qualified for the study; and a total of 26 supervisors, one from each of the Integrated and Roman Catholic School Districts from which the schools were drawn. Each respondent was mailed a questionnaire listing 83 duties commonly performed by

elementary school principals. Although the questionnaire varied somewhat for each group, all were similar in two respects. First, all questionnaires asked the respondent to rate each of the 83 duties (representing five task areas) in terms of the difficulty presented the principal. Second, the instrument solicited the inservice education views of each respondent. Data gained from the 39 principals, 139 teachers and 22 supervisors who responded to the questionnaire were analyzed and treated by comparisons of mean ratings, rank order difference correlation, a one way analysis of variance, and general observation of patterns and trends which the responses seem to indicate. Parts II and III of the supervisors' instrument and Part III for principals and teachers were statistically treated by percentage rankings.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Section I -- Difficulty of the Elementary Principal's Duties as Rated by the Total Sample of Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors

The findings related to question 1 (do elementary principals, teachers, and supervisors agree as to the most and least difficult problems faced by elementary school principals?) support the hypothesis that differing role expectations confront the elementary principal.

A comparison of the five duties rated most difficult in each of the task areas revealed that principals, teachers, and supervisors agreed on only six of a possible twenty-five functions. "Agreement" was considered to have been reached within a task area if three of the top five ranks of all three groups of respondents overlapped, and this situation occurred only in the General Administration category. Respondents displayed a similar consensus of opinion with respect to their individual lists of the

five least difficult functions of the elementary principal. Although no meaningful pattern could be discerned between those functions which were commonly agreed upon by the respondents, several points need to be emphasized. Firstly, while teachers were more likely than either principals or supervisors to assign higher mean scores to General Administration duties, all perceived the supervision of students outside the classroom to present considerable difficulty for elementary principals. Other problems which were reported in the General Administration task area (developing an operational budget; requisitioning, accounting for and distributing supplies and materials) reflect not so much the capabilities of elementary principals as they do the present inadequacies in the allocation of funds and the availability of sufficient supplies.

Secondly, Supervision of Instruction responsibilities were characterized by high mean scores. This trend was particularly evident for supervisors who were in this instance rating the task area most clearly linked with their own responsibilities. On an arbitrarily chosen scale ranging from minor (mean: 0.00 - 1.49) through moderate (mean: 1.50 - 2.49) to major (mean: 2.50 - 4.00) almost two-thirds of the Supervision of Instruction functions were perceived by supervisors to be of major difficulty for elementary principals. Furthermore, these ratings represent 72% of the total number (28) of duties reported as major problems by the respondents for all task areas combined. Teachers responded with the most difficult ratings for principals in those Supervision of Instruction responsibilities requiring principal assistance to individual teachers. Principals expressed concern with the difficulties in finding time for planning new school facilities to meet educational needs and fit instructional programs. The difficulties experienced in performing these functions

are closely related to the current practices of allocating teaching personnel, insufficient space and finances, and the minor role which the principal has been permitted to play.

Thirdly, notable differences occurred in the top ranks of the respondents' selections of two staff personnel items. Whereas principals ranked the item, "evaluating and rating teacher effectiveness," first, or most difficult, teachers and supervisors did not include this duty within their respective lists of the five most difficult problems. Conversely, teachers and supervisors placed the item, "equitable assignment of teachers," first in order of difficulty for elementary principals while principals omitted the function from their list of five most difficult duties.

Fourthly, the two duties which were commonly selected by respondents plus combinations of principal-teacher-supervisor selections strongly suggest that interpretation of the school's immediate and long range programs to parents highlight school-community relations.

Fifthly, no clearly established perceptual pattern of agreement was observed between any two subgroups. However, rank order correlation coefficients indicated that teachers and supervisors complemented each other more than did either of the two with principals. Furthermore, teachers and supervisors agreed on three of the top five ranked problems in four of the five task areas of the principalship. With the exception of the General Administration category, agreement was not generally evident between principals and either teachers or supervisors, as principals tended to rate more duties minor (mean: 0.00 - 1.49).

It was concluded on the basis of these findings that elementary principals, teachers, and supervisors do not show strong agreement with respect to the problems facing elementary school principals. Where agree-

ment has been shown to exist, the degree of difficulty rating has varied. With the exception of Supervision of Instruction duties all concurred, moreover, that the elementary principalship as presently constituted posed few major problems for the elementary principal.

In order to obtain an inventory of the duties listed on the research instrument which were considered by the respondents not to be a function of the elementary principalship in the province, a 'not applicable' rating could be assigned by the respondents where they found it necessary. Only those duties which were reported not applicable by one-fifth or more of the total of either group were considered for analysis. Duties listed under the School-Community Relations task area received some of the highest not applicable ratings, particularly by teachers. Three of these revolved around the principal's relationship in parent-teacher functions: "organizing effective parent-teacher conferences," "working effectively with parent groups such as the PTA," and "handling complaints from parents." The former two items were supported by a similar percentage (50%) of supervisors. A fourth function in the School-Community Relations category, "administering the use of school property by outside groups," received not applicable ratings from one-half of teachers. The majority of principals included these functions as part of their responsibility in school-community relations. However, one-third of the principals reporting indicated no involvement in two duties associated with the media: "preparing news releases for local press," and "maintaining cooperative relations with press, radio and TV."

The majority of items receiving not applicable ratings in the Administration of Staff Personnel category centered around the employment-dismissal responsibility of elementary principals with respect to certified

and non-certified personnel. One-fourth of the principals indicated no participation in the employment of certified and non-certified personnel. A similar number of principals reported no involvement in the recommending of certified and non-certified personnel for dismissal. One-fourth of the teachers replied that the principal did not recommend certified personnel for dismissal. Teachers also felt that the principal was not involved in developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified personnel or in establishing and maintaining professional relations with his staff.

Three of four duties in the Administration of Pupil Personnel category receiving not applicable ratings were singled out by over one-half of principals, teachers, or supervisors. The development of summer programs, educational and recreational, was part of the functions of only 46% of the principals responding. A similar percentage of teachers and supervisors reported that elementary principals were not organizing and administering extra-curricular activities. Singly, teachers (30) revealed that their principals did not involve parents in solving problem cases.

From an analysis of the 'not applicable' responses of principals, teachers, and supervisors it can be concluded that the elementary principal's role in this province is seriously questioned relative to (a) school-community relations responsibilities specifically related to parent-teacher-principal relationships, and (b) the minor role accorded principals in recommending certified and non-certified personnel for employment or dismissal. A third area of concern which principals might do well to consider is the provision of leadership in the future development of summer educational and recreational programs.

Section II -- Responses of Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors
as They Vary with School Staff Size and Selected Personal
and Professional Characteristics

The purpose of this section was to analyze the responses of principals, teachers, and supervisors as they varied with school staff size and selected personal and professional characteristics. Specifically, Category II focused on (a) those administrative practices showing a significant difference in mean response within the subgroups, and (b) general observation drawn from a detailed compilation of the responses for each of the subgroups. The results of these measures formed the basis for the following summary findings:

- a) School staff size as a significant factor contributing to the problems of elementary principals did not emerge with any dominant pattern relative to the kind or magnitude of problems.
- b) Analysis of the personal and professional characteristics of elementary principals revealed that age, administrative experience and years of teaching experience were not significantly related to the manner in which duties were rated. Lower mean score ratings by principals with the most professional preparation (five or more years), and conversely, higher mean score ratings by principals with four years or less of professional preparation were established in a fairly consistent pattern. However, only two of the differences in mean scores within this subgroup were shown to be significant. Sex, more than any other subgroup, set a definite trend. Female principals consistently reported a greater degree of difficulty in meeting the responsibilities of the elementary principalship than did male principals. Once again significant differences were reported in only a small number (12%) of the 83

duties presented. Most of these involved interpersonal relationships.

- c) With reference to teacher's sex the same pattern as noted for principals was observed. Seven of the fifteen functions which showed significant differences were related to the principal's responsibilities in school-community relations. The remaining duties were fairly evenly distributed over the four task areas. Teachers of primary grades (K-3) and teachers with the most years of teaching experience (5 years or more) responded in like manner assigning higher mean score ratings than their respective counterparts, elementary section teachers (4-6) and less experienced teaching personnel. Both professional characteristics, however, revealed significant differences in a relatively small number of duties. While significant mean differences between grades were concentrated in the Supervision of Instruction category, significant mean differences between teaching experience occurred mainly on General Administration functions. Professional preparation did not influence significantly the mean score ratings of teachers subdivided on the basis of this professional characteristic.

- d) Supervisors were asked to indicate the degree of relationship which they believed to exist between the principal's personal and professional characteristics and his/her effectiveness in the position. Age, sex, academic and professional qualifications and teaching experience were considered on a scale ranging from no relationship to an extreme one. While age and sex were perceived by supervisors to play a minor role in the performance of principals, the two professional characteristics, academic and professional character-

istics, and teaching experience were seen to have a high relationship in this regard. Since supervisory personnel are very much involved in the recruitment of administrative staff, it would appear that the latter characteristics are prime pre-requisites for potential candidates to the principalship to possess. However, this study has shown that the relationship does not necessarily follow. Consequently, caution is urged so that professional qualifications do not become the sole or basic criteria for principal selection.

Section III -- Inservice Education Considerations (Program: Activities, Personnel, Location, etc.) for the Elementary Principal

The purpose of this section was to present the direction and approach to inservice education suggested by principals, teachers, and supervisors. More specifically, the section sought to identify the respondents' opinions relative to (a) the five most pressing problems facing elementary principals today, (b) inservice education activities presently available to the elementary principal, (c) five activities of greatest benefit to inservice education of elementary principals, (d) those persons best suited to teach the inservice program, (e) the best location for the inservice program, (f) an optional length of the inservice program, and (g) the best time for inservice activity.

Specific problems which might form the focal point of a proposed inservice education program were not readily identified by the respondents since most respondents opted to rank the five task areas in most and least need of inservice help. Supervision of Instruction and School-Community Relations responsibilities emerged as the task areas in most and least need

of inservice programs.

Although the respondents were in fairly close agreement both on what inservice activities are presently available and those activities which are of most value for inservice education, one major exception did occur. Whereas principals, teachers, and supervisors selected visitations to school systems outside their district as the top priority, neither of these groups placed this activity in the top six presently available to elementary principals. Two other notable differences occurring in the inservice activities presently available were reported by principals and supervisors: "working as a member of curriculum committees," and "university personnel invited to your system to provide information services." While both inservice education activities were reported available by the majority of supervisors, only one-half of the principals reporting supported this contention. Principals, moreover, did not exhibit the strong support for the benefits which supervisors indicated would accrue to principals from participation in the former activity.

Respondents, however, agreed that three of the inservice activities presently available also were most beneficial: "workshops provided by central office," "visitations to other schools in your district," and "seminars provided by MUN." The two remaining activities which were reported available and which were accessible through principal initiative (membership and participation in professional organizations, professional reading, e.g. reading printed accounts of successful ways in which a problem has been met) did not appear in the respondents' ranks of five most beneficial inservice education activities. With respect to the further development of future inservice education programs respondents expressed their preference for a combination of instructional personnel representing

the Department of Education, Memorial University, the school boards, and individual schools who would offer a flexible program at some central point during release time from school. In essence, it can be concluded that the inservice education program as envisioned by respondents is a cooperative venture which involves all phases of the educational hierarchy, and which demands a flexible ongoing approach to the problems identified in large measure by the recipients for whom its benefits are intended.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered after consideration of the major findings and general conclusions drawn from the study.

1. Irrespective of personal and professional characteristics it would appear that elementary principals experience considerable difficulty in the Supervision of Instruction task area of the principalship. Therefore, it is recommended that the following short and long range measures be undertaken in an attempt to rectify the present situation.
 - (a) Since supervisory personnel have most strongly recognized the need for additional help to the elementary principal in the area of curriculum and curriculum related duties, it is imperative that a greater concentration of effort on their part through more frequent visitation be forthcoming.
 - (b) Whereas it has been shown that functions pertaining to the Supervision of Instruction duties of the principalship present the greatest burden to elementary principals and whereas principals ranked working as a member of curriculum committees eight (in terms of benefits received) in comparison to the

number one priority given by supervisors, it is recommended that this form of inservice activity as presently offered either at system or district level be reorganized to offer principals greater opportunity for professional growth.

- (c) Since this study has with respect to its Supervision of Instruction findings replicated previous studies, and since most administrative personnel will come from the teaching ranks, greater emphasis should be given to this area of teacher training, especially with regard to "administration" courses.

2. In view of the fact that the three respondent groups showed little agreement as to which duties presented the greatest problems for elementary school principals, it is recommended that boards of education pay particular attention to those duties which were commonly given highest mean ratings by principals, teachers, and supervisors. These include (a) providing supervision of pupils during recess periods, lunch periods or before and after school, (b) developing operational budget, (c) requisitioning, accounting for and distributing supplies and materials, (d) building staff morale, (e) interpreting school programs to the community, and (f) encouraging community participation in day-to-day school activities.
3. Since the evaluation of teachers is at present carried out by a limited number of principals and since this facet of professional development is fast becoming a growing area of concern, it is recommended that elementary principals are able by self-initiated inservice education, i.e. taking advantage of the professional literature available, to education themselves for the future role which they can be expected to play.

4. In recent years educators in general have been confronted with the accelerating trend toward accountability in education. A better informed and more vocal public are placing increasing demands on the school. The principal, occupying as he does, the position most visible to the community, is subjected more than any other school board employee to the new influence. This study shows that the elementary principal's responsibilities in the School-Community Relations task area has in certain duties been minimal. Therefore, it is recommended that boards of education urge and support their principals in future to assert a more positive and responsive role in working with parents in particular and the public in general.

5. One of the purposes of the present study was to ascertain the inservice education needs of elementary school principals in the province through (i) mean responses assigned to duties of the principalship, and (ii) questions aimed directly at this form of professional growth. From observation of the findings related to these measures it is recommended that:

- (a) Supervision of Instruction functions receive immediate inservice education attention.
- (b) those forms of inservice activity presently available, since they coincide with those activities which the respondents felt were of greatest benefit, be continued and improved. Boards of education should make note of two exceptions: accessibility to university personnel and visitation to schools outside the district warrant closer future inservice education consideration.

It is further recommended that inservice education programs being

developed at local or district level focus attention on the direction and approach proposed below:

- (i) A combination of instructional personnel as suggested by the respondents should be employed to teach the program. Other elementary principals and teachers would form part of the team.
 - (ii) Avoid "crash" type programs wherever possible. Instead, inservice education activities flexible in nature, reflecting the needs of participants should be pursued.
 - (iii) Greatest good to the greatest number should be the guiding principle in locating the program. Activities initiated and structured at the system level can make programs more accessible and more realistic.
 - (iv) Boards of education are urged to recognize the principal's need for a systematic and continuing inservice education program. Patchwork measures consisting mainly of after school or Saturday meetings need to be supplemented and strengthened by release time from school -- the respondents' choice.
6. The current study raises several questions concerning the principalship that might be considered in future investigations.
- (a) Do women principals experience a greater degree of difficulty in administering the principalship than their male counterparts?
 - (b) Why do primary section teachers perceive their principals to be experiencing greater role difficulties than their counterparts, elementary section teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A: BOOKS

Becker, Gerald, et al. Issues and Problems in Elementary School Administration. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, 1970.

Elsbree, Willard S., Harold J. McNally, and Richard Wynn. Elementary School Administration and Supervision. New York: American Book Company, 1967.

Faber, Charles F., and Gilbert F. Shearson. Elementary School Administration: Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Fisher, R. D., and P. J. Warren. Schools in Newfoundland and Labrador: A Survey of Existing Facilities. St. John's: Department of Educational Administration, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1972.

Glass, Gene V., and Julian C. Stanley. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Hemphill, John K., Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Jenson, Theodore J., et al. Elementary School Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

Otto, Henry J., and David C. Sanders. Elementary School Organization and Supervision. New York:

Shuster, W., and W. Wetzler. Leadership in Elementary School Administration and Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1959.

B. ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Connelly, George W. "District Superintendent Looks at the Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (February, 1967), 38-40.

Ennis, F. "Perception in the Study of Administration," The Canadian Administrator, V, No. 6 (March, 1966), 218-35.

Ludlow, Wayne Everett. "The Administrative Performance of Elementary School Principals in the Province of Newfoundland," Unpublished Master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1968.

Means, Robert Samuel. "A Study of Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Selected Personnel Services," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:2953, February, 1968.

Moberely, David Lindsey. "Problems of Beginning Elementary School Principals With Implications for On-the-Job Training," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1965.

Paulo, William Eugene. "In-Service Education Needs of Elementary School Principals," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1965.

Reid, John Ephraim. "Task Expectations of the Elementary Principal as Perceived by Principals, Superintendents, Teachers, School Boards, and the Public," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1967.

Shoaf, Ted Byron. "A Study of the Relative Importance of the Tasks of the Elementary School Principalship as Seen by Elementary School Principals, Teachers, Their Superintendents, and Professors of Educational Administration," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1967.

Symanski, Gregory G. "The Elementary School Principal as Perceived by Experienced School Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3953-A, April, 1968.

Thornton, John Thomas. "A Survey of the Little Rock Elementary Principalship With Recommendations for In-Service Education," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1966.

_____. "An Inservice Training Program for Elementary School Administrators," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (September, 1966), 642.

Wilson, C. M. "Problems of Elementary School Principals in Arkansas With Implications for In-Service Training," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969.

D. PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Department of Education, The Newfoundland and Labrador Schools Directory, 1972-73 (St. John's: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1973).

- Goodlad, John I. "Beyond Survival for the Elementary Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (September, 1966), 10-15.
- Graves, William J., and Nathan Stoller, "Reports of Selected Elementary Principals on Their Professional Problems," New York: APEA-MRA Digest Series, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954.
- Gross, Neal, and Robert E. Herriott. "The EPL of Elementary Principals: A Study of Executive Professional Leadership," The National Elementary Principal, XLV (April, 1966), 66.
- Melton, Joseph. "Role Perceptions of the Elementary Principals," The National Elementary Principal, L (February, 1972), 40-43.
- Miel, Alice. "In-Service Education Re-examined," The National Elementary Principal, XLV (February, 1962), 7.
- Pharis, William L. "In-Service Education for Elementary School Principals," Washington, D. C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, 1966. 8.
- Theilman, Giles. "What are the Characteristics of an Effective In-Service Program?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (March, 1952), 361-366.
- Warren, Philip J. "Developing an In-Service Education Program." Address to the Administrator's Practicum, Roman Catholic School Board, St. John's, Newfoundland, 1973.
- Zalkind, S. G., and W. Costello. "Perception: Some Recent Research and Implications for Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, VII (September, 1963), 218-35.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- England, Clifford N. "Analysis of the Role Expectations of the Principal as it Affects the Professional Growth in a Selected School System," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3922-A, April, 1968.
- Frazier, Calvin Morton. "Role Expectations of the Elementary Principals as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals and Teachers," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964.
- Grant, William Watson. "A Model for the In-Service Education of School Administrators Within the State of New South Wales, Australia," The University of Florida, 1970.
- Johnson, Herbert Raymond Jr. "A Study of Perceptions of Duties of Elementary School Principals," Dissertation Abstracts, 26:1592-A, December, 1966.

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE WITH PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND SUPERVISORS

May 4, 1973

Dear Principal:

At the present time I am engaged in gathering information for a Master's Degree in Educational Administration at Memorial University. The purpose of this study is to identify the current professional problems and inservice education needs of the elementary principalship as perceived by teachers, principals and supervisors. Through this identification it is intended that recommendations be made which will facilitate performance in certain administrative practices.

As a principal your candid response to the questionnaire items can provide a significant contribution to the elementary principalship. Numerous studies have centered on the need for inservice education of teachers, but none in this province and relatively few in Canada have concentrated on the inservice education needs of practising elementary school principals. Your cooperation will assure the collection of information in this area which is relevant to our province.

I certainly realize the importance of a few minutes time in a principal's day, but I will reciprocate by making available to you the results of the study in summary form.

You may be assured that the information you provide will be kept in strictest confidence and that neither you nor your school will be specifically identified with any data presented in the study.

This study has been approved by Dr. Philip Warren, Head, Department of Educational Administration at Memorial University. It will be conducted under the guidance and supervision of Dr. James Jesse.

When you have completed the questionnaire, you are asked to return it in the self-addressed envelope provided.

Having been an elementary principal, I can appreciate the extra burden required of you to complete, at this late stage in the school year, the enclosed questionnaire. However, I earnestly solicit your help because I feel that this first attempt in the province to examine the elementary principalship by gathering your views together with the views of teachers and supervisors will provide information relevant to the practising needs of elementary principals.

Your consideration and support will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Cyril Ivany

May 4, 1973

Dear Teacher:

At the present time I am engaged in gathering information for a Master's Degree in Educational Administration at Memorial University. The purpose of this study is to identify the current professional problems and inservice education needs of the elementary principalship as perceived by teachers, principals and supervisors. Through this identification it is intended that recommendations be made which will facilitate performance in certain administrative practices.

As a teacher your close and constant working relationship with elementary principals can provide a significant contribution to an understanding of the problems which beset the elementary principalship. It is not the intention of this study to have you evaluate your principal but, rather, to have you shed your views so that all concerned with the elementary principalship may better understand and appreciate this administrative role.

I certainly realize the importance of a few minutes time in a teacher's day, but I will reciprocate by making the results of the study available to you in summary form.

You may be assured that the information you provide will be kept in strictest confidence and that neither you nor your school will be specifically identified with any data presented in the study.

This study has been approved by Dr. Philip Warren, Head, Department of Educational Administration at Memorial University. It will be conducted under the guidance and supervision of Dr. James Jesse.

When you have completed the questionnaire, you are asked to return it in the self-addressed envelope provided.

Having been an elementary teacher, I can appreciate the extra burden required of you, at this late stage in the school year, to complete this questionnaire. However, I earnestly feel that this first attempt in the province to examine the elementary principalship by soliciting your views together with the views of principals and supervisors will provide information relevant to the practising needs of teachers and principals.

Your consideration and support will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Cyril Ivany

May 4, 1973

Dear Supervisor:

At the present time I am engaged in gathering information for a Master's Degree in Educational Administration at Memorial University. The purpose of this study is to identify the current professional problems and inservice education needs of the elementary principalship as perceived by teachers, principals and supervisors. Through this identification it is intended that recommendations be made which will facilitate performance in certain administrative practices.

As a supervisor your candid response to the questionnaire items can provide a significant contribution to the elementary principalship. Numerous studies have centered on the need for inservice education of teachers, but none in this province and relatively few in Canada have concentrated on the inservice education needs of practising elementary school principals. Your cooperation will assure the collection of information in this area which is relevant to our province.

I certainly realize the importance of a few minutes time in a supervisor's day, but I will reciprocate by making available to you the results of the study in summary form.

This study has been approved by Dr. Philip Warren, Head, Department of Educational Administration at Memorial University. It will be conducted under the guidance and supervision of Dr. James Jesse.

When you have completed the questionnaire, you are asked to return it in the self-addressed envelope provided.

I can appreciate the extra burden required of you to complete, at this late stage in the school year, the enclosed questionnaire. However, I earnestly solicit your help because I feel that this first attempt in the province to examine the elementary principalship by gathering your views together with the views of teachers and principals will provide information relevant to the practising needs of elementary principals.

Your consideration and support will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Cyril Ivany

APPENDIX B

THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

PRINCIPALS

This form is composed of three parts: Part I: Some biographical data relative to you (the principal) and your school; (2) Part II: ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES -- an indication of the degree of difficulty which you experience in performing these practices; and Part III: four questions related to inservice education.

THE DATA OBTAINED FROM THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

PART I

Please fill in or check the blanks in the spaces indicated.

1. Sex: _____ (1) Male _____ (2) Female

2. What is your age to the nearest year?

_____ (1) 24 or under _____ (4) 35 - 39 _____ (7) 50 - 54
_____ (2) 25 - 29 _____ (5) 40 - 44 _____ (8) 55 - 59
_____ (3) 30 - 34 _____ (6) 45 - 49 _____ (9) 60 or over

3. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

_____ (1) 1 - 4 years _____ (4) 15 - 19 years
_____ (2) 5 - 9 years _____ (5) 20 years and over
_____ (3) 10 - 14 years

4. How many years have you served as a principal, including the present year?

_____ (1) 1 - 4 years _____ (4) 15 - 19 years
_____ (2) 5 - 9 years _____ (5) 20 years and over
_____ (3) 10 - 14 years

5. What are your academic and professional qualifications? (Check more than one if necessary)

- ☐ (1) No degree
- ☐ (2) B.A. (Ed.)
- ☐ (3) B.A. or B.Sc.
- ☐ (4) Other (please specify) _____
- ☐ (5) M.Ed. (Educational Administration)
- ☐ (6) Graduate work in Educational Administration
- ☐ (7) Graduate work in area other than Educational Administration.

(Please specify) _____

6. What is your present teaching license/grade? _____

7. What is the size of your school? (Administrators and teachers)

- ☐ (1) 6 - 10 ☐ (3) 21 or over
- ☐ (2) 11 - 20

PLEASE FOLLOW THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTS II AND III CAREFULLY

PART II

On the following pages are listed a number of administrative practices which you may or may not be performing in your role as principal.

These administrative practices are categorized under five task areas.

Think carefully about each task area and rate each of the following items as to the degree of difficulty which they present to you as an elementary principal.

Please use the following scale:

- (0) none
- (1) minor
- (2) moderate
- (3) considerable
- (4) extreme
- (5) not applicable

Example: 4 provides consultants when needed.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

TEACHERS

This form is composed of three parts: (1) Part I: Some biographical data relative to you (the teacher); Part II: ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES -- an indication of your principal's degree of difficulty in performing these practices, as you perceive it; Part III: two questions related to inservice education.

THE DATA OBTAINED FROM THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

PART I

Please fill in or check the blanks in the spaces indicated.

1. Sex: _____ (1) Male _____ (2) Female

2. How many years of teaching experience do you have, including the present year?

_____ (1) 1 - 4 years _____ (4) 15 - 19 years

_____ (2) 5 - 9 years _____ (5) 20 years and over

_____ (3) 10 - 14 years

3. What is your present teaching certificate or grade? (Please state degrees if any) _____

4. What grade(s) do you teach? (Please circle)

K I II III IV V VI

5. How many teachers are on the staff of the school where you are presently teaching? (Include principal and vice-principal)

_____ (1) 6 - 10 _____ (2) 11 - 20 _____ (3) 21 and over

PLEASE FOLLOW THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTS II AND III CAREFULLY

PART II

On the following pages are listed a number of administrative practices which your principal may or may not be performing in his role of principal. These administrative practices are categorized under five task areas. Think carefully about each task area . . . and rate each of the following items as you perceive their degree of difficulty for the elementary principal with whom you work.

Please use the following scale:

- (0) none
- (1) minor
- (2) moderate
- (3) considerable
- (4) extreme
- (5) not applicable

Example: 4 provides consultants when needed.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

SUPERVISORS

This form is composed of three parts: Part I: ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES -- an indication of the degree of difficulty which you feel elementary principals with whom you work are experiencing; Part II: five questions related to basic characteristics of elementary school principals; and Part III: four questions related to inservice education for elementary principals.

THE DATA OBTAINED FROM THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

PLEASE OBSERVE THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTION CAREFULLY

WHEN COMPLETING EACH PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE KEEP IN MIND THAT THIS STUDY IS CONCERNED WITH THE PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS WHO ADMINISTER SCHOOLS WITH AN ADMINISTRATIVE-TEACHING STAFF OF SIX OR OVER.

NOTE OF EXPLANATION

SOME OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS INVOLVED IN THIS STUDY HAVE ONLY ONE BOARD SUPERVISOR: OTHERS HAVE SEVERAL.

SINCE NO ACCURATE LISTING OF SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITY PER DIVISION (PRIMARY, ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY) WAS AVAILABLE, I HAVE TAKEN THE LIBERTY OF IDENTIFYING YOU IN THIS WAY. PLEASE ACCEPT MY APOLOGIES FOR ANY INCONVENIENCE CAUSED.

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS IN THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALSHIP. (i.e. SCHOOLS WITH SIX OR MORE ADMINISTRATIVE-TEACHING STAFF).

YOU MAY BE ASSURED THAT THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE WILL BE KEPT IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE AND THAT NEITHER YOU NOR YOUR DISTRICT WILL BE SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED WITH ANY DATA PRESENTED IN THE STUDY.

Rating Scale: (0) none
 (1) minor
 (2) moderate
 (3) considerable
 (4) extreme
 (5) not applicable

- _____ (51) Evaluating and rating non-certified personnel (janitorial staff, general office, maintenance).
- _____ (52) Building staff morale.
- _____ (53) Participating in the employment of non-certified personnel.
- _____ (54) Participating in the employment of certified personnel (certified to instruct pupil personnel).
- _____ (55) Recommending certified personnel for dismissal.
- _____ (56) Recommending non-certified personnel for dismissal.
- _____ (57) Establishing and maintaining professional relations with your staff.
- _____ (58) Developing mutual respect and understanding between certified and non-certified personnel.
- _____ (59) Providing means for staff-central office communication concerning requests and complaints.
- _____ (60) Keeping staff members informed (school board policies).
- _____ (61) Communicating with staff (general).
- _____ (62) Others (specify) _____

ADMINISTRATION OF PUPIL PERSONNEL

- _____ (63) Developing and supervising a system for the maintenance of pupil records.
- _____ (64) Securing effective use of pupil records.
- _____ (65) Providing for orientation of new pupils.
- _____ (66) Providing for a counselling program. Developing skills in the educational and personal guidance of pupils.
- _____ (67) Maintaining discipline.
- _____ (68) Diagnosing problem cases.

Rating Scale: (0) none
 (1) minor
 (2) moderate
 (3) considerable
 (4) extreme
 (5) not applicable

- _____ (34) Planning new school facilities to meet educational needs and fit instructional programs.
- _____ (35) Developing effective procedures for changing people's thinking and performance such as case studies, reading materials, discussion, action research and experimentation.
- _____ (36) Developing more democratic behavior in both individual and group situations.
- _____ (37) Encouraging creativity in teachers.
- _____ (38) Involving citizens in curriculum development.
- ~~_____ (39) Visiting classrooms for the purpose of helping teachers improve instruction.~~
- _____ (40) Finding time for classroom visitation.
- _____ (41) Conducting individual conferences with teachers for the purpose of improving instruction.
- _____ (42) Coordinating the activities of special teachers (music, art, special reading, phys. ed. etc.).
- _____ (43) Supervising the selection of textbooks and other instructional materials.
- _____ (44) Developing adequate pupil testing programs.
- _____ (45) Developing policies for the grouping of students for most effective learning.
- _____ (46) Conducting effective faculty meetings which are worthwhile.
- _____ (47) Providing adequate library services.
- _____ (48) Others (specify) _____

ADMINISTRATION OF STAFF PERSONNEL

- _____ (49) Equitable assignment of teachers.
- _____ (50) Evaluating and rating teacher effectiveness.

Rating Scale: (0) none
(1) minor
(2) moderate
(3) considerable
(4) extreme
(5) not applicable

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

- ____ (17) Supervising the development of written educational philosophy and objectives for own school.
- ____ (18) Providing evaluation of program of instruction in terms of school objectives.
- ____ (19) Initiating and implementing curriculum revision.
- ____ (20) Helping teachers identify and provide for individual differences within their classrooms.
- ____ (21) Planning and organizing programs of instruction for exceptional children.
- ____ (22) Helping teachers with individual student behavior problems.
- ____ (23) ~~Assisting teachers in making written lesson plans and formulating objectives, goals, and procedures.~~
- ____ (24) Establishing practices (procedures) for sharing good practices of teachers.
- ____ (25) Orienting new teachers.
- ____ (26) Assisting teachers organize new units of work.
- ____ (27) Helping teachers utilize educational resources of the community.
- ____ (28) Planning with teachers for inservice training programs.
- ____ (29) Providing help and encouragement in the use of audio-visual aids to learning.
- ____ (30) Assisting the staff in using research findings to help solve practical problems within the school.
- ____ (31) Keeping the staff informed of curriculum trends, new programs and materials.
- ____ (32) Keeping abreast of issues in elementary education (phonics vs. look-say, grades vs. non-graded).
- ____ (33) Delegating leadership responsibilities among staff members.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS OF
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Rating Scale: (0) none
(1) minor
(2) moderate
(3) considerable
(4) extreme
(5) not applicable

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

- _____ (1) Developing written policies and regulations within own building.
- _____ (2) Requisitioning, accounting for, and distributing supplies and materials.
- _____ (3) Developing operational budget.
- _____ (4) Developing a system of accurate and efficient attendance accounting.
- _____ (5) Formulating schedules for convening recesses and dismissals.
- _____ (6) Implementing central office directives.
- _____ (7) Preparing reports for the central office and Department.
- _____ (8) Supervising maintenance of the school plant.
- _____ (9) Supervising bus transportation.
- _____ (10) Supervising school safety programs.
- _____ (11) Establishing and supervising proper accounting procedures for school funds.
- _____ (12) Providing supervision of pupils during recess periods, lunch periods, or before and after school.
- _____ (13) Preparation for opening and closing of the school year.
- _____ (14) Communicating with central office.
- _____ (15) Organizing and supervising general office routine.
- _____ (16) Others (specify) _____

Rating Scale: (0) none
(1) minor
(2) moderate
(3) considerable
(4) extreme
(5) not applicable

- _____ (69) Involving parents in solving problem cases.
- _____ (70) Counselling with students referred for disciplinary reasons.
- _____ (71) Developing summer educational programs.
- _____ (72) Developing summer recreational programs.
- _____ (73) Helping and encouraging teachers to use specialized services of the school for the benefit of individual pupils.
- _____ (74) Organizing and administering extra-curricular activities.
- _____ (75) Others (specify) _____

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

- _____ (76) Organizing effective parent-teacher conferences.
- _____ (77) Reconciling controversies between teachers and parents.
- _____ (78) Reporting the needs of the school to teachers, superintendent, parents and community.
- _____ (79) Involving teachers in school-community relations.
- _____ (80) Encouraging community participation in day-to-day school activities.
- _____ (81) Preparing news releases for local press.
- _____ (82) Communicating effectively with parents through school publications.
- _____ (83) Maintaining cooperative relations with press, radio and TV.
- _____ (84) Interpreting school program to community.
- _____ (85) Working effectively with parent groups such as the PTA.
- _____ (86) Handling complaints from parents.
- _____ (87) Administering the use of school property by outside groups.
- _____ (88) Others (specify) _____

PART II (SUPERVISORS)

Before you begin Part II, please consider the items and task areas which you have just completed . . . then answer the following questions concerning basic characteristics of principals. Relate your responses as near as possible to the problems which you feel they present to performance in the elementary principalship.

Tick the appropriate blank. If you feel that the relationship is high or extreme, please comment.

1. How do you feel about the relationship between the principal's age and his/her effectiveness in the elementary principalship?

- (0) ☐ no relationship
(1) ☐ minor relationship
(2) ☐ moderate relationship
(3) ☐ high relationship
(4) ☐ extreme relationship

Comment: _____

2. Based on your experience working with men and women principals, how do you feel about the relationship between the principal's sex and his/her effectiveness in the elementary principalship?

- (0) ☐ no relationship
(1) ☐ minor relationship
(2) ☐ moderate relationship
(3) ☐ high relationship
(4) ☐ extreme relationship

Comment: _____

5. School boards in the province have shown a tendency to centralize their elementary schools. Using the following classification as a basis for discussion, what problems for the elementary principal do you perceive to be related to increase in school size?

6 - 10 teachers

11 - 20 teachers

21 teachers and over

You may wish to comment on one or more of the five task areas of:

(a) General Administration _____

(b) Supervision of Instruction _____

(c) Administration of Staff Personnel _____

(d) Administration of Pupil Personnel _____

(e) School-Community Relations _____

3. There has been a significant increase in academic and professional qualifications of teachers and administrators in recent years. How do you feel about the relationship between the principal's formal training and his/her effectiveness in the elementary principalship?

- (0) _____ no relationship
(1) _____ minor relationship
(2) _____ moderate relationship
(3) _____ high relationship
(4) _____ extreme relationship

Comment: _____

4. How do you feel about the relationship between the principal's experience as a teacher and/or administrator and his/her effectiveness in the elementary principalship?

- (0) _____ no relationship
(1) _____ minor relationship
(2) _____ moderate relationship
(3) _____ high relationship
(4) _____ extreme relationship

Comment: _____

PART III (PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORS)

1. What do you consider to be the five most pressing problems facing elementary principals today in need of inservice education? If you are unable to be specific, please rank the following task areas in order of importance for inservice education of principals.

- (1) _____
 (2) _____
 (3) _____
 (4) _____
 (5) _____

Task Areas: (0) _____ General Administration

(1) _____ Supervision of Instruction

(2) _____ Administration of Staff Personnel

(3) _____ Administration of Pupil Personnel

(4) _____ School-Community Relations

2. Which of the following inservice activities are presently available to the elementary principal? (Check all items that pertain to your situation.)

- (0) _____ visitations to other schools in your district.
 (1) _____ visitations to school systems outside your district.
 (2) _____ seminars provided by Memorial University.
 (3) _____ workshops provided by central office.
 (4) _____ university personnel invited to your school system to provide information services.
 (5) _____ membership and participation in professional organizations.
 (6) _____ professional reading (e.g.) reading printed accounts of successful ways in which a problem has been met.
 (7) _____ professional writing.
 (8) _____ public speaking.
 (9) _____ advanced study and research (leave of absence).

- (10) _____ pursuit of personal independent research while employed with the board.
- (11) _____ working as a member of curriculum committees.
- (12) _____ participation in work of PTA.
- (13) _____ actively working in community service clubs.
- (14) _____ participating in clinics conducted by central office around one particular problem.
- (15) _____ simulation techniques.
- (16) _____ other (please specify) _____
- _____
- _____

3. From No. 2 list five (5) factors that you feel are or would be of greatest benefit to inservice education of elementary principals? (Use the numbers of the items.)

(0) _____ (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____

4. If you feel improvement is needed in the inservice education function, what would be your preferences toward that end? In answering this question you may want to use the following short questions as a guide. Please use the numbers of the following scale, placing the number in the space provided.

(1) Highly Recommended

(2) Recommended.

(3) Not Recommended.

(a) Who would teach the inservice program?

- (0) _____ university personnel who have served as consultants in the area.
- (1) _____ supervisors from central office.
- (2) _____ someone from the Department of Education who is sophisticated with the K-6 system.
- (3) _____ combination of these people.
- (4) _____ other (please specify) _____
- _____

(b) Where would these inservice programs be conducted?

- (0) _____ at the university.
- (1) _____ in the individual school.
- (2) _____ some central point so that more than one school may benefit from the information.
- (3) _____ other (please specify) _____

(c) How long should these inservice programs be?

- (0) _____ a short-term course (5-6 weeks), meeting once a week.
- (1) _____ a "crash" program meeting 2 or 3 times for an overview.
- (2) _____ flexible in time scheduling.
- (3) _____ other (please specify) _____

(d) When should these inservice activities be carried out?

- (0) _____ after school or evenings.
- (1) _____ Saturdays.
- (2) _____ release time from school.
- (3) _____ summer sessions.
- (4) _____ other (please specify) _____

- (7) professional writing.
- (8) public speaking.
- (9) advanced study and research (leave of absence).
- (10) pursuit of personal independent research while employed with the board.
- (11) working as a member of curriculum committees.
- (12) participation in work of PTA.
- (13) actively working in community service clubs.
- (14) participating in clinics conducted by central office around one particular problem.
- (15) simulation techniques.
- (16) other (please specify) _____

(0) _____ (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____

PART III (TEACHERS)

Before you begin Part III, please consider the items and task areas which you have just completed . . . then answer these questions.

1. What do you consider to be the five most pressing problems facing elementary principals today in need of inservice education? If you are unable to be specific, please rank the following task areas in order of importance for inservice education of principals.

- (1) _____
- (2) _____
- (3) _____
- (4) _____
- (5) _____

- Task Areas: (0) _____ General Administration
- (1) _____ Supervision of Instruction
 - (2) _____ Administration of Staff Personnel
 - (3) _____ Administration of Pupil Personnel
 - (4) _____ School-Community Relations

2. If you were given the responsibility to develop an inservice education program for elementary principals, which five (5) of the following list of inservice activities would you select? (Use the numbers of the items to fill the blanks at the end of this list.)

- (0) visitations to other schools in the district.
- (1) visitations to school systems outside your district.
- (2) seminars provided by Memorial University.
- (3) workshops provided by central office.
- (4) university personnel invited to the school system to provide information services.
- (5) membership and participation in professional organizations.
- (6) professional reading (e.g.) reading printed accounts of successful ways in which a problem has been met.

APPENDIX C

MEANS FOR PRINCIPALS CLASSIFIED ON THE
BASIS OF SELECTED VARIABLES

	Years, of Teaching Exp.			Sex		School Size		
	1 - 9	10 - 19	20	Male	Female	9 - 10	11 - 20	21
Item 51	1.20	1.60	1.53	1.50	1.57	1.55	1.86	2.00
Item 52	1.75	1.73	1.80	1.60	2.38	1.77	1.87	1.60
Item 53	.50	1.14	1.20	1.09	1.00	1.30	.90	1.00
Item 54	1.50	1.29	1.31	1.21	1.71	1.42	1.60	.89
Item 55	1.50	2.07	1.00	1.54	1.86	1.82	1.55	1.44
Item 56	.60	1.93	1.00	1.42	1.29	1.50	1.33	1.33
Item 57	2.00	1.38	1.73	1.58	1.88	1.62	1.63	1.70
Item 58	1.40	1.19	1.31	1.08	1.88	.92	1.50	1.40
Item 59	2.25	1.19	1.87	1.58	2.00	1.15	2.00	1.80
Item 60	1.38	1.44	2.20	1.58	2.25	1.46	2.06	1.50
Item 61	1.75	.94	1.60	1.23	1.88	1.31	1.50	1.20
Item 63	1.75	1.38	1.87	1.55	2.00	1.62	1.88	1.30
Item 64	2.13	1.56	2.20	1.90	2.00	1.77	2.44	1.30
Item 65	.75	1.44	1.40	1.10	2.00	1.31	1.25	1.30
Item 66	2.33	2.27	2.39	2.37	2.14	2.50	2.15	2.33
Item 67	1.63	1.25	1.73	1.45	1.75	1.54	1.75	1.10
Item 68	2.25	1.94	2.40	2.19	2.13	1.79	2.47	2.25
Item 69	2.13	1.94	2.07	1.97	2.25	2.23	2.00	1.80
Item 70	2.13	1.40	2.14	1.86	1.75	1.67	2.07	1.70
Item 71	.33	.77	0.00	.62	0.00	.71	.50	0.00
Item 72	.33	.89	0.00	.54	.40	.71	.67	0.00
Item 73	1.67	1.20	1.75	1.50	1.43	1.62	1.30	1.50
Item 74	1.50	1.69	2.07	1.73	2.00	1.62	2.00	1.70
Item 76	1.38	1.63	1.93	1.55	2.25	1.69	1.81	1.50
Item 77	1.43	1.56	1.20	1.17	2.25	1.69	1.40	1.00
Item 78	1.88	1.50	1.73	1.58	2.00	1.62	1.75	1.60
Item 79	2.25	1.63	2.08	1.86	2.13	1.83	2.07	1.80
Item 80	1.57	1.56	2.21	1.76	2.00	1.50	1.88	2.10
Item 81	1.00	1.00	1.10	1.00	1.14	.63	1.50	.71
Item 82	1.33	1.07	1.77	1.24	1.88	.70	1.92	1.40
Item 83	.50	1.08	1.40	1.16	1.00	.57	1.36	1.25
Item 84	2.75	1.81	2.07	2.00	2.50	1.92	2.31	2.00
Item 85	1.17	1.31	1.47	1.26	1.71	1.46	1.50	1.00
Item 86	1.50	1.63	1.60	1.42	2.25	1.31	1.88	1.50
Item 87	.71	1.33	1.64	1.23	1.57	1.00	1.69	1.11

		Years of Teaching Exp.			Sex		School Size		
		1 - 9	10 - 19	20	Male	Female	6 - 10	11 - 20	21
Item 1		1.50	1.13	1.33	1.13	1.88	1.23	1.31	1.30
Item 2		1.88	1.06	1.47	1.32	1.63	1.54	1.31	1.30
Item 3		2.57	1.36	1.64	1.76	1.57	2.22	1.71	1.22
Item 4		1.29	1.31	1.23	1.21	1.50	1.27	1.33	1.20
Item 5		1.38	.94	.68	.81	1.38	.77	1.25	.60
Item 6		1.50	.94	1.27	1.21	1.00	1.00	1.29	1.20
Item 7		1.63	1.13	1.27	1.19	1.63	1.62	1.13	1.10
Item 8		1.63	1.67	.93	1.29	1.71	1.33	1.75	.80
Item 9		1.50	1.08	1.00	1.18	1.47	1.10	1.46	.67
Item 10		1.43	1.38	1.43	1.23	2.14	1.39	1.47	1.33
Item 11		1.86	1.13	1.20	1.21	1.63	1.50	1.27	1.10
Item 12		2.13	1.81	2.33	1.54	2.63	2.00	2.38	1.70
Item 13		1.75	1.75	1.47	1.58	1.88	1.31	2.06	1.40
Item 14		1.14	1.00	1.27	.97	1.75	1.15	1.13	1.10
Item 15		1.33	1.31	1.29	1.07	2.13	1.50	1.43	.90
Item 17		1.83	1.81	2.07	1.93	1.88	1.83	2.14	1.70
Item 18		2.00	2.13	2.40	2.10	2.63	1.92	2.38	2.30
Item 19		2.29	2.00	2.07	2.10	2.00	2.17	2.00	2.10
Item 20		2.50	2.31	2.33	2.26	2.75	2.29	2.69	1.80
Item 21		2.43	2.53	2.33	2.33	2.86	2.55	2.56	2.10
Item 22		1.50	1.94	2.13	1.81	2.38	1.85	2.06	1.80
Item 23		1.63	1.00	1.33	1.27	1.25	1.31	1.27	1.20
Item 24		1.57	1.53	1.53	1.41	2.00	1.69	1.43	1.50
Item 25		1.50	1.63	1.40	1.39	2.00	1.62	1.44	1.50
Item 26		1.25	1.13	1.36	1.17	1.50	1.08	1.33	1.30
Item 27		2.13	1.81	1.88	1.71	2.63	1.92	1.87	1.90
Item 28		1.50	1.64	1.80	1.53	2.29	1.46	1.79	1.80
Item 29		2.38	1.44	1.80	1.74	1.88	1.54	2.00	1.70
Item 30		1.75	1.80	1.93	1.88	1.75	1.85	1.73	2.00
Item 31		1.38	1.75	2.27	1.87	1.88	2.00	1.81	1.80
Item 32		1.88	2.31	2.20	2.13	2.38	2.46	2.31	1.60
Item 33		1.63	1.50	1.67	1.52	1.88	1.54	1.75	1.40
Item 34		2.71	2.13	2.08	2.19	2.38	2.36	2.42	1.80
Item 35		2.50	2.06	2.21	2.27	2.00	2.33	1.94	2.50
Item 36		2.14	1.69	1.87	1.69	2.57	2.08	1.75	1.67
Item 37		2.38	1.73	2.20	1.90	2.63	1.92	2.07	2.20
Item 38		2.00	1.71	1.77	1.96	1.00	1.82	1.57	2.13
Item 39		1.75	1.44	2.00	1.61	2.13	1.85	1.75	1.50
Item 40		2.38	2.44	2.53	2.68	2.38	2.54	2.44	3.00
Item 41		2.25	1.81	1.60	1.74	2.13	2.23	1.81	1.30
Item 42		2.00	1.53	1.77	1.46	2.50	1.82	1.62	1.70
Item 43		2.00	1.81	1.86	1.75	2.25	2.09	1.67	1.90
Item 44		2.57	1.94	1.93	1.97	2.38	2.08	2.06	2.00
Item 45		2.75	1.88	2.33	2.23	2.25	2.31	2.44	1.80
Item 46		2.38	1.88	2.33	2.07	2.50	1.69	2.38	2.40
Item 47		2.50	2.44	2.57	2.50	2.50	2.92	2.75	.60
Item 49		2.00	1.38	1.29	1.27	2.25	1.23	1.67	1.50
Item 50		2.50	2.00	2.27	2.26	2.00	2.15	2.38	2.00

	Years as a Principal			Qualifications		Age		
	1 - 4	5 - 9	10	1 - 4	5	34	35 - 44	45
Item 47	2.64	2.54	2.31	2.93	2.25	2.57	2.35	2.71
Item 49	1.55	1.54	1.36	1.36	1.54	1.86	1.24	1.29
Item 50	2.46	1.77	2.36	2.36	2.12	2.21	2.06	2.50
Item 51	1.44	1.73	1.43	1.67	1.44	1.40	1.77	1.13
Item 52	1.60	1.69	1.93	1.86	1.71	1.69	1.77	1.88
Item 53	.83	1.27	1.00	1.10	1.06	.75	1.33	.80
Item 54	1.29	1.18	1.50	1.10	1.43	1.50	1.40	1.00
Item 55	2.33	1.80	1.00	1.70	1.57	2.09	1.71	.50
Item 56	1.67	1.80	.91	1.40	1.38	1.50	1.71	.57
Item 57	1.64	1.62	1.71	1.64	1.64	1.57	1.71	1.63
Item 58	1.33	1.17	1.25	.91	1.44	1.27	1.33	1.13
Item 59	1.73	1.46	1.64	1.64	1.68	1.79	1.53	1.75
Item 60	1.36	1.31	2.21	1.71	1.72	1.36	1.77	2.25
Item 61	1.27	1.00	1.79	1.57	1.24	1.14	1.41	1.63
Item 63	1.36	1.39	2.07	2.00	1.44	1.29	1.82	1.88
Item 64	1.73	1.54	2.36	2.21	1.76	1.71	1.94	2.25
Item 65	.55	1.69	1.50	1.36	1.24	.86	1.59	1.38
Item 66	2.10	2.36	2.33	2.33	2.32	2.33	1.93	3.00
Item 67	1.36	1.23	1.86	1.93	1.28	1.21	1.65	1.75
Item 68	2.09	1.92	2.50	2.50	2.00	1.79	2.47	2.25
Item 69	2.00	1.92	2.14	2.14	1.96	2.00	1.88	2.38
Item 70	1.83	1.42	2.31	2.33	1.60	1.77	1.88	1.88
Item 71	.20	1.00	.14	.57	.36	1.00	.40	0.00
Item 72	.20	1.17	.14	.57	.46	.75	.60	0.00
Item 73	1.20	1.50	1.73	1.64	1.41	1.46	1.27	2.00
Item 74	1.55	1.54	2.15	2.08	1.64	1.57	1.88	2.00
Item 76	1.18	1.77	2.00	2.00	1.52	1.57	1.82	1.63
Item 77	1.27	1.67	1.21	1.64	1.25	1.54	1.47	1.00
Item 78	1.64	1.46	1.86	1.79	1.60	1.64	1.65	1.75
Item 79	1.90	1.77	2.00	1.93	1.91	2.29	1.47	2.33
Item 80	1.50	1.62	2.15	1.77	1.83	1.77	1.59	2.43
Item 81	.71	1.14	1.08	1.18	.94	1.25	1.00	.80
Item 82	1.00	1.40	1.69	1.42	1.38	1.33	1.47	1.33
Item 83	.43	2.14	1.00	1.11	1.12	1.13	1.39	.40
Item 84	2.36	2.00	2.08	2.36	1.96	2.57	1.82	1.86
Item 85	1.00	1.55	1.50	1.67	1.18	1.50	1.31	1.25
Item 86	1.46	1.46	1.79	1.79	1.48	1.50	1.77	1.38
Item 87	.73	1.40	1.75	1.58	1.14	1.00	1.53	1.40

MEANS FOR ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS SUBDIVIDED ON THE BASIS OF
SELECTED PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Years as a Principal			Qualifications		Age		
	1 - 4	5 - 9	10	1 - 4	5	34	35 - 44	45
Item 1	1.27	1.23	1.43	1.43	1.13	1.21	1.35	1.25
Item 2	1.46	1.39	1.43	1.43	1.36	1.36	1.29	1.63
Item 3	2.10	2.00	1.17	2.18	1.48	2.00	1.40	2.00
Item 4	1.40	1.23	1.33	1.39	1.22	1.15	1.41	1.17
Item 5	1.36	.69	.79	.93	.92	1.00	.88	.88
Item 6	1.20	1.00	1.21	1.31	1.08	1.25	1.12	1.13
Item 7	1.46	1.00	1.43	1.43	1.20	1.21	1.18	1.63
Item 8	1.82	1.08	1.29	1.46	1.32	1.54	1.47	.88
Item 9	.86	.91	1.54	1.42	.95	1.50	1.13	.50
Item 10	1.10	1.46	1.54	1.62	1.29	1.39	1.38	1.50
Item 11	1.30	1.42	1.21	1.50	1.20	1.58	1.06	1.38
Item 12	2.09	1.85	2.21	2.29	1.96	2.00	1.88	2.63
Item 13	1.64	1.39	1.86	1.43	1.76	1.57	1.82	1.38
Item 14	.73	1.25	1.36	1.21	1.08	.69	1.35	1.38
Item 15	1.00	1.25	1.62	1.46	1.22	1.00	1.41	1.57
Item 17	2.00	1.85	1.86	2.15	1.78	1.92	1.94	1.86
Item 18	2.18	2.00	2.36	2.29	2.16	2.14	2.12	2.50
Item 19	2.40	1.92	2.00	2.31	1.96	2.39	1.94	1.85
Item 20	2.55	2.00	2.50	2.57	2.24	2.36	2.35	2.38
Item 21	2.40	2.50	2.29	2.62	2.33	2.58	2.23	2.63
Item 22	1.55	1.77	2.43	2.29	1.72	1.36	2.41	1.88
Item 23	1.20	1.08	1.43	1.36	1.21	1.39	1.12	1.38
Item 24	1.44	1.39	1.71	1.92	1.33	1.67	1.41	1.63
Item 25	1.36	1.62	1.50	1.50	1.52	1.43	1.53	1.64
Item 26	1.00	1.23	1.39	1.29	1.22	1.31	1.06	1.57
Item 27	2.00	1.86	2.21	1.86	1.92	2.21	1.65	1.88
Item 28	1.50	1.75	1.64	1.58	1.74	1.70	1.59	1.88
Item 29	1.91	1.46	1.93	1.79	1.76	2.00	1.47	2.00
Item 30	1.70	2.00	1.64	1.43	2.08	1.77	1.64	2.38
Item 31	1.46	1.62	2.29	1.93	1.84	1.36	2.06	2.38
Item 32	1.82	2.15	2.36	2.36	2.08	2.07	2.35	2.00
Item 33	1.64	1.23	1.79	1.64	1.56	1.50	1.53	1.88
Item 34	2.30	2.25	2.17	2.55	2.08	2.67	2.06	1.86
Item 35	2.55	2.00	2.00	2.21	2.21	2.43	1.94	2.43
Item 36	2.10	1.54	1.93	2.29	1.58	1.92	1.77	1.88
Item 37	2.30	1.77	2.14	2.21	1.96	2.00	2.06	2.13
Item 38	1.75	2.17	1.25	1.83	1.76	1.80	1.88	1.50
Item 39	1.64	1.54	1.79	1.50	1.84	1.57	1.59	2.25
Item 40	2.64	2.31	2.79	2.50	2.68	2.14	2.77	3.13
Item 41	2.00	1.92	1.64	2.07	1.68	1.93	1.88	1.50
Item 42	1.44	1.83	1.83	1.82	1.65	1.75	1.64	1.75
Item 43	2.00	2.08	1.54	1.92	1.83	1.83	1.88	1.86
Item 44	2.50	2.00	1.79	2.21	1.96	2.15	2.00	2.00
Item 45	2.46	1.92	2.29	2.64	2.00	2.36	2.24	2.00
Item 46	2.00	2.00	2.36	2.21	2.12	2.14	2.12	2.25

APPENDIX D

MEANS FOR TEACHERS CLASSIFIED ON THE
BASIS OF SELECTED VARIABLES

MEANS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS SUBDIVIDED ON THE BASIS OF
SELECTED PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Grade		Years of Teaching Exp.		
	K - 3	4 - 6	1 - 4	5 - 9	10
Item 1	1.57	1.71	1.48	1.91	1.53
Item 2	1.89	1.96	1.75	2.04	2.06
Item 3	2.03	2.15	2.22	1.90	2.14
Item 4	1.44	1.35	1.07	1.78	1.42
Item 5	1.64	1.47	1.22	2.08	1.52
Item 6	1.69	1.75	1.41	2.07	1.79
Item 7	1.70	1.85	1.50	2.14	1.77
Item 8	1.98	1.71	1.67	2.00	1.94
Item 9	1.61	1.32	1.10	1.64	1.67
Item 10	1.66	1.54	1.29	1.95	1.66
Item 11	1.81	1.53	1.46	2.00	1.59
Item 12	1.97	1.88	1.93	2.00	1.82
Item 13	1.72	1.94	1.64	2.04	1.85
Item 14	1.83	1.91	1.62	2.09	2.00
Item 15	1.60	1.69	1.36	1.94	1.72
Item 17	1.84	1.65	1.70	1.89	1.63
Item 18	1.96	1.76	1.79	2.04	1.73
Item 19	2.15	2.00	2.14	2.26	1.73
Item 20	2.03	2.02	1.83	2.22	2.09
Item 21	2.23	2.39	2.25	2.59	2.03
Item 22	2.10	2.06	1.93	2.26	2.09
Item 23	1.74	1.23	1.35	1.75	1.33
Item 24	1.86	1.52	1.69	1.91	1.41
Item 25	1.76	1.55	1.61	1.94	1.38
Item 26	1.71	1.89	1.33	1.67	1.34
Item 27	1.57	1.44	1.44	1.77	1.27
Item 28	1.86	1.50	1.57	1.88	1.58
Item 29	1.66	1.56	1.10	2.00	1.78
Item 30	1.94	1.39	1.74	1.75	1.47
Item 31	2.00	1.82	1.88	2.13	1.67
Item 32	2.03	1.83	1.76	2.22	1.85
Item 33	2.00	1.71	1.76	2.20	1.55
Item 34	2.25	2.03	2.20	2.25	1.90
Item 35	2.00	1.63	1.75	1.98	1.72
Item 36	1.94	1.99	1.79	2.00	2.21
Item 37	2.03	1.97	1.80	2.24	2.03
Item 38	2.02	1.82	2.09	1.91	1.62
Item 39	2.00	1.39	1.86	1.64	1.50
Item 40	2.20	1.61	2.03	1.93	1.68
Item 41	1.83	1.55	1.83	1.67	1.50
Item 42	1.84	1.73	1.83	1.90	1.56
Item 43	1.78	1.94	1.76	2.05	1.79
Item 44	1.70	2.08	1.86	2.09	1.63
Item 45	1.89	2.17	2.02	2.28	1.66
Item 46	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.98	2.12

light

	Grade		Years of Teaching, Exp.		
	K - 3	4 - 6	1 - 4	5 - 9	10
Item 47	2.12	2.06	1.85	2.36	2.13
Item 49	2.03	1.92	1.63	2.23	2.24
Item 50	2.07	1.83	1.78	2.07	2.13
Item 51	1.73	1.54	1.52	1.73	2.69
Item 52	2.04	1.75	1.86	1.96	1.88
Item 53	1.50	1.39	1.34	1.48	1.58
Item 54	1.84	1.60	1.62	1.97	1.57
Item 55	1.49	1.35	1.25	1.64	1.46
Item 56	1.46	1.20	1.02	1.80	1.32
Item 57	2.07	1.73	1.76	1.98	2.06
Item 58	1.58	1.34	1.13	1.74	1.77
Item 59	1.56	2.02	1.92	2.07	2.00
Item 60	1.97	1.78	1.81	2.02	1.79
Item 61	1.94	1.81	1.68	2.09	1.94
Item 63	1.76	1.94	1.73	1.96	1.91
Item 64	1.88	1.78	1.71	2.02	1.77
Item 65	1.86	1.32	1.55	1.78	1.46
Item 66	2.05	1.62	1.86	1.92	1.79
Item 67	2.14	2.09	1.93	2.35	2.12
Item 68	2.24	1.99	1.98	2.26	2.15
Item 69	2.25	1.99	2.02	2.18	2.18
Item 70	2.20	2.05	1.98	2.20	2.27
Item 71	1.09	.59	.81	.96	.80
Item 72	.97	.63	.76	.95	.73
Item 73	1.84	1.50	1.55	1.98	1.48
Item 74	1.67	1.41	1.23	1.98	1.48
Item 76	2.03	1.82	2.12	1.75	1.82
Item 77	2.03	1.64	1.82	1.89	1.81
Item 78	2.08	2.00	2.02	2.09	2.03
Item 79	2.07	1.57	1.98	1.67	1.80
Item 80	1.87	1.59	1.83	1.76	1.53
Item 81	.90	.88	.81	.97	.90
Item 82	1.39	1.39	1.24	1.57	1.39
Item 83	.83	.84	.69	.74	1.14
Item 84	1.68	1.57	1.59	1.77	1.48
Item 85	1.88	1.39	1.84	1.48	1.42
Item 86	2.01	1.97	1.88	1.89	2.32
Item 87	1.60	1.59	1.27	1.70	1.93

	Qualifications		School Size			Sex	
	1 - 3	4 - 6	6 - 10	11 - 20	21	Male	Female
Item 1	1.51	1.77	1.21	1.75	2.00	1.75	1.60
Item 2	1.85	2.00	1.98	1.94	1.81	1.91	1.93
Item 3	2.13	2.05	1.78	2.23	2.16	1.97	2.13
Item 4	1.49	1.30	1.43	1.40	1.34	1.23	1.45
Item 5	1.70	1.40	1.47	1.58	1.65	1.36	1.62
Item 6	1.83	1.59	1.44	1.80	1.91	1.93	1.66
Item 7	1.88	1.66	1.74	1.77	1.81	1.87	1.74
Item 8	1.95	1.75	2.03	1.81	1.73	1.48	1.95
Item 9	1.43	1.51	1.32	1.55	1.53	.96	1.60
Item 10	1.67	1.52	1.61	1.67	1.45	1.57	1.61
Item 11	1.65	1.71	1.56	1.66	1.85	1.55	1.71
Item 12	1.81	2.05	1.84	2.03	1.85	1.63	2.02
Item 13	1.92	1.72	1.84	1.77	1.91	1.88	1.81
Item 14	1.94	1.79	1.84	1.82	2.00	1.90	1.86
Item 15	1.65	1.65	1.63	1.57	1.82	1.65	1.65
Item 17	1.55	1.95	.09	.10	0.00	.19	.04
Item 18	1.85	1.88	1.60	1.69	2.03	1.74	1.75
Item 19	2.20	1.94	1.79	1.92	1.85	1.81	1.88
Item 20	1.99	2.06	1.88	2.20	2.09	1.91	2.13
Item 21	2.29	2.33	2.09	1.90	2.16	1.78	2.10
Item 22	2.04	2.12	2.22	2.46	2.15	2.43	2.27
Item 23	1.52	1.46	2.07	2.07	21.3	1.97	2.11
Item 24	1.65	1.75	1.50	1.64	1.20	1.23	1.58
Item 25	1.57	1.77	1.71	1.73	1.62	1.59	1.73
Item 26	1.45	1.46	1.48	1.74	1.78	1.77	1.63
Item 27	1.45	1.57	1.57	1.54	1.13	1.19	1.54
Item 28	1.72	1.63	1.29	1.62	1.58	1.42	1.54
Item 29	1.67	1.53	1.63	1.82	1.49	1.32	1.73
Item 30	1.64	1.72	1.63	1.67	1.47	1.59	1.62
Item 31	2.03	1.79	1.65	1.79	1.52	1.41	1.77
Item 32	1.99	1.88	2.00	1.82	1.97	1.86	1.92
Item 33	1.81	1.91	1.81	1.82	2.30	1.84	1.96
Item 34	2.33	1.95	1.70	1.93	1.94	1.69	1.91
Item 35	1.84	1.81	1.95	2.13	2.41	1.90	2.22
Item 36	1.95	1.98	1.50	1.89	2.10	1.53	1.91
Item 37	2.00	2.00	1.74	2.00	2.19	1.90	1.98
Item 38	1.92	1.92	1.93	1.95	2.18	1.94	2.02
Item 39	1.74	1.66	1.95	1.95	1.83	1.60	2.02
Item 40	2.03	1.79	1.62	1.85	1.55	1.22	1.85
Item 41	1.70	1.68	2.02	1.97	1.67	1.47	2.05
Item 42	1.71	1.87	1.64	1.65	1.85	1.25	1.83
Item 43	1.84	1.88	1.51	1.74	2.19	1.53	1.87
Item 44	1.91	1.84	1.90	1.87	1.78	1.66	1.92
Item 45	1.94	2.11	1.80	1.80	2.13	1.84	1.89
Item 46	1.86	1.99	2.00	1.97	2.15	1.97	2.04
Item 47	2.19	1.98	1.84	1.98	1.91	1.66	2.00
Item 49	2.06	1.89	2.13	1.98	2.26	1.72	2.20
Item 50	2.03	1.88	0.00	.08	.13	.09	.06

	Qualifications		School Size			Sex	
	1 - 3	4 - 6	6 - 10	11 - 20	21	Male	Female
Item 51	1.74	1.51	2.14	1.92	1.87	1.77	2.04
Item 52	1.85	1.96	1.88	1.95	2.06	1.68	1.04
Item 53	1.58	1.32	1.50	1.86	2.10	1.48	1.67
Item 54	1.82	1.63	1.74	2.00	2.19	1.56	2.00
Item 55	1.56	1.29	1.93	1.95	2.18	1.22	1.52
Item 56	1.49	1.20	1.95	1.95	1.83	1.31	1.83
Item 57	1.90	1.91	1.62	1.85	1.55	1.50	1.39
Item 58	1.59	1.33	2.02	1.97	1.67	1.35	1.33
Item 59	2.04	1.92	1.64	1.65	1.85	1.44	2.05
Item 60	1.84	1.92	1.51	1.74	2.19	1.26	1.53
Item 61	1.82	1.94	1.90	1.87	1.78	1.94	2.00
Item 63	1.86	1.83	1.80	1.80	2.13	1.59	1.96
Item 64	1.80	1.86	2.00	1.97	2.15	1.66	1.94
Item 65	1.54	1.68	1.84	1.98	1.91	0.00	.05
Item 66	1.79	1.94	2.13	1.98	2.26	1.84	1.85
Item 67	2.10	2.14	0.00	.08	.13	1.72	1.86
Item 68	2.14	2.09	2.14	1.92	1.87	1.28	1.70
Item 69	2.22	2.02	1.88	1.95	2.06	1.33	1.99
Item 70	2.15	2.09	1.78	1.51	1.66	1.92	2.17
Item 71	1.18	.50	2.00	1.85	1.85	1.88	2.19
Item 72	.97	.66	1.36	1.50	1.43	1.72	2.24
Item 73	1.67	1.69	1.51	1.67	2.07	1.63	2.27
Item 74	1.66	1.42	1.29	1.44	1.52	.25	1.06
Item 76	2.11	1.72	1.36	1.32	1.33	.33	1.00
Item 77	1.85	1.84	2.00	1.87	1.85	1.28	1.81
Item 78	1.96	2.14	1.79	1.34	1.32	1.09	1.70
Item 79	1.81	1.86	1.79	1.98	2.24	0.00	0.00
Item 80	1.68	1.80	1.93	1.77	2.00	1.53	2.05
Item 81	.89	.89	1.98	1.82	1.85	1.34	2.00
Item 82	1.54	1.24	.07	0.00	.06	1.75	2.13
Item 83	.93	.77	1.93	1.74	1.94	1.39	1.97
Item 84	1.59	1.66	1.71	1.79	2.06	1.55	1.80
Item 85	1.53	1.71	1.57	1.52	1.81	.58	.98
Item 86	1.96	2.03	1.77	1.94	1.86	.87	1.54
Item 87	1.82	1.34	2.23	2.15	1.91	.50	.93

27652

