

AN INVESTIGATION COMPARING TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR
PERCEPTION OF THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES OF
TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

Paul J. Smith

Major Professor

F. L. Elder

Committee Member

Charles J. Cross

Committee Member

Swann Kingery

Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulouse

Dean of the Graduate School

AN INVESTIGATION COMPARING TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR
PERCEPTION OF THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES OF
TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Wayne Hendrick, B. S., M. S.

Denton, Texas

January, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | v |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | |
| Purpose of the Study | |
| Hypotheses | |
| Background and Significance of the Study | |
| Definition of Terms | |
| Limitations of the Study | |
| Procedures for Collecting Data | |
| Development of the Questionnaire | |
| Method of Selecting the Sample | |
| Method of Analyzing the Data | |
| II. SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE | .24 |
| Professional Growth | |
| The Professional Staff | |
| III. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS | .49 |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 1 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 2 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 3 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 4 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 5 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 6 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 7 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 8 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 9 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 10 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 11 | |
| Analysis of Data Concerning Hypothesis 12 | |
| IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . | 102 |
| Summary | |
| Conclusions | |
| Recommendations | |

| | Page |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX A: Questionnaire Statement | .117 |
| APPENDIX B: Letters to Panel of Judges | .126 |
| APPENDIX C: Letters to Superintendents and Classroom Teacher Presidents | .128 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | .130 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Actual Role of School Superintendents as Perceived by School Superintendents and Classroom Teacher Presidents in Small School Systems | 50 |
| II. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Actual Role of School Superintendents as Perceived by School Superintendents and Classroom Teacher Presidents in Large School Systems | 60 |
| III. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Ideal Role of School Superintendents as Perceived by School Superintendents and Classroom Teacher Presidents in Small School Systems | 68 |
| IV. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Ideal Role of School Superintendents as Perceived by School Superintendents and Classroom Teacher Presidents in Large School Systems | 74 |
| V. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Actual and Ideal Roles of School Superintendents as Perceived by Classroom Teacher Presidents in Small School Systems | 78 |
| VI. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Actual and Ideal Roles of School Superintendents as Perceived by Classroom Teacher Presidents in Large School Systems | 81 |
| VII. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Actual Role of School Superintendents as Perceived by Classroom Teacher Presidents in Small and Large School Systems | 84 |
| VIII. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Ideal Role of School Superintendents as Perceived by Classroom Teacher Presidents in Small and Large School Systems | 87 |

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| IX. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Actual Role of School Superintendents as Perceived by School Superintendents in Large and Small School Systems | .91 |
| X. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Ideal Role of School Superintendents as Perceived by School Superintendents in Large and Small School Systems | .94 |
| XI. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Actual and Ideal Roles of School Superintendents as Perceived by School Superintendents in Large School Systems | .97 |
| XII. Summary of t Tests Between Mean Item Weights for the Actual and Ideal Roles of School Superintendents as Perceived by School Superintendents in Small School Systems | 100 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The superintendency of public schools is one of the most crucial and perhaps most difficult positions in American life today. The occupant of this position, possibly more than any other single person in the community, influences the shape of public education. Thus he has a basic role in determining what will become of the young people of his community, and through them what his community and the nation will become (14, p. 1).

There is little question that the job of the superintendent should be done well. But the superintendency is today further complicated by the great changes which are sweeping civilization. Among these changes are the growth of knowledge and its impact on life, the population explosion, rural depopulation and urban growth, technological progress, and widespread demand for greater involvement in the development of policies and regulations which affect the individual's role. Though all these changes and the corresponding impacts on education are worthy of investigation, this study will center on the latter one--the policies and regulations affecting the individual's role.

The superintendent's many functions all focus on a single goal: to provide for the best possible education in

his community. This means creating conditions in which people can get things done and, above all, in which the teacher in the classroom can perform to the best of his ability.

Traditionally, the superintendent and the school board have established policies and regulations governing the conditions of performance of the teacher in the classroom. Increasingly today, teachers and their organizations are seeking and obtaining a role in the formulation of major policies, especially on welfare matters which affect the quality of their teaching, such as salaries and conditions of service. There is little doubt that this is a development which should be encouraged, but many questions remain unanswered about the proper role of the superintendent in such matters.

It is believed that the superintendent should be able to identify what he is actually doing and what he should ideally be doing in carrying out the functions of his position in matters of concern to the teaching personnel. It is also believed that the presidents of the classroom teacher associations, who would be representative of the teaching staff, should be able to identify what the school superintendent is actually and ideally doing in carrying out the function of his position. The degree to which the superintendent and the president of the classroom teachers perceive this actual and ideal role may account for much of the present desire of the teachers to play a more direct part in matters affecting them.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to compare concepts of the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents as they are perceived by superintendents and by classroom teacher presidents.

Purpose of the Study

Seven critical task areas in which the superintendent functions in relation to teachers have been identified. These areas are instruction and supervision, staff personnel, pupil personnel, public relations, school finance, plant development and maintenance, and professional relations (7). The purpose of this study was to analyze the views of both superintendents and classroom teacher presidents concerning certain questions as they relate to the role of the school superintendent. The questions studied were

1. To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in small school systems?
2. To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in large school systems?
3. To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher

presidents and school superintendents in small school systems?

4. To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in large school systems?
5. To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents in small school systems?
6. To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents in large school systems?
7. To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by classroom teacher presidents in small and large school systems?
8. To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by classroom teacher presidents in small and large school systems?
9. To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by school superintendents in large and small school systems?
10. To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by school superintendents in large and small school systems?

11. To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike as perceived by school superintendents in large school districts?
12. To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike as perceived by school superintendents in small school districts?

Hypotheses

The major hypotheses to be drawn were

1. There will be no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents perceive the actual role of superintendents in small school systems.
2. There will be no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents perceive the actual role of superintendents in large school systems.
3. There will be no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents perceive the ideal role of superintendents in small school systems.
4. There will be no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents perceive the ideal role of superintendents in large school systems.
5. There will be no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents perceive the actual

and ideal roles of school superintendents in small school systems.

6. There will be no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents perceive the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents in large school systems.
7. There will be no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents perceive the actual role of school superintendents in small and large school systems.
8. There will be no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents perceive the ideal role of school superintendents in small and large school systems.
9. There will be no significant difference between the actual role of school superintendents as it is perceived by school superintendents in large and in small school systems.
10. There will be no significant difference between the ideal role of school superintendents as it is perceived by school superintendents in large and in small school systems.
11. There will be no significant difference between the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents as perceived by school superintendents in large school districts.

12. There will be no significant difference between the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents as perceived by school superintendents in small school districts.

Background and Significance of the Study

The regulations of the state require the local governing school board to employ a superintendent of schools. By precedent the superintendent functions as the executive officer of the local board. The board depends upon him to furnish the professional counsel necessary in formulating policies for the school district.

Traditionally, the superintendent, as a professional educator, is thought to be the educational leader of the school district. As the appointed executive officer of the board, it is his responsibility to help evaluate the effectiveness of the educational enterprise and the extent to which it is meeting the needs of the young people. It is his responsibility to execute policies which the board establishes and to inform the board of the extent to which effectiveness of the program is promoted or hindered by these policies. Teachers have had little voice in policies affecting their role (16, p. 264). Where teachers and administrators have held different concepts of how the school should be operated, morale has been low and efficiency lacking.

As early as 1903, John Dewey was pleading that teachers should have some voice in school administration:

If there is a single public school system in the United States where there is official and constitutional provision made for submitting questions of methods of discipline and teaching, and the questions of the curriculum, textbooks, etc., to the discussion of those actually engaged in the work of teaching, that fact has escaped my notice. Indeed, the opposite situation is so common that it seems, as a rule, to be absolutely taken for granted as the normal and final condition of affairs.--But until the public-school system is organized in such a way that every teacher has some regular and representative way in which he or she can register judgement upon matters of educational importance, with the assurance that this judgement will somehow affect the school system, the assertion that the present system is not, from the internal standpoint, democratic, seems to be justified (8).

Wahlquist (22, p. 21) states that

In American education, theory always paces practice. For some time, the critics have been harping on the inconsistencies in American school administration. While it may be conceded that education in a totalitarian government must be authoritarian, many thinkers have wondered why education under our form of government is not more democratic. Teachers resent situations where they serve merely as instruments in the hands of others, where they are not free to organize their own professional activities, and where they are compelled to operate in isolation from other members of the group. In brief, they clamor for more professional freedom.

Presently organized teacher groups are questioning the traditional position of the superintendent. With greater teacher organization and activity, the perceived role of the superintendent is beginning to change for a large number of teachers (10, p. 349).

Some see the time when the total operation of the school system will become the accepted and recognized subject of teacher-board negotiations. Others see the superintendent in a new and creative role absorbing the impact of negotiation from both boards and teachers.

Rasmussen (17, p. 10) believes the superintendent of the future will be the significant third voice in matters of negotiation and policy making. At the bargaining table where the taxpayer is represented on one side and the taxearner on the other, he will represent the student of his district.

Clark (6) found that teachers respect the traditional role of the superintendent in initiating policy development. However, teachers do feel that issues directly concerning their welfare should be subject to negotiation. He also concluded that it appears questionable whether the superintendent in negotiation can continue to perform the traditional role of serving both the board and teachers.

There seem to be several forces which might be causative factors in the desire of teachers to organize for negotiation, such things as the new public awareness that education is the prime implementation of our national purpose and the corresponding prestige given to teachers, trends toward national uniformity of teacher attitudes and professional goals, the numerical supremacy of the teachers at the polls and in the lobbies of Congress, the realization that a "true professional" has autonomy over the job, and the desire to

participate to a greater extent in the high standard of living. However, the factors which have thus far been recognized as trouble areas do not directly pinpoint these.

Metzler and Knade (12, p. 12) found that most administrators say that they use the consultative process as a matter of course in educational decision making. However, in essence the use of consultation was found to be irregular, haphazard, and without plan. They concluded that to give teachers a true voice in resolving educational problems, consultation must be continuous, planned, and have structure. The lack of such procedure leaves teachers with relatively little effective voice in decision making. Such frustration of teachers could well be a factor in the move to intensify organization.

Benner (4), in an investigation comparing teacher and superintendent perceptions of actual and ideal decision-making participation patterns, found that teachers tended to think that they were less involved in district decision making than the superintendents thought they were.

Howell (9) was interested in finding the extent to which educational planning for new facilities provided flexibility for new curricular innovations and to what extent educational consultants were used. He found that the major role in planning (educational) the new facility was played by the superintendent, and the importance of the educational consultant (teachers and others) does not appear to be

understood by superintendents. Likewise, that superintendents failed to give sufficient consideration to future curricular innovations in planning schools.

Many small things in building design make a lot of difference in the successful implementation of the desired educational program to be housed. When teachers are not consulted in the development of educational specifications and the resulting building is poorly designed, it seems quite possible that resentment could develop.

Alonzo (1, p. 29) stated, "that education is being threatened from within by the growing rift between teacher and administrator." He feels that in many schools the respected teacher of yesterday is the suspected teacher of today simply because he has taken a new educational stance. Much of this suspicion comes from administrators who feel that they have, in the past, diligently worked for teacher welfare and that this new stance is a display of ingratitude.

Griffin (18, p. 8) feels that this new stance is no longer debatable; it is a fact of life. Some of the reasons presented are that the patronizing master-servant attitude of the superintendent is outmoded, professional teachers are utilized in too many unprofessional activities and duties, and that effective school administration necessitates providing teachers a role in policy formation.

Sharma (23), in a study to find those prominent factors affecting the job satisfaction of teachers, concludes that

teacher satisfaction is a function of the extent to which teachers participate in decision making, especially the degree to which practice in decision making conforms to practice felt by the teacher to be desirable.

Bidwell (5) found that the extent to which teachers felt that school administrators were fulfilling the teacher's expectations regarding leadership style has a high degree of positive association between such fulfillment and satisfaction with the job. He also found that the quality of expectations is irrelevant to this relationship; either authoritarian or democratic expectations might be held and either, if fulfilled, would lead to satisfaction.

Another lack of understanding on the part of the superintendent which might lead to conflict with teachers was found by Sergiovanni (20). His study of factors which affect job satisfaction of teachers led him to conclude that teacher job satisfaction tends to come from the work itself, while job dissatisfaction tends to focus on the conditions of work.

Although professional negotiation was originally conceived as a way of lessening overt tension between teachers and administrators, the doctrine and practice of professional negotiation have instead tended to heighten tensions and exacerbate suspicions. Rising militancy and mass resignations in recent months are signs that teachers are dissatisfied with their roles (16, p. 264). Although money is usually

listed with the points of discontent, other items of concern to teachers are high on the list.

Teachers are demanding inclusion in the decision-making process in education. These demands have often been met with hostility from superintendents. These conflicts are placing definite strains upon the present organizational structure in education.

School superintendents recognize that today's teacher is better trained and more professional than just a few years ago. But how he will adjust his traditional role to include teachers in policy development and simultaneously keep harmony with his school board and the power structure of the community is a question which merits investigation.

First, research must pinpoint those relationships between superintendent and staff which really concern today's teacher. When these concerns have been found, the skillful superintendent can so structure his leadership role to use this new teacher interest in strengthening the educational programs.

Definition of Terms

Superintendent's actual role. The superintendent's actual role will be determined by the manner in which the subject emphasizes the concepts so that they best describe what he perceives a superintendent to be doing in carrying out the functions and activities of a given superintendency.

Superintendent's ideal role. The superintendent's ideal role will be determined by the manner in which the subject emphasizes the concepts so that they best describe what he thinks a superintendent should be doing in carrying out the functions and activities of a given superintendency.

Jury. Individuals recognized as authorities in the field of school administration.

Small school systems. Schools with fewer than 5,000 pupils in average daily attendance as listed in the Annual Statistical Report from the Texas Education Agency for the 1966-67 school year (3).

Large school systems. Schools with 5,000 or more pupils in average daily attendance as listed in the Texas Education Agency bulletin cited above.

Limitations of the Study

1. The subjects were limited to school districts in the state of Texas which have both a superintendent and a classroom teacher association.
2. The study was limited by the nature of the forced-choice questionnaire. It is possible that some subjects were not able to clearly define the superintendent's role.
3. All conclusions drawn concerning the role of the superintendent were limited to concepts presented in the questionnaire.

4. Interpretation of the results was subject to the accuracy of testing for significance by Fisher's t.

Basic Assumptions

1. It was assumed that adequate and reliable data can be secured through questionnaires.
2. It was assumed that the conclusions drawn can be applied to all superintendents of schools.
3. It was assumed that the subjects filled out the questionnaire objectively.
4. It was assumed that no teacher sanctions or other unusual circumstances affected this study.

Procedure for Collecting Data

The first consideration in collecting data was the construction of a questionnaire, from which the basic data for the study were received. A list of statements concerning the duties and functions of the school superintendent as related directly to teachers was developed from a survey of professional publications and authoritative opinion. The Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (7) has identified several critical task areas in school administration. Six of these areas--instruction and curriculum, staff personnel, pupil personnel, finance, public relations and school facilities--relate directly to superintendent-teacher relationships. These six administrative areas, along with a seventh area, professional relations, were used to categorize

functions of the superintendent for the development of the questionnaire.

Another consideration of primary importance was the selection of the subjects. A basic consideration of this study involves both large and small school systems. The school systems were designated large and small on the basis of the average daily attendance. The subjects were selected from those school districts both large and small which had local classroom teacher associations. Questionnaires were mailed to all local classroom teacher presidents, in both groups, and to their superintendents of schools. A total of four hundred questionnaires were mailed: fifty-two to large school classroom teacher presidents, one hundred forty-eight to small school presidents, and a corresponding number to their school districts' superintendents.

The next consideration was the collection of data. An introductory post card was mailed to the subjects about two weeks prior to mailing the questionnaire, informing them of this doctoral study and requesting their cooperation. A cover letter further explaining the study and soliciting assistance and cooperation accompanied each questionnaire. Each subject was asked to indicate the degree of emphasis on each of the functions listed according to two frames of reference: (1) what the school superintendent actually does in performing the functions of the position; (2) what the

school superintendent should ideally do in performing the functions of the position.

The collected data were computed and statistically analyzed in part by the investigator and in part by the Computer Center, North Texas State University. The statistical procedure utilized to analyze the data was the Fisher's t test.

Development of the Questionnaire

A list of concepts concerning the duties and functions of the public school superintendent was developed from a survey of professional publications, previous studies, and authoritative opinion. These concepts were categorized, in main, under critical task areas as defined in a study conducted by Truman Pierce and C. E. Merrill in connection with the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (7). One additional critical task area, Professional Relations, was included in the study because of recent developments in public school staff relationships.

The seven administrative areas used to categorize the concepts for the questionnaire development were as follows: (1) instruction and curriculum, (2) staff personnel, (3) pupil personnel, (4) finance, (5) public relations, (6) plant development and maintenance, and (7) professional relations. A panel of jurors was then selected to validate the questionnaire. The jury was comprised of recognized authorities in the field of school administration. All had served as a

superintendent of schools, and all were at this time serving education in other capacities. Six were chairmen of the Departments of Educational Administration of six Texas colleges and universities, one was the director of professional and public relations for the Texas State Teachers Association, and one was the director of the Texas Association for School Administrators.

These jurors were mailed copies of the categorized duties and functions of the school superintendent. They were requested to select the ten most representative functions describing what the school superintendent should be doing in each of the seven categories. In categories where the juror did not find as many as ten different concepts which he considered appropriate to this study, he was requested to select only the pertinent ones. Only eight concepts were selected in one of the categories; therefore, the final questionnaire contained a total of sixty-eight statements.

Method of Selecting the Sample

The next consideration was the selection of the subjects for the study. According to the 1966 Annual Statistical Report of the Texas Education Agency (3) 60 percent of the students in Texas public schools were enrolled in school districts with an average daily attendance of 5,000 or more. Approximately 40 percent of the students were enrolled in school districts with an average daily attendance of fewer than 5,000 students. For the purpose of this study, all

Texas school districts, which have both offices: school superintendents and classroom teacher association presidents, were divided into two groups: (1) districts with an average daily attendance of more than 5,000 students; (2) districts with an average daily attendance of fewer than 5,000 students.

The Texas Classroom Teachers Association was requested to provide a list of presidents of all local classroom teacher associations in Texas, by school districts. The names of the corresponding school superintendents were obtained from the Texas Education Agency (15). Questionnaires were mailed to both the school superintendent and the president of the classroom teacher association in that district. A total of two hundred school systems were included in this study: fifty-two large and one hundred forty-eight small systems.

Method of Analyzing the Data

In using the forced choice questionnaire (Appendix A), the subject was asked to indicate the degree of emphasis the superintendent placed on a given function, both in his actual and ideal role, in performing the functions of the position. The subject could select from four degrees of emphasis in expressing what he felt the school superintendent was actually doing and what ideally he should be doing with each function. A weight of 4 signified much emphasis was placed on the response, 3 some, 2 little, and 1 no emphasis.

The tenability of the hypotheses was determined by using the Fisher t to test the significance of difference between the means obtained for each item in the questionnaire. Sixty-eight t tests were computed for each of twelve hypotheses totaling 816 t 's. The .05 level of confidence was required for the acceptance or rejection of each t test. The hypothesis was accepted or rejected on the basis of the number of items with t -ratios significant at the .05 level of confidence. A majority of the total items must have had significant t -ratios for the rejection of a hypothesis. The converse was true for the acceptance of a hypothesis.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alonzo, Braulio, "Commitment to Action," The National Education Association Journal, September, 1967, p. 29.
2. American Association of School Administrators, Staff Relations in School Administration, 33rd Yearbook, Washington, D. C., Department of NEA, 1955.
3. Annual Statistical Report, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, 1966.
4. Benner, Thomas E., "An Investigation Comparing Teacher and Administrator Perception of Actual and Ideal Decision-Making Participation Patterns in Selected Elementary School Districts in Illinois," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966.
5. Bidwell, C. E., "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (September, 1955), 41-48.
6. Clark, Robert L., "The Role and Position of the NEA and the AFT in Collective Negotiation: Opinion of Teachers and School Administrators in Five Selected School Districts in Illinois," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Illinois, 1965.
7. Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration, A Competency Approach to Improving Preparation Programs in Educational Administration, Nashville, McCuddy Printing Co., 1955.
8. Dewey, John, "Democracy in Education," The Elementary School Teacher, III (Fall, 1903), 18-22.
9. Howell, G. F., "The Significance of Educational Planning of the Physical Plant in Adapting to Curricular Innovations," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1967.
10. Hunt, John J., "Politics in the Role of the Superintendent," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (February, 1968), 348-350.

11. Indiana and Midwest School Building Planning Conference: "Proceedings: Planning Educationally Sound Buildings at Low Cost," Bulletin, School of Education, 29: 1-102, Bloomington, Indiana, University of Indiana, November, 1953.
12. Metzler, John H. and Oscar Knade, Jr., "A Tranquilizer for Negotiation," The American School Board Journal, 155 (December, 1967), 12-14.
13. National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Programs for Preparing Educational Administrators in 1950, Fourth Work-Conference held at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, August, 1950.
14. National Education Association, The Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools, Washington, D. C., Educational Policies Commission, 1965.
15. Public School Directory, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, 1967-68.
16. Rand, M. J. and Fenwick English, "Towards a Differential Teaching Staff," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (January, 1968), 264-268.
17. Rasmussen, L. V., "New Role for the Middleman," American School Board Journal, 155 (February, 1968), 10-11.
18. Russell, Dwane, "Professional Negotiations," Texas Association for Supervisors and Curriculum Development Newsletter, III, No. 1, (January, 1966), 8.
19. Sandler, Steven, "Perceptions of the Actual and Ideal Roles of Texas Public School Superintendents," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1968.
20. Sergiovanni, T. J., "An Investigation of Factors Which Affect Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction of Teachers," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1966.
21. Strevell, W. H. and Aruid J. Burke, Administration of the School Building Program, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959.
22. Wahlquist, J. T., Administration of Public Education, New York, Ronald Press Co., 1952.

23. "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook III, April, 1955, No. 8.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will contain a survey of the literature concerning the development of the role of the public school superintendent. The historical development will be reviewed along with several related studies to help develop an understanding of the superintendent-teacher relationships which serve as a basis for this study.

Superintendents of schools were historically assigned only those duties which the board chose to delegate. Early boards were reluctant to grant duties which might give the administrator undesired power. There still existed a strong anti-executive tradition among the American colonists and this attitude was evident in the early state constitutions adopted from 1775 to 1800 (20). The anti-executive attitude can be explained, in part, by the activities of royal governors who represented the first image of an executive developed by the colonists. The image or conception of an administrator was a person with little concern for the best interest of the people in general and who was primarily concerned with feathering his own nest.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the development of a full-time professionally prepared individual as an

executive officer in the public schools was delayed until almost 200 years after the start of the American system of public education. During this period the town meeting was the legislative body and also the executive agency. Policy making and policy execution were not separated during the early history of education. They were to be joined together for so long that it would take a century or more to see the need for distinguishing between these functions. However, as the urban population began to grow, it soon became apparent that the "town meeting" which worked in the rural community failed to be effective with a larger population.

The first reaction was the creation of another version of lay administration of schools. School committees or local boards of education were delegated legislative and executive responsibilities during the early years of the nineteenth century. The image of the administrator of public education became the school committee or the board of education. To cope with increasing enrollment and the complexity of instructional supervision, as well as compelling children to attend school and collecting financial resources for schools, school boards grew rather large. The unwieldy size led to the organization of permanent or standing committees to supervise and inspect the schools at somewhat regular intervals.

With the continued growth in urban population and with rapid industrial and business development, school affairs soon began to take more time away from private jobs than

most board or committee members desired. This led the more enlightened school boards to seek executive assistance from individuals who could spare the time and had some degree of professional preparation and experience in teaching (8).

The early superintendent was considered an agent or assistant to the board. The typical board continued to exercise extensive executive power through executive committees during all of the nineteenth century (13). The superintendent was assigned the menial chores or detail work. This image of the superintendent provided little opportunity for him to express professional and leadership ability.

Baltimore offers an example showing the trials involved in creating the new post. By 1848, the board of education found itself unable to oversee the schools and recommended to the city council that a superintendent be appointed. A year later one of the board members was appointed treasurer. His duties were clerical, statistical, business, and financial. In addition, he visited the schools, kept office hours, and made reports to the public. The position proved so useful that in 1866 the title was changed from treasurer to superintendent of schools (18).

Many authors describe the development of the position of superintendent of schools by dividing it into three stages (9). The first period (1837-1910) saw the establishment of the school superintendency and witnessed its development from a position with responsibilities limited largely to

instruction and to advising the board of education to that of being the executive officer of the board with responsibilities stretching across the whole spectrum of school activities. As the period ended, both business ideology and the reform movement were gathering strength and began focusing upon the schools.

In the second period (1910-1945) the businessman superintendent emerged as the prototype. He became the executive officer of the board of education. He emphasized efficiency in operation and made educational decisions based upon business criteria. The superintendents were reinforced by professors of school administration who provided the rationale for the movement.

During the third period (1945-), aided by the Kellogg Foundation, the superintendent of schools became known as a professional school administrator. This period opened as World War II ended. The national organizations of school administrators and the Kellogg Foundation combined with many universities to inaugurate an intensive examination of the superintendency and other administrative posts. The Russian "sputnik," huge government grants, the teacher organization movement, the civil rights movement, and an intense public interest in education all combined to create a new setting for education. The question arises--what is the role of the superintendent as the social, political, and economic conditions of the society change? Griffith (9) states that the

following list is representative of the most pressing problems facing the present superintendent of schools.

1. How can schools meet the challenge of the new society being created by the introduction of automation into American life?
2. How can superintendents cope with the demand for collective action by public school teachers?
3. What must be done to solve the dilemmas posed in resolving the conflict among the races?
4. What will happen to the superintendency as a result of federal education legislation of 1965?

Though incomplete, this list indicates some of the important stresses and strains now visible.

The year 1865 saw the founding of the superintendents' national association, today called the American Association of School Administrators. At that time the office of superintendent existed in fewer than fifty cities. Its responsibilities varied widely, depending on how school boards perceived their problems. In some places the board assigned responsibility which emphasized the managerial roles of the superintendent, such as school building and business problems. In others, the board looked to the superintendent for leadership. Whatever the superintendent's functions, many members of school boards maintained direct participation in details of administration.

Even in those early years of the superintendency, there was some recognition of the need to fix supervisory responsibility upon some one person. In Providence, Rhode Island, a committee of the City Council, in urging the appointment of a superintendent, said that "he might carefully survey the whole ground and understand from time to time its actual condition. He should have knowledge of all the children--confer with the teachers and submit to the school committee a quarterly report on the conditions of the schools" (14). In Washington, D. C., the superintendent was granted authority for "everything." He was to select books, maps, apparatus, make improvements in school houses, furniture, and methods of instruction. Other duties were to encourage attendance of teachers and pupils, and to lecture to pupils on moral and scientific subjects (4).

Professional Growth

Many attempts to define the requirement of the position of superintendent have been made and many different answers have evolved. As part of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration at some university centers, exhaustive job analyses have identified hundreds of activities in which superintendents engage. One thing appeared to be certain: The concept of the administrator's position and the nature of his work is undergoing substantial change. This statement is interestingly conveyed in a W. K. Kellogg Foundation Report in 1961 (9).

Before 1950 the subject of how to do a better job of administering schools was prevalent at all conferences for school superintendents. The speakers were fellow superintendents or a college professor who had just recently left a superintendency. The administrators exchanged shop-talk on successful techniques and related how they have solved problems in their local districts. There was little or no talk about "theory." Theory might be all right for the college professor in his ivy-covered tower, but we are practical men faced with the tough job of administering real schools in real communities; and theory usually is impractical, visionary, and idealistic.

Since the year 1960, many conferences have been held for superintendents to consider the subject of theory as a guide to action in educational administration. Speakers have included psychologists, sociologists, and specialists in research design, as well as scholars in educational administration. The social scientists explain how recent research findings and theoretical formulations can serve the superintendents as guides to intelligent administrative action. And the superintendents listen intently, for they have learned that "Theory is in the end--the most practical of things."

There were some significant reasons for this change in the insights of school superintendents. Effective preservice and inservice education accounted for much of the change. During this period of time, 1950-1960, the Kellogg Foundation spent and committed several million dollars for educational administration programs. And the American Association of School Administrators took what has been called "the most significant step in the Association's ninety-four year history." At the 1959 convention a constitutional amendment was adopted requiring two years of approved graduate study at an approved institution as a qualification for membership in the AASA.

Also, many of the leading universities initiated summer seminars in educational administration.

For the profession as a whole the most significant vitalizing influence was the Cooperative Project in Educational Administration (12). This project was conceived on the basis that school administration must be studied in terms of functions performed by many, rather than as a job held by one individual. The Cooperative Project was actually eight projects rather than one. The administration of the Project was allocated to universities.

In general, the proposals of the eight institutions designated as Project Centers indicated as purposes the (1) improvement of preparation programs for the preservice training of potential administrators and the inservice training of administrators already in the field; (2) development of greater sensitivity to large social problems through an interdisciplinary approach involving most of the social sciences; (3) dissemination of research findings to practicing administrators; (4) discovery of new knowledge about education and about administration; and (5) development of continuing patterns of cooperation and communication among various universities and colleges within a region and between these institutions and other organizations and agencies working in the field of educational administration (12).

Out of this study developed three notable structural organizations for continuing study of educational

administration: the Tri-Dimensional Concept, the Competency Pattern, and the Factors Affecting Educational Administration in Ohio.

The Tri-Dimensional Concept (5) established three horizontal panels dealing respectively with the administrator's job, the kind of person he is, and the social setting in which he operates. The Competency Pattern (18) established eight critical task areas: Instruction and Curriculum Development, Pupil Personnel, Community-School Leadership, Staff Personnel, School Plant, School Transportation, Organization and Structure, and School Finance. The Ohio State Project identified nine areas of administrative behavior, and thirty-seven factors affecting administrative behavior were identified under six general headings (15). The nine areas under which most problems of administrative behavior arose were those of setting goals, making policy, determining roles, appraising effectiveness, coordinating administrative functions and structure, working with community leadership to promote improvements in education, using the educational resources of the community, involving people, and communicating. The thirty-seven factors affecting administration were classified under the following categories: the administrator himself, the persons with whom the administrator works, the relationship between the administrator and the individuals and groups with whom he works, the institutional organization, the

cultural setting, and the physical characteristics and legal provisions of the community itself (15).

As educational administration becomes a field of study and development, the difference between the "practical" and the "theoretical" turns into a search for the interplay and the relationship between practice and theory. The development of concepts, taxonomies, and theories is an essential task in bringing educational administration to the level of a professional field of study (12).

Concept development pertinent to the ideas about school administration provides for borrowing and adapting of generalizations from other fields of study. Taxonomies provide a basis for sorting and collecting ideas and facts and experiences and for organizing them so that they may be more advantageously studied. The Tri-Dimensional Concept, the Competency Pattern, and the listing of Factors Affecting Educational Administration mentioned earlier are illustrations of taxonomies. These structured organizations encourage the gathering of concepts which have been developed from experience, insights, borrowed from related fields, and from considering analogies.

Theory served as a rational explanation of how something is put together, of how it works, and of why it works that way. In the earlier exchange of administrative experiences and views, each hearer likely weighed the value of what he heard in terms of whether it matched his own notion of what

ought to be done or of what would fit the way he saw things. In an attempt to generate concepts, taxonomies, and theory, there was an effort to value what could be dependably demonstrated, regardless of who conducted the experiment. The effort was upon developing dependable definitions, classifications, and hypothetical relationships. Miller (12) felt that from this store of generalized knowledge each practitioner could establish his own practices, weighing them against the values he holds and in terms of the situational context within which he works. Theory not only then unifies educational administration, it tends to bring the whole field into focus so that the concepts and classifications are seen and relationships are put into order.

The Professional Staff

The superintendent of schools gained in status as school systems grew too large for laymen to administrate. The superintendent was appointed by the board and generally assigned certain operational functions. He was the board's right-hand man.

The dimension of his position, however, threw him into constant contact with teachers, central office staff, and others in the school system. This relationship and authority was defined by the board of education. It soon became evident that the executive post must have authority in matters of personnel; otherwise, it would be extremely difficult for the superintendent to discharge the responsibilities assigned

to him. The delegation of authority by the board over other central staff positions was of particular significance to the status of the superintendency (11).

This plan has led to a general acceptance of the unit type of organization with teachers, principals, and all other employees recognizing the superintendent as the professional administrator or chief executive of the school system. All others have a subordinate status, and their contact with the board of education should be through the superintendent of schools.

Attempts in recent years to drive a wedge between superintendents and teachers are not in the best interest of public education. School administrators are educators and have many professional interests in common with teachers. Administrators have served as teachers. Many problems in public education will go begging for a solution unless teachers and administrators join forces (11).

Working relationships between the teaching staff and the superintendent can be complicated by many layers of administrative responsibility between the two. This is particularly true in the very large and complex school districts. The one-man office of superintendent is passing rapidly from the American scene. If administration is looked upon as a means to an end, and due recognition is given to the importance of the teachers at the class level, it will be difficult indeed to justify teachers and administrators as opposing forces,

rather than a unified body of professional educators assigned various functions to perform in a complex institution (11).

The factor of teacher morale becomes much more significant as the one-man central office passes from the scene. In the layers of administration, individuality is easily lost. This was brought out in a study conducted by Western Electric. Along with the importance of morale, the general acceptance of the following truisms was revealed by this study (6).

1. Best results are obtained when teachers realize that their individuality is recognized and genuinely appreciated.
2. Best results are obtained by allowing teachers to work in areas where they have strong interest and abilities and of reducing their responsibilities in those areas in which they have less interest and fewer abilities.
3. Best results may be obtained by having a number of teachers with varying backgrounds work cooperatively on the solution of a problem.
4. Best results are obtained when teachers know their responsibilities and their commensurate authority. Concomitant with this is inclusion of a permissive atmosphere so that the teacher will not be afraid to voice his opinions or to try a new approach.

Archambault (2) found wide variance in the views of superintendents and teachers about just how high in the hierarchy of authority the teachers' voice should be heard. He drew these conclusions:

1. Teacher participation in making educational policies disturbs school administrators. They feel that teachers should not have a voice "at the higher levels" in setting educational policy.
2. Superintendents need to be aware that younger teachers desire a greater role for themselves in policy making than older teachers.
3. Superintendents should try to improve communications among board members, school administrators, and teachers; encourage personnel to attend conferences on negotiation; and involve representatives of each group in long-term cooperative studies on school problems.

Halpin (10) investigated the relationship between the superintendent's own perception of how he behaves on the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions, as contrasted with the board and staff perception. A second part of the study was to discover the corresponding relationship between the superintendent's, the board's, and the staff's belief concerning how the school superintendent should behave as a leader. Initiating structure was defined as the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and

members of the work group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration referred to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff.

The leadership behavior of 50 Ohio school superintendents was studied from responses on 1274 questionnaires. Each of the 50 superintendents received an Initiating Structure score and a Consideration score that expressed his description of his own behavior in respect to these two dimensions. Similarly, his two Ideal scores indicated what he believed his behavior should be on these dimensions. The staff scores were obtained by having members of each superintendent's staff describe his leader's behavior in contrast to what would be considered ideal behavior. The board scores were similarly obtained.

On each leader behavior dimension, the staff respondents tended to agree in the description of their respective superintendents. Likewise, the board respondents tended to agree in the description of their respective superintendents. Although the staff and the board members each agree among themselves, as a group, in their description of the superintendent's leadership behavior, the two groups do not agree with each other. Halpin (10) concluded from these findings that superintendents tend to adopt different behavioral

roles in dealing with the members of the staff and board members.

Although staff members show statistically significant agreement among their members in their descriptions of their superintendent's leadership behavior, an unbiased correlation ratio of .44 for each dimension, these findings raise a provocative question: if staff member agreement in describing the leadership behavior of superintendents is no greater than these correlations indicate, then how much attention should be given staff criticism of superintendent behavior?

In respect to consideration, the superintendents do not see themselves as either their staffs or boards see them. The staffs see the superintendents as showing less consideration than they are described as showing either by the boards or by the superintendents themselves. On both dimensions the boards tend to describe the superintendents higher than they are described by the staffs, and in this sense show greater inclination than the staffs to view their superintendents as effective leaders. Halpin suggests that the superintendents "play up to the boards"--behave, in fact, more effectively as leaders in dealing with their boards than in working with their own staffs.

The superintendents set for themselves higher standards of consideration than either the staffs or the boards set for them. The boards expect the superintendents to show greater consideration to their staffs than the staffs themselves

indicate as ideal. Likewise, school boards and superintendents felt that the superintendent should be stronger in Initiating Structure than the staff prefers.

The findings indicate that superintendents differentiate their role behavior. In dealings with board members, the superintendent is rated as an effective leader. He rates less effective when working with the school faculty; there seems to be a tendency to "let down" a little in dealing with teachers.

Sandler (17), in an investigation of the role of Texas school superintendents, found that there was no significant difference in the ways superintendents of large school districts perceived their ideal role and the way they were actually functioning on the job. This study included reaction to seventy statements under seven different categories: curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, pupil personnel, finance, transportation, community relations, and plant development. The superintendents believed that the school staff was involved in these areas to the extent they should be. However, school board presidents of these same school systems rated these superintendents as not functioning as they should in the following areas of staff relation:

1. Organizing the staff to study its needs and problems.
2. Assisting the school board in performing its function of establishing satisfactory personnel

3. Providing for the assignment (or reassignment) of staff personnel in view of the professional aspirations of the employee, the opinions of co-workers, job requirements of the school system, and personnel policies.
4. Arranging with the staff the kinds of programs which they desire to improve themselves professionally (in-service programs, workshops, short courses, etc.).

Whether school board presidents and superintendents disagree in the amount of staff participation in the above areas or if school board presidents feel that the staff is not as involved as the superintendent thinks they are involved, cannot be determined from the study. However, it is interesting to relate this investigation to the findings of Benney (6). In a comparison of teacher and administrator perception of actual decision participation patterns, teachers tended to think that they were less involved in system-wide decision making than the superintendent thought they were. Also, teachers felt that they should be more involved than the superintendent thought they ideally should be. These studies suggest the need for further study of the superintendents' behavior in relating to the faculty.

Griffiths (9) suggests that most public school teachers today do not perform as professionals. They work in fully

hours; most of them teach from syllabi which they have not prepared; and their decision making is restricted to a narrowly defined area. Teachers are normally considered by administrators as being interchangeable parts of a large machine--the school system. Many see the present interest in teacher organization as an attempt by teachers to gain the professional status denied them by the school district in which they work.

Up until World War II, in many school systems the school superintendent was the only college graduate on the staff; in others, he was generally the person with the most degrees. Therefore, he wrote the courses of study and proceeded to teach them to the teachers. Griffiths (9) feels that most superintendents, and especially the older ones, view themselves today as "teachers-of-teachers." It is highly probable that the present militancy on the part of teachers is, in large part, a reaction to this conception of the administrator-teacher relationship.

Increasingly, teachers and their organizations are seeking and obtaining a role in the formulation of major policies, especially on personnel matters which affect the quality of their teaching, such as salaries and conditions of service. Most authorities seem to agree that the superintendent should have an important role in such negotiations. Tradition places the superintendent simultaneously as agent

Teacher groups, however, are seriously questioning this dual role as evidenced by the current rift between the American Association of School Administrators and the National Education Association. The AASA executive committee has published several potential role relationships with the NEA, one being a complete withdrawal from that organization (7).

The 1966 publication of the American Association of School Administrators sounded a strong concern over some of the current inter-staff conflict (1).

Public education in the United States is handicapped by a worn-out set of policies and practices with reference to seniority and tenure. Tenure laws were written by representatives of the teaching profession after a long period of exploitation by entirely too many boards of education and superintendents of schools. They now need to be re-evaluated and rewritten. The organized teaching profession and the superintendent of schools in the United States need to back themselves into a corner and decide again whether certain of our policies and practices in this area serve the welfare of the nation and the education of her children, or whether they serve stagnation and the exploitation of educational opportunity for too many young citizens.

The teaching profession has a right to demand integrity in evaluation, but it has no right to get it through a process that results in no evaluation and no action to remove those of us who should not continue to teach. The current development of direct negotiation between teacher representatives and the public or the public's representatives, ranging from boards of education to mayors--is dubious practice that holds more promise of grief for public education, including its teachers, than promise of long-run success. There are many developments in education that are best done by committee, but the management of a modern school system is a complicated matter; and it will never get done well by transitory boards, committees or political office holders. One of the foremost reasons for

the amazing success of this country in both private and public sectors lies in the traditional concept of centralized executive authority operating within a framework of representatively determined policies and guidelines.

Summary

The local school superintendency position began to develop in the public school systems of the United States about the middle of the nineteenth century. The trials and errors, the successes, and the creative processes which characterized the gradual evolution of this position during the many ensuing years eventually resulted in the widespread recognition and general acceptance of certain relatively fixed ideas about the role of the superintendent in the school system hierarchy.

Among the more important of these ideas are the following: (1) the superintendent should serve as the school board's chief executive officer; (2) he should be directly responsible to the board for the administration of all divisions and units of the school system; (3) he should be the educational leader of the school system; (4) he should be competent in the delicate areas of human relations, personnel administration, and staff involvement in the planning and decision-making processes; (5) he should present such policy recommendations and other recommendations to the board as will provide for the continued improvement of the school system's many affairs; and (6) he should be the chief

spokesman for the staff in its relationships with the school board.

In most states the legal status of the school superintendent position has not been well defined. For the most part, the major duties, functions and responsibilities of school superintendents are delegated to them by their own school boards, and the authority so delegated is subject to the will of the school board.

The superintendent of schools is not only confronted with the jobs of finance and of organization, of personnel management, of creative capacity in the field of education; but he is confronted with being at the center of the cross currents of social, economic, political, and even religious change and tensions in American life.

Teachers frequently feel that superintendents are in the way of educational progress and in the way of teacher welfare. During the second quarter of the nineteenth century, superintendents of schools began to be identified in America as being for cheap education. It appears that a great many classroom teachers still feel the same way about them (1).

There have been probably too few studies and investigations concerning the superintendent's role in relation to teachers. But of the existing studies, there seems to be one principle which is always present. This is the idea that while the superintendent is executing the school board's policies and providing educational leadership, teachers

desire to be more involved in those areas which directly affect them than they presently believe they are involved.

After reviewing the literature concerning the superintendent's role, it may be assumed that professional educators have not as yet come to an agreement, in the areas directly relating to the staff, on (1) whether or not school superintendents perceive their actual and ideal role to be the same and (2) whether or not school superintendents and classroom teachers perceive the actual and ideal role of the school superintendent to be the same.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Association of School Administrators, Forty-Fourth Yearbook, Washington, D. C., National Education Association, 1966.
2. Archambault, Eldon, "Teacher Role in School Policy Development," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa, 1967.
3. Benney, Thomas E., "An Investigation Comparing Teacher and Administrator Perception of Actual and Ideal Decision-Making Participation Patterns in Selected Elementary School Districts in Illinois," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Illinois, 1966.
4. Board of Trustees, Annual Report, Washington, D. C., The Board of Education, 1854.
5. Cooperative Development of Public School Administration, A Developing Concept of the Superintendent of Education, Albany, New York, 1955.
6. Davies, Daniel R. and Laurance Iannaccone, "Ferment in Study of Organization," Teachers College Record, LX (November, 1958), 61-72.
7. Educational Dispatch, Croft Educational Service, New London, Connecticut, October, 1968.
8. Gilland, Thomas M., The Origin and Development of the Power and Duties of the City-Superintendent, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1935.
9. Griffiths, Daniel, The School Superintendent, The Center for Applied Research in Education, New York, 1966.
10. Halpin, Andrew W., The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1956.
11. Kuezevich, Stephen, Administration of Public Education, New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1962.
12. Miller, Van, The Public Administration of American School Systems, New York, The MacMillian Company, 1965.

13. Moehlman, A. B., School Administration, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1940.
14. Providence City Council Committee, Report on the Expediency of a New Organization of the Public School, Providence, R. I., The Committee, 1837.
15. Ramseyer, John A., Factors Affecting Educational Administration: Guideposts for Research and Action, School-Community Development Study Monograph, No. 2, Columbus, The Ohio State University Press, 1955.
16. Reller, Theodore L., The Development of the City Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, The Author, 1935.
17. Sandler, Steve, "Perceptions of the Actual and Ideal Roles of Public School Superintendents in Texas," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Education Department, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1968.
18. Southern States Cooperative Project in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration, Nashville, Tennessee, McGuiddy Printing Co., 1955.
19. Toward Improved School Administration, Battle Creek, Michigan, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1961.
20. White, Leonard, Introduction to the Study of Public Administration, New York, McMillian, 1939.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the statistical results of the analysis of the data. The questions developed in the statement of the problem will be restated in sequential order and the findings presented. The null hypothesis was used to test each question. It was rejected when at least 50 percent of the concepts under the question were found significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Question I

To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in small school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means as reported in Table I revealed fifty-six of the sixty-eight ratios significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents perceive the actual role of the school superintendent in small school systems was rejected.

The findings seem to indicate that school superinten-

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE ACTUAL
 ROLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL
 SUPERINTENDENTS AND CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS
 IN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Actual Role | | Superintendents Small School System Actual Role | | t |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 2.6966 | .9410 | 3.0224 | .7027 | -2.6026* |
| 2 | 2.4719 | .8879 | 2.8539 | .6795 | -3.2049* |
| 3 | 2.5955 | .9447 | 3.2247 | .6491 | -5.1492* |
| 4 | 3.1797 | .7869 | 3.4494 | .6705 | -2.4465* |
| 5 | 3.0000 | .8740 | 3.1348 | .7816 | -1.0786 |
| 6 | 2.1685 | 1.0834 | 2.8539 | .8683 | -4.6307* |
| 7 | 3.0000 | .8072 | 3.2808 | .7342 | -2.4147* |
| 8 | 2.3932 | .9315 | 2.8426 | .7328 | -3.5570* |
| 9 | 2.4269 | .8331 | 2.6741 | .7610 | -2.0549* |
| 10 | 2.0561 | .9284 | 2.6067 | .7877 | -4.2415* |
| 11 | 2.1123 | .9879 | 2.7528 | .6915 | -4.9818* |
| 12 | 1.8764 | .8587 | 2.5955 | .7748 | -5.8318* |
| 13 | 2.6629 | 1.0160 | 3.2584 | .8006 | -4.3182* |
| 14 | 2.6741 | .8966 | 3.4719 | .6375 | -6.8019* |
| 15 | 2.1910 | .9929 | 2.8651 | .7219 | -5.1514* |
| 16 | 2.4494 | .9119 | 3.1573 | .7774 | -5.5409* |
| 17 | 2.9438 | .9162 | 3.1573 | .5588 | -1.8659 |
| 18 | 2.3595 | .9743 | 3.1460 | .6280 | -6.3648* |
| 19 | 3.1123 | .9293 | 3.5056 | .6203 | -3.3014* |
| 20 | 2.7865 | .8801 | 3.2247 | .6135 | -3.8313* |
| 21 | 3.0561 | .8527 | 3.2022 | .7522 | -1.2050 |
| 22 | 2.5842 | 1.0146 | 2.8202 | .7579 | -1.7477 |
| 23 | 2.4044 | .9911 | 2.8988 | .8078 | -3.6268* |
| 24 | 2.2022 | .9383 | 2.7303 | .7608 | -4.1007* |
| 25 | 2.3033 | .9876 | 2.6067 | .9315 | -2.0961* |
| 26 | 2.5730 | 1.0373 | 2.9887 | .7419 | -3.0578* |
| 27 | 1.7752 | .8963 | 2.3595 | .7967 | -4.5703* |
| 28 | 2.7640 | 1.0279 | 2.7640 | .8743 | .0000 |
| 29 | 2.8426 | 1.0155 | 3.2921 | .6395 | -3.5128* |

TABLE I--Continued

| Variable Number | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Actual Role | | Superintendents Small School System Actual Role | | t |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 30 | 3.0561 | .7696 | 2.9887 | .6618 | .6230 |
| 31 | 2.0112 | 1.0330 | 2.7415 | .9060 | -4.9859* |
| 32 | 2.1011 | .9835 | 2.7640 | .8349 | -4.8202* |
| 33 | 1.4606 | .7040 | 2.0112 | .9420 | -4.3914* |
| 34 | 3.0898 | .8432 | 3.5168 | .7049 | -3.6443* |
| 35 | 3.2808 | .8071 | 3.3033 | .7989 | -.1856 |
| 36 | 3.3246 | .8155 | 3.4044 | .6656 | -.8010 |
| 37 | 3.3258 | .9804 | 3.0561 | .8914 | 1.9090 |
| 38 | 2.0337 | .9994 | 2.5056 | 1.0180 | -3.1029* |
| 39 | 1.6516 | .9130 | 2.3033 | 1.0211 | -4.4627* |
| 40 | 2.9550 | .8334 | 3.3932 | .6110 | -3.9775* |
| 41 | 1.9325 | .9574 | 2.6516 | .8624 | -5.2347* |
| 42 | 2.0449 | .8983 | 3.0000 | .8868 | -7.0973* |
| 43 | 1.9213 | .9969 | 3.0224 | 1.0383 | -7.1760* |
| 44 | 1.8651 | .9737 | 2.6629 | .8604 | -5.7592* |
| 45 | 3.0224 | .9358 | 3.2022 | .7217 | -1.4269 |
| 46 | 2.9101 | .9318 | 3.2584 | .7115 | -2.7869* |
| 47 | 2.0224 | .8865 | 2.7078 | .8238 | -5.3125* |
| 48 | 2.7865 | .9418 | 3.1573 | .7628 | -2.8698* |
| 49 | 1.9213 | .8897 | 2.6292 | .7986 | -5.5541* |
| 50 | 1.7528 | .8776 | 2.7078 | .8373 | -7.3855* |
| 51 | 1.8202 | .8287 | 2.6853 | .8943 | -6.6563* |
| 52 | 1.6292 | .8262 | 2.4269 | .8596 | -6.2761* |
| 53 | 2.5393 | 1.0815 | 2.9887 | .9420 | -2.9394* |
| 54 | 2.3370 | .8472 | 3.0449 | .7630 | -5.8237* |
| 55 | 2.2808 | .9828 | 3.1573 | .7328 | -6.7058* |
| 56 | 3.2471 | .7684 | 3.4382 | .6352 | -1.7971 |
| 57 | 2.8202 | .9187 | 3.1685 | .6908 | -2.8425* |
| 58 | 2.3370 | .9111 | 2.9775 | .8477 | -4.8275* |
| 59 | 3.0112 | 1.1659 | 3.3483 | .7803 | -2.2537* |
| 60 | 1.7752 | 1.0249 | 2.4494 | 1.0278 | -4.3567* |
| 61 | 2.2584 | 1.2134 | 3.1910 | .8978 | -5.7953* |
| 62 | 2.4719 | 1.0066 | 2.9213 | 1.0729 | -2.8657* |
| 63 | 2.0337 | 1.0647 | 2.3033 | 1.0642 | -1.6803 |
| 64 | 1.7865 | 1.0543 | 2.6404 | .9743 | -5.5797* |
| 65 | 2.7977 | 1.0076 | 3.5393 | .6543 | -5.7901* |
| 66 | 2.8426 | 1.0694 | 3.4382 | .6862 | -4.3962* |
| 67 | 2.8314 | .9147 | 3.2696 | .7608 | -3.4548* |
| 68 | 2.8876 | .9293 | 3.3258 | .6495 | -3.6253* |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

hold different perceptions of the actual role of the school superintendent. This difference in perception is further emphasized since a majority of the ratios were significant for each of the seven categories: Instruction and Curriculum Development, Staff Personnel, Pupil Personnel, School Finance, Plant Development and Maintenance, Public Relations, and Professional Relations.

The analysis yielded statistically significant differences at the .05 level of confidence for each of the following concepts under the seven categories.

Instruction and Curriculum Development

1. Systematically involves teachers in the development of curriculum materials.
2. Involves teachers in the evaluation of progress made in meeting desired educational objectives.
3. Sees that the organization, administration and supervision of the school serve to facilitate the work of the teacher.
4. Focuses the attention of the entire school program on the welfare of the child.
6. Provides opportunities for teachers to pool ideas in grade level and departmental meetings on school time.
7. Makes available to teachers the needed equipment and materials to adequately instruct students.

8. Provides the necessary leadership and in-service education to help teachers individualize instruction.
9. Provides adequate supervision to properly coordinate and improve instruction and to assist teachers.
10. Establishes a planned program whereby the school board, administration and teachers continuously evaluate the educational needs of the school system.

Staff Personnel

11. Involves teachers in the development of personnel policies and in maintaining professional working conditions.
12. Establishes a cooperative plan of personnel evaluation to improve instruction.
13. Conscientiously recommends to the school board the release of incompetent teachers and other staff members.
14. Provides for the assignment and reassignment of staff members in view of their professional aspirations as well as the needs of the educational program.
15. Arranges with teachers the kinds of in-service education programs which they desire to improve their teaching effectiveness.
16. Carefully evaluates teacher assignments to prevent unfair work loads.
18. Develops a strong team spirit and group loyalty on the part of teachers.

19. Uses criteria in evaluating teachers for dismissal based on objective information and not on personal bias or prejudice.
20. Exercises skill in talking with people so that they will understand the job to be done and in developing satisfactory human relationships with personnel.

Pupil Personnel

23. Makes available to teachers adequate special counseling services to cope with pupils with severe adjustment problems.
24. Involves teachers in the development of policies and procedures for the handling of all types of discipline problems.
25. Involves teachers in developing a policy for conserving teacher time in the building of pupil cumulative folders and other records.
26. Involves teachers in the development of student promotion policies.
27. Establishes a policy to regularly involve students and teachers in a dialogue on school improvement.
29. Provides funds, staff and equipment to carry on a well-developed extra-curricular activities program for students.

School Finance

31. Involves teachers in the development of educational needs for the budget.
32. Helps teachers to translate the educational needs into financial requirements within the community's ability to pay.
33. Establishes priorities in funding the educational program with representative teacher committees for school board consideration.
34. Closely evaluates the expenditure of funds to insure the most education per dollar spent.
38. Utilizes teachers in presenting the local educational needs to the public as a means of gaining additional school tax funds.
39. Establishes a committee (including teachers) to study salaries and other welfare benefits, making periodic recommendations to the school board.
40. Closely supervises the distribution of budgetary funds, channels every available dollar into the actual teaching program.

Plant Development and Maintenance

41. Involves teachers in a study and evaluation of existing facilities in the light of present educational needs.
42. Involves teachers in the development of educational specifications for new physical facilities.

43. Evaluates the architect's preliminary building plans with teachers.
44. Involves teachers and students in the proper selection of classroom furniture, fixtures and equipment.
46. Provides sufficient leadership to get flexibility designed into new school buildings and renovated older ones to provide for future trends in education.
47. Establishes procedures for the involvement of students in the daily care of their school and/or in the planning of new schools.
48. Establishes, in cooperation with the school board, policies which give educational values priority over building cost, when these are in conflict.

Public Relations

49. Establishes policies which systematically involve teachers and lay public in educational decision making.
50. Involves teachers in a planned program of informing the public of educational needs.
51. Develops procedure to regularly assess teacher attitudes on educational and staff welfare matters.
52. Regularly assesses community opinion of the schools and involves teachers in an analysis of the findings.

53. Enthusiastically supports the Parent-Teacher Associations, keeps membership informed, and solicits its criticisms and assistance.
54. Keeps the press accurately informed of the successes and weaknesses of the school (which includes teacher welfare) and the trends in education.
55. Helps teachers develop a feeling of importance to the total school program by encouraging them to be an effective part of the staff recruiting program, public information, community opinion, assessment, etc.
57. Identifies, with the assistance of the staff and interested lay people, the contribution which the school can make to community improvement.
58. Involves students in the public relations program.

Professional Relations

59. Encourages teachers to join and attend meetings sponsored by the classroom teacher association.
60. Arranges for a committee of teachers to meet regularly to study fringe benefits and make recommendations to the school board.
61. Provides budgeted funds to send key teachers to area, state and national educational and professional meetings.
62. Recognizes, by established policy, teacher rights to

exert political influence on local, state and national levels.

64. Establishes a plan whereby teachers can make grievances known without being singled out.
65. Appreciates the work of teachers and makes this known.
66. Supplies the staff with information concerning possible personnel benefits within the school system.
67. Exercises skill in the formulation of policies which protect staff personnel and yet do not commit the school system beyond its resources nor decrease the professional services required by the school system.

Question II

To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in large school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table II, revealed that fifty-three of the sixty-eight ratios were significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents perceive the actual role of the school superintendent in large school systems was rejected.

The findings seem to indicate that school superintendents and classroom teacher presidents in large school systems hold different perceptions of the actual role of the school superintendent. This difference in perception is further emphasized since a majority of the ratios were significant for six of the seven categories: Instruction and Curriculum Development, Staff Personnel, School Finance, Plant Development and Maintenance, Public Relations, and Professional Relations. Only four of the ten ratios were significant under the category--Pupil Personnel. These findings seem to indicate that school superintendents and classroom teacher presidents in large school systems hold similar perceptions of the actual role of the school superintendent in Pupil Personnel relations.

The analysis yielded statistically significant difference at the .05 level of confidence for each of the following concepts under the seven categories.

Instruction and Curriculum Development

2. Involves teachers in the evaluation of progress made in meeting desired educational objectives.
3. Sees that the organization, administration and supervision of the school serve to facilitate the work of the teacher.
4. Focuses the attention of the entire school program on the welfare of the child.

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF t TEST BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE ACTUAL
 ROLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL
 SUPERINTENDENTS AND CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS
 IN LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Actual Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Actual Role | | t |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 3.0000 | .7071 | 2.9722 | .7632 | .1579 |
| 2 | 2.7222 | .6916 | 2.3333 | .8498 | 2.0996* |
| 3 | 3.5277 | .5520 | 2.5277 | .8328 | 5.9206* |
| 4 | 3.5000 | .6009 | 3.0277 | 1.0404 | 2.3251* |
| 5 | 3.2222 | .6285 | 2.8055 | .8762 | 2.2859* |
| 6 | 3.1666 | .6454 | 2.4166 | 1.2104 | 3.2343* |
| 7 | 3.1944 | .6999 | 2.9722 | .8970 | 1.1553 |
| 8 | 2.9722 | .7259 | 2.5000 | .9574 | 2.3251* |
| 9 | 2.9722 | .7259 | 2.4722 | .8970 | 2.5632* |
| 10 | 2.8333 | .7637 | 1.9444 | .9702 | 4.2588* |
| 11 | 2.9444 | .6211 | 1.9166 | .9537 | 5.3420* |
| 12 | 2.6388 | .7871 | 1.9722 | .9275 | 3.2420* |
| 13 | 3.3055 | .7752 | 2.4166 | 1.0103 | 4.1292* |
| 14 | 3.5277 | .6448 | 2.3611 | .9175 | 6.1544* |
| 15 | 3.0833 | .7216 | 2.5000 | .9574 | 2.8783* |
| 16 | 3.2222 | .7856 | 2.3611 | .9472 | 4.1393* |
| 17 | 3.0277 | .7632 | 2.8055 | 1.0493 | 1.0132 |
| 18 | 3.1111 | .6136 | 2.3888 | 1.0076 | 3.6215* |
| 19 | 3.7777 | .4157 | 3.0000 | 1.1055 | 3.8957* |
| 20 | 3.2222 | .5826 | 2.8888 | .9060 | 1.8305 |
| 21 | 3.1944 | .7752 | 3.1944 | .8439 | .0000 |
| 22 | 2.8888 | .7370 | 2.5000 | .9279 | 1.9414 |
| 23 | 2.8055 | .8762 | 2.4444 | .8958 | 1.7048 |
| 24 | 2.6388 | .7130 | 1.9166 | .8291 | 3.9069* |
| 25 | 2.6388 | .8867 | 2.1388 | .9761 | 2.2430* |
| 26 | 3.1666 | .7264 | 2.1111 | .9654 | 5.1684* |
| 27 | 2.1944 | .7385 | 1.7500 | .9242 | 2.2224* |
| 28 | 3.1111 | .8089 | 2.8888 | .9362 | 1.0625 |
| 29 | 3.1388 | .7871 | 2.9444 | .9111 | .9553 |
| 30 | 2.9722 | .6448 | 3.1666 | .8975 | -1.0408 |
| 31 | 2.6944 | .7752 | 1.9166 | .9242 | 3.8143* |
| 32 | 2.6388 | .7510 | 2.1111 | .8089 | 2.8287* |

TABLE II--Continued

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Actual Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Actual Role | | t |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 33 | 2.1388 | .8216 | 1.6388 | .8867 | 2.4469* |
| 34 | 3.6111 | .5905 | 2.7500 | 1.1636 | 3.9038* |
| 35 | 3.3611 | .6303 | 2.9166 | 1.1149 | 2.0529* |
| 36 | 3.4166 | .7592 | 3.2500 | .7216 | .9413 |
| 37 | 3.4722 | .8970 | 3.2500 | .9537 | 1.0040 |
| 38 | 2.6666 | .7071 | 1.9166 | .8620 | 3.9796* |
| 39 | 2.6388 | 1.0581 | 2.0277 | 1.1422 | 2.3219* |
| 40 | 3.5833 | .5464 | 2.9444 | .8801 | 3.6483* |
| 41 | 2.7777 | .7856 | 2.0000 | .9718 | 3.6820* |
| 42 | 3.3333 | .7817 | 2.0277 | .9570 | 6.2504* |
| 43 | 3.1944 | .9374 | 1.7222 | .9606 | 6.4888* |
| 44 | 2.6666 | .8819 | 1.7777 | .8202 | 4.3662* |
| 45 | 3.1944 | .8103 | 2.8888 | .9362 | 1.4599 |
| 46 | 3.3333 | .7071 | 2.6944 | .8439 | 3.4329* |
| 47 | 2.5833 | .8291 | 1.8888 | .8089 | 3.5466* |
| 48 | 3.3055 | .6591 | 2.5555 | 1.0657 | 3.5409* |
| 49 | 2.5555 | .8314 | 2.0833 | .8620 | 2.3326* |
| 50 | 2.8333 | .7993 | 2.0000 | .9428 | 3.9886* |
| 51 | 2.5277 | .7632 | 1.8333 | .8660 | 3.5589* |
| 52 | 2.4444 | .7243 | 1.7500 | .6821 | 4.1291* |
| 53 | 3.5000 | .7637 | 2.8055 | .8103 | 3.6894* |
| 54 | 3.4444 | .6431 | 2.2500 | .9242 | 6.2760* |
| 55 | 3.0555 | .6211 | 2.1666 | .9860 | 4.5126* |
| 56 | 3.3333 | .6236 | 2.9722 | 1.1176 | 1.6691 |
| 57 | 3.3333 | .6236 | 2.7500 | .8291 | 3.3263* |
| 58 | 2.7222 | .6916 | 2.4722 | .9570 | 1.2525 |
| 59 | 3.3055 | .6591 | 2.7222 | 1.2158 | 2.4952* |
| 60 | 2.3611 | 1.1583 | 2.0277 | 1.1422 | 1.2121 |
| 61 | 3.4166 | .7216 | 2.6666 | 1.1547 | 3.2585* |
| 62 | 3.2222 | .8854 | 2.3333 | 1.2247 | 3.4796* |
| 63 | 2.5000 | 1.1426 | 1.9444 | 1.1041 | 2.0685* |
| 64 | 2.9166 | 1.0103 | 2.1388 | 1.1093 | 3.0665* |
| 65 | 3.6111 | .5905 | 2.6666 | 1.0801 | 4.5388* |
| 66 | 3.5277 | .6002 | 2.8333 | 1.0929 | 3.2948* |
| 67 | 3.2777 | .7307 | 2.8055 | .9949 | 2.2630* |
| 68 | 3.4166 | .7216 | 2.8333 | 1.0137 | 2.7731* |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

5. Involves teachers in the cooperative selection and evaluation of teaching materials and equipment.
6. Provides opportunities for teachers to pool ideas in grade level and departmental meetings on school time.
8. Provides the necessary leadership and in-service education to help teachers individualize instruction.
9. Provides adequate supervision to properly coordinate and improve instruction and to assist teachers.
10. Establishes a planned program whereby the school board, administration and teachers continuously evaluate the educational needs of the school system.

Staff Personnel

11. Involves teachers in the development of personnel policies and in maintaining professional working conditions.
12. Establishes a cooperative plan of personnel evaluation to improve instruction.
13. Conscientiously recommends to the school board the release of incompetent teachers and other staff members.
14. Provides for the assignment and reassignment of staff members in view of their professional aspirations as well as the needs of the educational program.
15. Arranges with teachers the kinds of in-service

education programs which they desire to improve their teaching effectiveness.

16. Carefully evaluates teacher assignments to prevent unfair work loads.
18. Develops a strong team spirit and group loyalty on the part of teachers.
19. Uses criteria in evaluating teachers for dismissal, based on objective information and not on personal bias or prejudice.

Pupil Personnel

24. Involves teachers in the development of policies and procedures for the handling of all types of discipline problems.
25. Involves teachers in developing a policy for conserving teacher time in the building (compilation of information) of pupil cumulative folders and other records.
26. Involves teachers in the development of student promotion policies.
27. Establishes a policy to regularly involve students and teachers in a dialogue on school improvement.

School Finance

31. Involves teachers in the development of educational needs for the budget.
32. Helps teachers to translate the educational needs

into financial requirements with the community's ability to pay.

33. Establishes criteria in funding the educational program with representative teacher committees for school board consideration.
34. Closely evaluates the expenditures of funds to insure the most education per dollar spent.
35. Understands such things as how the necessary financial resources are controlled, how to deal with conflicting aims in the political system, and is energetically using this knowledge to gain the needed financial support for public schools.
38. Utilizes teachers in presenting the local educational needs to the public as a means of gaining additional school tax funds.
39. Establishes a committee (including teachers) to study salaries and other welfare benefits, making periodic recommendations to the school board.
40. Closely supervises the distribution of budgetary funds, channels every available dollar into the actual teaching program.

Plant Development and Maintenance

41. Involves teachers in a study and evaluation of existing facilities in the light of present educational needs.

42. Involves teachers in the development of educational specifications for new physical facilities.
43. Evaluates the architect's preliminary building plans with teachers.
44. Involves teachers and students in the proper selection of classroom furniture, fixtures and equipment.
46. Provides sufficient leadership to get flexibility designed into new school buildings and renovated older ones to provide for future trends in education.
47. Establishes procedures for the involvement of students in the daily care of their school and/or in the planning of new schools.
48. Establishes, in cooperation with the school board, policies which give educational values priority over building cost, when these are in conflict.

Public Relations

49. Establishes policies which systematically involve teachers and lay public in educational decision making.
50. Involves teachers in a planned program of informing the public of educational needs.
51. Develops procedure to regularly assess teacher attitudes on educational and staff welfare matters.
52. Regularly assesses community opinion of the schools

- and involves teachers in an analysis of the findings.
53. Enthusiastically supports the Parent-Teacher Associations, keeps membership informed, and solicits its criticisms and assistance.
 54. Keeps the press accurately informed of the successes and weaknesses of the school (which also includes teacher welfare) and the trends in education.
 55. Helps teachers develop a feeling of importance to the total school program by encouraging them to be an effective part of the staff recruiting program, public information, community opinion, assessment, etc.
 57. Identifies, with the assistance of the staff and interested lay people, the contribution which the school can make to community improvement.

Professional Relations

59. Encourages teachers to join and attend meetings sponsored by the classroom teacher association.
61. Provides budgeted funds to send key teachers to area, state and national educational and professional meetings.
62. Recognizes, by established policy, teacher rights to exert political influence on local, state and national levels.
63. Encourages school board adoption and community acceptance of the continuing contract for teachers.

64. Establishes a plan whereby teachers can make grievances known without being singled out.
65. Appreciates the work of teachers and makes this known.
66. Supplies the staff with information concerning possible personnel benefits within the school system.
67. Exercises skill in the formulation of policies which protect staff personnel and yet do not commit the school system beyond its resources nor decrease the professional services required by the school system.
68. Works with the staff to stimulate a desire for professional growth and to identify professional needs.

Question III

To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike, as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in small school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table III, revealed that sixteen of the sixty-eight ratios were significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Since this represents less than 50 percent of the ratios, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents perceive the ideal role of the school superintendent in small school systems was accepted.

TABLE III

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE IDEAL
 ROLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL
 SUPERINTENDENTS AND CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS
 IN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Ideal Role | | Superintendents Small School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 3.8089 | .3930 | 3.8314 | .4302 | -.3617 |
| 2 | 3.7528 | .4313 | 3.7640 | .4745 | -.1643 |
| 3 | 3.7415 | .4627 | 3.7640 | .4245 | -.3356 |
| 4 | 3.9101 | .2860 | 3.9438 | .2747 | -.7972 |
| 5 | 3.8988 | .3014 | 3.7303 | .5561 | 2.4992* |
| 6 | 3.6629 | .4959 | 3.5617 | .6172 | 1.1980 |
| 7 | 3.8988 | .3014 | 3.8764 | .4452 | .3920 |
| 8 | 3.6966 | .4835 | 3.7640 | .4976 | -.9113 |
| 9 | 3.6516 | .5214 | 3.7752 | .4681 | -1.6544 |
| 10 | 3.7191 | .4737 | 3.7528 | .4806 | -.4685 |
| 11 | 3.7415 | .4627 | 3.5617 | .5987 | 2.2285* |
| 12 | 3.4943 | .6019 | 3.4943 | .6555 | .0000 |
| 13 | 3.6966 | .5488 | 3.8988 | .3014 | -3.0297* |
| 14 | 3.7528 | .4566 | 3.7977 | .4541 | -.6545 |
| 15 | 3.6404 | .4798 | 3.7865 | .4614 | -2.0584* |
| 16 | 3.7977 | .4782 | 3.6853 | .5527 | 1.4420 |
| 17 | 3.8876 | .3158 | 3.9213 | .2691 | -.7620 |
| 18 | 3.8651 | .4290 | 3.9213 | .3081 | -.9977 |
| 19 | 3.9325 | .2507 | 3.8988 | .3367 | .7532 |
| 20 | 3.8539 | .3531 | 3.8988 | .3014 | -.9079 |
| 21 | 3.6966 | .5062 | 3.6067 | .6468 | 1.0265 |
| 22 | 3.6179 | .5084 | 3.6179 | .6620 | .0000 |
| 23 | 3.7303 | .4918 | 3.7865 | .4363 | -.8015 |
| 24 | 3.7191 | .4494 | 3.4831 | .6553 | 2.7854* |
| 25 | 3.5393 | .6369 | 3.3370 | .8604 | 1.7722 |
| 26 | 3.6067 | .5324 | 3.5280 | .6013 | .9186 |
| 27 | 3.3146 | .7125 | 3.3258 | .8041 | -.0981 |
| 28 | 3.7752 | .4681 | 3.6516 | .5825 | 1.5514 |
| 29 | 3.5617 | .5797 | 3.6067 | .5531 | -.5261 |
| 30 | 3.7303 | .4437 | 3.7528 | .4806 | -.3222 |
| 31 | 3.4269 | .6514 | 3.4943 | .5829 | -.7233 |
| 32 | 3.4328 | .6352 | 3.6292 | .5057 | -2.2068* |

TABLE III--Continued

| Variable Number | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Ideal Role | | Superintendents Small School System Ideal Role | | <u>t</u> |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 33 | 3.5056 | .5430 | 3.0786 | .8509 | 3.9676* |
| 34 | 3.8426 | .3640 | 3.9101 | .2860 | -1.3659 |
| 35 | 3.8539 | .3836 | 3.7528 | .5253 | 1.4582 |
| 36 | 3.8314 | .3743 | 3.8314 | .4302 | .0000 |
| 37 | 3.6629 | .6860 | 3.4606 | .8080 | 1.7898 |
| 38 | 3.3820 | .7420 | 3.2696 | .9339 | .8839 |
| 39 | 3.6292 | .5879 | 3.2134 | .8275 | 3.8418* |
| 40 | 3.7977 | .4287 | 3.8202 | .4635 | -.3338 |
| 41 | 3.5393 | .4984 | 3.4831 | .6379 | .6509 |
| 42 | 3.5730 | .5784 | 3.5617 | .6696 | .1191 |
| 43 | 3.5505 | .6705 | 3.5505 | .7033 | .0000 |
| 44 | 3.5280 | .7357 | 3.2471 | .7829 | 2.4525* |
| 45 | 3.7752 | .4173 | 3.7303 | .5355 | .6209 |
| 46 | 3.7528 | .4566 | 3.8314 | .4032 | -1.2110 |
| 47 | 3.3707 | .7092 | 3.4831 | .7049 | -1.0540 |
| 48 | 3.6853 | .5727 | 3.7078 | .5236 | -.2716 |
| 49 | 3.4606 | .6878 | 3.5505 | .5998 | -.9238 |
| 50 | 3.4831 | .6553 | 3.5280 | .6013 | -.4740 |
| 51 | 3.4606 | .6369 | 3.5056 | .6019 | -.4810 |
| 52 | 3.2696 | .6993 | 3.4269 | .7478 | -1.4412 |
| 53 | 3.1685 | .9147 | 3.2808 | .8478 | -.8450 |
| 54 | 3.4382 | .7337 | 3.5955 | .6656 | -1.4895 |
| 55 | 3.5955 | .5552 | 3.7752 | .4434 | -2.3731* |
| 56 | 3.9101 | .3229 | 3.9213 | .3081 | -.2361 |
| 57 | 3.7191 | .4737 | 3.7528 | .4806 | -.4685 |
| 58 | 3.5617 | .5797 | 3.6404 | .5658 | -.9107 |
| 59 | 3.7752 | .4681 | 3.5168 | .7805 | 2.6634* |
| 60 | 3.6853 | .5104 | 3.1685 | .8771 | 4.7775* |
| 61 | 3.6853 | .6288 | 3.6404 | .5853 | .4907 |
| 62 | 3.6292 | .5684 | 3.4269 | .7326 | 2.0458* |
| 63 | 3.5393 | .8353 | 2.8426 | 1.1307 | 4.6482* |
| 64 | 3.7303 | .5141 | 3.3258 | .8041 | 3.9755* |
| 65 | 3.8202 | .4386 | 3.9438 | .2302 | -2.3403* |
| 66 | 3.7415 | .5089 | 3.7752 | .4434 | -.4683 |
| 67 | 3.7303 | .5141 | 3.7078 | .5446 | .2814 |
| 68 | 3.7528 | .4806 | 3.8764 | .3291 | -1.9903 |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The findings seem to indicate that school superintendents and classroom teacher presidents in small school systems hold similar perceptions of the ideal role of the school superintendent. This similarity is further emphasized as only one of the seven categories had as many as 50 percent significant ratios: Professional Relations.

Since six of the ten ratios were significant under the Professional Relations category, it seems that classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in small school systems hold different perceptions of the ideal role of the school superintendent in that area.

The analysis yielded statistically significant difference at the .05 level of confidence for each of the following concepts under the seven categories.

Instruction and Curriculum Development

5. Involves teachers in the cooperative selection and evaluation of teaching materials and equipment.

Staff Personnel

11. Involves teachers in the development of personnel policies and in maintaining professional working conditions.
13. Conscientiously recommends to the school board the release of incompetent teachers and other staff members.
15. Arranges with teachers the kinds of in-service

education programs which they desire to improve their teaching effectiveness.

Pupil Personnel

24. Involves teachers in the development of policies and procedures for the handling of all types of discipline problems.

School Finance

32. Helps teachers to translate the educational needs into financial requirements with the community's ability to pay.
33. Establishes priorities in funding the educational program with representative teacher committees for school board consideration.
39. Establishes a committee (including teachers) to study salaries and other welfare benefits, making periodic recommendations to the school board.

Plant Development and Maintenance

44. Involves teachers and students in the proper selection of classroom furniture, fixtures and equipment.

Public Relations

55. Helps teachers develop a feeling of importance to the total school program by encouraging them to be an effective part of the staff recruiting program,

public information, community opinion, assessment,
etc.

Professional Relations

59. Encourages teachers to join and attend meetings sponsored by the classroom teacher association.
60. Arranges for a committee of teachers to meet regularly to study fringe benefits and make recommendations to the school board.
62. Recognizes by established policy, teacher rights to exert political influence on local, state and national levels.
63. Encourages school board adoption and community acceptance of the continuing contract for teachers.
64. Establishes a plan whereby teachers can make grievances known without being singled out.
65. Appreciates the work of teachers and makes this known.

Question IV

To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike, as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in large school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table IV, revealed eleven of the sixty-eight ratios significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that

there was no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents perceive the ideal role of the superintendent in large school systems was accepted.

The findings seem to indicate that school superintendents and classroom teacher presidents in large school systems hold similar perceptions of the ideal role of the school superintendent. This similarity in perception is further emphasized since only one of the seven categories had as many as 50 percent significant ratios: Professional Relations.

Since five of the ten ratios were significant under the Professional Relations category, it seems that classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in large school systems hold different perceptions of the ideal role of the school superintendent in that area.

The analysis yielded statistically significant difference at the .05 level of confidence for each of the following concepts under the seven categories.

Staff Personnel

11. Involves teachers in the development of personnel policies and in maintaining professional working conditions.
19. Uses criteria in evaluating teachers for dismissal based on objective information and not on personal bias or prejudice.
20. Exercises skill in talking with people, so that they

TABLE IV

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE IDEAL
 ROLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL
 SUPERINTENDENTS AND CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS
 IN LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Ideal Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 3.7500 | .4330 | 3.8611 | .3458 | -1.1861 |
| 2 | 3.6111 | .5414 | 3.7777 | .4157 | -1.4443 |
| 3 | 4.0000 | .0000 | 3.8888 | .3928 | 1.6733 |
| 4 | 3.9444 | .2290 | 3.9166 | .2763 | .4577 |
| 5 | 3.7500 | .4930 | 3.8333 | .4409 | -.7453 |
| 6 | 3.6666 | .5270 | 3.6666 | .5270 | .0000 |
| 7 | 3.9166 | .2763 | 3.8611 | .3458 | .7424 |
| 8 | 3.7777 | .4157 | 3.5555 | .6431 | 1.7167 |
| 9 | 3.8611 | .3458 | 3.7222 | .6060 | 1.1775 |
| 10 | 3.7777 | .4157 | 3.7777 | .4157 | .0000 |
| 11 | 3.3888 | .5414 | 3.8055 | .4606 | -3.4674* |
| 12 | 3.3055 | .6591 | 3.5277 | .5520 | -1.5291 |
| 13 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.7222 | .5061 | 1.6550 |
| 14 | 3.8611 | .3458 | 3.8333 | .3726 | .3232 |
| 15 | 3.6111 | .5414 | 3.7500 | .4330 | -1.1851 |
| 16 | 3.6944 | .5174 | 3.7500 | .4330 | -.4871 |
| 17 | 3.9444 | .2290 | 3.8333 | .3726 | 1.5026 |
| 18 | 3.8611 | .3458 | 3.8333 | .3726 | .3232 |
| 19 | 4.0000 | .0000 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 2.0916* |
| 20 | 3.9722 | .1643 | 3.7500 | .4330 | 2.8385* |
| 21 | 3.6388 | .6303 | 3.6388 | .4803 | .0000 |
| 22 | 3.4444 | .5983 | 3.5555 | .4969 | -.8451 |
| 23 | 3.7777 | .4779 | 3.7777 | .4157 | .0000 |
| 24 | 3.3888 | .6358 | 3.5000 | .6009 | -.7513 |
| 25 | 3.5000 | .6009 | 3.5833 | .5464 | -.6069 |
| 26 | 3.5833 | .5464 | 3.4722 | .6448 | .7776 |
| 27 | 3.3333 | .5773 | 3.2777 | .6916 | .3648 |
| 28 | 3.7777 | .4779 | 3.7500 | .4930 | .2393 |
| 29 | 3.6111 | .5414 | 3.4722 | .6002 | 1.0163 |
| 30 | 3.7222 | .4479 | 3.5833 | .5464 | 1.1629 |
| 31 | 3.4166 | .6400 | 3.5277 | .6448 | -.7234 |

TABLE IV--Continued

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Ideal Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 33 | 2.9722 | .8655 | 3.4722 | .6002 | -2.8081* |
| 34 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.7500 | .5951 | 1.2209 |
| 35 | 3.9166 | .2763 | 3.8055 | .4606 | 1.2236 |
| 36 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.6944 | .5685 | 1.7706 |
| 37 | 3.6388 | .7871 | 3.6944 | .5685 | -.3384 |
| 38 | 3.4444 | .6849 | 3.4444 | .6849 | .0000 |
| 39 | 3.2500 | .8620 | 3.8888 | .3142 | -4.1195* |
| 40 | 3.8055 | .3957 | 3.8333 | .3726 | -.3022 |
| 41 | 3.4166 | .6400 | 3.5277 | .6002 | .7490 |
| 42 | 3.6666 | .5270 | 3.5833 | .6400 | .5945 |
| 43 | 3.5277 | .7632 | 3.6388 | .5350 | -.7052 |
| 44 | 3.1666 | .7993 | 3.5555 | .5499 | -2.3712* |
| 45 | 3.6944 | .5174 | 3.5833 | .5951 | .8335 |
| 46 | 3.7777 | .4779 | 3.8333 | .3726 | -.5423 |
| 47 | 3.3888 | .7915 | 3.2777 | .7307 | .6101 |
| 48 | 3.8333 | .3726 | 3.7222 | .5061 | 1.0458 |
| 49 | 3.4722 | .6448 | 3.5833 | .5951 | -.7490 |
| 50 | 3.5833 | .4930 | 3.6388 | .4803 | -.4775 |
| 51 | 3.5000 | .5527 | 3.6944 | .4606 | -1.5987 |
| 52 | 3.3333 | .6666 | 3.4444 | .6431 | -.7096 |
| 53 | 3.7222 | .5583 | 3.5277 | .6448 | 1.3485 |
| 54 | 3.8333 | .3726 | 3.7777 | .4157 | .5886 |
| 55 | 3.6944 | .4606 | 3.7222 | .4479 | -.2557 |
| 56 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.8888 | .3142 | .0000 |
| 57 | 3.6944 | .4606 | 3.6944 | .4606 | .0000 |
| 58 | 3.5000 | .6009 | 3.5277 | .4992 | -.2103 |
| 59 | 3.4722 | .5520 | 3.9444 | .2290 | -4.6740* |
| 60 | 2.8888 | .8748 | 3.7222 | .6060 | -4.6322* |
| 61 | 3.6388 | .5350 | 3.7777 | .4157 | -1.2126 |
| 62 | 3.4444 | .7617 | 3.8888 | .3142 | -3.1908* |
| 63 | 2.8888 | 1.0743 | 3.6666 | .6666 | -3.6391* |
| 64 | 3.3611 | .9175 | 3.8611 | .3458 | -3.0168* |
| 65 | 3.9166 | .2763 | 3.8333 | .3726 | 1.0625 |
| 66 | 3.7777 | .4779 | 3.8055 | .3957 | -.2648 |
| 67 | 3.7222 | .5583 | 3.6944 | .4606 | .2270 |
| 68 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.8055 | .3957 | .9755 |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

will understand the job to be done and in developing satisfactory human relationships with personnel.

School Finance

33. Establishes priorities in funding the educational program with representative teacher committees for school board consideration.
39. Establishes a committee (including teachers) to study salaries and other welfare benefits, making periodic recommendations to the school board.

Plant Development and Maintenance

44. Involves teachers and students in the proper selection of classroom furniture, fixtures and equipment.

Professional Relations

59. Encourages teachers to join and attend meetings sponsored by the classroom teacher association.
60. Arranges for a committee of teachers to meet regularly to study fringe benefits and make recommendations to the school board.
62. Recognizes by established policy, teacher rights to exert political influence on local, state and national levels.
63. Encourages school board adoption and community acceptance of the continuing contract for teachers.

64. Establishes a plan whereby teachers can make grievances known without being singled out.

Question V

To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike, as perceived by classroom teacher presidents in small school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table V, revealed sixty-eight of the sixty-eight ratios significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents perceived the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents in small school systems was rejected.

The findings seem to indicate that classroom teacher presidents in small school systems perceive the school superintendent's actual behavior as different from what would be ideal behavior. This difference in perception is further emphasized since all ratios under each category were significant.

Question VI

To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike, as perceived by classroom teacher presidents in large school systems?

TABLE V

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS IN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Numbers | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Actual Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Ideal Role | | t |
|------------------|--|--------------------|---|--------------------|------------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 2.69662 | .94100 | 3.80898 | .39309 | -10.68533* |
| 2 | 2.47191 | .88799 | 3.75280 | .43137 | -12.83708* |
| 3 | 2.59550 | .94475 | 3.74157 | .46272 | -10.99458* |
| 4 | 3.17977 | .78699 | 3.91011 | .28602 | - 8.52157* |
| 5 | 3.00000 | .87409 | 3.89887 | .30149 | - 9.50186* |
| 6 | 2.16853 | 1.08343 | 3.66292 | .49591 | -14.07821* |
| 7 | 3.00000 | .80727 | 3.89887 | .30149 | -11.23987* |
| 8 | 2.39325 | .93156 | 3.69662 | .48353 | -13.90534* |
| 9 | 2.42696 | .83312 | 3.65168 | .52147 | -12.47335* |
| 10 | 2.05617 | .92844 | 3.71910 | .47377 | -15.02888* |
| 11 | 2.11235 | .98799 | 3.74157 | .46272 | -15.13412* |
| 12 | 1.87640 | .85879 | 3.49438 | .60193 | -15.71594* |
| 13 | 2.66292 | 1.01609 | 3.69662 | .54883 | - 9.92848* |
| 14 | 2.67415 | .89662 | 3.75280 | .45668 | -10.91768* |
| 15 | 2.19101 | .99296 | 3.64044 | .47986 | -12.95606* |
| 16 | 2.44943 | .91198 | 3.79775 | .47828 | -13.49329* |
| 17 | 2.94382 | .91626 | 3.88764 | .31580 | - 9.93246* |
| 18 | 2.35955 | .97435 | 3.86516 | .42903 | -14.51688* |
| 19 | 3.11235 | .92939 | 3.93258 | .25074 | - 8.16048* |
| 20 | 2.78651 | .88014 | 3.85393 | .35317 | -11.16418* |
| 21 | 3.05617 | .85274 | 3.69662 | .50624 | - 6.75062* |
| 22 | 2.58426 | 1.01460 | 3.61797 | .50848 | - 9.59521* |
| 23 | 2.40449 | .99118 | 3.73033 | .49182 | -12.00360* |
| 24 | 2.20224 | .93831 | 3.71910 | .44943 | -13.82922* |
| 25 | 2.30337 | .98761 | 3.53932 | .63699 | -10.52293* |
| 26 | 2.57303 | 1.03736 | 3.60674 | .53249 | - 9.92848* |
| 27 | 1.77528 | .89634 | 3.31460 | .71257 | -14.35075* |
| 28 | 2.76404 | 1.02795 | 3.77528 | .46814 | - 8.90537* |
| 29 | 2.84269 | 1.01559 | 3.56179 | .57971 | - 5.76217* |
| 30 | 3.05617 | .76964 | 3.73033 | .44378 | - 8.30961* |
| 31 | 2.01123 | 1.03309 | 3.42696 | .65149 | -12.55301* |
| 32 | 2.10112 | .98351 | 3.43820 | .63520 | -12.21206* |
| 33 | 1.46067 | .70402 | 3.50561 | .54305 | -21.06347* |

TABLE V--Continued

| Variable Numbers | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Actual Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Ideal Role | | <u>t</u> |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|------------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 34 | 3.08988 | .84322 | 3.84269 | .36408 | - 9.01938* |
| 35 | 3.28089 | .80711 | 3.85393 | .38367 | - 7.33693* |
| 36 | 3.31460 | .81551 | 3.83146 | .37434 | - 6.21162* |
| 37 | 3.32584 | .98042 | 3.66292 | .68603 | - 3.67507* |
| 38 | 2.03370 | .99943 | 3.38202 | .74208 | -11.26488* |
| 39 | 1.65168 | .91308 | 3.62921 | .58793 | -17.50477* |
| 40 | 2.95505 | .83343 | 3.79775 | .42873 | - 8.80140* |
| 41 | 1.93258 | .95749 | 3.53932 | .49845 | -15.22420* |
| 42 | 2.04494 | .89831 | 3.57303 | .57840 | -14.56741* |
| 43 | 1.92134 | .99690 | 3.55056 | .67058 | -13.69982* |
| 44 | 1.86516 | .97371 | 3.52808 | .73576 | -14.03891* |
| 45 | 3.02247 | .93589 | 3.77528 | .41739 | - 7.93115* |
| 46 | 2.91011 | .93183 | 3.75280 | .45668 | - 8.34857* |
| 47 | 2.02247 | .88657 | 3.37078 | .70920 | -13.85220* |
| 48 | 2.78651 | .94181 | 3.68539 | .57270 | - 9.11953* |
| 49 | 1.92134 | .88970 | 3.46067 | .68787 | -13.10174* |
| 50 | 1.75280 | .87769 | 3.48314 | .65535 | -14.76746* |
| 51 | 1.82022 | .82872 | 3.46067 | .63699 | -15.43268* |
| 52 | 1.62921 | .82628 | 3.26966 | .69934 | -15.79375* |
| 53 | 2.53932 | 1.08157 | 3.16853 | .91474 | - 5.66097* |
| 54 | 2.33707 | .84725 | 3.43820 | .73370 | -10.38267* |
| 55 | 2.28089 | .98287 | 3.59550 | .55524 | -12.05161* |
| 56 | 3.24719 | .76849 | 3.91011 | .32292 | - 8.14453* |
| 57 | 2.82022 | .91874 | 3.71910 | .47377 | - 8.77993* |
| 58 | 2.33707 | .91115 | 3.56179 | .57971 | -11.20866* |
| 59 | 3.01123 | 1.16594 | 3.77528 | .46814 | - 6.27685* |
| 60 | 1.77528 | 1.02499 | 3.68539 | .51046 | -16.63356* |
| 61 | 2.25842 | 1.21348 | 3.68539 | .62881 | -11.44380* |
| 62 | 2.47191 | 1.00660 | 3.62921 | .56849 | -10.57517* |
| 63 | 2.03370 | 1.06475 | 3.53932 | .83539 | -11.76595* |
| 64 | 1.78651 | 1.05438 | 3.73033 | .51416 | -16.49831* |
| 65 | 2.79775 | 1.00760 | 3.82022 | .43863 | - 9.33528* |
| 66 | 2.84269 | 1.06948 | 3.74157 | .50897 | - 7.65145* |
| 67 | 2.83146 | .91474 | 3.73033 | .51416 | - 9.24180* |
| 68 | 2.88764 | .92939 | 3.75280 | .48065 | - 8.53999* |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table VI, revealed all sixty-eight of the sixty-eight ratios were significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents perceived the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents in large school systems was rejected.

The findings seem to indicate that classroom teacher presidents in large school systems perceive the school superintendent's actual behavior as different from what would be ideal behavior. This difference in perception is further emphasized since all ratios under each of the seven categories were significant.

Question VII

To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike, as it is perceived by classroom teacher presidents in large and small school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table VII, revealed only two of the sixty-eight ratios significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents in large and small school systems perceive the actual role of the school superintendent was accepted.

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS IN LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Numbers | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Actual Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Ideal Role | | t |
|------------------|--|--------------------|---|--------------------|------------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 2.97222 | .76325 | 3.86111 | .34583 | - 6.24151* |
| 2 | 2.33333 | .84983 | 3.77777 | .41573 | - 9.53939* |
| 3 | 2.52777 | .83287 | 3.88888 | .39283 | - 9.08119* |
| 4 | 3.02777 | 1.04046 | 3.91666 | .27638 | - 5.01682* |
| 5 | 2.80555 | .87621 | 3.83333 | .44095 | - 6.35346* |
| 6 | 2.41666 | 1.21048 | 3.66666 | .52704 | - 6.10919* |
| 7 | 2.97222 | .89709 | 3.86111 | .34583 | - 6.01074* |
| 8 | 2.50000 | .95742 | 3.55555 | .64310 | - 6.25441* |
| 9 | 2.47222 | .89709 | 3.72222 | .60603 | - 8.27515* |
| 10 | 1.94444 | .97023 | 3.77777 | .41573 | -11.68815* |
| 11 | 1.91666 | .95379 | 3.80555 | .46064 | -11.57469* |
| 12 | 1.97222 | .92754 | 3.52777 | .55207 | - 9.62822* |
| 13 | 2.41666 | 1.01036 | 3.72222 | .50613 | - 7.76280* |
| 14 | 2.36111 | .91750 | 3.83333 | .37267 | - 8.83684* |
| 15 | 2.50000 | .95742 | 3.75000 | .43301 | - 8.00152* |
| 16 | 2.36111 | .94729 | 3.75000 | .43301 | - 9.22587* |
| 17 | 2.80555 | 1.04932 | 3.83333 | .37267 | - 5.69953* |
| 18 | 2.38888 | 1.00768 | 3.83333 | .37267 | - 8.01832* |
| 19 | 3.00000 | 1.10554 | 3.88888 | .31426 | - 4.78091* |
| 20 | 2.88888 | .90608 | 3.75000 | .43301 | - 5.74524* |
| 21 | 3.19444 | .84391 | 3.63888 | .48032 | - 3.45179* |
| 22 | 2.50000 | .92796 | 3.55555 | .49690 | - 6.63508* |
| 23 | 2.44444 | .89580 | 3.77777 | .41573 | - 8.64098* |
| 24 | 1.91666 | .82915 | 3.50000 | .60092 | -10.48186* |
| 25 | 2.13888 | .97618 | 3.58333 | .54645 | - 8.22192* |
| 26 | 2.11111 | .96545 | 3.47222 | .64489 | - 7.61020* |
| 27 | 1.75000 | .92421 | 3.27777 | .69166 | -10.07522* |
| 28 | 2.88888 | .93623 | 3.75000 | .49300 | - 5.95964* |
| 29 | 2.94444 | .91117 | 3.47222 | .60028 | - 3.16792* |
| 30 | 3.16666 | .89752 | 3.58333 | .54645 | - 2.85964* |
| 31 | 1.91666 | .92421 | 3.52777 | .64489 | -11.09770* |
| 32 | 2.11111 | .80890 | 3.47222 | .64489 | - 7.80634* |
| 33 | 1.91666 | .92421 | 3.52777 | .64489 | -11.09770* |

TABLE VI--Continued

| Variable Numbers | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Actual Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Ideal Role | | t |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|------------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 34 | 2.75000 | 1.16368 | 3.75000 | .59511 | - 5.61248* |
| 35 | 2.91666 | 1.11492 | 3.80555 | .46064 | - 4.78091* |
| 36 | 3.25000 | .72168 | 3.69444 | .56859 | - 3.16227* |
| 37 | 3.25000 | .95379 | 3.69444 | .56859 | - 2.46717* |
| 38 | 1.91666 | .86200 | 3.44444 | .68493 | - 8.27278* |
| 39 | 2.02777 | 1.14227 | 3.88888 | .31426 | - 9.50515* |
| 40 | 2.94444 | .88016 | 3.83333 | .37267 | - 5.80381* |
| 41 | 2.00000 | .97182 | 3.52777 | .60028 | - 8.68696* |
| 42 | 2.02777 | .95702 | 3.58333 | .64009 | - 9.62822* |
| 43 | 1.72222 | .96064 | 3.63888 | .53503 | -12.26900* |
| 44 | 1.77777 | .82026 | 3.55555 | .54997 | -10.48516* |
| 45 | 2.88888 | .93623 | 3.58333 | .59511 | - 4.25012* |
| 46 | 2.69444 | .84391 | 3.83333 | .37267 | - 7.88211* |
| 47 | 1.88888 | .80890 | 3.27777 | .73071 | - 9.56698* |
| 48 | 2.55555 | 1.06574 | 3.72222 | .50613 | - 5.68845* |
| 49 | 2.08333 | .86200 | 3.58333 | .59511 | - 8.52597* |
| 50 | 2.00000 | .94280 | 3.63888 | .48032 | - 9.65491* |
| 51 | 1.83333 | .86602 | 3.69444 | .46064 | -11.62301* |
| 52 | 1.75000 | .68211 | 3.44444 | .64310 | -11.04794* |
| 53 | 2.80555 | .81033 | 3.52777 | .64489 | - 4.31964* |
| 54 | 2.25000 | .92421 | 3.77777 | .41573 | - 8.68696* |
| 55 | 2.16666 | .98601 | 3.72222 | .44790 | - 8.63511* |
| 56 | 2.97222 | 1.11768 | 3.88888 | .31426 | - 4.56750* |
| 57 | 2.75000 | .82915 | 3.69444 | .46064 | - 6.34813* |
| 58 | 2.47222 | .95702 | 3.52777 | .49922 | - 6.85348* |
| 59 | 2.72222 | 1.21589 | 3.94444 | .22906 | - 5.89178* |
| 60 | 2.02777 | 1.14227 | 3.72222 | .60603 | - 8.53692* |
| 61 | 2.66666 | 1.15470 | 3.77777 | .41573 | - 5.97614* |
| 62 | 2.33333 | 1.22474 | 3.88888 | .31426 | - 7.32077* |
| 63 | 1.94444 | 1.10414 | 3.66666 | .66666 | - 8.54171* |
| 64 | 2.13888 | 1.10937 | 3.86111 | .34583 | - 9.09072* |
| 65 | 2.66666 | 1.08012 | 3.83333 | .37267 | - 6.46755* |
| 66 | 2.83333 | 1.09290 | 3.80555 | .39577 | - 5.67561* |
| 67 | 2.80555 | .99497 | 3.69444 | .46064 | - 5.14867* |
| 68 | 2.83333 | 1.01379 | 3.80555 | .39577 | - 5.52806* |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The findings seem to indicate that classroom teacher presidents in large and small school systems perceive the school superintendent's behavior to be the same. This similarity is further emphasized since no single category had a majority of significant ratios. In fact, only two categories had any significant ratios. These categories were pupil personnel and school finance; they had one significant ratio each. These concepts were

Pupil Personnel

26. Involves teachers in the development of student promotion policies.

School Finance

35. Understands such things as how the necessary financial resources are controlled, how to deal with conflicting aims in the political system, and is energetically using this knowledge to gain the needed financial support for public schools.

Question VIII

To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike, as it is perceived by classroom teacher presidents in large and small school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table VIII, revealed only seven of the sixty-eight ratios significant at the

TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE
ACTUAL ROLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED
BY CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS IN SMALL AND
LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Numbers | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Actual Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Actual Role | | t |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 2.6966 | .9410 | 2.9722 | .7632 | -1.5491 |
| 2 | 2.4719 | .8879 | 2.3333 | .8498 | .7934 |
| 3 | 2.5955 | .9447 | 2.5277 | .8328 | .3721 |
| 4 | 3.1797 | .7869 | 3.0277 | 1.0404 | .8798 |
| 5 | 3.0000 | .8740 | 2.8055 | .8762 | 1.1164 |
| 6 | 2.1685 | 1.0834 | 2.4166 | 1.2104 | -1.1111 |
| 7 | 3.0000 | .8072 | 2.9722 | .8970 | .1672 |
| 8 | 2.3932 | .9315 | 2.5000 | .9574 | -.5708 |
| 9 | 2.4269 | .8331 | 2.4722 | .8970 | -.2667 |
| 10 | 2.0561 | .9284 | 1.9444 | .9702 | .5965 |
| 11 | 2.1123 | .9879 | 1.9166 | .9537 | 1.0046 |
| 12 | 1.8764 | .8587 | 1.9722 | .9275 | -.5473 |
| 13 | 2.6629 | 1.0160 | 2.4166 | 1.0103 | 1.2191 |
| 14 | 2.6741 | .8966 | 2.3611 | .9175 | 1.7416 |
| 15 | 2.1910 | .9929 | 2.5000 | .9574 | -1.5788 |
| 16 | 2.4494 | .9119 | 2.3611 | .9472 | .4809 |
| 17 | 2.9438 | .9162 | 2.8055 | 1.0493 | .7259 |
| 18 | 2.3595 | .9743 | 2.3888 | 1.0076 | -.1497 |
| 19 | 3.1123 | .9293 | 3.0000 | 1.1055 | .5738 |
| 20 | 2.7865 | .8801 | 2.8888 | .9060 | -.5791 |
| 21 | 3.0561 | .8527 | 3.1944 | .8439 | -.8167 |
| 22 | 2.5842 | 1.0146 | 2.5000 | .9279 | .4273 |
| 23 | 2.4044 | .9911 | 2.4444 | .8958 | -.2079 |
| 24 | 2.2022 | .9383 | 1.9166 | .8291 | 1.5791 |
| 25 | 2.3033 | .9876 | 2.1388 | .9761 | .8391 |
| 26 | 2.5730 | 1.0373 | 2.1111 | .9654 | 2.2806* |
| 27 | 1.7752 | .8963 | 1.7500 | .9242 | .1403 |
| 28 | 2.7640 | 1.0279 | 2.8888 | .9362 | -.6254 |
| 29 | 2.8426 | 1.0155 | 2.9444 | .9111 | -.5179 |
| 30 | 3.0561 | .7696 | 3.1666 | .8975 | -.6862 |
| 31 | 2.0112 | 1.0330 | 1.9166 | .9242 | .4735 |
| 32 | 2.1011 | .9835 | 2.1111 | .8089 | -.0535 |
| 33 | 1.4606 | .7040 | 1.6388 | .8867 | -1.1758 |

TABLE VII--Continued

| Variable Numbers | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Actual Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Actual Role | | <u>t</u> |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 34 | 3.0898 | .8432 | 2.7500 | 1.1636 | 1.8030 |
| 35 | 3.2808 | .8071 | 2.9166 | 1.1149 | 2.0178* |
| 36 | 3.3146 | .8155 | 3.2500 | .7216 | .4109 |
| 37 | 3.3258 | .9804 | 3.2500 | .9537 | .3915 |
| 38 | 2.0337 | .9994 | 1.9166 | .8620 | .6110 |
| 39 | 1.6516 | .9130 | 2.0277 | 1.1422 | -1.9183 |
| 40 | 2.9550 | .8334 | 2.9444 | .8801 | .0629 |
| 41 | 1.9325 | .9574 | 2.0000 | .9718 | -.3520 |
| 42 | 2.0449 | .8983 | 2.0277 | .9570 | .0941 |
| 43 | 1.9213 | .9969 | 1.7222 | .9606 | 1.0136 |
| 44 | 1.8651 | .9737 | 1.7777 | .8202 | .4708 |
| 45 | 3.0224 | .9358 | 2.8888 | .9362 | .7167 |
| 46 | 2.9101 | .9318 | 2.6944 | .8439 | 1.1936 |
| 47 | 2.0224 | .8865 | 1.8888 | .8089 | .7756 |
| 48 | 2.7865 | .9418 | 2.5555 | 1.0657 | 1.1846 |
| 49 | 1.9213 | .8897 | 2.0833 | .8620 | -.9225 |
| 50 | 1.7528 | .8766 | 2.0000 | .9428 | -1.3840 |
| 51 | 1.8202 | .8287 | 1.8333 | .8660 | -.0784 |
| 52 | 1.6292 | .8262 | 1.7500 | .6821 | -.7703 |
| 53 | 2.5393 | 1.0815 | 2.8055 | .8103 | -1.3225 |
| 54 | 2.3370 | .8472 | 2.2500 | .9242 | .5026 |
| 55 | 2.2808 | .9828 | 2.1666 | .9860 | .5831 |
| 56 | 3.2471 | .7684 | 2.9722 | 1.1176 | 1.5633 |
| 57 | 2.8202 | .9187 | 2.7500 | .8291 | .3945 |
| 58 | 2.3370 | .9111 | 2.4722 | .9570 | -.7340 |
| 59 | 3.0112 | 1.1659 | 2.7222 | 1.2158 | 1.2294 |
| 60 | 1.7752 | 1.0249 | 2.0277 | 1.1422 | -1.1961 |
| 61 | 2.2584 | 1.2134 | 2.6666 | 1.1547 | -1.7130 |
| 62 | 2.4719 | 1.0066 | 2.3333 | 1.2247 | .6480 |
| 63 | 2.0337 | 1.0647 | 1.9444 | 1.1041 | .4165 |
| 64 | 1.7865 | 1.0543 | 2.1388 | 1.1093 | -1.6530 |
| 65 | 2.7977 | 1.0076 | 2.6666 | 1.0801 | .6397 |
| 66 | 2.8426 | 1.0694 | 2.8333 | 1.0929 | .0436 |
| 67 | 2.8314 | .9147 | 2.8055 | .9949 | .1386 |
| 68 | 2.8876 | .9293 | 2.8333 | 1.0137 | .2857 |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way classroom teacher presidents in large and small school systems perceive the ideal role of the school superintendent was accepted.

The findings seem to indicate that classroom teacher presidents in large and small school systems perceive the school superintendent's ideal role to be the same. This finding is further emphasized since none of the seven categories had a majority of significant ratios.

The analysis yielded statistically significant difference at the .05 level of confidence for each of the following concepts under the seven categories.

Pupil Personnel

24. Involves teachers in the development of policies and procedures for the handling of all types of discipline problems.

School Finance

39. Establishes a committee (including teachers) to study salaries and other welfare benefits, making periodic recommendations to the school board.

Plant Development and Maintenance

45. Provides consistent leadership in the daily (as well as long range) maintenance of school facilities and grounds (clean and well-groomed).

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE
 IDEAL ROLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED
 BY CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS IN SMALL AND
 LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Ideal Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|---------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 3.8089 | .3930 | 3.8611 | .3458 | -.6886 |
| 2 | 3.7528 | .4313 | 3.7777 | .4157 | -.2937 |
| 3 | 3.7415 | .4627 | 3.8888 | .3928 | -1.6673 |
| 4 | 3.9101 | .2860 | 3.9166 | .2763 | -.1161 |
| 5 | 3.8988 | .3014 | 3.8333 | .4409 | .9473 |
| 6 | 3.6629 | .4959 | 3.6666 | .5270 | -.0372 |
| 7 | 3.8988 | .3014 | 3.8611 | .3458 | .6022 |
| 8 | 3.6966 | .4835 | 3.5555 | .6431 | 1.3257 |
| 9 | 3.6516 | .5214 | 3.7222 | .6060 | -.6474 |
| 10 | 3.7191 | .4737 | 3.7777 | .4157 | -.6436 |
| 11 | 3.7415 | .4627 | 3.8055 | .4606 | -.6953 |
| 12 | 3.4943 | .6019 | 3.5277 | .5520 | -.2852 |
| 13 | 3.6966 | .5488 | 3.7222 | .5061 | -.2394 |
| 14 | 3.7528 | .4566 | 3.8333 | .3726 | -.9314 |
| 15 | 3.6404 | .4798 | 3.7500 | .4330 | -1.1784 |
| 16 | 3.7977 | .4782 | 3.7500 | .4330 | .5149 |
| 17 | 3.8876 | .3158 | 3.8333 | .3726 | .8185 |
| 18 | 3.8651 | .4290 | 3.8333 | .3726 | .3865 |
| 19 | 3.9325 | .2507 | 3.8888 | .3142 | .8110 |
| 20 | 3.8539 | .3531 | 3.7500 | .4330 | 1.3812 |
| 21 | 3.6966 | .5062 | 3.6388 | .4803 | .5812 |
| 22 | 3.6179 | .5084 | 3.5555 | .4969 | .6205 |
| 23 | 3.7303 | .4918 | 3.7777 | .4157 | -.5056 |
| 24 | 3.7191 | .4494 | 3.5000 | .6009 | 2.2103* |
| 25 | 3.5393 | .6369 | 3.5833 | .5464 | -.3609 |
| 26 | 3.6067 | .5324 | 3.4722 | .6448 | 1.1911 |
| 27 | 3.3146 | .7125 | 3.2777 | .6916 | .2617 |
| 28 | 3.7752 | .4681 | 3.7500 | .4930 | .2670 |
| 29 | 3.5617 | .5797 | 3.4722 | .6002 | .7680 |
| 30 | 3.7303 | .4437 | 3.5833 | .5464 | 1.5521 |
| 31 | 3.4269 | .6514 | 3.5277 | .6448 | -.7793 |
| 32 | 3.4382 | .6352 | 3.4722 | .6448 | -.2677 |

TABLE VIII--Continued

| Variable Number | Classroom Teacher Presidents Small School System Ideal Role | | Classroom Teacher Presidents Large School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 33 | 3.5056 | .5430 | 3.4722 | .6002 | .2994 |
| 34 | 3.8426 | .3640 | 3.7500 | .5951 | 1.0505 |
| 35 | 3.8539 | .3836 | 3.8055 | .4606 | .5964 |
| 36 | 3.8314 | .3743 | 3.6944 | .5685 | 1.5667 |
| 37 | 3.6629 | .6860 | 3.6944 | .5685 | -.2419 |
| 38 | 3.3820 | .7420 | 3.4440 | .6849 | -.4317 |
| 39 | 3.6292 | .5879 | 3.8888 | .3142 | -2.4888* |
| 40 | 3.7977 | .4287 | 3.8333 | .3726 | -.4322 |
| 41 | 3.5393 | .4984 | 3.5277 | .6002 | .1094 |
| 42 | 3.5730 | .5784 | 3.5833 | .6400 | -.0866 |
| 43 | 3.5505 | .6705 | 3.6388 | .5350 | -.6990 |
| 44 | 3.5280 | .7357 | 3.5555 | .5499 | -.2006 |
| 45 | 3.7752 | .4173 | 3.5833 | .5951 | 2.0275* |
| 46 | 3.7528 | .4566 | 3.8333 | .3726 | -.9314 |
| 47 | 3.3707 | .7092 | 3.2777 | .7307 | .6528 |
| 48 | 3.6853 | .5727 | 3.7222 | .5061 | -.3336 |
| 49 | 3.4606 | .6878 | 3.5833 | .5951 | -.9298 |
| 50 | 3.4831 | .6553 | 3.6388 | .4803 | -1.2819 |
| 51 | 3.4606 | .6369 | 3.6944 | .4606 | -1.9844 |
| 52 | 3.2696 | .6993 | 3.4444 | .6431 | -1.2840 |
| 53 | 3.1685 | .9147 | 3.5277 | .6448 | -2.1328* |
| 54 | 3.4382 | .7337 | 3.7777 | .4157 | -2.5915* |
| 55 | 3.5955 | .5552 | 3.7222 | .4479 | -1.2085 |
| 56 | 3.9101 | .3229 | 3.8888 | .3142 | .3326 |
| 57 | 3.7191 | .4737 | 3.6944 | .4606 | .2634 |
| 58 | 3.5617 | .5797 | 3.5277 | .4992 | .3063 |
| 59 | 3.7752 | .4681 | 3.9444 | .2290 | -2.0535* |
| 60 | 3.6853 | .5104 | 3.7222 | .6060 | -.3426 |
| 61 | 3.6853 | .6288 | 3.7777 | .4157 | -.8060 |
| 62 | 3.6292 | .5684 | 3.8888 | .3142 | -2.5647* |
| 63 | 3.5393 | .8353 | 3.6666 | .6666 | -.8090 |
| 64 | 3.7303 | .5141 | 3.8611 | .3458 | -1.3918 |
| 65 | 3.8202 | .4386 | 3.8333 | .3726 | -.1564 |
| 66 | 3.7415 | .5089 | 3.8055 | .3957 | -.6706 |
| 67 | 3.7303 | .5141 | 3.6944 | .4606 | .3609 |
| 68 | 3.7528 | .4806 | 3.8055 | .3957 | -.5786 |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Public Relations

53. Enthusiastically supports the Parent-Teacher Association, keeps membership informed, and solicits its criticisms and assistance.
54. Keeps the press accurately informed of the successes and weaknesses of the school (which also includes teacher welfare) and the trends in education.

Professional Relations

59. Encourages teachers to join and attend meetings sponsored by the classroom teacher association.
62. Recognizes by established policy teacher rights to exert political influence on local, state and national levels.

Question IX

To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by school superintendents in large and small school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table IX, revealed only six of the sixty-eight ratios significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way the actual role of the school superintendent was perceived by school superintendents in large and small school systems was accepted.

The findings seem to indicate that school superintendents in both large and small school systems perceive their actual role to be the same. This finding is further emphasized since none of the seven categories had as many as 50 percent significant ratios.

The analysis yielded statistically significant difference at the .05 level of confidence for each of the following concepts under the seven categories.

Instruction and Curriculum Development

3. Sees that the organization, administration and supervision of the school serve to facilitate the work of the teacher.

Staff Personnel

19. Uses criteria in evaluating teachers for dismissal based on objective information and not on personal bias or prejudice.

Pupil Personnel

28. Provides special teachers for students who cannot adjust, educationally and socially, to the regular classroom.

School Finance

37. Diligently obtains all available federal funds and private grants for experimentation and enrichment programs.

TABLE IX

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE
ACTUAL ROLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED
BY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN LARGE AND
SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Actual Role | | Superintendents Small School System Actual Role | | t |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|---------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 3.0000 | .7071 | 3.0224 | .7027 | -.1603 |
| 2 | 2.7222 | .6916 | 2.8539 | .6795 | -.9683 |
| 3 | 3.5277 | .5520 | 3.2247 | .6491 | 2.4439* |
| 4 | 3.5000 | .6009 | 3.4494 | .6705 | .3898 |
| 5 | 3.2222 | .6285 | 3.1348 | .7816 | .5924 |
| 6 | 3.1666 | .6454 | 2.8539 | .8683 | 1.9379 |
| 7 | 3.1944 | .6999 | 3.2808 | .7342 | -.5992 |
| 8 | 2.9722 | .7259 | 2.8426 | .7328 | .8900 |
| 9 | 2.9722 | .7259 | 2.6741 | .7610 | 1.9929 |
| 10 | 2.8333 | .7637 | 2.6067 | .7877 | 1.4571 |
| 11 | 2.9444 | .6211 | 2.7528 | .6915 | 1.4321 |
| 12 | 2.6388 | .7871 | 2.5955 | .7748 | .2798 |
| 13 | 3.3055 | .7752 | 3.2584 | .8006 | .2983 |
| 14 | 3.5277 | .6448 | 3.4719 | .6375 | .4386 |
| 15 | 3.0833 | .7216 | 2.8651 | .7219 | 1.5178 |
| 16 | 3.2222 | .7856 | 3.1573 | .7774 | .4180 |
| 17 | 3.0277 | .7632 | 3.1573 | .5588 | -1.0414 |
| 18 | 3.1111 | .6136 | 3.1460 | .6280 | -.2813 |
| 19 | 3.7777 | .4157 | 3.5056 | .6203 | 2.4021* |
| 20 | 3.2222 | .5826 | 3.2247 | .6135 | -.0207 |
| 21 | 3.1944 | .7752 | 3.2022 | .7522 | -.0516 |
| 22 | 2.8888 | .7370 | 2.8202 | .7579 | .4585 |
| 23 | 2.8055 | .8762 | 2.8988 | .8078 | -.5659 |
| 24 | 2.6388 | .7130 | 2.7303 | .7608 | -.6144 |
| 25 | 2.6388 | .8867 | 2.6067 | .9315 | .1757 |
| 26 | 3.1666 | .7264 | 2.9887 | .7419 | 1.2114 |
| 27 | 2.1944 | .7385 | 2.3595 | .7967 | -1.0624 |
| 28 | 3.1111 | .8089 | 2.7640 | .8743 | 2.0361* |
| 29 | 3.1388 | .7871 | 3.2921 | .6395 | -1.1229 |
| 30 | 2.9722 | .6448 | 2.9887 | .6618 | -.1264 |
| 31 | 2.6944 | .7752 | 2.7415 | .9060 | -.2719 |
| 32 | 2.6388 | .7510 | 2.7640 | .8349 | -.7743 |
| 33 | 2.1388 | .8216 | 2.0112 | .9420 | .7052 |

TABLE IX--Continued

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Actual Role | | Superintendents Small School System Actual Role | | <u>t</u> |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|----------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 34 | 3.6111 | .5905 | 3.5168 | .7049 | .7023 |
| 35 | 3.3611 | .6303 | 3.3033 | .7989 | .3844 |
| 36 | 3.4166 | .7592 | 3.4044 | .6656 | .0880 |
| 37 | 3.4722 | .8970 | 3.0561 | .8914 | 2.3396* |
| 38 | 2.6666 | .7071 | 2.5056 | 1.0180 | .8612 |
| 39 | 2.6388 | 1.0581 | 2.3033 | 1.0211 | 1.6328 |
| 40 | 3.5833 | .5464 | 3.3932 | .6110 | 1.6092 |
| 41 | 2.7777 | .7856 | 2.6516 | .8624 | .7529 |
| 42 | 3.3333 | .7817 | 3.0000 | .8868 | 1.9513 |
| 43 | 3.1944 | .9374 | 3.0234 | 1.0383 | .8548 |
| 44 | 2.6666 | .8819 | 2.6629 | .8604 | .0217 |
| 45 | 3.1944 | .8103 | 3.2022 | .7217 | -.0523 |
| 46 | 3.3333 | .7071 | 3.2584 | .7115 | .5296 |
| 47 | 2.5833 | .8291 | 2.7078 | .8238 | -.7577 |
| 48 | 3.3055 | .6591 | 3.1573 | .7628 | 1.0136 |
| 49 | 2.5555 | .8314 | 2.6292 | .7986 | -.4576 |
| 50 | 2.8333 | .7993 | 2.7078 | .8373 | .7623 |
| 51 | 2.5277 | .7632 | 2.6853 | .8943 | -.9218 |
| 52 | 2.4444 | .7243 | 2.4269 | .8596 | .1066 |
| 53 | 3.5000 | .7637 | 2.9887 | .9420 | 2.8707* |
| 54 | 3.4444 | .6431 | 3.0449 | .7630 | 2.7464* |
| 55 | 3.0555 | .6211 | 3.1573 | .7328 | -.7274 |
| 56 | 3.3333 | .6236 | 3.4382 | .6352 | -.8334 |
| 57 | 3.3333 | .6236 | 3.1685 | .6908 | 1.2313 |
| 58 | 2.7222 | .6916 | 2.9775 | .8477 | -1.5910 |
| 59 | 3.3055 | .6591 | 3.3483 | .7803 | -.2872 |
| 60 | 2.3611 | 1.1583 | 2.4494 | 1.0278 | -.4157 |
| 61 | 3.4166 | .7216 | 3.1910 | .8978 | 1.3318 |
| 62 | 3.2222 | .8854 | 2.9213 | 1.0729 | 1.4778 |
| 63 | 2.5000 | 1.1426 | 2.3033 | 1.0642 | .9081 |
| 64 | 2.9166 | 1.0103 | 2.6404 | .9743 | 1.4085 |
| 65 | 3.6111 | .5905 | 3.5393 | .6543 | .5662 |
| 66 | 3.5277 | .6002 | 3.4382 | .6862 | .6789 |
| 67 | 3.2777 | .7307 | 3.2696 | .7608 | .0541 |
| 68 | 3.4166 | .7216 | 3.3258 | .6495 | .6796 |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Public Relations

53. Enthusiastically supports the Parent-Teacher Association, keeps membership informed, and solicits its criticisms and assistance.
54. Keeps the press accurately informed of the successes and weaknesses of the school (which also includes teacher welfare) and the trends in education.

Question X

To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike, as it is perceived by school superintendents in large and small school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table X, revealed only three of the sixty-eight ratios significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way the ideal role of the school superintendent was perceived by school superintendents in large and small school systems was accepted.

The findings seem to indicate that school superintendents in both large and small school systems perceive their ideal role to be the same. This finding is strengthened further since none of the seven categories had as many as 50 percent significant ratios.

The analysis yielded statistically significant difference

TABLE X

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE
IDEAL ROLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED
BY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN LARGE AND
SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Ideal Role | | Superintendents Small School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|---------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 3.7500 | .4330 | 3.8314 | .4302 | -.9491 |
| 2 | 3.6111 | .5414 | 3.7640 | .4745 | -1.5523 |
| 3 | 4.0000 | .0000 | 3.7640 | .4245 | 3.3075* |
| 4 | 3.9444 | .2290 | 3.9438 | .2747 | .0119 |
| 5 | 3.7500 | .4930 | 3.7303 | .5561 | .1833 |
| 6 | 3.6666 | .5270 | 3.5617 | .6172 | .8886 |
| 7 | 3.9166 | .2763 | 3.8764 | .4452 | .5006 |
| 8 | 3.7777 | .4157 | 3.7640 | .4976 | .1450 |
| 9 | 3.8611 | .3458 | 3.7752 | .4681 | .9876 |
| 10 | 3.7777 | .4157 | 3.7528 | .4806 | .2708 |
| 11 | 3.3888 | .5414 | 3.5617 | .5987 | -1.4898 |
| 12 | 3.3055 | .6591 | 3.4943 | .6555 | -1.4443 |
| 13 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.8988 | .3014 | -.1643 |
| 14 | 3.8611 | .3458 | 3.7977 | .4541 | .7472 |
| 15 | 3.6111 | .5414 | 3.7865 | .4613 | -1.8133 |
| 16 | 3.6944 | .5174 | 3.6853 | .5527 | .0837 |
| 17 | 3.9444 | .2290 | 3.9213 | .2691 | .4491 |
| 18 | 3.8611 | .3458 | 3.9213 | .3081 | -.9470 |
| 19 | 4.0000 | .0000 | 3.8988 | .3367 | 1.7875 |
| 20 | 3.9722 | .1643 | 3.8988 | .3014 | 1.3680 |
| 21 | 3.6388 | .6303 | 3.6067 | .6468 | .2514 |
| 22 | 3.4444 | .5983 | 3.6179 | .6620 | -1.3525 |
| 23 | 3.7777 | .4779 | 3.7865 | .4363 | -.0978 |
| 24 | 3.3888 | .6358 | 3.4831 | .6553 | -.7284 |
| 25 | 3.5000 | .6009 | 3.3370 | .8604 | 1.0299 |
| 26 | 3.5833 | .5464 | 3.5280 | .6013 | .4734 |
| 27 | 3.3333 | .5773 | 3.3258 | .8041 | .0504 |
| 28 | 3.7777 | .4779 | 3.6516 | .5825 | 1.1421 |
| 29 | 3.6111 | .5414 | 3.6067 | .5531 | .0399 |
| 30 | 3.7222 | .4479 | 3.7528 | .4806 | -.3258 |
| 31 | 3.4166 | .6400 | 3.4943 | .5829 | -.6505 |
| 32 | 3.5000 | .6009 | 3.6292 | .5057 | -1.2131 |

TABLE X--Continued

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Ideal Role | | Superintendents Small School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|---------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 33 | 2.9722 | .8655 | 3.0786 | .8509 | - .6250 |
| 34 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.9101 | .2860 | - .3620 |
| 35 | 3.9166 | .2763 | 3.7528 | .5253 | 1.7604 |
| 36 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.8314 | .4302 | .7205 |
| 37 | 3.6388 | .7871 | 3.4606 | .8080 | 1.1158 |
| 38 | 3.4444 | .6849 | 3.2696 | .9333 | 1.0099 |
| 39 | 3.2500 | .8620 | 3.2134 | .8275 | .2189 |
| 40 | 3.8055 | .3957 | 3.8202 | .4635 | - .1655 |
| 41 | 3.4166 | .6400 | 3.4831 | .6379 | - .5228 |
| 42 | 3.6666 | .5270 | 3.5617 | .6696 | .8334 |
| 43 | 3.5277 | .7632 | 3.5505 | .7033 | - .1586 |
| 44 | 3.1666 | .7993 | 3.2471 | .7829 | - .5133 |
| 45 | 3.6944 | .5174 | 3.7303 | .5355 | - .3398 |
| 46 | 3.7777 | .4779 | 3.8314 | .4032 | - .6328 |
| 47 | 3.3888 | .7915 | 3.4831 | .7049 | - .6476 |
| 48 | 3.8333 | .3726 | 3.7078 | .5236 | 1.2991 |
| 49 | 3.4722 | .6448 | 3.5505 | .5998 | - .6416 |
| 50 | 3.5833 | .4930 | 3.5280 | .6013 | .4848 |
| 51 | 3.5000 | .5527 | 3.5056 | .6019 | - .0479 |
| 52 | 3.3333 | .6666 | 3.4269 | .7478 | - .6482 |
| 53 | 3.7222 | .5583 | 3.2808 | .8478 | 2.8575* |
| 54 | 3.8333 | .3726 | 3.5955 | .6656 | 2.0032* |
| 55 | 3.6944 | .4606 | 3.7752 | .4434 | - .9051 |
| 56 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.9213 | .3081 | - .5260 |
| 57 | 3.6944 | .4606 | 3.7528 | .4806 | - .6171 |
| 58 | 3.5000 | .6009 | 3.6404 | .5658 | -1.2242 |
| 59 | 3.4722 | .5520 | 3.5168 | .7805 | - .3103 |
| 60 | 2.8888 | .8748 | 3.1685 | .8771 | -1.6023 |
| 61 | 3.6388 | .5350 | 3.6404 | .5853 | - .0137 |
| 62 | 3.4444 | .7617 | 3.4269 | .7326 | .1184 |
| 63 | 2.8888 | 1.0743 | 2.8426 | 1.1307 | .2080 |
| 64 | 3.3611 | .9175 | 3.3258 | .8041 | .2112 |
| 65 | 3.9166 | .2763 | 3.9438 | .2302 | - .5578 |
| 66 | 3.7777 | .4779 | 3.7752 | .4434 | .0276 |
| 67 | 3.7222 | .5583 | 3.7078 | .5446 | .1314 |
| 68 | 3.8888 | .3142 | 3.8764 | .3291 | .1929 |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

at the .05 level of confidence for each of the following concepts under the seven categories.

Instruction and Curriculum Development

3. Sees that the organization, administration and supervision of the school serve to facilitate the work of the teacher.

Public Relations

53. Enthusiastically supports the Parent-Teacher Associations, keeps membership informed, and solicits its criticisms and assistance.
54. Keeps the press accurately informed of the successes and weaknesses of the school (which also includes teacher welfare) and the trends in education.

Question XI

To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike, as perceived by school superintendents in large school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table XI, revealed all sixty-eight of the sixty-eight ratios significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way school superintendents in large school systems perceive the actual and ideal roles of the school superintendent was rejected.

TABLE XI

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Actual Role | | Superintendents Large School System Ideal Role | | t |
|-----------------|---|--------------------|--|--------------------|-----------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 3.00000 | .70710 | 3.75000 | .43301 | -6.93187* |
| 2 | 2.72222 | .69166 | 3.61111 | .54148 | -8.46986* |
| 3 | 3.52777 | .55207 | 4.00000 | .00000 | -5.06039* |
| 4 | 3.50000 | .60092 | 3.94444 | .22906 | -4.39435* |
| 5 | 3.22222 | .62853 | 3.75000 | .49300 | -5.65573* |
| 6 | 3.16666 | .64549 | 3.66666 | .52704 | -5.35129* |
| 7 | 3.19444 | .69997 | 3.91666 | .27638 | -7.05023* |
| 8 | 2.97222 | .72595 | 3.77777 | .41573 | -6.80840* |
| 9 | 2.97222 | .72595 | 3.86111 | .34583 | -8.00000* |
| 10 | 2.83333 | .76376 | 3.77777 | .41573 | -7.16555* |
| 11 | 2.94444 | .62112 | 3.38888 | .54148 | -4.08857* |
| 12 | 2.63888 | .78714 | 3.30555 | .65910 | -5.29150* |
| 13 | 3.30555 | .77529 | 3.88888 | .31426 | -4.34121* |
| 14 | 3.52777 | .64489 | 3.86111 | .34583 | -4.18330* |
| 15 | 3.08333 | .72168 | 3.61111 | .54148 | -4.84164* |
| 16 | 3.22222 | .78567 | 3.69444 | .51744 | -4.65397* |
| 17 | 3.02777 | .76325 | 3.94444 | .22906 | -7.14311* |
| 18 | 3.11111 | .61363 | 3.86111 | .34583 | -7.45575* |
| 19 | 3.77777 | .41573 | 4.00000 | .00000 | -3.16227* |
| 20 | 3.22222 | .58267 | 3.97222 | .16433 | -8.11974* |
| 21 | 3.19444 | .77529 | 3.63888 | .63037 | -4.39435* |
| 22 | 2.88888 | .73702 | 3.44444 | .59835 | -5.97614* |
| 23 | 2.80555 | .87621 | 3.77777 | .47790 | -7.53578* |
| 24 | 2.63888 | .71308 | 3.38888 | .63586 | -5.58156* |
| 25 | 2.63888 | .88671 | 3.50000 | .60092 | -8.08150* |
| 26 | 3.16666 | .72648 | 3.58333 | .54645 | -3.85104* |
| 27 | 2.19444 | .73859 | 3.33333 | .57735 | -8.20000* |
| 28 | 3.11111 | .80890 | 3.77777 | .47790 | -5.04524* |
| 29 | 3.13888 | .78714 | 3.61111 | .54148 | -4.33200* |
| 30 | 2.97222 | .64489 | 3.72222 | .44790 | -8.11974* |
| 31 | 2.69444 | .77529 | 3.41666 | .64009 | -6.57078* |
| 32 | 2.63888 | .75102 | 3.50000 | .60092 | -7.56966* |
| 33 | 2.13888 | .82167 | 2.97222 | .86557 | -6.45497* |

TABLE XI--Continued

| Variable Number | Superintendents Large School System Actual Role | | Superintendents Large School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------|
| | OBS=36 | | OBS=36 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 34 | 3.61111 | .59056 | 3.88888 | .31426 | -2.71163* |
| 35 | 3.36111 | .63037 | 3.91666 | .27638 | -5.11071* |
| 36 | 3.41666 | .75920 | 3.88888 | .31426 | -4.06876* |
| 37 | 3.47222 | .89709 | 3.63888 | .78714 | -2.23606* |
| 38 | 2.66666 | .70710 | 3.44444 | .68493 | -6.46755* |
| 39 | 2.63888 | 1.05811 | 3.25000 | .86200 | -4.37754* |
| 40 | 3.58333 | .54645 | 3.80555 | .39577 | -2.75092* |
| 41 | 2.77777 | .78567 | 3.41666 | .64009 | -5.99595* |
| 42 | 3.33333 | .78173 | 3.66666 | .52704 | -3.16227* |
| 43 | 3.19444 | .93747 | 3.52777 | .76325 | -3.41565* |
| 44 | 2.66666 | .88198 | 3.16666 | .79930 | -4.92247* |
| 45 | 3.19444 | .81033 | 3.69444 | .51744 | -4.07172* |
| 46 | 3.33333 | .70710 | 3.77777 | .47709 | -4.39435* |
| 47 | 2.58333 | .82915 | 3.38888 | .79154 | -6.14700* |
| 48 | 3.30555 | .65910 | 3.83333 | .37267 | -4.54744* |
| 49 | 2.55555 | .83147 | 3.47222 | .64489 | -7.14311* |
| 50 | 2.83333 | .79930 | 3.58333 | .49300 | -6.93187* |
| 51 | 2.52777 | .76325 | 3.50000 | .55277 | -7.92303* |
| 52 | 2.44444 | .72435 | 3.33333 | .66666 | -6.50108* |
| 53 | 3.50000 | .76376 | 3.72222 | .55832 | -2.09165* |
| 54 | 3.44444 | .64310 | 3.83333 | .37267 | -4.24883* |
| 55 | 3.05555 | .62112 | 3.69444 | .46064 | -5.99595* |
| 56 | 3.33333 | .62360 | 3.88888 | .31426 | -5.11071* |
| 57 | 3.33333 | .62360 | 3.69444 | .46064 | -3.99291* |
| 58 | 2.72222 | .69166 | 3.50000 | .60092 | -6.85465* |
| 59 | 3.30555 | .65910 | 3.47222 | .55207 | -2.23606* |
| 60 | 2.36111 | 1.15836 | 2.88888 | .87488 | -3.90872* |
| 61 | 3.41666 | .72168 | 3.63888 | .53503 | -2.75092* |
| 62 | 3.22222 | .88540 | 3.44444 | .76173 | -2.75092* |
| 63 | 2.50000 | 1.14260 | 2.88888 | 1.07439 | -3.20460* |
| 64 | 2.91666 | 1.01036 | 3.36111 | .91750 | -4.08857* |
| 65 | 3.61111 | .59056 | 3.91666 | .27638 | -3.49350* |
| 66 | 3.52777 | .60028* | 3.77777 | .47790 | -3.41565* |
| 67 | 3.27777 | .73071 | 3.72222 | .55832 | -4.08857* |
| 68 | 3.41666 | .72168 | 3.88888 | .31426 | -4.33200* |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The findings seem to indicate that school superintendents in large school systems perceive their actual role to be different from their ideal role. These findings were strengthened further since all ratios under all seven categories were significant.

Question XII

To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike, as perceived by school superintendents in small school systems?

The results of the tests for significance of the difference between means, as reported in Table XII, revealed that all sixty-eight of the sixty-eight ratios were significant at the accepted level of confidence ($P=.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the way school superintendents in small school systems perceive the actual and ideal roles of the school superintendent was rejected.

The findings seem to indicate that school superintendents in small school systems perceive their actual role to be different from their ideal role. These findings were strengthened further since all ratios under all seven categories were significant.

TABLE XII

SUMMARY OF t TESTS BETWEEN MEAN ITEM WEIGHTS FOR THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

| Variable Number | Superintendents Small School System Actual Role | | Superintendents Small School System Ideal Role | | t |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|------------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | 3.02247 | .70276 | 3.83146 | .43020 | -11.07990* |
| 2 | 2.85393 | .67956 | 3.76404 | .47457 | -11.24743* |
| 3 | 3.22471 | .64916 | 3.76404 | .42459 | - 7.35500* |
| 4 | 3.44943 | .67058 | 3.94382 | .27476 | - 6.89653* |
| 5 | 3.13483 | .78168 | 3.73033 | .55615 | - 8.18694* |
| 6 | 2.85393 | .86830 | 3.56179 | .61726 | - 8.19716* |
| 7 | 3.28089 | .73421 | 3.87640 | .44520 | - 7.99624* |
| 8 | 2.84269 | .73283 | 3.76404 | .49769 | -11.25873* |
| 9 | 2.67415 | .76106 | 3.77528 | .46814 | -13.24995* |
| 10 | 2.60674 | .78779 | 3.75280 | .48065 | -12.97543* |
| 11 | 2.75280 | .69153 | 3.56179 | .59878 | -10.36046* |
| 12 | 2.59550 | .77487 | 3.49438 | .65554 | -10.26208* |
| 13 | 3.25842 | .80067 | 3.89887 | .30149 | - 8.31229* |
| 14 | 3.47191 | .63758 | 3.79775 | .45418 | - 5.30470* |
| 15 | 2.86516 | .72190 | 3.78651 | .46135 | -12.82046* |
| 16 | 3.15730 | .77747 | 3.68539 | .55273 | - 7.03124* |
| 17 | 3.15730 | .55886 | 3.92134 | .26919 | -11.94470* |
| 18 | 3.14606 | .62800 | 3.92134 | .30811 | -11.51454* |
| 19 | 3.50561 | .62032 | 3.89887 | .33670 | - 6.43658* |
| 20 | 3.22471 | .61356 | 3.89887 | .30149 | -10.30024* |
| 21 | 3.20224 | .75222 | 3.60674 | .64682 | - 5.56094* |
| 22 | 2.82022 | .75790 | 3.61797 | .66206 | - 9.57561* |
| 23 | 2.89887 | .80789 | 3.78651 | .43632 | -10.23770* |
| 24 | 2.73033 | .76089 | 3.48314 | .65535 | - 9.36935* |
| 25 | 2.60674 | .93156 | 3.33707 | .86041 | - 8.67367* |
| 26 | 2.98876 | .74191 | 3.52808 | .60130 | - 7.73133* |
| 27 | 2.35955 | .79672 | 3.32584 | .80413 | -10.95822* |
| 28 | 2.76404 | .87438 | 3.65168 | .58253 | -10.23770* |
| 29 | 3.29213 | .63956 | 3.60674 | .55319 | - 3.96973* |
| 30 | 2.98876 | .66187 | 3.75280 | .48065 | - 9.55817* |
| 31 | 2.74157 | .90601 | 3.49438 | .58297 | - 8.42299* |
| 32 | 2.76404 | .83494 | 3.62921 | .50574 | -10.02068* |
| 33 | 2.01123 | .94207 | 3.07865 | .85097 | -11.32346* |

TABLE XII--Continued

| Variable Number | Superintendents Small School System Actual Role | | Superintendents Small School System Ideal Role | | t |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|------------|
| | OBS=89 | | OBS=89 | | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | |
| 34 | 3.51685 | .70491 | 3.91011 | .28602 | - 5.06381* |
| 35 | 3.30337 | .79893 | 3.75280 | .52533 | - 6.28715* |
| 36 | 3.40449 | .66567 | 3.83146 | .43020 | - 6.92471* |
| 37 | 3.05617 | .89140 | 3.46067 | .80805 | - 4.80777* |
| 38 | 2.50561 | 1.01807 | 3.26966 | .93332 | - 7.46499* |
| 39 | 2.30337 | 1.02117 | 3.21348 | .82750 | - 8.33940* |
| 40 | 3.39325 | .61109 | 3.82022 | .46354 | - 6.50175* |
| 41 | 2.65168 | .86246 | 3.48314 | .63798 | - 9.62286* |
| 42 | 3.00000 | .88685 | 3.56179 | .66964 | - 7.67992* |
| 43 | 3.02247 | 1.03833 | 3.55056 | .70330 | - 6.46983* |
| 44 | 2.66292 | .86041 | 3.24719 | .78297 | - 7.49314* |
| 45 | 3.20224 | .72172 | 3.73033 | .53556 | - 7.76982* |
| 46 | 3.25842 | .71151 | 3.83146 | .40324 | - 7.84615* |
| 47 | 2.70786 | .82383 | 3.48314 | .70491 | - 8.35074* |
| 48 | 3.15730 | .76288 | 3.70786 | .52364 | - 6.62910* |
| 49 | 2.62921 | .79862 | 3.55056 | .59983 | -10.66522* |
| 50 | 2.70786 | .83736 | 3.52808 | .60130 | - 9.60420* |
| 51 | 2.68539 | .89437 | 3.50561 | .60193 | - 9.28463* |
| 52 | 2.42696 | .85967 | 3.42696 | .74784 | -10.42965* |
| 53 | 2.98876 | .94207 | 3.28089 | .84784 | - 3.57137* |
| 54 | 3.04494 | .76305 | 3.59550 | .66567 | - 7.18219* |
| 55 | 3.15730 | .73283 | 3.77528 | .44350 | - 7.37366* |
| 56 | 3.43820 | .63520 | 3.92134 | .30811 | - 7.30877* |
| 57 | 3.16853 | .69080 | 3.75280 | .48065 | - 8.21492* |
| 58 | 2.97752 | .84770 | 3.64044 | .56582 | - 8.85578* |
| 59 | 3.34831 | .78039 | 3.51685 | .78055 | - 2.40472* |
| 60 | 2.44943 | 1.02782 | 3.16853 | .87712 | - 7.71869* |
| 61 | 3.19101 | .89789 | 3.64044 | .58534 | - 5.51455* |
| 62 | 2.92134 | 1.07290 | 3.42696 | .73266 | - 5.96634* |
| 63 | 2.30337 | 1.06427 | 2.84269 | 1.13076 | - 5.96096* |
| 64 | 2.64044 | .97435 | 3.32584 | .80413 | - 7.51246* |
| 65 | 3.53932 | .65439 | 3.94382 | .32026 | - 6.19052* |
| 66 | 3.43820 | .68622 | 3.77528 | .44350 | - 5.64887* |
| 67 | 3.26966 | .76089 | 3.70786 | .54468 | - 6.47146* |
| 68 | 3.32584 | .64955 | 3.87640 | .32911 | - 7.90173* |

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to compare concepts of the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents as they are perceived by superintendents and by classroom teacher presidents in large and small school systems in Texas.

Specifically, the investigation was designed to permit conclusions to be drawn concerning the following questions:

1. To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in small school systems?
2. To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in large school systems?
3. To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents in small school systems?
4. To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher

presidents and school superintendents in large school systems?

5. To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents in small school systems?
6. To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike as perceived by classroom teacher presidents in large school systems?
7. To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by classroom teacher presidents in small and large school systems?
8. To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by classroom teacher presidents in small and large school systems?
9. To what extent is the actual role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by school superintendents in large and small school systems?
10. To what extent is the ideal role of school superintendents alike as it is perceived by school superintendents in large and small school systems?
11. To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike as perceived by school superintendents in large school districts?
12. To what extent are the actual and ideal roles of school superintendents alike as perceived by school superintendents in small school districts?

It was hypothesized at the outset of the study that there would be no significant difference in the way the role of the school superintendent was perceived in each of the above-stated questions.

In order to arrive at conclusions concerning the questions, the following procedure was adopted. The investigation began with a review of the related literature. The next step was the development of an instrument to be used in the collection of data. From a survey of professional publications and authoritative opinion, a list of statements concerning the duties and functions of the school superintendent, as related to teachers, was developed. Seven categories were used to divide the functions of the school superintendent, as related to teachers, into a manageable questionnaire. These categories were selected in the main from the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. A universe of concepts was submitted to a panel of eight jurors. The jurors selected the most representative functions describing the proper role of the school superintendent in relating to teachers under each of the seven categories. Ten concepts were selected for six of the categories and only eight for the seventh. The final questionnaire contained these sixty-eight concepts.

Next, the subjects were selected. All the superintendents in the state of Texas, which have local classroom teacher associations, were selected to participate in the

study. Two hundred superintendents were included in the sample. The classroom teacher president in each of these school systems was also invited to participate. The school systems were divided into large and small categories to ascertain the relationship of school system size to various role concepts. The figure of 5,000 students in average daily attendance was selected as the dividing point for classifying the school systems.

The next step was the collection of data. Each subject was mailed a questionnaire and requested to indicate the degree of emphasis placed on each of the functions listed according to two frames of reference: (1) what the school superintendent actually does in performing the function of his position; (2) what the school superintendent should ideally do in performing the function of the position. One hundred and four questionnaires were mailed to subjects in large school systems and two hundred and ninety-six to subjects in small school systems. The subject in each of the four classifications--small school superintendents, small school classroom teacher presidents, large school superintendents and large school classroom teacher presidents--returned 60 percent or better of the questionnaires in usable form.

The statistical procedure employed to analyze the data was the Fisher t test, with the .05 level of confidence required for significance. Each hypothesis was accepted or rejected, depending on the percentage of significant t tests.

The hypothesis was accepted when less than half of the t tests were significant; it was rejected when more than half were significant.

A summary of the findings follows:

Findings Related to Questions 1, 2 and 7

Classroom teacher presidents in both large and small school systems perceive the actual role of the school superintendent to be different from the perception held by school superintendents. While they differ with the school superintendents,, the two classifications of classroom teacher presidents are in agreement on the actual role of school superintendents. Of the sixty-eight t tests computed, fifty-six t ratios were significant when testing the difference between means for small classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents; fifty-three t ratios were significant for large classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents; and only two t ratios were significant when testing the difference between means for small classroom teacher presidents and large classroom teacher presidents.

Findings Related to Questions 3, 4 and 8

Classroom teacher presidents in both large and small school systems perceive the ideal role of the school superintendent to be the same as the perception held by school superintendents. The two classifications of classroom teachers are also in agreement on the ideal role of the school

superintendent. Of the sixty-eight t tests computed, sixteen t ratios were significant when testing the difference between means for small classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents; eleven t ratios were significant for large classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents; and seven t ratios were significant for large classroom teacher presidents and small classroom teacher presidents.

Findings Related to Questions 5, 6, 11 and 12

Classroom teacher presidents in both large and small school systems perceive the actual role of the school superintendent to be different from the ideal role. Likewise, the school superintendents in both large and small districts perceive the actual and ideal role of the superintendents to be different. Of the sixty-eight t tests computed, all sixty-eight t ratios were significant when testing the difference between the means for the actual and ideal role of the school superintendent, as perceived by superintendents in small school systems, and all sixty-eight t ratios were significant when testing the difference between means for the actual and ideal role of school superintendents, as perceived by superintendents in large school systems. All sixty-eight t ratios were significant when testing the difference between the means for the actual and ideal role of the school superintendent, as perceived by classroom teacher presidents in large school systems. At the same time, all sixty-eight t ratios

were significant in a similar test for classroom teacher presidents in small school systems.

Findings Related to Questions 9 and 10

School superintendents in both large and small school systems hold like perceptions of the actual role of the superintendent of schools. The same is also true for perceptions held for the ideal role. Of the sixty-eight t tests computed for the actual role, six t ratios were significant. Of the sixty-eight computed for the ideal role, only three t ratios were significant.

Without regard to the above questions, the following summarization seems appropriate.

1. School system size was not a significant factor concerning the general role perceptions of the school superintendent. However, there were some specific concepts where school system size did become an important factor.

Classroom teacher presidents are in general agreement over the perceived ideal role of the school superintendent. However, it was of interest to this investigation that large school classroom teacher presidents disagreed with small school classroom teacher presidents over the superintendent's ideal role in the following concepts: (1) encouraging teachers to join and attend meetings sponsored by the classroom teachers association; (2) recognizing teacher rights to exert political influence; (3) establishing committees, which include teachers, to study welfare benefits and make periodic

recommendations to the school board. Teachers from small school systems tend to be less concerned with these areas than teachers from large school systems.

Although superintendents are in general agreement over the perceived ideal role of school superintendents, they disagree over what is considered ideal in the following concepts: (1) seeing that the organization, administration, and supervision of the school serve to facilitate the work of the teacher; (2) supporting the Parent-Teacher Associations, keeping membership informed, and soliciting its criticisms and assistance; (3) keeping the press accurately informed of the successes and weaknesses of the school (which also include teacher welfare) and trends in education. Superintendents from large school systems tend to be much more concerned with these three areas than small school superintendents.

Also, school superintendents from large school systems were actually more involved (1) in causing the school's organization, administration, and supervision to facilitate the work of the teacher, (2) in working with and supporting the Parent-Teacher Association, and (3) in keeping the press informed than were small school superintendents.

Classroom teacher presidents from small school systems disagree with the school superintendent over the superintendent's actual role in pupil personnel concerns, while classroom teacher presidents from large school systems did

not significantly disagree with school superintendents over the superintendent's actual role in this category.

2. On the basis of the statistical data for this study, superintendents' perceptions of the actual and ideal roles of the school superintendent are no more similar than the corresponding perceptions held by classroom teacher presidents.

However, from further study of the ratings given on the returned questionnaires, it becomes apparent that there is closer agreement between the superintendent's actual and ideal roles, than the actual and ideal role perceptions held by classroom teacher presidents. Both groups are in general agreement that the superintendent's actual performance is quite different from the perceived ideal performance.

3. Classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents are in general agreement on what the superintendent should ideally be doing in carrying out the functions of the position. However, the two groups do not agree on the ideal role of the school superintendent in the area of professional relations. The disagreement centers around the following relationships: continuing contracts for teachers, joining and participating in professional teacher associations, arranging for teachers to make recommendations to the school board on welfare benefits, recognition of the rights of teachers to exert political influence, and providing the opportunity for teachers to make grievances known.

It was of additional interest that superintendents and classroom teacher presidents did not disagree over the ideal role of the school superintendent in helping teachers (financially from budget) attend professional conventions.

4. Classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents do not agree on the actual role of the superintendent. Although the two groups generally agree on what the superintendent should ideally be doing, there is disagreement over how the superintendent is actually performing the functions of that office. This disagreement is uniformly evident under each of the seven categories for small school systems, while uniformly evident under six of the seven categories for large school systems.

5. Superintendents are not actually performing the functions of the office of the school superintendent as superintendents think these functions should ideally be performed.

6. Classroom teacher presidents feel that superintendents are not actually performing the functions of the office of school superintendent as these functions should ideally be performed.

Conclusions

Superintendents must realize that change is gathering momentum, and if they are to continue to make an effective contribution in the field of education, they must not only

learn to adjust to, but provide active democratic leadership in directing, the new way. Teachers are asking for a voice in many things that heretofore have been considered outside their sphere of operation and influence. This new voice is being sounded because school superintendents are not and have not been functioning as both teachers and superintendents know they should function. Superintendents, to effectively utilize the democratic process, must learn to make use of teacher influence in getting things done in public school education that they, alone, have not been able to accomplish.

Teachers are interested in how funds contained in the budget are to be allocated. Interest is high in the funds allocated for salaries and fringe benefits, but teachers are also interested in available funds for teachings aids, audio-visual materials, textbooks, and many other supplementary materials that are considered essential for good instruction. Teachers are concerned with policy development that directly affects staff welfare, class size, grouping of students and types of innovations to be tried. Most of all, teachers simply desire to be brought back into the picture in a working relationship that will satisfy their professional desires and needs.

School superintendents, failing to take advantage of teacher influence and prestige, have let today's society place too much emphasis upon the mechanical efficiency of the educational process and in turn tend to overlook that most

important aspect: the human relations among everyone connected with the school.

The superintendent of the future must be a person who understands the learning process, the characteristics of a good school program and how to involve people. The demands on education are too great for a one-man operation; the superintendent must have broad scale support, financial and other, which comes from informed and participating persons.

There is strong disagreement between superintendents and teachers over the actual performance of the present-day school superintendent. Much of this disagreement seems to stem from a lack of knowledge on the side of teachers of just what the superintendent is doing and trying to do. To survive in this essential position to education, the superintendent must exercise the same concern over his working relationship with teachers and other staff members as he has exercised in the past with school boards and community power structure. The superintendent has always been careful to keep these groups informed and involved, and he has used his best skills in developing and maintaining a respected relationship. On the other hand, he has often been careless and aloof in relating to teachers; they have not seen him at his best.

The present-day superintendent is desirous of being a strong leader for the cause of good public school education. He is capable of providing that leadership. However, he must

look at studies such as this one to convince him that his staff does not understand his actual performance and then re-direct much of his busy schedule to inform this staff by involving them.

Many present-day superintendents are saying, "We know what needs to be done," then asking, "Why is it that we are not able to perform as we know we should?" As they turn to staff involvement, the gap between the statement and question will begin to close. This kind of involvement will bring a bright new day for public school education.

Recommendations

There are many possibilities for future study and action in this area. As a result of the findings of this study, the following suggestions are presented:

1. An investigation designed to identify those factors which cause classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents to be in such strong disagreement over the actual role of the school superintendent.
2. An investigation designed to determine those factors which keep the school superintendent from actually performing the functions of his office in the way he thinks would be ideal.
3. An investigation to determine those factors which promote such strong disagreement between the perceptions classroom teacher presidents hold for the

actual and ideal roles of the school superintendent.

4. An investigation to determine the extent school boards and classroom teachers agree on the actual and ideal roles of the school superintendent.
5. Additional efforts should be focused on determining just how the school superintendent is actually performing the duties of the office.
6. An investigation to determine the extent classroom teachers desire school superintendents to represent them in negotiating welfare matters with the school board.
7. A study to design a structure for the school superintendent's office allowing the superintendent more time for direct personal communication with teachers.
8. A study to determine what, if any, help the classroom teacher and building principal desire from the central administration staff, other than direct contact with the superintendent of schools.
9. An investigation to determine the behavioral characteristics of those superintendents who were generally rated high by their classroom teacher presidents. A second part should be to determine the behavioral characteristics of those superintendents who received extremely low ratings.
10. The school superintendents should establish a faculty

council which meets regularly to discuss policy and welfare matters. The superintendent should be a working part of this council.

11. The school superintendent must keep the layers of administration to a minimum, thus bringing the top authority closer to the teacher. This can best be done by assigning many of the coordinators and supervisors to the building faculty, maybe with new titles.
12. The superintendent must develop a sincere concern for the welfare of the teacher and the student. He must establish a schedule which permits him to visit regularly in the classrooms.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS

COMPARING TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTION
OF THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLES OF TEXAS
PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

Directions:

In the right-hand column, under the heading of actual role, please circle the number which indicates the degree of emphasis on each function as it best describes what you perceive the superintendent to be actually doing in carrying out the functions of his position in your school district.

Under the heading of ideal role, please circle the number which indicates the degree of emphasis on each function as it best describes what you perceive the superintendent should be doing in carrying out the functions of his position in your school district.

- 4 = Much emphasis
3 = Some emphasis
2 = Little emphasis
1 = No emphasis

Section I: Instruction and Curriculum Development

| | Actual Role | Ideal Role |
|--|-------------|------------|
| 1. Systematically involves teachers in the development of curriculum materials. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Involves teachers in the evaluation of progress made in meeting desired educational objectives. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Sees that the organization, administration and supervision of the school serve to facilitate the work of the teacher. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Focuses the attention of the entire school program on the welfare of the child. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

| | Actual Role | Ideal Role |
|--|-------------|------------|
| 5. Involves teachers in the cooperative selection and evaluation of teaching materials and equipment. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Provides opportunities for teachers to pool ideas in grade level and departmental meetings on school time. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Makes available to teachers the needed equipment and materials to adequately instruct students. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Provides the necessary leadership and in-service education to help teachers individualize instruction. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Provides adequate supervision to properly coordinate and improve instruction, and to assist teachers. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 10.. Establishes a planned program whereby the school board, administration and teachers continuously evaluate the educational needs of the school system. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

Section II: Staff Personnel

| | | |
|---|---------|---------|
| 1. Involves teachers in the development of personnel policies and in maintaining professional working conditions. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Establishes a cooperative plan of personnel evaluation to improve instruction. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Conscientiously recommends to the school board the release of incompetent teachers and other staff members. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

| | Actual Role | Ideal Role |
|---|-------------|------------|
| 4. Provides for the assignment and reassignment of staff members in view of their professional aspirations as well as the needs of the educational program. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Arranges with teachers the kinds of in-service education programs which they desire to improve their teaching effectiveness. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Carefully evaluates teacher assignments to prevent unfair work loads. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Gains the respect of the teaching staff as the local educational leader. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Develops a strong team spirit and group loyalty on the part of teachers. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Uses criteria in evaluating teachers for dismissal based on objective information and not on personal bias or prejudice. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 10. Exercises skill in talking with people so that they will understand the job to be done and in developing satisfactory human relationships with personnel. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

Section III: Pupil Personnel

| | | |
|---|---------|---------|
| 1. Develops with teachers and principals procedures for dealing with attendance and enrollment problems. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Involves teachers in a continuous study of procedures for successfully reporting to parents on pupil progress. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

| | Actual Role | Ideal Role |
|---|-------------|------------|
| 3. Makes available to teachers adequate special counseling services to cope with pupils with severe adjustment problems. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Involves teachers in the development of policies and procedures for the handling of all types of discipline problems. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Involves teachers in developing a policy for conserving teacher time in the building (compilation of information) of pupil cumulative folders and other records. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Involves teachers in the development of student promotion policies. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Establishes a policy to regularly involve students and teachers in a dialogue on school improvement. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Provides special teachers for students who cannot adjust, educationally and socially, to the regular classroom. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Provides funds, staff and equipment to carry on a well-developed extra-curricular activities program for students. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 10. Makes provision for giving information to pupils and parents concerning the program and the activities of the school. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

Section IV: School Finance

| | | |
|--|---------|---------|
| 1. Involves teachers in the development of educational needs for the budget. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
|--|---------|---------|

| | Actual Role | Ideal Role |
|---|-------------|------------|
| 2. Helps teachers to translate the educational needs into financial requirements with the community's ability to pay. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Establishes priorities in funding the educational program with representative teacher committees for school board consideration. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Closely evaluates the expenditures of funds to insure the most education per-dollar spent. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Understands such things as how the necessary financial resources are controlled, how to deal with conflicting aims in the political system, and is energetically using this knowledge to gain the needed financial support for public schools. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Budgets funds for sufficient daily and long-range maintenance of buildings and grounds. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Diligently obtains all available federal funds and private grants for experimentation and enrichment programs. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Utilizes teachers in presenting the local educational needs to the public as a means of gaining additional school tax funds. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Establishes a committee (including teachers) to study salaries and other welfare benefits, making periodic recommendations to the school board. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 10. Closely supervises the distribution of budgetary funds, channels every available dollar into the actual teaching program. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

Section V: Plant Development and Maintenance

| | Actual Role | Ideal Role |
|---|-------------|------------|
| 1. Involves teachers in a study and evaluation of existing facilities in the light of present educational needs. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Involves teachers in the development of educational specifications for new physical facilities. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Evaluates the architect's preliminary building plans with teachers. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Involves teachers and students in the proper selection of classroom furniture, fixtures and equipment. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Provides consistent leadership in the daily (as well as long-range) maintenance of school facilities and grounds (clean and well-groomed). | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Provides sufficient leadership to get flexibility designed into new school buildings and renovated older ones to provide for future trends in education. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Establishes procedures for the involvement of students in the daily care of their school and/or in the planning of new schools. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Establishes, in cooperation with the school board, policies which give educational values priority over building cost, when these are in conflict. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

Section VI: Public Relations

| | | |
|--|---------|---------|
| 1. Establishes policies which systematically involve | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
|--|---------|---------|

| | Actual Role | Ideal Role |
|--|-------------|------------|
| teachers and lay public in educational decision making. | | |
| 2. Involves teachers in a planned program of informing the public of educational needs. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Develops procedure to regularly assess teacher attitudes on educational and staff welfare matters. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Regularly assesses community opinion of the schools and involves teachers in an analysis of the findings. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Enthusiastically supports the Parent-Teacher Associations, keeps membership informed, and solicits its criticisms and assistance. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Keeps the press accurately informed of the successes and weaknesses of the school (which also includes teacher welfare) and the trends in education. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Helps teachers develop a feeling of importance to the total school program by encouraging them to be an effective part of the staff recruiting program, public information, community opinion, assessment, etc. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Creates a good image for the school system. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Identifies with the assistance of the staff and interested lay people the contribution which the school can make to community improvement. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 10. Involves students in the public relations program. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

Section VII: Professional Relations

| | Actual Role | Ideal Role |
|--|-------------|------------|
| 1. Encourages teachers to join and attend meetings sponsored by the classroom teacher association. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Arranges for a committee of teachers to meet regularly to study fringe benefits and make recommendations to the school board. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. Provides budgeted funds to send key teachers to area, state and national educational and professional meetings. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Recognizes, by established policy, teacher rights to exert political influence on local, state and national levels. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Encourages school board adoption and community acceptance of the continuing contract for teachers. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Establishes a plan whereby teachers can make grievances known without being singled out. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Appreciates the work of teachers and makes this known. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Supplies the staff with information concerning possible personnel benefits within the school system. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Exercises skill in the formulation of policies which protect staff personnel and yet do not commit the school system beyond its resources nor decrease the professional services required by the school system. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |
| 10. Works with the staff to stimulate a desire for professional growth and to identify professional needs. | 4 3 2 1 | 4 3 2 1 |

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PANEL OF JUDGES

I am soliciting your help in the validation of a questionnaire to be used in collecting data for my doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University. The study will be a comparison of teacher and administrator perception of the actual and ideal roles of Texas public school superintendents.

I have enclosed a list of statements under seven different categories which describe functions of the superintendent as he works with teachers. Please check, in the space provided to the left of the item number, the ten statements under each category which you feel are the most appropriate for this study. If under any category you do not find as many as ten appropriate statements, then please check only the appropriate ones.

The final questionnaire will be mailed to classroom teacher presidents and school superintendents. These subjects will be requested to react to each statement under two frames of reference: superintendent's actual role and superintendent's ideal role.

Please check and return the enclosed list of statements by June 29. I will be deeply grateful to you for helping me with this study. Serving presently as a superintendent of schools, I am particularly interested in this project.

APPENDIX C

LETTERS TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND
CLASSROOM TEACHER PRESIDENTS

I am soliciting your assistance in gathering data for my doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University.

This doctoral study will compare the actual and ideal roles of the superintendent of schools as perceived by classroom teachers and school superintendents.

You can make a vital contribution to this study by conscientiously checking the enclosed questionnaire. It will take only 15 minutes of your time.

The results of this study will be obtained from the thinking of several hundred persons, so no attempt will be made to identify any particular returned questionnaire.

I will be most grateful to you for a quick return of the enclosed questionnaire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- American Association of School Administrators, Staff Relations in School Administration, 33rd Yearbook, Washington, D. C., Department of NEA, 1955.
- Campbell, Roald F., Administrative Behavior in Education, New York, Harper Brothers, 1957.
- Cooperation Program in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration, A Competency Approach to Improving Preparation Programs in Educational Administration, Nashville, McCuddy Printing Co., 1955.
- Cooperative Development of Public School Administration, A Developing Concept of the Superintendent of Education, Albany, New York, 1955.
- Fensch, Edwin A. and Robert E. Wilson, The Superintendency Team, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964.
- Gilland, Thomas M., The Origin and Development of the Power and Duties of the City-Superintendent, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1935.
- Griffiths, Daniel E., The School Superintendent, The Center for Applied Research in Education, New York, 1966.
- Halpin, Andrew W., The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents, Columbus, Ohio, College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1956.
- Knezevich, Stephen J., Administration of Public Education, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York, 1962.
- Miller, Van, The Public Administration of American School Systems, New York, The MacMillian Company, 1965.
- Moehlman, A. B., School Administration, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

- Ramseyer, John A., Factors Affecting Educational Administration: Guideposts for Research and Action, School-Community Development Study Monograph, No. 2, Columbus, The Ohio State University Press, 1955.
- Reller, Theodore L., The Development of the City Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, The Author, 1935.
- Southern States Cooperative Project in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration, Nashville, Tennessee, McGuiddy Printing Co., 1955.
- Strevell, W. H. and Aruid J. Burke, Administration of the School Building Program, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Toward Improved School Administration, A Decade of Professional Effort to Heighten Administrative Understanding and Skills, Battle Creek, Michigan, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1961.
- Wahlquist, J. T., Administration of Public Education, New York, Ronald Press Co., 1952.
- White, Leonard, Introduction to the Study of Public Administration, New York, McMillian, 1939.

Articles

- Alonzo, Braulio, "Commitment to Action," The National Education Association Journal, September, 1967, p. 29.
- Bidwell, C. E., "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (September, 1955), 41-48.
- Davies, Daniel R. and Laurance Iannaccone, "Ferment in the Study of Organization," Teachers College Record, LX (November, 1958), 61-72.
- Dewey, John, "Democracy in Education," The Elementary School Teacher, III (Fall, 1903), 18-22.
- Hunt, John J., "Politics in the Role of the Superintendent," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (February, 1968), 348-350.
- Metzler, John H. and Oscar Knade, Jr., "A Tranquilizer for Negotiation," The American School Board Journal, 155 (December, 1967), 12-14.

- Rand, M. J. and Fenwick English, "Towards a Differential Teaching Staff," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (January, 1968), 264-268.
- Rasmussen, L. V., "New Role for the Middleman," American School Board Journal, 155 (February, 1968), 10-11.
- Russell, Dwane, "Professional Negotiations," Texas Association for Supervisors and Curriculum Development Newsletter, III, No. 1 (January, 1966), 8.
- "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook III, April, 1955, No. 8.

Reports

- Annual Statistical Report, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, 1966.
- Board of Trustees, Annual Report, Washington, D. C., The Board, 1854.
- Indiana and Midwest School Building Planning Conference: "Proceedings: Planning Educationally Sound Buildings at Low Cost," Bulletin, School of Education, 29: 1-102, Bloomington, Indiana, University of Indiana, November, 1953.
- National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Programs for Preparing Educational Administrators in 1950, Fourth Work-Conference held at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, August, 1950.
- Providence City Council Committee, Report on the Expediency of a New Organization of the Public School, Providence, R. I., The Committee, 1837.
- Public School Directory, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, 1967-68.

Unpublished Materials

- Archambault, Eldon, "Teacher Role in School Policy Development," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.
- Benney, Thomas E., "An Investigation Comparing Teacher and Administrator Perception of Actual and Ideal Decision-Making Participation Patterns in Selected Elementary School Districts in Illinois," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966.

Clark, Robert L., "The Role and Position of the NEA and the AFT in Collective Negotiation: Opinion of Teachers and School Administrators in Five Selected School Districts in Illinois," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Illinois, 1965.

Howell, G. F., "The Significance of Educational Planning of the Physical Plant in Adapting to Curricular Innovations," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1967.

Sandler, Steven, "Perceptions of the Actual and Ideal Roles of Texas Public School Superintendents," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1968.

Sergiovanni, T. J., "An Investigation of Factors Which Affect Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction of Teachers," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1966.

Publications of Educational Organizations

American Association of School Administrators, Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1966.

Educational Dispatch, Croft Educational Services, New London, Connecticut, October, 1968.

National Education Association, The Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools, Washington, D. C., Educational Policies Commission, 1965, p. 1.