

TEACHER EXPECTATIONS FOR THE ROLE BEHAVIOUR OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL -  
A MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF TEACHER ACCEPTABILITY RESPONSES TO A  
PREDETERMINED SET OF HYPOTHETICAL PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOURS

by

WILLIAM HUMPHREYS

B.Ed. University of British Columbia, 1970

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)

in the Faculty

of

Education



WILLIAM HUMPHREYS 1977

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

APRIL 1977

All rights reserved. This thesis may  
not be reproduced in whole or in part  
by photocopy or other means, without  
permission of the author.

APPROVAL

ii

Name: William Humphreys  
Degree: Master of Arts (Education)  
Title of Thesis: Teacher Expectations for the Role Behaviour  
of the Elementary Principal - A Multivariate  
Analysis of Teacher Acceptability Responses  
To a Predetermined Set of Hypothetical  
Principal Behaviours

Examining Committee

Chairman: Dr. M. Manley-Casimir

Dr. D. Erickson  
Senior Supervisor

Dr. A. Elliott  
Associate Professor

Dr. J. Martin  
Assistant Professor  
Faculty of Education  
Simon Fraser University  
External Examiner

Date approved April 22, 1977.

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation:

TEACHER EXPECTATIONS FOR THE ROLE BEHAVIOUR OF THE ELEMENTARY  
PRINCIPAL - A MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF TEACHER ACCEPTABILITY  
RESPONSES TO A PREDETERMINED SET OF HYPOTHETICAL PRINCIPAL  
BEHAVIOURS

Author:

(signature)

WILLIAM HUMPHREYS

(name)

April 22 /77

(date)

## ABSTRACT

The growth of teacher professionalization and a concomitant rise in teacher-principal conflict has been a recurrent theme in much of the educational literature. Rising teacher professionalization was seen by some writers as more and more restrictive of the traditional supervisory role functions of the principal. These claims of literature were challenged in a dissertation (Zivin: 1973). Zivin found little evidence to support the claims of literature that teachers were viewing the principal's role in successively more restrictive terms. Zivin claimed, in fact, that her research indicated that teachers were willing to accept a very broad range of principal behaviour providing teacher status was not denigrated.

This present study sought to test and possibly extend the Zivin findings in the light of several limitations that had been explicated within the original research. Of first concern amongst these was the Zivin study's potential for generalizability because of the restricted nature of her sample. There were, as well, questions raised regarding the validity of the instrumentation.

Zivin examined the expectations of teachers for the role behaviour of the principal utilizing a set of behavioural vignettes designed to elicit a range of teacher responses. The vignettes depicted hypothetical principal behaviours seen as being either acceptable or unacceptable in the eyes of teachers. The research used the Zivin instrument in conjunction with a larger and far more diverse sample of teachers. Situational diversity was primarily assured by stratifying the sample population into two major socio-economic status cells, one including teachers who taught in low socio-economic status school communities and the other teachers who taught in high socio-economic status school communities.

Three major hypotheses were generated. The first two hypotheses dealt with the question of generalizability and the third dealt with the question of instrument validity. The hypotheses were as follows:

1. Differences in teacher demographic and personal variables will not be related to teacher acceptance or rejection of specific administrative role behaviours.
2. Differences in the socio-economic status of the school community in which the teacher teaches will not be related to teacher acceptance or rejection of specific administrative role behaviour.
3. Items of principal behaviour are representative of specific types of behaviour which in turn are representative of Zivin's hypothesized zones of teacher indifference.

The major findings of this present study derive from the above hypotheses and were briefly as follows:

1. Teachers with different demographic and personal characteristics and who teach in different socio-economic settings apparently perceive administrative role behaviour with considerable similarity.
2. The behavioural vignettes utilized in this present study did not always measure the specific behaviours they were intended to measure.

One of the major implications for future research must be the use of carefully validated instruments coupled with analytical techniques that are commensurate with the complexity of the social phenomena investigated in this study. One of the major implications for administrative behaviour relates to the apparent broad teacher acceptance of his actions provided he is tactful, sensitive, and perceived as competent. It would appear that the principal may feel confident that his supervisory responsibility vis-a-vis teachers will be respected if he complies with the above criteria.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is most grateful for the encouragements and criticisms of Dr. D. A. Erickson and Dr. J. G. Johnston. Dr. Johnson had the task of guiding the writer through much of the analysis. His sound advice, patience, and generosity with his time were greatly appreciated.

Very special thanks must go to my wife Fran for her understanding and tireless typing.

The writer is indebted to Mr. and Mrs. W. G. Humphreys for their many extra helps during two years of study.

And finally to Melanie, Erin, and Janine who have waited so long.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. . . . .	v
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
Chapter	
1. THE PROBLEM. . . . .	1
BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM. . . . .	1
DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM. . . . .	4
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE . . . . .	5
THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK . . . . .	6
THE HYPOTHESES . . . . .	9
2. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH . . . . .	12
THE FORMAL ORGANIZATION . . . . .	12
THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE SCHOOL SETTING . . . . .	20
TEACHER ZONES OF INDIFFERENCE. . . . .	22
CATEGORIES OF PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOUR. . . . .	25
SUMMARY. . . . .	30
3. LIMITATIONS, DESIGN, AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	32
LIMITATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL RESEARCH . . . . .	32
THE RESEARCH DESIGN. . . . .	34
METHODOLOGY. . . . .	39
THE HYPOTHETICAL CONSTRUCTS. . . . .	48
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	56

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS . . . . .	61
OVERVIEW . . . . .	61
COMPARATIVE ANALYSES . . . . .	61
VALIDITY OF THE INSTRUMENT . . . . .	82
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	95
SUMMARY . . . . .	95
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	98
IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	106
APPENDICES . . . . .	
APPENDIX A - List of Stimulus Items . . . . .	109
APPENDIX B - Supplementary Data Analyses . . . . .	114
APPENDIX C - Ancillary Materials . . . . .	128



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I Ranking of Acceptability Ratings of Four Populations and the Spearman Rank Order Correlations Between Each Population. . . . .	63
II Comparison of the Perceptions of the Total Response in Each Acceptability Category . . . . .	64
III Teacher Demographic and Attitudinal Variables. . . . .	73
IV Matrix of Statistically Significant Relationships between Independent Variables and Items - One-way Analysis of Variance and "t" tests(Zivin) . . . . .	75
V Significant Values Obtained in the N-way Analysis and the Proportion of Variance Explained ( $\text{Eta}^2$ ) in each Analysis. . . . .	80
VI Matrix of Statistically Significant Relationships between Independent Variables and Items - N-way Analysis of Variance and "t" tests(Zivin) . . . . .	81
VII Factor Pattern Matrix After Rotation With Kaiser Normalization . . . . .	89
VIII Discipline Category Items Using Unrotated Principal Component Factor Analyses. . . . .	90
IX Participation in Classroom Proceedings Items Using Unrotated Principal Component Factor Analyses . . . . .	91
X Observation, Evaluation, and Supervision of the Teacher Items Using Unrotated Principal Component Factor Analyses . . . . .	92
XI Evaluation of Student Progress Items Using Unrotated Principal Component Factor Analyses. . . . .	93
XII Selection and Ordering of Instructional Materials Items Using Unrotated Principal Component Factor Analyses. . . . .	94
XIII Frequency Distribution of Teacher Responses. . . . .	115
XIV Descriptive Statistics - Preliminary Analysis Entire Sample. . . . .	116

Table	Page
XV Descriptive Statistics - Preliminary Analysis Low and High Socio-Economic Status Groups. . . . .	117
XVI Response Sitem Statistics - Preliminary Analysis Entire Sample. . . . .	118
XVII Response Item Statistics - Preliminary Analysis Low Socio-Economic Status Group. . . . .	119
XVIII Response Item Statistics - Preliminary Analysis High Socio-Economic Status Group . . . . .	120
XIX Comparison of Positive - Negative Acceptability Response Patterns. . . . .	121
XX One-Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Response Scores Grouped According to Demographic and Personal Variables. . . . .	122
XXI Five-Way Analysis of Variance Data . . . . .	125

## Chapter 1

## THE PROBLEM

## BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The existence of teacher-principal conflict has been the subject of considerable research discussion.<sup>1</sup> A recurrent theme in much of the educational literature over the past decade has been the growth of this conflict as a result of rising teacher professionalization.<sup>2</sup> W. S. Simpkins and D. Friesen, reporting the results of research in Alberta, state that

According to expressed preferences, there appears to be a growing desire for teachers to obtain power on an individual basis not only over classroom tasks but also over those tasks which directly influence... [such] matters as textbooks, instructional materials, and curriculum content. In addition, the teachers as members of the group would exert influence and decide on organizational arrangements that relate directly to staff and student behaviour. As a group, teachers would extend their decision-making role in the school. Thus the teachers' target in their professional aspirations appears at the minimum to be the right to individually decide on matters closely related to their work.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles E. Bidwell, "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching," Journal of Educational Sociology, No. 29 (September, 1955), pp. 41 - 47; Merton V. Campbell, "Teacher-Principal Agreement on the Teacher Role," Administrator's Notebook, VII, No. 6 (February, 1959); Francis S. Chase and Egon G. Guba, "Administrative Roles and Behavior," Review of Educational Research, XXV, No. 4 (October, 1955) pp. 291 - 298; J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (September, 1955), pp. 30 - 40.

<sup>2</sup>Willard R. Lane, Ronald C. Corwin, and William C. Monahan, "Professional Persons in Public Organizations," Foundations of Educational Administration: A Behavioral Analysis (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1967), pp. 411 - 421; L. H. Morin, "Role Perception and Principals," The Canadian Administrator, IV, No. 5 (February, 1965), pp. 13 - 20; Llewelyn G. Parsons, "Teachers Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness," The Canadian Administrator, XI, No. 2 (November, 1971), p. 100.

<sup>3</sup>W. S. Simpkins and D. Friesen, "Discretionary Powers of Classroom Teachers," The Canadian Administrator, IX, No. 8 (Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, May, 1970), p. 38.

If the claims illustrated in the Simpkins and Friesen quote are accurate, the rise of teacher professionalization must be seen as an influence which is narrowing the zone of principal authority and necessitating a redefinition of the principal's role, even in areas that were previously considered entirely within the principal's realm.

A consideration of areas of teacher-principal authority found some further explication in the writings of Dan C. Lortie who stated:

Research is needed to clarify zoning within the school system hierarchy. In the case of principal-teacher relationship, for example, we would expect that while matters of compliance with record-keeping would fall into the principal's zone of influence, in-class affairs (eg: the specifics of a particular class) would fall within the teacher's territory.

Conflict would then arise, in zones where hegemony is unclear. The author's observations of teachers and school administrators suggest that the chain of linkages is zoned so that executive dominance is clear over "administrative" matters but muted in "instructional" areas.

It appears that decision areas are subjected to differential definition, and that "variable zoning" exists in which, within the same dyad, initiatory power varies by topic. (One thinks of marriage in which the husband has hegemony over some issues, the wife over others and discussion, or argument, arises over the rest.)<sup>4</sup>

It would appear, therefore, that the zone of teacher authority most readily distinguishable should be that which incorporates events that are considered strictly classroom affairs. Similarly, the zone of principal authority most readily distinguishable should be that which incorporates events that are considered strictly administrative in nature.

Chester I. Barnard defined the term "authority" as "...a relationship which [is] incomplete unless it is accepted by its subject."<sup>5</sup> H. D. Hemphill, utilizing the same concept of authority, defined it as "...the intrinsic accep-

---

<sup>4</sup>Dan C. Lortie, "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, ed. Amitai Etzioni (New York: Free Press, 1969), p. 13.

<sup>5</sup>Edward B. Smith, "Chester Barnard's Concept of Authority," Educational Administration Quarterly, II, No. 1 (Winter, 1975), pp. 21 - 37.

tance of power."<sup>6</sup> The key word is acceptance. Having certain expectations for particular roles implies, therefore, some recognition by others of legitimate areas of authority. In other words, it would appear that role occupants are granted by others, in various ways, certain areas of authority which are more or less defined or prescribed.

The writings of Dan C. Lortie proved influential in a relevant dissertation completed at the University of Chicago by Reni-Zoe Zivin in 1973.<sup>7</sup> The Zivin research examined teacher "sentiments" concerning the role of the elementary principal. Seriously questioning the claims of recent writers who saw teachers as viewing the role of the principal in "...successively more restrictive terms" as a result of rising professionalization, Zivin chose to investigate the validity of these claims, since they were, Zivin suggested, "...thus far largely unsubstantiated by research."<sup>8</sup> The stated purpose of the Zivin study was "...to investigate teacher sentiment concerning the role of the elementary principal by asking selected teachers how acceptable they would find a range of hypothetical principal behaviors."<sup>9</sup> It seemed reasonable to this present researcher, that any investigation of changing principal roles, resulting directly from teacher demands for expanded professional responsibility, should be concerned with the opinions of teachers in this regard.

Zivin had initiated her investigation of teacher opinions regarding various types of principal role behaviour with certain important expectations for the research in mind. The major postulate of the Zivin study was as

---

<sup>6</sup>H. David Hemphill, "What is Leadership," The Canadian Administrator, VIII, No. 2 (November, 1968), p. 5.

<sup>7</sup>Reni-Zoe Zivin, "The Acceptability to Elementary Teachers of a Set of Hypothetical Principal Behaviours" (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, University of Chicago, 1973), pp. 2 - 4.

<sup>8</sup>Zivin, pp. 2 - 4.

<sup>9</sup>Zivin, p. 1.

follows:

...that if the selected possible principal functions were arranged in the order of their acceptability to each teacher, there would be some functions which would be highly acceptable to the teacher, another group that would be highly unacceptable, and one more group(s) indicating varying degrees of acceptability between the two extreme categories.<sup>10</sup>

In other words, Zivin hoped to see in an analysis of teacher responses to a set of hypothetical principal behaviours, certain patterns of response emerge that would help to clarify how teachers felt about specific behaviours. With considerable consistency, teachers were expected to find some of the principal behaviours acceptable and others unacceptable.

Zivin had identified, through an examination of the literature, various types of categories of behaviour that might be considered acceptable or unacceptable to teachers. Utilizing this information, Zivin constructed a set of hypothetical principal behaviours thought to be representative of these various categories. It was a major goal of the Zivin study, therefore, to

...attempt to assess the relationship between teacher acceptability responses and types of principal behaviors in order to be able to formulate a partial definition of the role of the elementary principal, recognizing the elementary teacher as a significant role definer, one whose acceptance or rejection of principal behavior is an ultimate constraint upon principal action.<sup>11</sup>

#### DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

Though Zivin investigated the "sentiments" of teachers regarding the role of the elementary principal with clear expectations in mind, the results of her study were thought to be possibly lacking in generalizability because of the nature of her sample and inconclusive in a number of areas because of methodological limitations. For example, Zivin makes such statements as the following in her concluding chapter:

---

<sup>10</sup>Zivin, pp. 5 - 6.

<sup>11</sup>Zivin, p. 7.

...it is not known to what degree teacher expectations for principal behavior as expressed in the present study were artifacts of teacher experiences within this particular district setting.<sup>12</sup>

Due to limitations in the sample utilized, insights gained from the present study regarding the acceptability to teachers of proposed principal behaviors may not be generalizable to other groups of teachers.<sup>13</sup>

...the influence of item wording on participants' response was not investigated.<sup>14</sup>

The degree to which the particular principal behaviors described in the items could be considered representative of the behavioral areas remains a matter of interpretation.<sup>15</sup>

The above limitations were centrally important to this present research.

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

It was the purpose of the present study to replicate Zivin's doctoral research in a deliberate attempt to overcome some of its more critical limitations. This researcher sought to test and possibly extend the research findings of the Zivin dissertation. Specifically, replication included the utilization of Zivin's set of hypothetical principal behaviours and the same interview protocol. The utilization of a larger and far more diverse sample population than the Zivin study facilitated an assessment of the original findings as to their generalizability to other settings. The present work included an analysis of teacher reasons for response, the use of n-way analyses of variance, and the use of factor analytic techniques.

#### THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This investigation of teacher perceptions for appropriate role behaviour

---

<sup>12</sup>Zivin, p. 257.

<sup>13</sup>Zivin, p. 278.

<sup>14</sup>Zivin, p. 254.

<sup>15</sup>Zivin, p. 255.

of the principal is conceptualized within the theoretical framework of general systems and role theory. Katz and Kahn, who have been credited with influencing much of the recent shift in organizational theory towards systems concepts, state that "...systems theory is basically concerned with problems of relationships of structures and inter-dependencies, rather than with the constant attributes of objects."<sup>16</sup> Within this framework, the elementary school is seen as a system of relationships and interdependencies that achieve their characteristic structure from the ways in which the sub-systems and supra systems interact with one another. Such is the interdependency of the constituent parts of systems that one part cannot be affected without that affecting other related parts and indeed the whole structure. Systems concepts, therefore, tended to release organizational thought from the confines of the more rigid structural perspectives by conceiving of formal organizations as open systems subject to the influence of both internal and external forces.

Schools, as open systems, are made up of individuals, each holding particular positions or roles within the organization. Sergiovanni and Carver define role as "...the images held for an individual's relational behaviour when he is operating in a particular position."<sup>17</sup> Every institution or organization establishes certain roles and the persons occupying the roles have their positions very largely defined for them in terms of the expectations that others hold for these roles. In other words, the role occupant's behaviour on the job is influenced by what others expect him to be doing. Because every role occupant has interaction with a number of role occupants, role definition always

---

<sup>16</sup>Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, "Organizations and the System Concept," The Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966).

<sup>17</sup>Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration (New York: Dodd, Mead, & Company, 1975), pp. 178 - 179.



involves more than one individual. Sergiovanni and Carver suggest that if "...we could isolate for any particular role all the other roles with which there are relationships [we could have a] family of roles" or what has been termed as the role set for a particular role occupant.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, and Derr state that "...it is possible to understand much of an individual's behavior in an organization by understanding his role relationships with others."<sup>19</sup>

From this perspective, therefore, the role of the school administrator and his administrative behaviour cannot be completely understood if the essential complementary nature of roles is neglected, for the behaviour of the administration must be seen in relation to the role expectations of others with whom he is in daily, or at least frequent contact. Role expectations were defined in Sergiovanni and Carver from Gross, Mason, and McEachern as "...an evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position."<sup>20</sup> Thus teacher expectations for the role behaviour of the principal can be seen as evaluative judgments of a relational nature.

Conflict can arise between teachers and principals when their mutual role expectations in certain areas are no longer congruent. Chester I. Barnard conceived of conflict arising when a hierarchical superior moved outside of a subordinate's "zone of indifference." Zivin considered Barnard's zone of indifference and Herbert A. Simon's zone of acceptance concepts as synonymous and defined the term from Simon as "...an area of acceptance in behavior

---

<sup>18</sup> Sergiovanni and Carver, pp. 178 - 179.

<sup>19</sup> Richard A. Schmuck and others, Handbook of Organization Development in Schools (Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1972), p. 139.

<sup>20</sup> Neal Gross, Ward Mason, and Alexander McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley, 1958), p. 58, cited by Sergiovanni and Carver, p. 178.

within which the subordinate is willing to accept the decisions made for him by his superior."<sup>21</sup> As mentioned, rising teacher professionalization was seen by much of the literature as a force which was narrowing the area of teacher acceptance of the principal's authority. An investigation of the expectations that teachers presently hold for the role behaviour of the principal was seen by this present writer, therefore, not only as a means of clarifying teacher expectations in relation to specific principal behaviours, but also as a means of identifying a little more precisely existing zones of teacher indifference.

Teacher acceptance or rejection of specific principal behaviours was meant to be related in the Zivin design to the acceptance or rejection of broader areas of principal behaviour. The emergence of certain patterns of teacher response in relation to a set of demographic and personal characteristic variables was an expectation of the Zivin research. If distinct patterns of response occurred, then some delineation of teacher zones of indifference might be attempted. A major assumption of this present study is that teacher perceptions of their role can be very largely determined through an examination of the expectations they hold for the role behaviours of others. This would be particularly true in relation to teacher expectations for the principal's role since teachers and principals are very important members of each others' role set.

#### THE HYPOTHESES

The major hypotheses of this present research were generated within the general systems framework that was briefly summarized above. Thus the hypothe-

---

<sup>21</sup>Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, 30th Anniversary edition (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 167; Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior (New York: Free Press, 1957), p. 133, cited by Zivin, pp. 29 - 30.

ses were designed to investigate relationships between the interactive elements of an open system. Hypotheses were therefore related to theory but grew out of an examination of research and the analytical concerns of this present study. A basic assumption of much of the literature appeared to be that rising teacher professionalization must inevitably generate teacher-principal conflict for the process of professionalization was conceived of as being in direct opposition to the bureaucratic requirements of administrative supervision. Since one of the distinguishing characteristics of professionalization is control over certain areas of recognized expertise, it was argued that in order to facilitate the teachers' professional aspirations, the supervisory role of the principal would be subject to increasing limitations. Thus teachers were seen as actively encroaching upon the role of the principal in an effort to increase their control over the areas that they considered teacher areas of expertise.

One of the fundamental conclusions of the Zivin research was that

...teacher responses indicated no support for the position of those contemporary authors who state that forces of teacher specialization, teacher professionalization, and teacher militancy have merged in the collective 'teacher psyche' towards redefinition of the teacher-principal relationship in terms of the teacher as specialist-professional and the principal as generalist-administrator.<sup>22</sup>

This present study sought to test the accuracy of this particular finding in another setting, utilizing the same instrument but at the same time attempting through the research design and analysis to overcome some of the limitations of the original study by Zivin.

It was assumed that demographic and situational differences that existed between Zivin's study and this present research might produce some measurably different teacher perceptions of the acceptability of the hypothetical principal

---

<sup>22</sup>Zivin, p. 241.

behaviours. Implicit in this assumption is that situational and personal factors can affect the attributes of individuals in relation to their role expectations. According to Dan C. Lortie, "Basic demographic and personal characteristic variables have proved time and time again in survey research to account for large proportions of attitudinal variance."<sup>23</sup> Consequently, the first hypothesis, stated in the null form is:

Hypothesis 1. Differences in teacher demographic and personal variables will not be related to teacher acceptance or rejection of specific administrative role behaviours.

Closely related to the above prediction was one that was associated with community setting differences between schools in which the teacher participants taught. The present study utilized a larger and socio-economically more diverse school district than the one sampled by Zivin. Based upon these situational differences, the second null hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 2. Differences in the socio-economic status of the school community in which the teacher teaches will not be related to teacher acceptance or rejection of specific administrative role behaviours.

One of the first expectations of the Zivin study was that through an analysis of the acceptance and rejection responses that teachers gave to a set of hypothetical principal behaviours, identifiable patterns of response would emerge such that the specific types of principal behaviour that teachers generally found acceptable or unacceptable could be identified. It was an assumption of this present writer that clear patterns of teacher response were

---

<sup>23</sup>Dan C. Lortie, "Observations on Teaching as Work," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. R.M.W. Travers (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1973), p. 490.

not likely to emerge if the behavioural items utilized did not always assess what they were intended to assess. In other words, it was assumed that other elements within the item wording besides the specific behaviours described were sometimes important determinants of the teacher's response to the behavioural vignettes. The individual response items or behavioural vignettes had been designed to be representative of categories or broad areas of principal behaviour that were thought to be acceptable or unacceptable to teachers. Zivin acknowledged, however, that the representativeness of the items in each category "...remained a matter of interpretation."<sup>24</sup> The above noted concerns about instrument validity prompted the formulation of the third hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3. Items of principal behaviour are representative of specific categories of behaviour which in turn are representative of Zivin's hypothesized zones of teacher indifference.

The present study hoped to see in the testing of the above hypotheses some insights into the usefulness of the original instrument and generalizability of Zivin's findings.

---

<sup>24</sup>Zivin, p. 255.

## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The importance of literature in the development of this study's research directions has had brief consideration in the introductory chapter. A discussion of the theoretical framework upon which justification for this present study must rest and a review of the pertinent literature is the concern of this chapter. Since this study replicates and seeks to extend another study, it is essential that consideration of the theoretical orientation of the original research form a part of this discussion.

#### THE FORMAL ORGANIZATION

Two definitions of the term formal organization were thought by Zivin to be particularly relevant to her study. The first definition from Blau and Scott distinguished formal organizations as those which had been "...formally ...or deliberately...established for the explicit purpose of achieving certain goals."<sup>1</sup> The second definition cited by Zivin was from Barnard and viewed the formal organization as "...a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons."<sup>2</sup>

Zivin suggested that conflicting expectations often arose within the role relationships in school organizations because of "...the impact of competing bureaucratic and professional organizational principles [for] each of

---

<sup>1</sup>Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962) p. 27, cited by Zivin, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup>Barnard, p. 81, cited by Zivin, p. 14.

these two organizational frameworks provides a unique set of criteria for legitimating organizational behavior."<sup>3</sup> Zivin, therefore, proceeded with a consideration of the elementary school, first of all as a bureaucratic organization and then as a professional organization, concluding her discussion with a simultaneous consideration of the elementary school as both a bureaucratic and a professional organization.

It can be argued, however, that schools should not be simply conceived of as organizations made up of some sort of mixture of these two organizational types. Robert Dreeben states that

While the fact remains that the character of teachers' work in the classroom is not mainly determined through a bureaucratic apparatus, conflicts with the administration develop to a large extent from the ambiguous position of teaching as an occupation - it is not an autonomous profession nor is it a bureaucratized occupation; the prevailing conflicts frequently develop between vaguely defined jurisdictional lines separating teachers and administrators.<sup>4</sup>

Zivin's argument that schools cannot be defined as either fully bureaucratic or fully professional organizations is based upon a consideration of the characteristics of the school organization in terms of fixed attributes that are in fact descriptive of ideal types. Vollmer and Mills, in a discussion of the term professionalization note that Max Weber was well aware that "...no individual organization is completely bureaucratic or completely traditional in its structure and behavior."<sup>5</sup> They further argued that it is more useful to ask the question "...how professionalized in certain identifiable respects" was a given organization rather than to ask whether an organization could be conceived

---

<sup>3</sup>Zivin, p. 16.

<sup>4</sup>Robert Dreeben, "The School as a Workplace," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. R. M. W. Travers (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publ. Co., 1973), p. 453.

<sup>5</sup>Howard M. Vollmer and Donald W. Mills, eds., "The Concepts of Professionalization," Professionalization (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 1.

of as either professional or bureaucratic for in reality these types of occupational organization did not exist.<sup>6</sup>

Professionalization is described by Vollmer and Mills as an ongoing process or movement that can be seen as affecting any organization. They specifically state that

...it seems more useful to analyze and describe the characteristics of the concept of 'professionalization', assuming that many, if not all, occupations may be placed somewhere on a continuum between the ideal-type "profession" at one end and completely unorganized occupational categories, or "non-professions," at the other end. Professionalization is a process, then, that may affect any occupation to a greater or lesser degree.<sup>7</sup>

When considering, therefore, the nature of the organizational structure of the elementary school, it is useful to think of it as involved at some level in the process of professionalization for then the organization can be more readily perceived of as an open system that is moving in the direction of more or less professionalization rather than as a structure possessing or not possessing the attributes of ideal types.

In the language of ideal types, bureaucratic organizations are seen as those that are characterized by such things as a structural hierarchical system, clearly defined superior-subordinate responsibilities, and precisely circumscribed decision making procedures.<sup>8</sup> The professional model on the other hand is seen as one in which "...work is controlled by ethical standards determined by colleagues in a professional association."<sup>9</sup> It has been assumed by many writers that because bureaucratic and professional occupational frameworks have their own unique set of criteria for legitimating organizational

---

<sup>6</sup>Vollmer and Mills, p. vii.

<sup>7</sup>Vollmer and Mills, p. 2.

<sup>8</sup>Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior In Schools (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 57.

<sup>9</sup>Vollmer and Mills, p. 265.



behaviour that they must, therefore, be always competing or in conflict with each other. Vollmer and Mills state, however, that

Although conflicts between professionals and bureaucrats may be frequent, they are not inevitable. Many professionals apparently learn to live in complex organizations [some becoming] less professional and more bureaucratic over time [while others make use of] adaptation mechanisms [that allow them to] live in more or less bureaucratic environments and yet retain their professional integrity and independence.<sup>10</sup>

Doctors working in hospitals might be seen as examples of the above for they are quite able, within the hospital's administrative bureaucracy, to retain their professional autonomy. Though teachers are not similarly thought of as professionals in the sense that doctors are, they do exercise considerable control over the teaching process.

From the social systems perspective of this present research, roles are not conceived of as simply the formal prescription of an organization with regard to specific positions, but as the images held by others for an individual's relational behaviour when he occupies a particular position. Further, the school organization is not seen as a system within which the professional aspirations of teachers should necessarily conflict with the bureaucratic responsibilities of the principal. It would appear that the argument that rising teacher professionalization must inevitably conflict with the bureaucratic responsibilities of the administration could be based upon a false premise. Zivin had argued that there was little actual research to substantiate the claims of literature with regard to the "conflictual nature" of the teacher-principal relationship. Thus an examination of teacher expectations for the role behaviour of the principal was thought by this present researcher to be well suited to the task of defining that role and the relationship that exists between role expectations and role behaviour.

---

<sup>10</sup>Vollmer and Mills, "Professionals and Complex Organization," pp. 275 - 276.

In summary, professionals and bureaucrats are working together in growing numbers in society (doctors in hospitals, lawyers in law firms) and though this does not suggest that role conflict in such settings does not exist, role conflict should not be considered as an inevitable result of bureaucrats and professionals attempting to co-exist.

Conflicts do appear to arise, however, when the administrative responsibilities of the bureaucracy intrude upon areas that professionals within the organization consider exclusively their own.<sup>11</sup> In the realm of teaching, there is evidence to suggest that teachers might well consider classroom affairs their professional concern, not to be intruded upon by the administrative personnel. The reason for this possible orientation has been suggested by Lortie:

Since the teacher's rewards depend primarily on what takes place in the classroom [because money rewards are increased by course taking and longevity and "hierarchical" rewards are virtually non-existent in teaching] she can be relatively independent of benefits controlled by administrators and peers. [This, therefore,] affects her relationship to the principal and colleagues [for] caring less about school-wide than classroom affairs, the teacher is not reluctant to grant the principal clear hegemony over those matters which do not bear directly upon her teaching activities. The basis for zoning decisions is laid; the principal's primary sphere is the school-at-large, the teacher's is the classroom [thus] teachers have a stake in warding off controls which reduce their options in the selection of working goals and assessment procedures.<sup>12</sup>

Based on the conception of the school organization as one made up of the conflicting elements of two opposing types of occupational structures, Zivin felt it was vitally important to her study that the "...control of the organizational behaviors of members can be interpreted within the framework of [these] divergent structural principles."<sup>13</sup> In the view of this present writer,

---

<sup>11</sup>Vollmer and Mills, "Professionals and Complex Organizations," pp. 265 - 275.

<sup>12</sup>Lortie, "The Balance of Control in Elementary School Teaching," pp. 37 - 38.

<sup>13</sup>Zivin, p. 24.

it appears far more useful to view the organizational behaviour of various role occupants within the framework of systems theory for within this conceptualization, the relational nature of roles is emphasized and not their supposed structural position.

The degree to which either the employee status or the professional status was emphasized within the school organization was seen by Zivin as crucial to the organizational position of the teacher and ultimately to the teacher's actual autonomy. Within this context, if teachers were to view, as appropriate, a superior-subordinate teacher-principal relationship, then they must, according to Zivin, acknowledge the superior competence of the principal for the superior-subordinate relationship was seen as being predicated upon such an acknowledgement and supervisory behaviours finally legitimized by this factor. Zivin suggested that "...alternatively, the process of teacher professionalization could be seen as an attempt by teachers to establish a domain of recognized teacher expertise" and that such a domain would include all matters related to the "...core teaching situation."<sup>14</sup> Thus, in this view, teacher concern for autonomy could be seen as quite possibly contrary to the bureaucratic requirements of hierarchical authority. It has already been argued, however, that rising professionalization does not necessarily need to conflict with the bureaucratic requirements and hierarchical authority structure of an organization.

In the school district with which this present study is concerned, rising teacher professionalization might be seen in the emergence of staff-committees for collegial decision-making at the elementary level. There appears to be some awareness, on the part of administrators in this southern British Columbia school district, that teacher involvement in certain school decisions is now

---

<sup>14</sup>Zivin, p. 25.

more important than it was in the past. W. S. Simpkins and D. Friesen, reporting the results of a study done by Simpkins in the Province of Alberta state that

During the last twenty years or so education administration has seen the emergence of participatory decision-making by members of the school organization. Teachers, it is agreed, need to be involved in the making of decisions on basic task activities in the school.<sup>15</sup>

With regard to teacher authority, Zivin quoted Lortie, who stated that teacher autonomy "...possesses no legitimation in the official statement of authority distribution in American public schools" and that this therefore, made teachers dependent on the "informal recognition" of teacher autonomy from other organizational members.<sup>16</sup> Within the theoretical framework of systems theory, with positions defined in terms of the role expectations that are held for the role by others, it might seem appropriate to regard teacher autonomy more in terms of the informal recognition granted them by others than in terms of any officially prescribed recognition. The problem inherent in this, however, is that authority informally granted can be relatively easily withdrawn since it is not legally prescribed. Thus, though the unofficial recognition of teacher autonomy by the principal can serve to effectively grant that autonomy, the position does remain vulnerable. As a result of this vulnerability, one might expect teachers to be sensitive about any principal behaviour that threatens the status of the teacher in relation to classroom affairs. This area, in particular then, would appear to have some potential for conflict between teachers and principals. W. R. Scott suggested that professional prestige seemed to be related to conflict within organizations:

---

<sup>15</sup>W. S. Simpkins and D. Friesen, "Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making," *The Canadian Administrator*, VIII (January, 1969).

<sup>16</sup>Lortie, "The Balance of Control in Elementary School Teaching," p. 41, cited by Zivin, p. 26.

It appears that the higher the general prestige of the professional group and the more central their skills to the functioning of the organization, the more likely they are to be successful in their attempt to control the conditions under which they work, with the result that there is less actual conflict between professionals and representatives of the bureaucracy.<sup>17</sup>

It could be implied from the above that since teachers belong to a rather low prestige professional group by comparison with the more traditionally recognized professions, that they might, therefore, be expected to experience greater conflict as they seek greater recognition. It is interesting to note in this regard that the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, in a recent publication concerning "learning and working conditions" in teaching, are actively seeking the legally constituted right to negotiate these conditions with all school boards.<sup>18</sup> The Federation suggests, in fact, the unilateral declaration of minimum learning and working conditions at the local association level, based on a format produced by the Federation, in an attempt to force recognition of teacher demands in this regard. This would appear to be a clear attempt on the part of the B. C. Teachers' provincial association to formalize a domain of teacher expertise, for within the minimum criteria considered the teachers' right to negotiate are the following items:

...class sizes, preparation time, freedom from noon-hour supervision duties, adequate space and facilities, safe and hygienic conditions for their students and themselves, adequate staffing and supplies and the autonomy to determine organization of the school.<sup>19</sup>

In the British Columbia teaching situation there would appear to be some evidence to support a claim of growing teacher professionalization, but just how

---

<sup>17</sup>W. R. Scott, "Professionals in Bureaucracies - Areas of Conflict," Professionalization, ed. Howard R. Vollmer and Donald W. Mills (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 275.

<sup>18</sup>B. C. Teachers' Federation, Learning Conditions - In Quest of Quality Education (August, 1976), p. 1.

<sup>19</sup>B. C. Teachers' Federation, p. 4.

supportive the collective teacher membership are of Federation policies is not readily apparent. An assessment of teacher expectations with regard to specific principal behaviours was seen, therefore, as a potentially useful indicator in this regard, for within the Federation's explication of teacher rights are areas of authority traditionally delegated to the principal's control.

#### THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE SCHOOL SETTING

As mentioned earlier, the sample in the present study was deliberately stratified to facilitate the consideration of several distinctive variables that the Zivin study could not include. The most important of these was thought to be socio-economic diversity of the school setting. Zivin reported a research finding by Howard S. Becker that "...when a slackening of discipline occurs (in a slum school) due to the replacement of a supportive principal by a non-supportive one, teachers transfer en masse."<sup>20</sup> This finding was of interest to this present study because of the expectation that teachers in lower and higher S.E.S. schools might place different demands upon principals.

Ricard O. Carlson, writing in 1964, stated that there was a "...need to know the ways in which organizational structure and behavior are constrained and facilitated by forces in the environment of an organization."<sup>21</sup> Citing a number of related research works, Carlson noted that Hollingshead, in an examination of "preferential treatment in public schools" had found that "...when teachers counsel with parents of lower-class children...the emphasis tends to

---

<sup>20</sup> Howard S. Becker, "The Career of the Chicago Public Schoolteacher," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (March, 1952), pp. 475 - 476, cited by Zivin, p. 40.

<sup>21</sup> Richard O. Carlson, Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 262.

be on discipline problems, and that when they counsel with parents of upper-class children the emphasis is on the pupil's work."<sup>22</sup> That students from different socio-economic backgrounds are often differently treated by teachers seems to be well documented by others.<sup>23</sup> In the area of discipline alone, therefore, it seemed probable that teachers in lower socio-economic settings might have, in contrast to teachers in higher socio-economic settings, if not some significantly different expectations for principal behaviour, then at least a somewhat differently organized order of priority with respect to what they considered the most desirable or acceptable of principal behaviours.

McPherson, Salley, and Baehr, discussing some preliminary findings of their "National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship" report a major finding of their research as follows:

Variables relating to type and size of school accounted for the greatest number of differentiations in the way principals described their jobs, although socio-economic status and ethnic composition of the student body and teaching staff made a sizeable contribution.<sup>24</sup>

They further state that an analysis of data "...indicates that ethnic and socio-economic characteristics play a significant part in defining the work of the principal."<sup>25</sup> This preliminary finding suggests that the principal's job is quite clearly affected by the socio-economic status setting within which he works. It was an assumption of this writer that teacher expectations for

---

<sup>22</sup>A. B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1949), p. 179, cited by Carlson, p. 270.

<sup>23</sup>Ray C. Rist, "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education," Harvard Educational Review, 40, No. 3 (August, 1970).

<sup>24</sup>R. Bruce McPherson, Columbis Salley, and Melany E. Baehr, What Principals Do: Preliminary Implications of "A National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship" (Chicago: Manpower Research and Development Division, Industrial Relations Center, The University of Chicago, 1975), pp. 12 - 13.

<sup>25</sup>R. Bruce McPherson, p. 21.

the principal's behaviour might also be affected by the socio-economic status level of the school within which the teachers taught. That is, it was assumed that different socio-economic status levels of school clientele would place such different demands upon teachers and administrators that teacher expectations for the principal's behaviour would vary significantly from one socio-economic status setting to another. Thus different teacher response patterns in relation to the range of pre-selected principal behaviours, used in this study, were expected to emerge. This was thought to be particularly likely in relation to the teachers' perceptions in lower socio-economic areas of the supportive behaviour of principals in student discipline matters, as compared to the expectations in this regard of teachers in upper-middle class areas.

#### TEACHER ZONES OF INDIFFERENCE

In order to assess teacher expectations for the role behaviour of the principal, Zivin constructed a set of hypothetical principal behaviours or "stimulus items" which were designed to elicit a range of teacher acceptability responses. Zivin's conception of acceptability in relation to teacher expectations for the principal's behaviour derived from the zone of indifference and zone of acceptance concepts of Barnard and Simon. Zivin pointed out that though the Barnard and Simon conceptualizations dealt with bureaucratic, superior-subordinate organizational relationships, an examination of their formulations concerning the zoning of organizational behaviours was thought to be "...relevant for understanding teacher expectations for principal behavior."<sup>26</sup>

Edward B. Smith, in a 1975 article directed towards a clarification of Barnard's theories, suggested that

---

<sup>26</sup>Zivin, p. 28.



...the significance of Barnard's theory is that the subjective concept of authority alone has validity. It is a multiple relationship among participants in an organization which allows one or another to exercise the decision-making process as long as basic agreement remains among all the members. It arises from the members and flows back to the members. The executive's role is to administer authority in accordance with the dictates of the membership.<sup>27</sup>

Thus the Barnardian conceptualization of authority rested entirely upon the need for acceptance by subordinates before the direction of a superior could be regarded, in any sense, to be authoritative. Zivin made use of this concept in her stimulus item formulation stating that

...the relevance for the present study of the subordinate-superior relationship posited by Barnard lies in the notion that the subordinate exercises evaluative and/or judgemental behavior in determination of the acceptability of the superior's order and compliance by the subordinate confirms the authority of the superior.<sup>28</sup>

Thus the superior's behaviour must comply with the subordinate's expectations for that behaviour as an essential prerequisite to maintaining existing authority relationships.

Zivin made use of Barnard's zone of indifference concept as an important element in determining something of the acceptability pattern that might be expected to result if teachers were to rate a range of principal behaviours. The acceptability scale constructed by Zivin for teacher use in response to specific principal behaviours was, in fact, couched in the language utilized by Barnard in the explanation of his zone of indifference concept. The explanatory quotation from Barnard that was utilized by Zivin is as follows:

If all the orders for actions reasonably practicable be arranged in the order of their acceptability to the person affected, it may be conceived that there are a number which are clearly unacceptable [Zivin's certainly unacceptable category], that is, which certainly will not be obeyed, there is another group somewhat more or less on the neutral line, that is either barely acceptable or barely unacceptable; [precisely the terms used by Zivin] and a third group unquestionably acceptable; [Zivin's

---

<sup>27</sup>Smith, "Chester Barnard's Concept of Authority," p. 35.

<sup>28</sup>Zivin, p. 28.

certainly acceptable category]. This last group lies within the 'zone of indifference'. The person affected will accept orders lying within this zone and is relatively indifferent as to what the order is so far as the question of authority is concerned.<sup>29</sup>

Barnard's zone of indifference and Simon's zone of acceptance concepts were conceived of as synonymous by Zivin and defined as "...an area of acceptance in behavior within which the subordinate is willing to accept the decisions made for him by his superior."<sup>30</sup> The Simon notion that differences existed in the expectations for authority between different types of employees, was considered by Zivin to be relevant to her study, for in this view, professionals or skilled persons were seen as likely having rather narrow zones of acceptance of authority in relation to their special competencies. Relating this concept to teachers it was expected, therefore, that they would have a narrow acceptance zone with regard to the instructional activities of the classroom, their area of special competence.<sup>31</sup> The concept of an area or zone of acceptance within which the behaviour of a superior can be regarded by a subordinate with indifference was a concept thought, therefore, to be readily extendible to the teacher-principal relationship.

The work of Dan C. Lortie that was influential in the formative stages of this present research was also important to some of the conceptualizations within Zivin's dissertation. Zivin extracted, from Lortie's discussion of the concept of variable zoning, two elements that were thought to be useful. The first of these derived from Lortie's statement that there existed a "differential definition" of the appropriate areas of decision making power between role incumbents. Thus teacher perceptions of appropriate zones of authority were seen as differing from individual to individual. The second idea that

---

<sup>29</sup>Barnard, p. 168 - 169, cited by Zivin, p. 29.

<sup>30</sup>Zivin, p. 30,

<sup>31</sup>Zivin, p. 30.

Zivin extracted from Lortie's discussion was that the acceptability of certain role behaviours would, it appeared, fall into various zones depending on the type of behaviour exercised.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, patterns of teacher response were expected to emerge in the analyses that would help delineate more clearly the types of behaviour that could be treated with indifference by the teacher and the types of behaviour that might be regarded as principal interference by the teacher.

#### CATEGORIES OF PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOUR

Zivin identified from a review of the literature certain types of principal behaviour which teachers were thought to find acceptable or unacceptable. These indications from the literature were then utilized in the construction of a range of hypothetical principal behaviours or stimulus items which comprised the major research tool of the Zivin study. This present research made use of the Zivin instrument in an attempt to test and extend her research findings. Zivin's categorization of behaviours and some of the supportive research for this categorization is, therefore, of concern to this present study and is summarized and discussed below under the Zivin headings.

##### Principal Behaviours Likely to be Acceptable

Administrative behaviours. Zivin found considerable agreement in the literature on the acceptance by teachers of those principal behaviours considered to be primarily managerial or administrative in orientation. It is of interest to this present writer that some of the areas of educational decision making considered inappropriate by teachers in the Carson, Goldhammer, and

---

<sup>32</sup>Lortie, "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," p. 13, cited by Zivin, pp. 33 - 34.

Pellegrin study cited by Zivin, was not considered inappropriate in a number of the schools in the school district presently under study.<sup>33</sup> For example, the assignment of children to various teachers and the determination of teacher schedules were considered, in the Carson, Goldhammer, and Pellegrin study, as outside the teachers' purview but in at least some of the schools in the present study, both these areas were decided upon by teachers. It has been previously noted that B. C. Teachers' Federation policy would clearly extend the authority of teachers to include autonomy in relation to certain school organizational matters, but Simpkins and Friesen found, in a study conducted in the Province of Alberta that teachers "...still saw those in higher official authority as playing the major role in deciding questions concerning curriculum, general school administration, and the arrangement of the school instructional program."<sup>34</sup>

Zivin's consideration, therefore, of just what constituted a strictly administrative function is an important one. Referring to research by Lortie, Zivin suggested that as functions pertain more to building-wide matters, the likelihood of teacher acceptance appears to increase.<sup>35</sup> This being the case, strictly administrative behaviours were then thought to be general administrative duties which were not directly related to the tasks of teaching. Such activities were thought to be the ones most likely to be found acceptable by teachers for they could be perceived as within the teacher's zone of indif-

---

<sup>33</sup>Robert B. Carson, Keith Goldhammer, and Roland J. Pellegrin, Teacher Participation in the Community (Eugene: University of Oregon Press for the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967), p. 12, cited by Zivin, p. 35.

<sup>34</sup>W. S. Simpkins and D. Friesen, "Teacher Participation," pp. 234 - 236.

<sup>35</sup>Lortie, "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," p. 39, cited by Zivin, p. 36.

ference.

Supportive behaviours. Another type of principal behaviour thought likely to be acceptable to teachers was supportive behaviour. Zivin singled out as being particularly relevant, the assertions of literature that teachers were clearly desirous of the support of the principal in student discipline matters. Zivin cited studies by Haralick and by Becker which referred to the supportive behaviour of principals as being part of "...a definite set of [teacher] expectations [or] norms."<sup>36</sup> G. Llewellyn Parsons reported that the most effective supervisors were seen as those that were, amongst other things, more supportive of teacher authority.<sup>37</sup> Parsons also stated that "...it is interesting to note that teachers' perceptions of the need for principal support of teacher authority decreased with an increase in professional preparation."<sup>38</sup> This finding was considered of some additional interest because of the wide differences in formal training that existed between the teachers in the Zivin study and the teachers in this present sample.

#### Principal Behaviours Likely to be Unacceptable

Behaviours related to classroom proceedings. Zivin found that the literature quite consistently singled out functions that related to the "core teaching tasks" as being the areas of most vital concern to the teacher. Thus principal intrusions into areas of instructional content, methodology, and the selection of teaching materials were seen as principal behaviours teachers

---

<sup>36</sup> Joy Gold Haralick, "Teacher Acceptance of Administrative Action," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXVII, No. 2 (Winter, 1968), p. 40; Howard S. Becker, "The Career of the Chicago Public Schoolteacher," pp. 475 - 476, cited by Zivin, pp. 37 - 40.

<sup>37</sup> Parsons, p. 100.

<sup>38</sup> Parsons, p. 104.

would likely find the least acceptable. Such behaviours, it was thought, might conceivably be seen as violations by the principal of the teachers' professional prerogatives, even though teachers enjoyed no official recognition as autonomous specialists. Zivin cited the research findings of Chase, Bridges, and Carson, Goldhammer, and Pellegrin in support of the contention that the least acceptable principal behaviours would be those that could be considered interventions in the classroom concerns of the teacher.<sup>39</sup>

In the Canadian context, Simpkins found that

Preferred authority relationships suggested that teachers wanted the apparent isolation of the self-contained classroom in the school authority structure to be maintained. Teachers preferred to have both those in higher official authority and their colleagues in the formal staff group exercise only secondary authority in the classroom. This evidence suggested that the individual teacher wished to protect his jurisdiction in the classroom decision-making from the authority exercised both by his colleague group and by those in administrative positions.<sup>40</sup>

Principal supervision of teachers. The desire for teacher autonomy in classroom proceedings might be manifest, Zivin suggested, in a "...teacher demand for freedom from principal supervision and evaluation of teacher execution of core teaching responsibilities."<sup>41</sup> Zivin cited Trask who saw the principal as constantly trying to reconcile contradictory or even conflicting professional and bureaucratic requirements.<sup>42</sup> As mentioned in the previous discussion on professionalization, however, it may be incorrect to assume that

---

<sup>39</sup>Francis S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (November, 1951), pp. 127 - 132; Edwin M. Bridges, "A Model for Shared Decision Making in the School Principalship," Educational Administration Quarterly, III, No. 1 (Winter, 1967), pp. 52, 56; Carson, Goldhammer, and Pellegrin, pp. 10 - 12, cited by Zivin, p. 40 - 43.

<sup>40</sup>Simpkins and Friesen, p. 236.

<sup>41</sup>Zivin, p. 47.

<sup>42</sup>Anne E. Trask, "Principals, Teachers and Supervision: Dilemmas and Solutions," Administrator's Notebook, XIII, No. 4 (December, 1964), p. 1, cited by Zivin, p. 47.

professional aspirations and bureaucratic requirements must always be in conflict with each other. Vollmer and Mills pointed out that professionals, in this present era, are functioning more and more within bureaucratic organizations and often, it would appear, with relatively minimal conflict with their bureaucratic peers.<sup>43</sup> Trask saw the principal as having to reconcile delegated bureaucratic responsibility to supervise teachers with the teacher's norm of professional independence and suggested that principals often resolved this dilemma by redefining their supervisory activities. The principals surveyed in the Trask study felt that they would only intervene in the classroom in extreme situations such as might be the case with a serious discipline problem. There was even greater reluctance to interfere in the classroom to correct teaching deficiencies.<sup>44</sup> The Trask findings would coincide with the earlier suggestion that the classroom is regarded by the teachers as their professional area of concern and as such clearly outside of their zone of indifference. If, as Lortie suggests, "...teachers have a stake in warding off controls"<sup>45</sup> in relation to classroom affairs, then principal involvement in this area would appear likely to meet with resistance. That many principals seem to deliberately avoid intrusions in classroom affairs is reported by E. H. Ziolkowski who states that:

Formal classroom visitation, the practice regarded in much of the literature as basic to any respectable program of supervision, was found to be conspicuously neglected. Just over two-thirds of the teachers in the sample reported having received no formal classroom visits from their principal over the past year. Of those visited, 62 percent were on interim staff which suggests that where classroom visits were made, the purpose was to evaluate for permanent tenure rather than to assist teachers in improving their classroom performance.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>Vollmer and Mills, "Professionals and Complex Organizations," p. 275.

<sup>44</sup>Trask, pp. 1 - 2, cited by Zivin, pp. 48 - 49.

<sup>45</sup>Lortie, "The Balance of Control in Elementary School Teaching," pp. 37 - 38.

<sup>46</sup>E. H. Ziolkowski, "Practices in supervision of Instruction," The Canadian Administrator, V (October, 1965), pp. 2 - 3.

In British Columbia, Norman Robinson noted that "...the bureaucratic demand for hierarchical supervision has been extended to include formal evaluation of teachers' performance" and that principals are required, in the Public Schools Act, to complete written reports on teachers at least once every three years.<sup>47</sup> This legal requirement is complied with, but it would appear that the formal evaluation of teacher performance is completed largely without the aid of formal classroom visitation. There is some suggestion in the literature that principal reluctance to conduct formal evaluations of teaching practices might derive from a fear of teacher censure in this regard.

P. C. Dodd suggests that

Although teachers are subordinate to the principal in the organization, they wield powerful sanctions. A principal who fails to meet the expectations of a majority of his teachers may find his authority severely undermined, if not openly flouted. Many teachers have tenure and can be dismissed or transferred only with difficulty.<sup>48</sup>

Zivin cited the works of several writers that went beyond Trask and suggested that the principal was no longer regarded as a specialist in the teaching area and because of this teachers would accept no supervision from the principal in relation to teaching.<sup>49</sup>

Principal participation in student evaluation. Student evaluation, Zivin suggested, was another important aspect of "...the teacher's intimate concern with the core teaching-learning situation."<sup>50</sup> It was thought, there-

---

<sup>47</sup> Norman Robinson, "Principal and Teacher Supervisory Relationships: Problems and Perspectives," Administrative Leadership in Schools - A Book of Readings, ed. N. Robinson (Burnaby: Simon Fraser University), pp. 112 - 113.

<sup>48</sup> P. C. Dodd, "Role Conflicts of School Principals," Final Report No. 4, Cooperative Research Project No. 853, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, cited by S. N. Boocock, An Introduction To The Sociology of Learning (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972), p. 179.

<sup>49</sup> Zivin, pp. 50 - 51.

<sup>50</sup> Zivin, p. 52.



fore, that student evaluation would likely be considered by teachers as clearly within their area of authority. Zivin cited the work of Trask once more in support of the above contention. Trask suggested the existence of a professional norm of autonomy amongst teachers that assumed "...the right of teachers to assess the needs and interests of their students and to determine...what best serves these interests, without direction or interference from...superordinates!"<sup>51</sup> Zivin concluded from this that teachers would expect the principal's role to be very limited with respect to student evaluation.

#### SUMMARY

The hypothetical behavioural constructs that were designed to be representative of the above categories of behaviours were conceived of by Zivin within a theoretical framework that considered an individual's authority as relational, the expectations of teachers for the role behaviour of the principal as zoned or discriminatory in relation to areas of principal involvement, and the school organization as possessed of some of the attributes of both a professional and a bureaucratic system.

As mentioned, this present study did not consider the principal-teacher dyad so much in terms of bureaucrat versus professional as it did in terms of a role set that was defined at least in part by the mutual interaction of role expectations.

---

<sup>51</sup>Trask, p. 1, cited by Zivin, p. 52.

## Chapter 3

## LIMITATIONS, DESIGN, AND METHODOLOGY

## LIMITATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Crucial to the findings of any study are, of course, the limitations imposed upon its findings by the very nature of the study itself. Zivin clearly explicated a number of these limitations. In relation to generalizability, which was one of the major concerns of this present research, Zivin specifically stated that since her study was restricted to a single "fortuitously selected" school district that

Insights gained from the present research regarding the acceptability to teachers of proposed principal behaviors may not be generalizable to teachers in situations other than the school district utilized [but that since] interesting indications of teacher sentiment regarding acceptable role behavior of the principal did emerge, [there was a] need for further research of a wider scope in this area.<sup>1</sup>

Despite this limitation, Zivin chose a single school district because "It was felt that the utilization of a single school district, while limiting the generalizability of the study results, would eliminate the necessity for assessing the effects of artifacts in the data due to district influence."<sup>2</sup>

The present study was restricted as well to a single school district but this was done when it appeared that this restriction would not in any way impair the major objectives of the present study. Of fundamental consideration in the selection of an appropriate school district were, therefore, the following criteria:

- a) proximity to Simon Fraser University

---

<sup>1</sup>Zivin, pp. 8 - 9.

<sup>2</sup>Zivin, p. 80.

- b) size of the district in terms of school population
- c) socio-economic structure of the district.

Central to the intentions of this present study which sought to test the Zivin findings as to their generalizability were two additional, very important limitations that were explicated within the original research. Zivin states:

Several factors related to this particular research methodology were potential sources of uncontrolled influence on study results. A deliberate attempt was made during construction of the stimulus items to avoid phrasing of items which would divert teacher attention away from consideration of the nature of the principal behavior being described and to the form of the item itself. The intent of each item was to elicit the sentiments of the participants concerning the hypothetical action taken by the principal and not to trigger an emotional reaction from the respondents concerning the contents of the particular vignette.<sup>3</sup>

Zivin acknowledged, however, that "...variations in individual interpretation of the hypothetical situations...remained potential artifacts of the response situation [and that the] influence of item wording on participants' responses was not investigated."<sup>4</sup> This particular limitation was regarded as one of the most important for it acknowledged some doubt as to the instrument's ability to measure precisely what it was intended to measure.

The second limitation of importance to this present analysis was related to Zivin's behavioural classification scheme. Zivin states:

...discussion related to types of acceptable and unacceptable principal behavior in the present study was limited by the researcher's precategorization of individual items as representative of various areas in which the elementary principal might function. Consistent with the purpose of the present study, i.e. assessment of the acceptability to elementary teachers of selected types of role behavior of the elementary principal, the areas of principal behavior to be investigated were first chosen by the researcher and then hypothetical behavioral situations were constructed as vehicles for eliciting teacher sentiments regarding the acceptability of various possible principal behaviors in these areas. The degree to which the particular principal behaviors described in the items could be considered representative of the behavioral areas remains a matter

---

<sup>3</sup>Zivin, pp. 253 - 254.

<sup>4</sup>Zivin, p. 254.

of interpretation.<sup>5</sup>

If, in fact, the hypothetical principal behaviours were not consistently eliciting teacher reactions to specific behaviours as they were intended then there was reason to believe that the items subsumed under each category of behaviour could not consistently represent one type of principal behaviour.

## THE RESEARCH DESIGN

The major purpose of this present study, as stated previously, was to replicate the Zivin research in an attempt to overcome some of the limitations inherent in the original research and to test and extend the findings. Of first concern was the potential lack of generalizability of Zivin's research because of the nature of the sample, but the other methodological limitations mentioned above were also considered in this study. Different data collecting methods and analytical techniques were, therefore, utilized in this study in an attempt to assess the extent of some of the restrictions of the original research. The specific techniques utilized are detailed below.

### Data Collecting

The small sample size. Zivin interviewed forty-four teachers in her research or 51% of her target population. In the present research, eighty teachers were interviewed representing 100% of the target population. Zivin sought volunteer participation through response to a letter. The present writer sent an introductory letter and sought volunteer participation after a personal contact with each potential respondent.

The homogeneity of the setting. The Zivin school district sampled was

---

<sup>5</sup>Zivin, p. 255.

socio-economically homogeneous in nature. The present school district sampled had a diverse socio-economic base and the targeted population of teachers was stratified to ensure the inclusion of teachers from schools rated as socio-economic extremes in terms of the school community.

The non-random selection of respondents. Zivin targeted the entire teacher population of her district, thus the 51% response represented a non-random sample of the total population. How representative teacher opinions were, therefore, could not be determined. In this present research, respondents were randomly selected from a target population that had been stratified in accordance to different socio-economic status rated school types.

#### Analytical Techniques

The lack of statistical control in the analytic techniques. Zivin utilized analytic techniques (Pearson Correlations and "t" tests) that could not control for the interactive effects of other independent variables. The occurrence of significance in relation to specific variables could not be viewed, therefore, as necessarily the most accurate picture of significant relationships. The use of an n-way analysis of variance enabled this present writer to control for the interactive effects of five independent variables within each analysis. The use of this more robust analytic technique was an attempt, therefore, to distinguish patterns of teacher response that controlled for the effects of systematic error variances due to interactive effects of independent variables.

The absence of tests for instrument validity. Zivin did not systematically test whether the hypothetical behavioural constructs utilized actually did measure what they were intended to measure. This present writer randomly sampled the reasons teachers gave for their responses. Indications as to why

and to what teachers were reacting within the hypothetical constructs were sought. Specific reasons for response were, therefore, recorded in this analysis so that the validity question could be systematically assessed.

The lack of statistical analysis of the item classification scheme.

As mentioned, Zivin did not attempt to test her categorization scheme to see whether the items included were indeed consistently representative of their category. The use of a principal component factor analysis was designed, therefore, to assess the unidimensionality of the categories.

District Comparisons

Though there were similarities between the Zivin district and the one utilized in this present study, the differences that existed were many and it was these that primarily justified the retention of the one-district orientation. A comparison of the main characteristics of the two districts is provided below.

Location. The districts are many thousands of miles apart and in different countries.

- a) The Chicago area district, used by Zivin, is located in northeastern Illinois, approximately fifteen miles north of downtown Chicago.<sup>6</sup>
- b) The Vancouver area district, used in this present study, is located in southwestern British Columbia, approximately fifteen miles east of downtown Vancouver.

District Structure. The districts were structured somewhat differently

---

<sup>6</sup>Zivin, p. 83.

spatially.

- a) The Chicago area children attending school in the district sampled "...lived in adjacent areas of four north-eastern Illinois suburbs, one subdivision, and one unincorporated area."<sup>7</sup>
- b) The Vancouver area children attending school in the district sampled lived in two incorporated town areas, one suburban municipality, and one unincorporated semi-rural area, all adjacent to each other and together comprising the school district.

Socio-economic status. The districts were structured differently socio-economically.

- a) The Chicago area school district population came entirely from middle, upper middle, and upper class families.<sup>8</sup>
- b) The Vancouver area school district population was economically quite broadly based encompassing socio-economic backgrounds ranging from lower class to upper middle class families.

School population and staff. The districts were very different in school population size and staff.

- a) The January 1971 school population count in the Chicago area district showed that the three elementary schools (K to 8) comprising the district had a total of 1404 students. There were 85 full-time elementary teachers, three elementary principals, three assistant principals, and one school superintendent in the school year 1970-71. The office of the superintendent was located in an extension of the junior-high building.<sup>9</sup>
- b) The January 1976 school population count in the Vancouver area district indicated that the forty-four elementary schools (K to 7)

---

<sup>7</sup>Zivin, p. 83.

<sup>8</sup>Zivin, p. 83.

<sup>9</sup>Zivin, p. 83.

in the district had a total of 14,674 students. In addition, the district had eleven secondary schools (8 to 12) with a January 1976 population total of 9,489, and three "special" schools for educationally handicapped children with a total student population of 131. Thus the total student population for the entire district was 24,293. There were 580 full-time elementary teachers, forty elementary principals, sixteen vice-principals, eight primary and intermediate co-ordinators, five associate supervisors, four assistant superintendents, and one superintendent in the school year 1975-76. The school board offices were located in a separate building adjacent to the largest senior secondary school in the district.

School sizes and distribution. The districts were different in the range of school sizes represented and in their spatial distribution.

- a) The three elementary schools in the Chicago area district had January 1971 enrolment figures of 326, 531, and 547. Two of the schools were primary schools (K to 4) and one was a "junior high" school (5 to 8). One of the primary schools and the junior high were located in adjacent buildings on a single site and the other primary school was located approximately a mile away.<sup>10</sup>
- b) The forty-four elementary schools in the Vancouver area district had February, 1976 enrolment figures ranging from 23 in the smallest school to 653 in the largest. Of the forty-four schools, thirty-four schools, or 77.27% had school populations of two hundred or more and nine schools or 20.45% had student populations in excess of five hundred students. The forty-four elementary

---

<sup>10</sup>Zivin, pp. 83 - 85.



schools contained within the 80 square mile district were spatially distributed in relation to the population density. Both the municipal area and the two incorporated city areas contained within their boundaries fairly large undeveloped land tracts.

## METHODOLOGY

Out of the forty-four elementary schools comprising the total number in the district, five were initially deleted for the following reasons: (1) Three schools were special education schools for the educationally handicapped and were thus thought to be sufficiently different from the more conventional schools to warrant their removal from consideration. (2) A fourth school consisted of only a kindergarten class in a rural area. This school was the supervisory responsibility of the principal of a nearby elementary school. Teacher expectations for the role behaviour of the principal in this instance could be quite different and thus this school was removed from the consideration of this present study. (3) The fifth school to be deleted from consideration was the one in which the author was teaching at the time of this research. It was felt that to include this school would introduce a possible sample bias in interview situations in which the teachers were close colleagues of the researcher. Thus a total of 39 schools remained in the sample being considered.

### Stratification of the Sample

From these 39 schools to be sampled, sixteen schools were selected as representative of the socio-economic extremes that existed within the district. Thus within the final selection of schools to be sampled, eight schools were from predominantly upper-middle class areas and eight schools were from predo-

minantly lower class areas. Care was taken to ensure that no overlap of the two distinctive socio-economic status (S.E.S.) categories would occur. Schools that were selected had to be, in other words, more clearly towards one end of the S.E.S. spectrum than the other.

The procedure used to ensure that each school's S.E.S. position was correctly chosen involved telephone interviews with ten randomly selected school principals and written responses from three randomly selected district supervisory personnel. All respondents provided strong confirmation of the first five schools in either socio-economic extreme by naming the same five schools in very nearly the same rank ordering in each interview. Choosing schools beyond the first five in each S.E.S. category proved to be somewhat more difficult for more than three schools were suggested by each respondent as quite readily fitting into the last three positions. Nevertheless, the complete complement of eight schools in each S.E.S. category that had been tentatively selected by the author were all individually named within the selections made by the respondents. Thus the S.E.S. positions chosen for all sixteen schools were seen as correct in each S.E.S. category but to further ensure that the last three schools chosen in each S.E.S. category did indeed belong in the positions chosen for them, the principals of the schools in question were interviewed and in each case, they suggested that their schools were correctly placed. Thus sixteen schools in total were selected from the initial thirty-nine, deliberately excluding a relatively large number of schools within the middle socio-economic range. This stratification ensured the inclusion of an S.E.S. variable that could not be present in the Zivin sample and facilitated a comparative analysis of teacher response patterns.

#### Random Selection

A random selection of potential participants from within the sixteen schools constituting the sample was made in such a way as to ensure that six teachers from each school were chosen and that of these six, one would be a male and five female. Restriction of the sample to one male per school was necessary because three of the schools in the sample were found to have only one full time male teacher. It was subsequently decided that the fifth female teacher randomly selected within each school would not be sent the introductory letter that was sent to the others for it was thought better to interview a total of five teachers in each school keeping the sixth person randomly selected in abeyance, should some teachers fail to comply with the request to participate.

The random selection of teachers was specifically accomplished in the following manner. All the male teachers from the lower S.E.S. schools were placed in one group and all the male teachers from the upper S.E.S. schools were placed in another group. The schools that had only one male, full time teacher on staff were singled out. The remaining male teachers' names were assigned sequential numbers beginning with the number one in each S.E.S. group. A table of random numbers was then used to select one male from each school by proceeding down the columns of numbers until at least one number from each school appeared in the table. When one male teacher was obtained in a particular school in this manner, all other numbers corresponding to males in the same school were rejected as they were encountered in the random number list. Every male in each school thus had an equal chance of being selected.

Basically the same procedure was utilized with the selection of the female participants in the study. The only real difference was that there was a considerably larger number to select from. In this way, 96 teachers were randomly selected from a total of 245.

## The Target Population

Shortly after the selection of a target population (the first 4 female and first male teachers randomly selected in each school for a total of 80), the first letters of introduction were personally delivered to several schools. It was decided not to send out all the introductory letters at once since the data collecting time period was seen as extending over a month and it was thought better, not only to contact teachers personally after receipt of their letters, but also very soon after the receipt of the letter. Thus letters were personally delivered to all the schools beginning with those located in the southern extremities of the district and working north. The letters were always delivered as a package with a covering letter for the principal on top explaining the study's intent and asking for his co-operation and permission to use the school premises for interview purposes. Included with the principal's letter was a copy of the district superintendent's letter of approval. Interviews commenced April 12, 1976 and were completed May 11, 1976.

Within a day or two of delivering the letters, phone contact was always made with each school principal involved so that any further questions could be answered and interview arrangements with the potential participants could be considered.

Personal teacher contacts were made either by phone or through staff room conversations with the author. It was discovered that most teachers preferred to be interviewed either early in the morning before school started, or in the afternoon immediately after their last class. In this way, the author was able to complete from three to five interviews a day. Occasionally, when a particular teacher found it hard to accommodate either the morning or the afternoon interview time slots, arrangements were made for noon-hour or weekend interviews. The time taken for each interview varied in length from

a minimum of fifteen minutes to a maximum of fifty minutes depending entirely on the speed with which the participant responded and upon the length of the reasons given for response.

### The Interview Technique

Zivin felt that the use of a questionnaire would "...severely limit the ease of the teacher discussion of expectations"<sup>11</sup> primarily because a questionnaire required either a complete precategorization of responses or reliance on the respondent to provide full written explanations. The interview technique was seen, therefore, as the best because it allowed for full expression of the reasoning behind the responses given. This was considered vitally important for it permitted exploration of relationships between the reasons teachers gave for responses and the responses themselves.

The utilization of the interview technique in this present study was thought to be well justified even when it was decided, because of thesis time constraints, to exclude any statistical analysis of the teacher reasons for response. Justification for retention of the interview technique was seen in the clarification of teacher responses that was provided when teachers were able to give full expression to their reasons for response. This clarification later proved to be invaluable in analyses that probed the validity of the original instrument.

Beyond these considerations, the writings of Dan C. Lortie were once more influential in the research decisions of this present writer. He states:

There are methodological habits which play a part in producing the gap in our knowledge of teacher viewpoints. One is the seemingly automatic reliance upon "instruments" which are so completely closed as to forestall the chance that teacher respondents will correct researcher assumptions and frameworks. Too many studies tell us of relationships between weak,

---

<sup>11</sup>Zivin, p. 69.

exotic variables and researcher-centered dimensions of sentiment and values; in balance, we have too few studies which explore the subjective world of teachers in terms of their conceptions of what is salient.<sup>12</sup>

### The Interview Protocol

As in the Zivin study, the interview protocol involved an introductory conversation followed by the reading of simple procedural instructions. The respondent was then handed a card on which was printed an acceptability rating scale and was then asked to respond to each hypothetical situation read by using the six point scale provided. The respondents were told they could use either the scaler numbers on the card or the corresponding scaler key words in their responses. The acceptability ratings utilized were as follows:

1) certainly acceptable, 2) moderately acceptable, 3) barely acceptable, 4) barely unacceptable, 5) moderately unacceptable, 6) certainly unacceptable. Each of the twenty-one response items was printed on a separate card and each was read in precisely the same order to each participant. Zivin had established the card order by a random selection process and the same order was retained in the present research so as not to bias in any way, comparative results.

The participants in both studies were encouraged to respond to the question, "How acceptable would this principal behaviour be to you?" It was found in both studies that this procedure very quickly became unnecessary for teachers soon responded automatically. Unlike the Zivin study, all twenty-one stimulus items were used with every teacher, whereas Zivin used only twenty with some teachers because of time constraints. Zivin's difficulty in this regard arose from the fact that many of her teacher interviews were scheduled for free periods during the teacher's day and were thus constrained within

---

<sup>12</sup>Lortie, "Observation on Teaching as Work," p.

strict time limitations. In the present study, most interviews were scheduled well before the first morning class or after the last class in the afternoon and thus did not suffer from the same time constraints. After each acceptability response was given, teachers were asked to give their reasons for responding in the way that they did. No time limit was placed on this aspect of the interview and completeness was always carefully encouraged.

Both studies at the very outset of each interview asked each respondent to visualize himself/herself as the teacher involved in the hypothetical situation described and his/her principal as the principal involved in each case. It was hoped that this approach would further enhance the realism of the events by providing a contextual anchor for the respondent and thereby an avoidance of any suggestion that the situations described were really impossible to relate to because the particular situational circumstances were unknown. Zivin found in her study, however, that there was a tendency for all teacher respondents to speak in terms of an "unidentified principal," casting themselves in the role of "outside observers."<sup>13</sup> This teacher orientation was of considerable concern in the Zivin study for fear that the insistent depersonalization of responses might distort intended study results.

It was felt, in this present study, that the same depersonalization did not as frequently occur, for there was evidence to the contrary in many of the teacher responses given. Teachers, for example, sometimes referred to their principal by name or qualified their responses by saying, "my principal wouldn't do that but if he did..." Despite the depersonalization that existed in the Zivin responses, that researcher felt that the technique of utilizing hypothetical situations with real actors was justified in that it still provided ample opportunity for teachers to express their expectations

---

<sup>13</sup>Zivin, p. 67.

for the principal's behaviour, which was a primary goal.

### Teacher Variables

At the end of the interview, the teachers in both studies were asked to fill in a teacher information sheet. Anonymity was assured by entering a number on the sheet corresponding to the order in which the participants were interviewed. Teachers, thereafter, were referred to by number and not by name.

The teacher information sheet utilized supplied basically two types of information. The first part collected relevant demographic data on each teacher and the second provided the researcher with each teacher's subjective evaluation of his/her own principal's performance and personal evaluation of teaching as a career. Zivin had hoped that the provision of these personal characteristics would prove to have some explanatory value for understanding the response patterns of teachers even though no relational hypotheses were formulated.<sup>14</sup> The teacher demographic information supplied by the information sheet was as follows: sex, age, marital status, whether he/she had children or not, formal education level, undergraduate major, graduate major, years of experience, years in the present school, and grade level taught.

The Zivin district had a high proportion of well educated teachers for all the teachers sampled had degrees and almost 50% had graduate degrees.<sup>15</sup> No assessment, however, of the relationship between the level of formal education and teacher professionalization was attempted in the Zivin study. The considerable contrast noted earlier between the formal education levels of the teachers in this present study (25% had no degree and 12% had graduate degrees) and teachers in Zivin's study was a matter, therefore, of some analytical interest.

---

<sup>14</sup>Zivin, p. 78.

<sup>15</sup>Zivin, p. 87.



## Methodological Assumptions

Participants were required to assess a series of behavioural vignettes each of which involved the hypothetical action of a principal. Zivin hoped to create realistic behavioural situations so that accurate teacher responses could be obtained. If the teachers could readily identify with the actions described, it was thought that analysis of teacher responses to the actions would then be greatly facilitated. Despite this concern, teacher reaction to the vignettes proved to be sufficiently complex to prompt the present writer to assess closely the teachers' reasons for their response and to employ factor analytic techniques when considering data results.

The range of principal behaviours extracted by Zivin from the literature and used as categories within which to formulate behavioural vignettes or stimulus items were modified slightly by this present writer for Canadian content. Items that referred to American historical events were modified to reflect Canadian historical occurrences, but were otherwise left intact. Each item, therefore, was designed to act as a stimulus, eliciting acceptable or unacceptable teacher responses which were thought then to be indicative of the teacher's personal expectations for specific principal behaviours. It was the intent of the Zivin study to examine the data thus collected for response trends and patternings and it was hoped that in this way some of the crucial aspects of teacher expectations for the role behaviour of the principal could be identified.

The basic assumption of the Zivin methodology was, therefore, that the hypothetical behavioural constructs utilized in the study would elicit a range of teacher responses (from acceptable to unacceptable) that were indicative of teacher expectations in relation to a set of specific principal behaviours.

## THE HYPOTHETICAL CONSTRUCTS

The Zivin designed hypothetical constructs that were utilized in both studies were meant to be representative of certain types of principal behaviour. These constructs were subjected in this present research to some scrutiny since it was by no means certain that the stimulus items constructed were in fact representative of the types of principal behaviour they were designed for, nor was it always certain that the respondents were actually reacting to the behavioural content of the construct or to some other aspect of the item wording. Factor analysis was thus decided upon as one means of answering one of these important questions. The possible use of factor analytic techniques is, in fact, suggested briefly by Zivin in an introductory discussion concerning the stimulus items. Zivin states that factor analytic methods would likely be necessary in combination with more restricted constructs if a "...more precise identification of and/or isolation of behavioral components which might be significant to teachers in determination of the acceptability of principal behavior" is to be obtained.<sup>16</sup> Zivin emphasizes, however, the "exploratory nature" of her study stating that "...the present study was more of a survey of broad teacher sentiment" than one which precisely isolated teacher reaction to particular behavioural components.<sup>17</sup>

The hypothetical situations that Zivin constructed to reflect the types of principal behaviour that were identified in the literature as acceptable and unacceptable to teachers are detailed below as Zivin listed them within their respective classifications. Zivin's summary of the main intent of each item is also included along with the present author's elaboration where necessary. Minor modifications of some of the items for Canadian his-

---

<sup>16</sup>Zivin, p. 56.

<sup>17</sup>Zivin, p. 57.

torical content is also noted.

### Category 1 - Enforcement of an Administrative Procedure

Item 20. You usually remember to send your attendance slip to the office by 9:00 a.m. (the "due" time), but one morning you forget. At 9:10 a.m., the principal pops his/her head into your room and says, "Attendance," and disappears.

"The intent of this item was to allow for teacher expression of sentiment regarding principal action in a managerial, school-wide activity, ie. the preparation of the daily attendance report."<sup>18</sup>

### Category 2 - Assignment of Teacher Auxiliary Duties

Item 14. Your principal assigns each teacher an auxiliary duty, such as lunchroom or playground supervisor or bus duty, for 1 week every 2 months.

Zivin was not certain to what extent "...the assignment of auxiliary duties would be considered a managerial activity" but because of the emergence of union negotiated teacher contracts in the United States which often emphasized the "...limiting [of] teacher responsibilities outside the classroom" Zivin decided to "...examine teacher sentiment concerning principal assignment of auxiliary duties without prior consultation with the teachers."<sup>19</sup>

With regard to the district utilized in this present research, teacher responsibilities are clearly delineated within the Administrative Guide For Elementary Schools published by the Department of Education of the Province of British Columbia. Within this document, principals are instructed to prepare "...a schedule of staff supervision, which must include noon-hour supervision and supervision of pupils awaiting bus transportation."<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Zivin, p. 57.

<sup>19</sup>Zivin, p. 58.

<sup>20</sup>Administrative Guide for Elementary Schools, Province of British Columbia, Department of Education, Division of Instructional Services, Curriculum Development Branch (Victoria, 1971), p. 36.

### Category 3 - Handling of an Emergency Situation

Item 15. While your children are working at their desks, a rock suddenly hits one of your windows, shattering it, and sending glass flying. No one is hurt, but the children are terribly frightened. You send one child down to the office, requesting that the principal come immediately. He/she enters the room and begins to calm the children and dispatch messengers to the office and to the custodian.

Zivin's purpose in this item "...was to allow for teacher evaluation of the principal's role in dealing with an emergency situation in the classroom...which does not involve teacher incapacitation..."<sup>21</sup>

### Category 4 - Discipline of Students

Item 1. You have a student in your room who is a bad discipline problem. One day, after many warnings, you send the child out of the room to stand by the lockers. After school, your principal comes to your room and mentions that he/she had seen the child out in the hall. The principal says that he/she does not like to see children sent from their rooms to stand in the hall and perhaps you should think of another method of handling this student.

Zivin designed this item to provide "...an opportunity for teacher assessment of the role of the principal in determining particular methods of discipline to be used with individual students within the school..."<sup>22</sup>

Item 8. You have talked to your principal many times about a particular student in your room who is a bad discipline problem. One day, you send the child out of the room to stand by the lockers. Later you find that the principal passed by, saw the child in the hall, and took him to the office for disciplinary purposes.

Zivin's intent in this item was "...to assess the acceptability to teachers of the principal assuming independent responsibility for the disciplining of an individual without prior consultation with the teacher..."<sup>23</sup>

Item 12. You have talked to your principal many times about a particular student in your room who is a bad discipline problem, especially during math period. The principal comes to observe

---

<sup>21</sup>Zivin, p. 58.

<sup>22</sup>Zivin, pp. 58 - 59.

<sup>23</sup>Zivin, p. 59.

your class during math period, and, as usual, the student becomes disruptive. Your principal finally says, "This behavior cannot go on. You're coming with me to the office." And the principal takes the child from your room.

Zivin constructed this item "...to assess the acceptability to teachers of direct principal action to handle a disciplinary situation observed in the course of on-going classroom proceedings."<sup>24</sup>

Item 16. You are walking with your class in the school hall and your class is making more noise than you would like. The principal is walking toward your group and, as you approach, he/she says to you quietly, "You really ought to do something about this noise." The children did not hear this comment to you.

Zivin designed this item "...to sample teacher opinion on principal expression of expectations for modification in the teacher's handling of a pupil control situation, especially as this pertains to establishment of the disciplinary tone of the school."<sup>25</sup>

Item 17. One day, your children have been particularly noisy in class and, finally, you decide to give the class a firm "lecture" on classroom behaviour. As your door is open, you can see that the principal just walked past your room. After school, the principal comes to your room and he/she suggests that instead of talking to the group perhaps you should single out the several disruptive students and send them to the office as an example to the other students.

Zivin intended this item "...to represent a supportive principal behavior regarding principal willingness to enforce student discipline imposed by the teacher."<sup>26</sup>

Item 19. One day, your children have been particularly noisy in class and, finally, you decide to give the class a firm "lecture" on classroom behavior (your door is open). As you conclude, you notice the principal standing in the doorway. He/she enters the room and says, "As soon as you enter the school building I expect you all to be on your best school behavior. Your teacher should not have to remind you of school manners.

Zivin constructed this item in an effort to describe "...a principal action which was intended to be directly supportive of teacher action in a

---

<sup>24</sup>Zivin, pp. 59 - 60.

<sup>25</sup>Zivin, p. 60.

<sup>26</sup>Zivin, p. 60.

a disciplinary situation."<sup>27</sup>

Category 5 - Participation in Classroom Proceedings

Item 2. Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching a unit on Mexico. As you conclude a discussion on the native foods of Mexico, your principal says, "May I tell you about an experience I had in a restaurant in Mexico City?" And he/she proceeds to tell a humorous story.

Zivin constructed this item "...to elicit teacher sentiment regarding principal participation in an on-going classroom situation when the principal's behavior consisted of a contribution of a non-critical, personalized comment."<sup>28</sup>

Item 6. Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching a lesson on the American Revolution. As you conclude a discussion of the motives of the colonists, your principal says, "I think we should emphasize here that the colonists were revolutionaries," thus signalling to you that he/she would like to see the discussion continue along these lines.

This item was modified for Canadian historical content, but the rest of Zivin's wording remained intact.

Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching a lesson on [Canadian Confederation.] As you conclude a discussion of [some of the obstacles there were to completion of that union,] your principal says, "I think we should emphasize here [the importance that the building of the C.P.R. played in the entry of B.C. and the other western provinces into Canadian Confederation,]" thus signalling to you that he/she would like to see the discussion continue along these lines.

It was Zivin's intent to "...sample teacher opinion concerning direct principal action in a classroom situation to modify instructional content, allowing for teacher expressions concerning the supervisory aspect of the behavior and/or the classroom intervention aspect."<sup>29</sup>

Item 9. Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching new math. The children have been having difficulty mastering elementary formulas. Although you have several boxes of cuisenaire rods on your shelf, you have not intro-

---

<sup>27</sup>Zivin, pp. 60 - 61.

<sup>28</sup>Zivin, p. 61.

<sup>29</sup>Zivin, pp. 61 - 62.

duced them to the children yet. Towards the end of the lesson, your principal says, "boys and girls, I think I know something which might help you understand formulas better," and he/she gets a box of the rods and demonstrates a formula with them. Sure enough, the children seem to grasp the concept of formulas better after this example.

Zivin's intention with this item was "...to sample teacher opinion concerning direct principal action in a classroom situation to modify teaching methodology."<sup>30</sup>

### Category 6 - Observation, Evaluation, and Supervision of the Teacher

Item 3. During the morning, your principal had observed you teaching a lesson on the American Revolution in which you discussed the motives of the colonists. After school, the principal comes to your room and suggests that you emphasize the colonists' role as revolutionaries to a greater degree.

This item, as with Item 6, was modified for Canadian historical content, but otherwise left intact.

During the morning your principal had observed you teaching a lesson on [Canadian Confederation] in which you discussed [the dates that various regions of Canada became a part of the nation and some of the obstacles to that union.] After school, the principal comes to your room and suggests that you place more emphasis on [the significant part that the building of the C.P.R. played in relation to the entry of the western provinces into the Canadian union.]

Zivin designed this item "...to provide teachers with a vehicle of assessment of the principal's role in supervision of teaching content, uncomplicated by the factor of direct classroom intervention to correct 'deficiencies' in teaching content."<sup>31</sup>

Item 11. In the middle of a lesson, your principal enters the room, quietly walks to the back, and sits down in the visitor's chair. He/she stays for ten minutes and then quietly leaves the room. You had not known in advance that the principal planned to visit your class that day.

Zivin's purpose in this item was to "...provide teachers with an

---

<sup>30</sup>Zivin, p. 62.

<sup>31</sup>Zivin, pp. 62 - 63.

opportunity to evaluate the nature of unannounced and uninvited classroom visitation by the principal and to assess whether or not this behavior constitutes an unwarranted evaluative activity."<sup>32</sup>

Item 13. Your principal had observed your class in the morning, and after school, he/she comes to your room. He/she suggests that your "habit" of "fiddling" with your watchband while talking is distracting to the children.

Zivin's purpose in this item "...was to probe teacher acceptability of personal criticism as an appropriate evaluative behavior of the principal to exercise."<sup>33</sup>

Item 21. Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching new math. The children have been having difficulty mastering elementary formulas. At the lesson's end, the children leave the room for recess. Your principal remains with you and suggests that perhaps using cuisenaire rods would help the children visualize the formulas. You have several boxes of rods in your room but you have not introduced them to the children yet.

Zivin intended this item to "...elicit teacher opinion concerning the role of the principal in supervision of teaching methodology, uncomplicated by teacher assessment of the effects of direct classroom intervention by the principal to modify methodology."<sup>34</sup>

#### Category 7 - Evaluation of Student Progress

Item 4. Your principal can make the final decision as to promotion or retention of individual students. After a year of successfully working with a slower student, you strongly feel that the student should be promoted. The principal admits that the child has made significant progress but still insists that he is not up to grade level standards and, thus, he will be retained.

Zivin intended this item to provide "...an opportunity for the teachers to assess the role of the principal in the ultimate evaluative decision regar-

---

<sup>32</sup>Zivin, p. 63.

<sup>33</sup>Zivin, p. 63

<sup>34</sup>Zivin, pp. 63 - 64.



ding pupil progress, promotion or retention."<sup>35</sup>

Item 10. Your principal makes it a point to read all grade reports before they are mailed home to the parents. He/she calls you into the office and asks you to modify the report you have written about one especially troublesome student. He/she feels that the report is too negative because the child really is quite bright.

Zivin's intent with this item was "...to elicit teacher sentiment regarding the role of the principal in the process of pupil evaluation for grade reporting."<sup>36</sup>

#### Category 8 - Selection and Ordering of Instructional Material

Item 5. One morning you find a carton of new readers outside your classroom door. Since you did not request any new books, you go to the office to find out if some mistake in delivery has been made. The principal tells you that he/she ordered this series of books for all rooms in your grade because he/she had been much impressed with them at a recent educational convention.

Zivin designed this item "...to sample teacher opinion concerning the role of the principal in selecting instructional materials for the school."<sup>37</sup>

Item 7. One morning, you find a carton of new books outside your classroom door. You requested a series of readers, but, upon opening the carton, you find that a different series has been delivered. You go to the office to report the mistake. Your principal tells you that your request was not approved by the superintendent, so he/she substituted this other series from the approved list for your request.

Item 18. Several months ago, you mentioned to your principal that you could really use a new set of readers. You've heard nothing else about it until one morning you find a carton of new books outside your door. Upon opening it, you discover that the new set of readers is not the set you would have liked to order. When you mention this to your principal, he/she says, "You wanted a new set of readers so I ordered these for you," and closes the discussion.

Zivin constructed Items 7 and 18 to "...assess teacher sentiment regarding the role of the principal in selecting instructional materials for an

---

<sup>35</sup>Zivin, p. 64.

<sup>36</sup>Zivin, pp. 64 - 65.

<sup>37</sup>Zivin, p. 65.

individual classroom. In both instances the principal took some independent action in the selection and ordering of materials, without consulting the teacher."<sup>38</sup>

As mentioned previously, there was some reason for concern with regard to the interpretation of the acceptability responses obtained, because of evidence suggesting that the items did not always measure in any "pure" form what they had been originally intended to measure. This being the case, categories of items might also not always represent single types or dimensions of principal behaviour as they were intended.

## ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

### Preliminary Procedure

As in the Zivin study, all interview tapes were exactly transcribed. Unlike the Zivin study, however, transcription did not commence when all the interviews were complete but was an on-going process. Tapes, transcriptions, and teacher information sheets were numbered sequentially in the same order that the interviews occurred. Tapes were numbered prior to each interview and the same number was recorded on the Teacher Information Sheet at the close of the taped portion of the interview. Tape numbers were simply entered at the head of each transcription sheet as they were typed thus ensuring teacher anonymity.

Each transcription sheet, in this present study, provided the following information; the participant's number (corresponding to his/her information sheet), the acceptability response given, item by item, for all 21 items, and an exact word for word transcription of the teacher's reason for each response.

---

<sup>38</sup>Zivin, pp. 65 - 66.

given.

### Preliminary Analysis

Preliminary analysis of the data was completed by this present writer on a programmable desk calculator. The following procedure was utilized:

1. A six-celled table of acceptability responses was compiled for all twenty-one stimulus items.
2. The calculator was programmed for a descriptive statistical analysis which was designed to produce mean, standard deviation, variance, and standard error of the mean from raw data inputs.
3. The numerical value of every acceptability response given was entered item by item.
4. When all acceptability response values for a particular item were entered, the descriptive statistics mentioned above were produced for that item.

In this way, descriptive statistical data was produced for the entire population ( $n = 80$ ) and for each of the two major socio-economic status groups that the sample was stratified for ( $n = 40$ ). With this completed, the items in these three separate analyses were rank ordered according to mean and the results in the three tables were then compared with each other and with the rank ordered means and variances obtained in the Zivin study. Though the above procedure was somewhat time consuming, it was valued by the author in that it helped to produce some initial familiarity with the data. (See appendix B)

### Computer Analyses

Preparation of data. Following the above preliminary analyses, the data was prepared for computer analysis as indicated below:

1. The information given on the Teacher Information Sheets was coded utilizing Zivin's coding key so that figures would be comparable.

2. Coded values from the information sheets and the teacher acceptability response values (1 - 6) were entered on data sheets prepared by the author.

3. The prepared data sheets were utilized in the key-punching of the program at Simon Fraser University's computer centre. Thirty-four variables, and twenty-one response item variables, and thirteen teacher demographic variables in total were entered. The coded demographic information and the teacher acceptability responses were key punched in their designated fields using one card per teacher. Initial computer runs were completed in October, 1976 and the final analyses in February, 1977.

4. Computer results were compared with preliminary analysis results to facilitate the detection of possible errors in either analyses. No numerical errors were evident.

### Types of Analyses

The analysis of the data proceeded through several distinct phases that were related to the major objectives of this research. The expressed purposes of this study included an investigation of the generalizability of original research findings, an analysis of the impact of school socio-economic status level upon the perceptions of teachers in relation to principal behaviours, and an investigation of the validity of the instrument through an analysis of teacher reasons for response and the use of factor analytic techniques. A summary of the intent of each analysis is provided below.

Spearman Rank Order Correlations. The Spearman Rank Order Correlations compared the patterns of teacher response in this present study with the patterns of teacher response in Zivin's study.

One-way analysis of variance. The one-way analysis of variance pro-

vided further analytic comparisons, looking for statistically significant differences between the responses of variously grouped teachers just as Zivin had done utilizing "t" tests.

Five-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An n-way analysis of variance using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (S.P.S.S.) at the Simon Fraser Computer Facility was completed for each of the response items using each item as the dependent variable. The limitations of the S.P.S.S. ANOVA package of five independent variables was met by selecting the five independent variables to be tested for each item used from those variables in the One-way ANOVA which had shown the most significant relationship. Five variables were thus selected for each response item even when they were higher than the accepted alpha level.

The ANOVA package in S.P.S.S. allows for non-ordinal designs and will even permit the number of cases in a cell to be zero. The flexibility allowed for the testing of the effects of each independent variable while the effects of other variables were controlled for. The method of partitioning variance used was the classical analysis in which variance due to interactive effects was pooled with the error variance.

In addition to considering significant differences between the various grouped responses, the proportion of variance ( $\text{Eta}^2$ ) explained by each 5-way analysis was also considered. This statistic provided a simple measure of the explanatory power of the main effects of each group of variables included in each analysis.

Response item analysis. The intent of this analysis was to assess the validity of the behavioural constructs. Very simply, since an instrument cannot be considered valid unless it measures what it is presumed to measure, the

teacher reasons for response were seen as a source of information in this regard. In other words, teacher reasons for response were used as a means of determining why teachers responded in the way they did and to what they were responding within the item wording.

Principal component factor analysis. The principal component factor analysis from the S.P.S.S. package was utilized in this analysis. The purpose of this analysis was to test the twenty-one items to determine whether teachers' perceptions of these vignettes had within them an underlying structure which corresponded to Zivin's categorization. In addition, a principal component factor analysis (S.P.S.S.) was completed on each grouping of items containing more than one item and representative of Zivin's categorization scheme. The purpose of this second set of factor analyses was to determine whether the items within each of Zivin's categories showed a unidimensional structure. If the items that were subsumed under each major category heading all measured a single dimension or single type of principal behaviour, then the factor loadings obtained should all have high loadings on the principal factor. If, on the other hand, dissimilar principal component factor loadings were obtained within a category, this would provide some statistical evidence that the category was in fact assessing more than one behavioural component or that the item itself was unreliable.

The analytical procedures outlined above provided for a relatively thorough statistical analysis of the data and the research design utilized. The results of these analyses must be limited by the usefulness of the various analyses chosen in this research to fulfill the tasks expected of them.

## Chapter 4

### ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

#### OVERVIEW

This chapter is concerned with the systematic presentation of the results of the various analyses. The analytical sequence began with Spearman Rank Order Correlations, one-way analysis of variance, and an n-way analysis of variance, and then progressed through a response item analysis and a principal component factor analysis. The first three analyses compared the perceptions of the teachers in this present study with the perceptions of the teachers in Zivin's study in relation to the set of hypothetical behavioural constructs. The remaining two analyses assessed in some detail the validity of the response items and Zivin's behavioural item classification scheme.

#### COMPARATIVE ANALYSES

##### Spearman Rank Order Correlations

The first two hypotheses in this present study made predictions in relation to the response item perceptions of the teachers in both studies. The populations sampled were very different in several ways; personal variables (formal education level and years in present school in particular), broad situational variables (large school district organization)<sup>1</sup> and specific socio-economic status groupings. Thus the first hypotheses that were generated

---

<sup>1</sup>Teachers were more remote from the school district hierarchy than in Zivin's more intimate setting. Zivin felt, in fact, that "...proximity and personalism substantially account[ed] for the almost total absence of teacher reference to the school as a bureaucratic organization." p. 239.

were related to the differences mentioned above.

Spearman Rank Order Correlations (Table 1) were seen as a useful means of comparing the variously grouped response item rank orderings. In addition, Table 2 provides some response category percentage comparisons. It was found that the mean acceptability rank orderings for the entire sample population in this present study and for each of the main socio-economic status groups were very similar to each other and to the mean rank ordering obtained in Zivin's sample. None of the Spearman Rank Order Correlations obtained fell below  $r = .90$ . Thus rank order correlations remained consistently high between all groups despite the fact that a few "middle-ranking" individual items did shift by as much as three to six rank positions. It would appear, therefore, that teachers generally responded to the stimulus items quite similarly despite situational differences that existed between groups and despite personal differences that existed between the teachers in Zivin's sample and the teachers in this present one. Zivin's hypothetical behavioural constructs do seem, therefore, to elicit some consistency of response between various populations. It would appear from Table 2 that the percentages of teacher response that were in each category were also very comparable.

#### One-Way Analysis of Variance\*

Zivin made use of Pearson Correlations and group "t" tests together with a "...substantial number of personal [teacher] characteristics" gathered from the teacher information sheets in an attempt to discover "...patterning of teacher acceptability responses" that were related to these teacher variables.<sup>2</sup> Zivin reported, however, that the "...resultant analyses failed to associate the factors collected with patterns identifiable in the responses."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Zivin, p. 131.

<sup>3</sup>Zivin, pp. 131 - 132.

\*The accepted level of significance throughout this study is  $p \leq .05$ .



Table I

Ranking of Acceptability Ratings of Four Populations and the Spearman Rank Order Correlations Between Each Population

Total Pop.		Zivin Pop. <sup>4</sup>		Low S.E.S.		Zivin Pop.		High S.E.S.		Total Pop.		High S.E.S.		Low S.E.S.		High S.E.S.									
R	I	I	R	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I								
1	21	15	1	1	21	15	1	1	15	1	1	21	15	1	1	21	15								
1	15	21	2	2	15	21	2	2	21	2	1	15	21	2	2	15	21								
2	11	11	3	3	11	11	3	3	11	3	2	11	11	3	3	11	11								
3	2	2	4	4	2	2	4	4	2	4	3	2	2	4	4	2	2								
4	12	1	5	5	12	1	5	5	12	5	4	12	12	5	5	12	12								
5	14	20	6	6	14	20	6	6	14	6	5	14	16	6	6	14	16								
6	16	14	7	7	16	14	7	7	14	7	6	16	14	7	7	16	14								
7	20	16	7	8	12	16	7	8	10	8	7	20	10	8	8	12	10								
8	10	13	8	9	1	13	8	9	20	9	8	10	20	9	9	1	20								
9	3	10	9	10	3	10	9	10	8	10	9	3	8	10	10	3	8								
10	1	12	10	11	10	12	10	11	3	11	10	1	10	11	11	10	3								
11	8	3	11	12	19	3	11	12	13	12	11	8	19	12	12	19	13								
12	19	9	11	13	8	9	11	15	19	13	12	19	8	13	13	8	19								
13	13	8	12	14	9	8	12	14	1	14	13	13	9	14	14	9	1								
14	9	17	13	15	13	17	13	15	17	15	14	9	17	15	15	13	17								
15	17	19	14	16	17	19	14	16	9	16	15	17	17	16	16	17	9								
16	6	5	15	17	6	5	15	17	5	17	16	6	6	17	17	6	5								
17	5	4	16	18	5	4	16	18	6	18	17	5	5	18	18	5	6								
18	7	6	17	19	7	6	17	19	18	19	18	7	7	19	19	7	18								
19	18	18	18	20	4	18	18	20	7	18	19	18	4	20	20	4	7								
20	4	7	19	21	18	7	19	21	4	18	20	4	18	21	21	18	4								
r = .91																		r = .92		r = .90		r = .98		r = .94	

R - Rank, I - Item.  
<sup>4</sup>Zivin, p. 158.

Table II

Comparison of the Perceptions of the Total Response  
in Each Acceptability Category

Present Research Number	Research %	Acceptability Response Category	Zivin Research <sup>5</sup> Number	Research <sup>5</sup> %
575	34.3	Certainly Acceptable	310	35.7
327	19.5	Moderately Acceptable	137	15.7
219	13.1	Barely Acceptable	104	12.0
84	5.0	Barely Unacceptable	42	4.8
153	19.0	Moderately Unacceptable	95	10.9
319	19.0	Certainly Unacceptable	177	20.4
1677	100.0	Total	865	100.0

This present study replicated the Zivin analyses mentioned above using one-way analyses of variance. Table XX provides the comparative data from which this discussion is drawn. The demographic and attitudinal variables utilized in Zivin's study and in this present research are recorded in Table 3. Results are reported briefly below and compared with Zivin's findings in each case.

Sex of the Teacher. Zivin found no significant correlations between sex and any of the acceptability response items, nor did she find significant differences in group "t" tests between male and female respondents. There were, however, only five males in the Zivin sample (11%) compared with sixteen males in the present sample (20% of the sample). Group analysis of variance

<sup>5</sup>Zivin, pp. 136 - 137.

Note: alpha levels are reported in the text as follows: (0.001) rather than ( $p \leq 0.001$ ).

on the response items indicated significantly different male-female responses on Item 7 (0.013) and Item 12 (0.001). Female teachers were less accepting of Item 7<sup>5</sup> and male teachers were less accepting of Item 12.<sup>7</sup>

Age of Teacher. Zivin formed two age groupings in her analysis, those teachers below the mean age (37) for the sample population and those teachers above the mean age. This present analysis utilized three age groupings, (Group 1 - 23 to 29, Group 2 - 30 to 39, and Group 3 - 40 to 57) finding that numbers seemed to be quite normally distributed when these age groups were utilized. Zivin reported in her correlation analysis that Items 1<sup>8</sup> and 19<sup>9</sup> were significantly more acceptable to older teachers but no significant differences between age groups was found in her "t" test analysis. The only response item that appeared significant in relation to age in this present study

---

<sup>6</sup>Item 7: One morning you find a carton of new books outside your door. You requested a series of readers, but upon opening the carton, you find that a different series has been delivered. You go to the office to report the mistake. Your principal tells you that your request was not approved by the superintendent, so he/she substituted this other series from the "approved list" for your request.

<sup>7</sup>Item 12. You have talked to your principal many times about a particular student in your room who is a bad discipline problem, especially during math period. The principal comes to observe your class during math period, and, as usual, the student becomes disruptive. Your principal finally says, "This behavior cannot go on. You're coming with me to the office." And the principal takes the child from your room.

<sup>8</sup>Item 1: You have a student in your room who is a bad discipline problem. One day, after many warnings, you send the child out of the room to stand by the lockers. After school, your principal comes to your room and mentions that he/she had seen the child out in the hall. The principal says that he/she does not like to see children sent from their rooms to stand in the hall and perhaps you should think of another method of handling this student.

<sup>9</sup>Item 19: One day your children have been particularly noisy in class and, finally, you decide to give the class a firm "lecture" on classroom behaviour (your door is open). As you conclude, you notice the principal standing in the doorway. He/she enters the room and says, "As soon as you enter the school building, I expect you all to be on your best school behavior. Your teacher should not have to remind you of school manners.

was Item 18<sup>10</sup> (0.013). Teachers in the thirty year old age group were significantly less accepting of this response item than were the teachers in the other two groups. The only other response item that even came close to significance was Item 7 which also involved the principal in the ordering of classroom reading material.

Marital status. Zivin reported no significant correlations between the marital status variable and the response items but reported finding that the married group were significantly less accepting of Items 6<sup>11</sup> and 18 than were the non-married group. In this present analysis, none of the one-way analyses produced any results that could be considered significant in relation to the teacher's marital status.

Teachers with or without children of their own. Zivin reported only one significant relationship in this analysis and that was for Item 1. In her correlation analysis and "t" test analysis, teachers who had children seemed to find Item 1 significantly more acceptable than did teachers without children. Group analyses of variance in this present study indicated a number of signi-

---

<sup>10</sup>Item 18: Several months ago, you had mentioned to your principal that you could really use a new set of readers. You've heard nothing else about it until one morning you find a carton of new books outside your door. Upon opening it, you discover that the new set of readers is not the set you would have liked to order. When you mention this to your principal, he/she says, "You wanted a new set of readers so I ordered these for you," and closes the discussion.

<sup>11</sup>Item 6: Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching a lesson on Canadian Confederation. As you conclude a discussion of some of the obstacles there were to completion of that union, your principal says, "I think we should emphasize here the importance that the building of the C.P.R. played in the entry of B.C. and the other western provinces into Canadian Confederation," thus signalling to you that he/she would like to see the discussion continue along these lines.

ficant variances. Significance occurred in relation to Items 5<sup>12</sup> (0.002), 7 (0.030), 13<sup>13</sup> (0.049), and 16<sup>14</sup> (0.035). Teachers without children appeared to be significantly less accepting of each of these response items than were teachers with children. It is interesting to note that though significance was not obtained on many of the items in this particular analysis, that on each of the twenty-one items with the exception of Items 3 and 21, teachers without children appeared to be somewhat less accepting of the response items than were teachers with children.

Formal education level of the teacher. The teachers in Zivin's analysis had generally attained a much higher formal education level than had most teachers in this present sample. All of the teachers in Zivin's analysis had degrees, with nearly half at the MA level, whereas in this present analysis, nearly one third of the teachers had no degree at all with only 12% of the sample at the MA level. Thus teachers in this present research could be considered less professionally oriented, at least in terms of the formal education level attained. Zivin found only Item 6 to be significantly correlated with the formal education level variable. In her "t" test analysis, she formed two groups: first-degree level teachers and MA degree level teachers. Teachers

---

<sup>12</sup>Item 5: One morning, you find a carton of new readers outside your classroom door. Since you did not request any new books, you go to the office to find out if some mistake in delivery has been made. The principal tells you that he/she ordered this series of books for all rooms in your grade because he/she had been much impressed with them at a recent educational convention.

<sup>13</sup>Item 13: Your principal had observed your class in the morning, and after school, he/she comes to your room. He/she suggests that your "habit" of "fiddling" with your watchband while talking is distracting to the children.

<sup>14</sup>Item 16: You are walking with your class in the school hall and your class is making more noise than you would like. The principal is walking toward your group and, as you approach, he/she says to you quietly, "You really ought to do something about this noise." The children did not hear this comment to you.

who had attained the higher level of formal education appeared to find Item 6 significantly more acceptable than did teachers with a lower formal education level. In this present analysis, only Item 18 appeared to produce significant (0.004) differences in this regard, with teachers with no degree apparently finding this response item significantly less acceptable than did teachers with degrees. The mean acceptability levels on this item decreased almost proportionately as the teacher's formal education level increased.

Undergraduate and graduate major. For the purposes of this analysis, teachers were divided into non-education majors and education majors. Zivin reported a significant correlation in relation to the teacher's formal major on Item 19. In her "t" test analysis, Items 6, 17<sup>15</sup> and 19 appeared to be significant with non-education majors finding all three items more acceptable than did education majors. In this present analysis, only Item 19 appeared to be significant (0.030) and in this case, non-education majors registered less acceptance of this item than did teachers with education majors.

Years of teaching experience. Zivin reported significant correlations for Items 1, 6, and 15<sup>16</sup> with teachers with more experience apparently finding these three items significantly more acceptable than did less experienced

---

<sup>15</sup>Item 17: One day, your children have been particularly noisy in class and, finally, you decide to give the class a firm "lecture" on classroom behavior. As your door is open, you can see that the principal just walked past your room. After school, the principal comes to your room and he/she suggests that instead of talking to the group perhaps you should single out the several most disruptive students and send them to the office as an example to the other students.

<sup>16</sup>Item 15: While your children are working at their desks, a rock suddenly hits one of your windows, shattering it, and sending glass flying. No one is hurt, but the children are terribly frightened. You send one child down to the office, requesting that the principal come immediately. He/she enters the room and begins to calm the children and dispatch messengers to the office and to the custodian.

teachers. Zivin's "t" test analysis confirmed this finding for Item 6 only. Zivin utilized two teaching experience groups based on the mean number of years experience for the teachers in her sample. This present analysis utilized four years of teaching experience groups which provided something approximating a normal distribution of the years of experience groupings formed (Group 1 - 1 to 5 years, Group 2 - 6 to 10 years, Group 3 - 11 to 15 years, Group 4 - 16 to 29 years). The only analysis of variance that produced any significance was with Item 21<sup>17</sup> (0.016). Teachers in the 11 to 15 years experience category appeared to find this response item significantly less acceptable than did the teachers in all the other groups.

Years in present school. Zivin found no significant correlations or group "t" test differences in relation to this variable. In the Zivin analysis, two groups were formed based upon the mean number of years teaching. One group included all teachers with less than seven years in their present school and the other all teachers with seven years or more. In this present study, five groups were utilized allowing for a relatively normal distribution of teachers in the five categories (Group 1 - 1 year, Group 2 - 2 years, Group 3 - 3 or 4 years, Group 4 - 5 to 8 years, and Group 5 - 9 to 12 years). Only one analysis of variance was significant (0.005) and that was with Item 19. Teachers with the most experience were apparently less accepting of this item than were all other experience groups.

---

<sup>17</sup>Item 21: Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching new math. The children have been having difficulty mastering elementary formulas. At the lesson's end, the children leave the room for recess. Your principal remains with you and suggests that perhaps using cuisenaire rods would help the children visualize the formulas. You have several boxes of rods in your room but you have not introduced them to the children yet.

Grade level taught. Zivin found no significant correlations in the analysis of this variable and reported significance only on Item 5 in the group "t" tests. Zivin utilized two grade level groups; primary teachers (K to 4) and junior-high together with special subject teachers (5 to 8). This present study had three groups; primary teachers (K to 4), intermediate teachers (5 to 7), and special class or special subject teachers. Only one group analysis of variance appeared significant and that was with Item 12 (0.000). The primary teachers seemed to find this particular response item significantly more acceptable than did intermediate or special class teachers.

Teacher satisfaction with the principal's performance. Zivin found no significant correlations or significant group "t" tests in relation to this variable. Group analysis of variance in this present study indicated significant relationships with Items 5 (0.051), 7 (0.021), and 17 (0.023). Teachers who rated their principal's performance the lowest were significantly less accepting of Items 5, 7, and 17 than were teachers who indicated greater satisfaction with their principal's general performance.

Teacher satisfaction with teaching as a career. Zivin found no significant correlations between teacher career satisfaction and the response items but did report that the teachers who found their career to be the most satisfying were significantly more accepting of Items 2<sup>18</sup> and 13 than did teachers who were less satisfied with their careers. There was only one group analysis of variance in this present study that identified a significant relationship between teacher career satisfaction and the response items. The relationship

---

<sup>18</sup>Item 2: Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching a unit on Mexico. As you conclude a discussion on the native foods of Mexico, your principal says, "May I tell you about an experience I had in a restaurant in Mexico City?" And he/she proceeds to tell a humorous story.



was with Item 13 (0.039). Career satisfied teachers seemed more accepting of this particular item than were teachers who were less satisfied with their careers.

Discussion of preceding analyses. It was apparent that the number of statistically significant group differences that did occur were very small in relation to the total number that could have occurred if every variable produced some significance. In this present analysis, only 6% of the total number of independent variables considered (13 out of a possible 273) indicated significantly different means and in the Zivin study, this figure was also 6%.

Since the alpha level accepted in this study and in Zivin's study was .05, then 5% of the significant differences could have occurred randomly. A matrix of teacher variables and significant response items was compared with a similar matrix derived from the results of Zivin's study (Table 4) Two additional variables included in this present analysis, but not in Zivin's were the socio-economic status level of the school and the school size. These are discussed in some detail below. No meaningful patterns of response were discernable through the examination of the significant differences recorded on the matrix. Further, the variables that appeared to be significant in this present study often were not in the Zivin study and vice versa. It would appear from this that the occurrence of significance in both studies was somewhat random.

The first two hypotheses in this present study predicted that teachers in the two studies would not perceive of the behavioural constructs in significantly different ways. As seen in the first analyses, there was a very high rank order correlation between the way teachers in this present study ranked the behavioural constructs and the way teachers in the Zivin study ranked the constructs. It was concluded that teachers reacted very similarly

despite personal characteristic differences and situational differences. Thus the first two null hypotheses proposed were not rejected. That teachers in the present study and Zivin's study should perceive of the behavioural constructs with great similarity might suggest similar expectations for the behaviours described within the constructs. It was not always known, however, what teachers were reacting to within the response item wording. The lack of patterning in teacher response and the apparent randomness with which significant differences occurred suggested to this present writer a lack of item validity. This being the case, replication involving a larger sample in a very different setting would not help to explicate patterns of teacher response in relation to particular principal behaviours.

#### Variables original to this study.

1. Low and High Socio-economic Status Groupings. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the socio-economic status of the schools sampled was a major consideration in the initial stratification of this present study. The sample was, in fact, divided into two equal cells, each containing eight schools, one serving predominantly lower socio-economic status clientel and the other predominantly higher socio-economic status clientel. There were no significant differences discovered in "t" tests between these two major cells on any variable nor were trends in the overall analyses distinguishable. As previously mentioned, the first five schools in the lower and upper socio-economic status categories were easily chosen by all the administrative respondents contacted in relation to the determination of school socio-economic status level. Thus the first five schools in each of the two categories were considered quite clearly to be the lowest and the highest socio-economic status schools in the district. Using the schools considered most representative of these particular socio-economic status categories, "t" tests were completed and once more,

Table III  
Teacher Demographic and Attitudinal Variables

Variables	Entire Sample		Low S.E.S.		High S.E.S.		Zivin's Sample	
	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
Sex	80	1.2000	40	1.2000	40	1.2000	44	1.113
Age	80	35.1875	40	34.8000	40	35.5750	44	37.295
Marital Status	80	1.3620	40	1.3000	40	1.4000	44	1.431
Children	80	1.6000	40	1.6500	40	1.5500	44	1.568
Educational Level	80	0.8250	40	0.8500	40	0.8500	44	2.363
Undergraduate Major	80	1.2500	40	1.2250	40	1.2750	44	1.409
Graduate Major	2	1.5000	0	-	2	1.5000	27	1.222
Years Experience	80	10.3370	40	10.2525	40	10.4812	44	9.250
Years in Present School	80	3.8620	40	4.0650	40	3.9125	44	6.409
Grade Taught	80	1.6000	40	1.7000	40	1.4750	44	1.909
Satisfaction with Principal	80	2.1375	40	2.2000	40	2.0750	44	2.590
Satisfaction with Teaching	80	1.8250	40	1.8500	40	1.8000	44	1.818

Coding Key utilized in the analysis:

Sex..... 1 - Female  
 2 - Male  
 Marital Status..... 1 - Married, 2 - Single  
 3 - Divorced  
 Age, Years of Experience,  
 Years in Present School.... given in years  
 Children ..... 1 - yes, 2 - no  
 Education Level<sup>19</sup>  
 0 - no degree, 1 - BA  
 or B.Ed., 2 - BA, B.Ed.  
 plus graduate hours,  
 3 - MA or M.Ed.

Undergraduate and  
 Graduate Major..... 1 - education major  
 2 - non-education major  
 Grade Taught<sup>20</sup> ..... 1 - K to 4, 2 - 5 to 7,  
 3 - special subjects  
 Satisfaction with.... 1 - best principal, 2 -  
 Present principal  
 better than most, 3 - as  
 good as most, 4 - inferior  
 to most.  
 Satisfaction with.... 1 - most sat. career, 2 -  
 Teaching  
 more sat. than most, 3 - as  
 sat. as most, 4 - less sat.  
 than most.

<sup>19</sup>Zivin's coding had no "0" (all teachers had degrees) and included category 4 for MA+ grad. hours. 73

<sup>20</sup>Zivin's "grade taught" categories included grade 8 in category number 2.

no significant differences were discovered between the two major groupings and consistent trends within the analysis were not distinguishable.

2. Size of School. It was previously mentioned that a range of school sizes existed within the sample selected. Several group "t" tests or analyses of variance were completed in relation to school size and the results are reported below.

In the "t" analyses, the four smallest schools and the four largest schools in each of the two socio-economic status categories were grouped for analysis. Once more little in the way of significant differences occurred throughout this analysis. An analysis of variance was completed for the four smallest schools in the entire sample and the four largest schools in the entire sample with only one group analysis of variance appearing as significant and that was with Item 18<sup>21</sup>. Teachers in larger schools in this instance seemed to be less accepting of this response item than were teachers in the smaller schools. Since this study was stratified primarily along socio-economic lines, the range of school sizes obtained was not representative of a random selection of school sizes from within the district. Even though there were some small schools and some large schools within the sample, this particular variable was considered weak and limited in analytic value.

#### N-Way Analysis of Variance

Following the analytical procedures outlined above, a five-way analysis

---

<sup>21</sup>Item 18: Several months ago, you had mentioned to your principal that you could really use a new set of readers. You've heard nothing else about it until one morning you find a carton of new books outside your door. Upon opening it, you discover that the new set of readers is not the set you would have liked to order. When you mention this to your principal, he/she says, "You wanted a new set of readers so I ordered these for you," and closes the discussion.

Table IV

Matrix of Statistically Significant Relationships between  
Independent Variables and Items - One-way Analysis  
of Variance and "t" tests (Zivin)

Variables	Present Study																					Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Sex of Teach.							x				x											2
Age of Teach.																		x				1
Marital Stat.																						-
Children					x		x					x				x						4
Formal Educa.																		x				1
Ed. Major																			x			1
Experience																				x		1
Yrs. in Pres.																			x			1
Grade Taught												x										1
Prin. Satis.						x		x										x				3
Career Satis.													x									1
Low/High SES																						-
Size of School																			x			1
Totals	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	3	2	-	1	17

Variables	Zivin's Study																					Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Sex of Teach.																						-
Age of Teach.	x																		x			2
Marital Stat.							x											x				2
Children	x																					1
Formal Educa.							x															1
Ed. Major							x										x		x			3
Experience	x						x								x							3
Yrs. in Pres.																						-
Grade Taught							x															1
Prin. Satis.																						-
Career Satis.			x										x									2
Totals	3	1	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	2	-	-	15

Significance level accepted is  $p \leq .05$ .

of variance was completed using the five independent variables which showed the greatest significance in the initial one-way analysis of variance of each item. The intent of this analysis was to examine the source or sources of variance when more than one independent variable appeared to have some effect on teacher responses to the item. Partitioning the variance in each item on a classical basis by the five independent variables which appeared to be most significant in accounting for the variance in the one-way analysis of variance would isolate the main effects due to each independent variable while the effects of other independent variables were controlled.

An item by item analysis of variance by the five most significant variables in the matrix for each item did not reveal many statistically significant variances. Table XXI provides the statistical data from which this discussion is drawn. The Eta<sup>2</sup> statistic provided a measure of the proportion of variance explained by the variables included in each analysis. The proportion of variance explained was thought to add a useful dimension to the analysis, for by explaining how much of the total variance was accounted for by the variables included in the analysis, a clearer knowledge of the explanatory power of the significant variables could be established. The relevance of this statistic can be readily seen, for if the variables utilized appear to be significant but only account for a very small proportion of the total variance, they may not be important despite their significant relationship. Those variables were significant at the  $p \leq .05$  level are recorded below. In each case, the behavioural constructs (response items) were used as the dependent variables.

Item 1. You have a student in your room who is a bad discipline problem. One day, after many warnings, you send the child out of the room to stand by the lockers. After school, your principal comes to your room and mentions that he/she had seen the child out in the hall. The principal says that he/she does not like to see children sent from their rooms to stand in the hall and perhaps you should think of another method of handling this student.

The five variables included in this analysis were teacher age, teachers with or without children of their own, socio-economic level of the school, the sex of the teacher, and the number of years the teacher has spent in their present school. Significant differences occurred with this construct on teacher age (.032) and years of experience in present school (.024). This proportion of the variance explained by all five variables in this analysis was 56.4%.

Item 5. One day you find a carton of new readers outside your classroom door. Since you did not request any new books, you go to the office to find out if some mistake in delivery has been made. The principal tells you that he/she ordered this series of books for all rooms in your grade because he/she had been much impressed with them at a recent educational convention.

The five variables included in this analysis were whether a teacher had children of their own or not, marital status, satisfaction with the principal's performance, satisfaction with teaching as a career, and the age of the teacher. Significant differences occurred with this construct on whether the teacher had children or not (.022). The proportion of variance explained by all five variables in this analysis was 44.4%.

Item 7. One morning, you find a carton of new books outside your door. You requested a series of readers, but upon opening the carton, you find that a different series has been delivered. You go to the office to report the mistake. Your principal tells you that your request was not approved by the superintendent, so he/she substituted this other series from the "approved list" for your request.

The five variables included in this analysis were the sex of the teacher, whether they had children or not, satisfaction with the principal's performance, the age of the teacher, and the grade level taught. Significant differences occurred with this construct on the sex of the teacher (.053). The proportion of the variance explained by all five variables in this analysis was 45.3%.

Item 12. You have talked to your principal many times about a particular student in your room who is a bad discipline problem, especially during math period. The principal comes to observe your class during math period, and, as usual, the student becomes disruptive. Your principal finally says, "This behavior cannot go on. You're coming with me to the office." And the principal takes the child from the room.

The five variables included in this analysis were the grade level taught, the age of the teacher, the sex of the teacher, the socio-economic status of the school, and the size of the school. Significant differences occurred with this construct on the age of the teacher (.005). The proportion of variance explained by the variables that were included in the analysis of Item 12 was 57.7%.

Item 13. Your principal had observed your class in the morning, and after school, he/she comes to your room. He/she suggests that your "habit" of "fiddling" with your watchband while talking is distracting to the children.

The five variables utilized in this analysis were teacher satisfaction with career, the socio-economic status level of the school, whether the teacher had children or not, the formal education level attained, and the teacher's marital status. Significant differences occurred with this construct on teacher satisfaction with career (.041), teachers with or without children (.035), and the marital status of the teacher (.024). The proportion of variance explained by the five variables included in this analysis was 65.6%.

Item 16. You are walking with your class in the school hall and your class is making more noise than you would like. The principal is walking toward your group and, as you approach, he/she says to you quietly, "You really ought to do something about this noise." The children did not hear this comment to you.

The five variables utilized in this analysis were whether a teacher had children or not, the sex of the teacher, the socio-economic status level of the school, the teacher's satisfaction with career, and the years of teaching experience. Significant differences occurred with this construct on whether the teacher had children of their own or not (.022). The proportion



of variance explained by the five variables included in this analysis was 34.8%.

Item 19. One day your children have been particularly noisy in class and, finally, you decide to give the class a firm "lecture" on classroom behavior (your door is open). As you conclude, you notice the principal standing in the doorway. He/she enters the room and says, "As soon as you enter the school building, I expect you all to be on your best school behavior. Your teacher should not have to remind you of school manners.

The five variables utilized in this analysis were years of teaching in the present school, education or non-education major, teachers with or without children, teacher satisfaction with career, and teacher satisfaction with the principal's performance. Significant differences occurred with this construct on the teacher's formal education major (.041). The proportion of variance explained by the five variables included in this analysis was 72.0%.

Item 21. Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching new math. The children have been having difficulty mastering elementary formulas. At the lesson's end, the children leave the room for recess. Your principal remains with you and suggests that perhaps using cuisenaire rods would help the children visualize the formulas. You have several boxes of rods in your room but you have not introduced them to the children yet.

The five variables utilized in this analysis were the teacher's years of experience, years in the present school, whether the teacher has children or not, the teacher's satisfaction with the principal's performance, and the teacher's age. Significant differences occurred with this construct on the teacher's years of experience (.050) and the teacher's satisfaction with the principal's performance (.038). The proportion of variance explained by the five variables included in this analysis was only 16.2%.

Discussion of n-way analysis. Because the n-way analysis of variance was able to control for the effects of other variables, a truer indication of

of significant relationships was thought possible. Out of the twenty-one items analyzed, however, only eight or 38% of the items were significantly related to any of the independent variables utilized in each analysis. The total number of significant differences decreased from seventeen in the one-way analysis to twelve in the n-way analysis. Thus only 4% of the total number of possible relationships indicated were significant and once more, no meaningful patterns of response were discernible.

Table V

Significant Values Obtained in the N-way Analysis and the Proportion of Variance Explained ( $\text{Eta}^2$ ) in each Analysis

Item 1		Item 5		Item 7		Item 12	
Age	0.032**	Children	0.022**	Sex	0.053*	Grade	0.293
Children	0.999	Marital	0.999	Children	0.999	Age	0.005**
S.E.S.	0.083*	Prin. Sat.	0.305	Prin. Sat.	0.086*	Sex	0.235
Sex	0.999	Career Sat.	0.999	Age	0.259	S.E.S.	0.262
Yrs. Pres.	0.024**	Age	0.999	Grade	0.999	Size	0.999
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
$\text{Eta}^2$	.56	$\text{Eta}^2$	.44	$\text{Eta}^2$	.45	$\text{Eta}^2$	.57
Item 13		Item 16		Item 19		Item 21	
Career Sat.	0.041**	Children	0.022**	Yrs. Pres.	0.999	Yrs. Exp.	0.050**
S.E.S.	0.199	Sex	0.999	Major	0.041**	Yrs. Pres.	0.999
Children	0.035**	S.E.S.	0.999	Children	0.999	Children	0.999
Ed. Level	0.204	Career Sat.	0.193	Career Sat.	0.158	Prin. Sat.	0.038**
Marital	0.024	Yrs. Exp.	0.166	Prin. Sat.	0.159	Age	0.999
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
$\text{Eta}^2$	.65	$\text{Eta}^2$	.34	$\text{Eta}^2$	.72	$\text{Eta}^2$	.16
		*p < .10		** p < .05			

The lack of significance in the results and lack of patterning was seen as a further indication that the instrument might well be lacking in validity. In order to facilitate some further assessment of the results of the n-way analysis, a matrix of the significant relationships was prepared as in the previous one-way analysis (Table 6).

Table VI

Matrix of Statistically Significant Relationships between  
Independent Variables and Items - N-way Analysis  
of Variance and "t" tests (Zivin)

Variables	Present Study																					Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Sex of Teach.							x															1
Age of Teach.	x										x											2
Marital Stat.													x									1
Children					x							x			x							3
Formal Educa.																						-
Ed. Major																				x		1
Experience	x																				x	2
Yrs. in Pres.																						-
Grade Taught																						-
Prin. Satis.																					x	1
Career Satsi.													x									1
Low/High SES																						-
Size of School																						-
Totals	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	12

Variables	Zivin's Study																					Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Sex of Teach.																						-
Age of Teach.	x																			x		2
Marital Stat.							x												x			2
Children	x																					1
Formal Educa.							x															1
Ed. Major							x												x		x	3
Experience	x						x									x						3
Yrs. in Pres.																						-
Grade Taught							x															1
Prin. Satis.																						-
Career Satis.														x								2
Totals	3	1	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	2	-	-	15

Significance level accepted is  $p \leq .05$ .

An examination of these relationships did not reveal any consistent patterns. The occurrences of significant differences, once more, appeared to be quite random. In other words, even though the multivariate analysis could control for the interactive effects of other variables, it could not, of course control for any inadequacies that might exist in the instrumentation utilized. It was assumed, in this present study, that the effects of item wording could be pervasive, creating a lack of instrument validity. This issue was investigated in some detail.

#### VALIDITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

##### Teacher Reasons for Response

As mentioned, Zivin had acknowledged that the influence of item wording on teacher responses was not investigated in her study. Despite this, she did suggest that the principal's perceived manner seemed to sometimes have a bearing upon the way teachers reacted to the behavioural constructs.<sup>22</sup> The fact that Zivin's hypothetical constructs did seem to elicit considerable consistency of response between various populations was taken as an indication that the instrument had some reliability in relation to teacher perceptions.

Of more critical importance than the apparent reliability of the instrument, however, was its validity, for an instrument that is reliable but cannot measure with certainty what it was intended to measure, has very limited value. Travers notes, "The user of an instrument must be able to make inferences that go beyond how a person would perform on similar test items before he can be said to have...a useful device."<sup>23</sup> As mentioned before, the simplest

---

<sup>22</sup>Zivin, pp. 278 - 279.

<sup>23</sup>Robert M. W. Travers, An Introduction to Educational Research (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969), p. 168.

possible statement of validity is that an instrument may be considered valid when it measures what it is presumed to measure. Zivin had constructed the response items to be representative of specific principal behaviours. It was discovered, however, both in the Zivin research and in this present research, that teachers seemed to sometimes respond to other stimuli within the item wording besides the specific behaviours. An analysis of a random selection of the transcribed teacher reasons for response was considered, therefore, of first importance in an assessment of instrument validity. Actual teacher responses are recorded below which were thought to provide evidence for the contention that the constructs did not always measure what they had been intended to measure.

Teachers sometimes seemed to respond to the manner in which the action was carried out rather than to the actual behaviour, colouring the final acceptability choice. Teacher reaction to Item 18 is a prime example of this type of response. The principal in this instance seemed to be considered rude or abrupt in his manner.

Item 18. Several months ago, you had mentioned to your principal that you could really use a new set of readers. You've heard nothing else about it until one morning you find a carton of new books outside your door. Upon opening it, you discover that the new set of readers is not the set you would have liked to order. When you mention this to your principal, he/she says, "You wanted a new set of readers so I ordered these for you," and closes the discussion.

1. Response:

"The last 'and closes the discussion' - I find that certainly unacceptable. I don't want to feel that the lines of communication are ever closed to me. I would open them again."

2. Response:

"If it came out in a statement that terse - no discussion, then as I said, there must not have been much thought put into the choice of the other readers."

The principal, in Item 16, seemed to be perceived of as insensitive of teacher feelings.

Item 16. You are walking with your class in the school hall and your class is making more noise than you would like. The principal is walking toward your group and, as you approach, he/she says to you quietly, "You really ought to do something about this noise." The children did not hear this comment to you.

1. Response:

"If he was at all sensitive he would know that you are not happy with it either and that you were thinking of doing something about it yourself so the comment is really unnecessary."

2. Response:

"I'd be hurt that I didn't have the children quiet enough or that he didn't realize I was having trouble with them. I don't think its typical."

Besides the perceived manner of principal behaviour, other response influences were sometimes apparent within the teacher reasons given such as the principal's perceived competence as seen in Items 9 and 3.

Item 9. Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching new math. The children have been having difficulty mastering elementary formulas. Although you have several boxes of cuisenaire rods on your shelf, you have not introduced them to the children yet. Towards the end of the lesson, your principal says, "Boys and girls, I think I know something which might help you understand formulas better." And he/she gets a box of the rods and demonstrates a formula with them. Sure enough, the children seem to grasp the concept of formulas better after this example.

1. Response:

"Wow! I can't imagine that situation happening. I'll say barely unacceptable. Well, I would probably like to introduce it in my own way so that I would feel all the children are getting the help where they are - when they're getting it at their own level. How do I know that he is going to do it at their level or that he understands their level."

2. Response:

"Depends on how he did it. Depending on the way he did it, it would be moderately acceptable I guess. That's a hard one because some people can do things in a way that you don't mind and others in a way that you would. If my principal did it? I don't think he knows enough about cuisenaire rods to do it. If it was somebody that did it and was quite capable of doing it and the children caught on - say the primary supervisor - I would accept that because she's capable of doing it. If \_\_\_\_\_ did it, it would be unacceptable because I know he doesn't know enough about rods to get it across.

Item 3. During the morning your principal had observed you teaching a lesson on Canadian Confederation in which you discussed the dates that various regions of Canada became a part of the nation and some of the obstacles to that union. After school, the principal comes to your room and suggests that you place more emphasis on the significant part that the building of the C.P.R. played in relation to the entry of the western provinces into the Canadian union.

1. Response:

"First of all, in my particular case, I feel that my principal is good - he is quite knowledgeable..."

2. Response:

"If I know he had a very good knowledge in that area I would be open to any suggestion on his part. If I felt that it was an area which he was not terribly knowledgeable in, I would feel I would take it with a grain of salt."

Several principal actions were considered more inappropriate by teachers than they were considered acceptable or unacceptable as shown in the following responses to Items 20 and 15.

Item 20. You usually remember to send your attendance slip to the office by 9:00 a.m. (the "due time"), but one morning you forget. At 9:10 a.m., the principal pops his/her head into your room and says, "Attendance," and disappears.

1. Response:

"...I don't think he should even necessarily be the messenger boy. He could send someone else I think."

2. Response:

"I'm sure that the principal has more important things to do at this time of the morning than to run up and down the halls reminding teachers about attendance slips. Perhaps a monitor

could do it or if there is a school secretary she could do it but I don't see any need for a principal to do it."

Item 15. While your children are working at their desks, a rock suddenly hits one of your windows, shattering it, and sending glass flying. No one is hurt, but the children are terribly frightened. You send one child down to the office, requesting that the principal come immediately. He/she enters the room and begins to calm the children and dispatch messengers to the office and to the custodian.

1. Response:

"I would give me a 6 [certainly unacceptable]. If a rock hit my window I wouldn't run to the principal and ask him to calm people down but if the teacher asked the principal to come down - he's only doing what he was asked to do - I'd give him a 1 [certainly acceptable] and the teacher a 6."

Item 15 was designed to allow teachers to evaluate the principal's role "...dealing with an emergency situation in the classroom."<sup>24</sup> This item, however, more often was reacted to with amusement that the principal should be sent for at all, most teachers stating or inferring that the situation could be very easily handled by the teacher. Situational differences between the Chicago area district and this study's district may have contributed to different teacher perceptions of this event.

Of all the above types of teacher reaction considered, one of the most pervasive seemed to be related to the manner of behaviour. One teacher made the following observation:

"It depends upon the approach the principal takes. If it seems he is interfering then I'm going to be resentful but if he thinks he is going to be of help and goes about it in a pleasant way then its more acceptable."

Though Zivin acknowledged that variations in item interpretation "...remained potential artifacts of the response situation" it appeared that for

---

<sup>24</sup>Zivin, p. 58.



analytical purposes, teacher reactions were assumed to be responses to the specific behaviours described.<sup>25</sup> It was felt by this present writer that because response items were perceived of differently by at least some of the respondents, the categorization of responses according to acceptability means may not be taken as a clear indication of acceptance or rejection of a single type of behaviour. This is a critical issue for it suggests that the degrees of item acceptability obtained might be a rather deceptive finding for the items may relate to several behavioural factors rather than just the one described. It follows from this that the acceptability groupings utilized in the Zivin analysis could then be misinterpreted for they do not appear to be consistently or unequivocally related to specific types of principal behaviour.

Other examples of the apparent multidimensional nature of some of the response items could be cited. It was decided, however, that an analytical treatment of the response items should be utilized in an effort to examine statistically, indications of response item multidimensionality.

#### Principal Component Factor Analysis

Zivin suggested, in a discussion of possible future research, that there was a need to

...probe teacher assessment of behavioral components which appeared to be differentiating factors in teacher acceptability responses [and further that] revision of the methodological techniques employed would allow more accurate assessment of the critical and perhaps subtle factors which determine what teachers were reacting to within the response wording.<sup>26</sup>

If teachers were sometimes reacting to factors within the item wording besides the specific principal behaviour described, then it would appear that the behavioural constructs were not always representative only of the broad

---

<sup>25</sup>Zivin, p. 254.

<sup>26</sup>Zivin, pp. 285, 286.

categories of principal behaviour they were subsumed under. As mentioned, Zivin suggested that the category representativeness of the items remained a matter of interpretation, but she added that "...teacher reasons for response confirmed that in no instance did a respondent misinterpret the general nature of the principal behavior to be considered in each item."<sup>27</sup> It was the feeling of this present writer, however, that even though the general nature of the item might appear not to have been misinterpreted, in the sense that the teacher respondent was cognizant of what the principal was described as doing, it was still not always apparent to what specific factor, within the wording, that the respondent was primarily reacting. Thus the specific purpose of this analysis was to empirically test the underlying structure of Zivin's categorized items. This would then provide some further assessment of instrument validity. Table 7 provides some of the initial factor analysis data. Most items appeared to load on more than one dimension. It was difficult to make sense of the factor loadings in terms of what teachers were reacting to. Item 20 seemed particularly lacking in discriminability.

Zivin's twenty-one hypothetical constructs were meant to be representative of eight categories or types of principal behaviour. A factor analysis based upon teacher responses to items in each category was meant to provide a statistical measure of whether individual teachers were responding to the items in similar ways. If this was occurring, then an underlying unidimensional factor structure would emerge. That is, we would expect that a single factor within each set would explain most of the variance in teacher responses. Similar factor loadings would be a statistical indication that the category items were indeed measuring a single dimension or type of behaviour. The results of

---

<sup>27</sup>Zivin, p. 255.

Table VII

## Factor Pattern Matrix After Rotation With Kaiser Normalization

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
1	0.09475	0.31363	-0.19458	0.15514	0.36544	0.10981	-0.24301	0.03857
2	0.34246	-0.01431	-0.01799	0.03272	0.08069	0.16400	0.36029	-0.08892
3	0.17929	-0.30546	-0.35357	-0.06381	0.13670	0.13414	-0.11503	0.00986
4	0.18502	-0.09506	0.02307	-0.15302	0.15107	0.15584	-0.49680	-0.04017
5	0.66148	0.02746	0.07043	-0.10280	-0.03489	0.04110	-0.00585	-0.05474
6	0.63082	0.01836	-0.04314	-0.12275	-0.03329	-0.07260	-0.05686	0.00497
7	0.33766	0.09321	0.05096	-0.10821	0.40175	0.00548	0.03017	0.05414
8	0.20580	0.25274	0.15518	0.02173	0.10685	0.18446	0.05568	0.72576
9	0.84134	-0.01669	-0.09444	0.23341	-0.09536	-0.08194	-0.00961	0.12539
10	-0.00934	0.16688	-0.07742	-0.18960	-0.05177	0.53547	-0.08456	0.01339
11	-0.00897	-0.05259	-0.24648	-0.23015	0.27425	0.23441	0.45739	-0.22392
12	0.26937	-0.20627	-0.02776	0.07576	-0.12126	0.07528	0.35544	0.31502
13	-0.00052	0.07395	0.00867	-0.83261	-0.22944	0.09590	-0.08167	-0.10691
14	0.37996	-0.08274	-0.43954	0.04429	0.12592	0.11594	0.09962	0.07798
15	-0.10739	0.30520	-0.79564	0.00785	-0.11781	-0.06446	0.08886	-0.04503
16	0.01757	0.72123	-0.17311	-0.09377	-0.03727	0.01238	0.02240	0.03768
17	-0.07247	-0.01396	-0.02913	-0.45409	0.31406	-0.27576	-0.03402	0.33336
18	0.18665	0.16686	-0.04069	-0.16248	0.03043	-0.50554	-0.04732	-0.10162
19	0.28828	0.09192	0.11335	-0.14169	0.08816	0.10401	0.11696	0.42417
20	0.18116	0.10315	0.08580	-0.06420	0.10123	0.01675	0.07431	-0.31030
21	-0.15461	-0.05902	0.00553	0.07634	0.51964	-0.04968	-0.03287	-0.03502

the principal component factor analyses are discussed below and are shown in TablesVIII, IX, X, XI and XII.

Though Zivin had eight categories of principal behaviour, three of these categories were represented by only one item each, so there was no necessity to include them in any factor analysis. The five categories that were subjected to a principal component factor analysis were as follows; discipline of students (Items 1, 8, 12, 17, and 19), participation in classroom proceedings (Items 2, 6, and 9), observation, evaluation, and supervision of the teacher (Items 3, 11, 13, and 21), evaluation of student progress (Items 4 and 10), and the selection and ordering of instructional materials (Items 5, 7, and 18). All factor analyses reported here were principal component factor analyses without rotations. The number of factors in each analysis was controlled by the default requirement that the eigen value of any factor included must be greater than or equal to 1.0.

The first category considered was the discipline category which contained the largest number of individual items.

TableVIII

Discipline Category Items Using Unrotated  
Principal Component Factor Analysis

Variables	Factor Loadings	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	0.37708	0.51289
Item 8	0.83255	-0.10826
Item 12	0.39592	-0.73008
Item 16	0.32905	0.69244
Item 17	0.46810	0.21663
Item 19	0.75851	-0.18914

% variance accounted for by principal factor = 31.6%.

The factor matrix obtained in the discipline category analysis did not have consistently high loadings on the principal factor and could not, therefore, be considered unidimensional. Two factors had eigen values greater than one. Items 17 and 19 were supposed to be representative of supportive principal behaviour in relation to student discipline but these behaviours were often construed as a criticism of the teacher's ability to handle the situation as is shown by the following teacher response to Item 19.

"It kind of infers a little bit of criticism of the teacher. I think that a lecture to the whole school on something like 'Always remember manners' - but to say it quite like that does sound a bit as if the teacher was at fault."

Since the principal component only accounted for 31.6% of the total variance, it would be difficult to concede that this factor represented a good measure of the category designated discipline.

The second category that was considered involved principal participation in classroom proceedings.

Table IX

Participation in Classroom Proceedings Items Using  
Unrotated Principal Component Factor Analyses

Variables	Factor Loadings
	Factor 1
Item 2	0.64550
Item 6	0.77172
Item 9	0.83155

% variance explained by principal  
factor = 56.8%.

The factor loadings obtained in this analysis were all relatively high and only one factor had an eigen value greater than 1.0. There was, therefore, an indication that these items were fairly unidimensional in character. There were, however, only three variables included in this category. Item 2 involved

the principal in an in-class participation where he adds to the classroom discussion with a personal experience of his own. Item 9, however, involved the principal in an in-class intervention to modify methodology and Item 6 in an in-class intervention to modify teaching content. Thus within this participation category, quite a broad range of participatory principal behaviour was represented by the three items. Though broad ranging, it would appear statistically that the three items included in this category would generally be assessing the same type or dimension of behaviour.

The third category involved the principal in the observation, evaluation and supervision of the teacher.

Table X

Observation, Evaluation, and Supervision of the Teacher Items  
Using Unrotated Principal Component Factor Analyses

Variables	Factor Loadings	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 3	0.71364	-0.18383
Item 13	0.25915	0.78548
Item 11	0.77323	0.21139
Item 21	0.34807	-0.67750

% Variance explained by principal factor = 32.4%

The factor matrix obtained in this analysis did not have consistently high loadings on factor one and could not, therefore, be considered unidimensional. Indeed, two factors had eigen values greater than 1.0 and the items that have high loadings on factor one are lost in factor 2 and vice versa. Item 11 involved the principal in an unannounced classroom visit for observation purposes, Item 13 in a criticism of a teacher mannerism, Item 21 in an after-class suggestion of a possible change of lesson content. Within this category of items, therefore, there was once again quite a broad range of

principal behaviours but because the items were not found to be statistically unidimensional, they could not likely be regarded as measures of only one type of principal behaviour.

The fourth category involved the principal in an evaluation of student progress.

Table XI

Evaluation of Student Progress Items Using Unrotated  
Principal Component Factor Analyses

Variables	Factor Loadings
	Factor 1
Item 4	0.76678
Item 10	0.76678
% variance explained by principal factor = 58.8%.	

It would appear that the two items representing this category were certainly unidimensional. Item 4 involved a principal decision contrary to a teacher's with regard to student promotion and Item 10 involved the principal in a suggested modification of a report card comment. Item 4 was obviously a much stronger action on the part of the principal in relation to student evaluation and was generally perceived much more negatively by teachers than Item 10. Both items seemed, however, to consistently elicit responses that were reactions to one dimension or type of principal behaviour.

The fifth category involved the principal in the ordering of instructional material without prior consultation with the teacher. Only one factor had an eigen value greater than 1.0.

Table XII

Selection and Ordering of Instructional Materials Items  
Using Unrotated Principal Component Factor Analyses

Variables	Factor Loadings
	Factor 1
Item 5	0.68179
Item 7	0.80388
Item 18	0.47398
% variance explained by principal factor = 44.5%.	

The items included in this category were considered unidimensional even though Item 18 loaded lower than the other factors. Item 5 involved the principal in the ordering of instructional material for all grades without prior teacher consultation and Items 7 and 18 involved the principal in ordering material without consultation for individual classrooms. All three items were consistently regarded as unacceptable by teachers, but as mentioned in the previous analysis, the principal's manner sometimes affected their choice of response. This was particularly true of lower loading Item 18 where the principal was often perceived of as abrupt.



## Chapter 5

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

## SUMMARY

The Purpose

The replication that is reported in this present study sought to test and extend the findings of a doctoral research completed by Reni-Zoe Zivin in 1973. In order to facilitate this endeavour, several specific limitations inherent in the original research were investigated. The limitations that are of critical concern to this present research are as follows:

1. Because of the nature of Zivin's sample, the findings of her research were deemed possibly not generalizable to other settings.
2. The validity of the behavioural vignettes that comprised Zivin's major research instrument and the specificity of their categorization scheme were not tested.

The Findings

The major findings of this present research derive from three related hypotheses that were formulated in an attempt to test and extend Zivin's research. The hypotheses and a summary of the related findings are reported below.

Hypothesis 1. Differences in teacher demographic and personal variables<sup>1</sup> will not be related to teacher acceptance or rejection of specific administrative role behaviours.

---

<sup>1</sup>The teacher variables included teacher sex, age, marital status, whether the teachers had children of their own or not, formal education level, undergraduate and graduate majors, years of teaching experience, years in present school, the grade level taught, satisfaction with the principal's performance, and satisfaction with teaching as a career.

Teachers in this present study and Zivin's study differed in their demographic and personal variables in a number of identifiable ways.<sup>2</sup> A Spearman Rank Order Correlation analysis of teacher responses to a set of behavioural vignettes that were descriptive of specific principal behaviours, revealed that teachers in this present study and teachers in Zivin's study perceived of the vignettes with considerable similarity. The behavioural vignettes that teachers found the most acceptable and the least acceptable were precisely the same in both studies. Thus hypothesis 1 was not rejected.

Hypothesis 2. Differences in the socio-economic status of the school community in which the teacher teaches will not be related to teacher acceptance or rejection of specific administrative role behaviours.

The present sample was stratified on the basis of the socio-economic status of the school community and the sample of teachers was randomly selected from the two major socio-economic cells that comprised this stratification. Spearman Rank Order Correlation analyses of the responses of teachers that taught in low socio-economic status communities and the responses of teachers that taught in upper socio-economic status communities revealed very high rank order correlations. Thus teachers grouped according to the socio-economic status of the school community in which they taught appeared to react to the hypothetical vignettes with considerable similarity. Once more, the vignettes that teachers found most acceptable and least acceptable were precisely the same in every correlational analysis. Thus hypothesis 2 was not rejected.

---

<sup>2</sup>The two strongest personal characteristic differences that existed between the present study and Zivin's study were related to the teacher's formal training and the number of years in the present school. Teachers in Zivin's study averaged a much higher formal education level and nearly twice the number of years in the present school than did teachers in this present study.

As in the Zivin study, an analysis of teacher responses to specific principal behaviours, when teachers were grouped according to specific demographic and situational variables, did not yield related identifiable patterns of teacher response. Further, there was no apparent relationship between the occurrence of statistically significant differences between groups in Zivin's study and the occurrence of statistically significant differences between groups in this present study. Zivin states that "...there was scant evidence that meaningful response trends in acceptability response patterns were related to either teacher characteristics or situational characteristics."<sup>3</sup> From this point, the two studies diverge in their analytical approaches. Zivin attempted to establish patterns of teacher response in crosstabulation analyses while this present writer sought to assess the ability of Zivin's behavioural response instrument to distinguish clear patterns of teacher response.. There was some suggestion in the preceding analyses that the behavioural vignettes might not always be measuring precisely what they had been intended to measure. The third hypothesis was related to this assumption and was formulated as follows:

Hypothesis 3. Items of principal behaviour are representative of specific types of behaviour which in turn are representative of Zivin's hypothesized zones of teacher indifference.

In order to facilitate an investigation of this hypothesis, two analyses were completed. The first involved an analysis of randomly selected teacher reasons for response and the second involved a principal component factor analysis that assessed the unidimensional nature of Zivin's categories or zones of behaviour. Thus some assessment of instrument validity with res-

---

<sup>3</sup>Zivin, p. 258.

pect to category specificity was attempted.

It was found in the analysis of teacher reasons for response that teachers often did react to other factors within the item wording besides just the specific behaviours described, and it was found in the principal component factor analysis that in most categories, more than one dimension of principal behaviour was apparently being assessed. Hypothesis 3 was therefore rejected.

## CONCLUSIONS

The first major finding of this present study is that teachers with identifiably different personal and demographic characteristic variables apparently perceive of administrative role behaviours similarly. It would appear from the above that the instrument utilized demonstrated considerable reliability in relation to teacher responses. Despite indications that teachers were responding to a variety of stimuli within the item wording, the similarity of their response to specific items was quite striking. As mentioned in the analysis, the items that were perceived of as most acceptable and the items that were perceived of as least acceptable were identical in both studies.

The second major finding of this present study is that the socio-economic status of the school community in which a teacher teaches apparently does not affect the teachers' perceptions of administrative role behaviours. Despite the evidence in the literature that lower socio-economic status clientele are often treated differently than higher socio-economic status clientele, there would appear to be little evidence that the perceptions of teachers differed with regard to the acceptability or unacceptability of specific administrative role behaviours in these two settings.

The third major finding of this present study was that the items of principal behaviour were not always representative of the specific categories of behaviour for which they had been designed. Teacher reactions to the vignettes were not always related to the specific principal behaviours described, therefore it was not surprising that the broad categories under which specific items were subsumed should not always represent single dimensions of principal behaviour. Though teachers in both studies, for example, seemed to regard the principal's involvement in the unilateral ordering of classroom instructional materials as unacceptable, inherent in some of the responses was also reaction to the principal's manner. Because of the apparent complexity of teacher reactions it was concluded, by this present writer, that unqualified statements regarding the relationship of responses to specific behaviours could not be made.

In summation, it would appear that Zivin's research instrument is generalizable to other populations and community settings for it elicited very similar teacher responses to the set of hypothetical principal behaviours. It was not always clear, however, why teachers responded the way they did and to what they were responding in the stimulus items. It appeared likely to this writer that the failure to distinguish clear patterns of teacher response in relation to teacher demographic and personal variables was, at least in part, attributable to stimulus item inconsistencies.

## IMPLICATIONS

### For Theory

The conceptualization of individuals as integral parts of a system that is constantly interacting and adapting as the perceptions and expectations of its role members change over time seems to be a useful one. Within this framework, an examination of the expectations of teachers for the role beha-

viour of the principal has meaning, for the principal's perception of his role is seen as largely influenced and shaped by other significant role members within the school system. Concomitantly, the teacher's perception of his role is also largely influenced and shaped by the significant others that comprise his role set.

Since role conflict can be seen as arising when mutual role expectations are no longer congruent, the delineation of teacher expectations for the role behaviour of the principal would appear to be a useful means of determining areas or zones of teacher indifference. It would appear from this present analysis, that teacher zones of indifference require complex definition, much beyond what might be implied through a simple identification of discrete categories of principal behaviour. Participants in the role structure of the public school system appear to evaluate the behaviour of others in terms of a complex set of personal perceptions of their own position and appropriate action within that role structure. It would appear that the very complexity of social systems must require adequate theory and commensurate analytical techniques.

#### For Principal Behaviour

Similarity of teacher perception of administrative role behaviours, despite the existence of identifiable differences in the demographic and situational characteristics of teachers, would appear to suggest that the principal's role, at least in terms of the expectations of teachers, would not vary significantly from school setting to school setting.

Though not systematically analyzed, there was a strong suggestion in the data that the principal might enjoy considerable latitude in his behaviour if his manner was perceived of as supportive and/or tactful. There were examples of this particular teacher orientation scattered throughout the data.

Several have been cited in the previous analyses. Two further examples of this phenomenon are recorded below.

Item 20. You usually remember to send your attendance slip to the office by 9:00 a.m. (the "due" time), but one morning you forget. At 9:10 a.m., the principal pops his/her head into your room and says, "Attendance," and disappears.

Item 20 was designed to represent the principal's involvement in a routine administrative procedure.

Response: "It would all depend on how he said it. You can forget a lot of things and if he said it in a pleasant manner I'd find it quite acceptable. If he said it in a scolding manner, I'd find it really unacceptable."

Item 19: One day, your children have been particularly noisy in class and, finally, you decide to give the class a firm "lecture" on classroom behavior (your door is open). As you conclude, you notice the principal standing in the doorway. He/she enters the room and says, "As soon as you enter the school building I expect you all to be on your best school behavior. Your teacher should not have to remind you of school manners."

Item 19 was meant to describe a principal action which was intended to be directly supportive of a teacher disciplinary action.

Response: "Moderately acceptable. Its backing up what the teacher has said, but I don't necessarily like the idea of his standing in the doorway as though he is going to stand there and listen to the whole lecture behind your back. It kind of bothers me but I think he is really trying to back up the teacher."

It has been suggested in the literature, that teachers might have a very "narrow zone of acceptance" in matters that concern their perceived area of competence. Even in the area of pupil discipline, however, it would appear that teachers can be accepting of principal involvement if his actions are perceived of as supportive of teacher status. Zivin similarly noted that the principal's perceived manner was an important factor in the teacher's determination of whether a specific principal behaviour was acceptable or not. She

states:

Regardless of the specific nature of the stimulus behaviors, the respondents indicated that a crucial factor in determination of acceptability of the hypothetical principal behaviors was the manner in which the behavior was executed.<sup>4</sup>

There was some indication in the analysis of teacher reasons for response that the teacher's perception of the principal's competence was an important variable in the determination of behavioural acceptance or rejection. Even a cursory examination of the data revealed teacher concern in this regard. Lack of perceived principal competence in relation to teaching methodology and content was alluded to by both primary and intermediate grade teachers. Item 3 was cited in the analysis as a response item eliciting this type of teacher response. Two additional responses to this particular lesson content item are recorded below:

Response: "If he has a valid reason and knows his subject matter, then that's acceptable."

Response: "From what you have told me I can see nothing that makes the principal more of an authority on this subject than the teacher. Not acceptable."

There would appear to be some indication in the analysis that teachers were really willing to accept quite a broad range of principal behaviours provided, as mentioned above, he was perceived of as tactful, supportive and competent by the teacher. Whether the teacher was responding primarily to the specific principal behaviour described, his perceived manner, or his perceived competence level did not appear to detract from the finding that teachers evidenced a willingness to accept the principal's involvement in many areas, quite contrary to some of the suggestions of the literature.

---

<sup>4</sup>Zivin, pp. 278 - 279.



### For Future Research

The considerable similarity of teacher perception evidenced between Zivin's study and this present study suggest the usefulness of further research in this area utilizing a similar instrument but taking into consideration the following recommendations:

1. The instrument should be repeatedly field tested to ensure that the item wording does consistently elicit responses to the specific behaviours described rather than to other reactive elements within the item wording. To further ensure that this is occurring, factor analytic methods should be utilized to statistically categorize the items according to teacher responses to them.

2. A larger number of items should be utilized with some balance as to the number of items contained within each category. It was felt in this present research that single items could not adequately represent whole categories of principal behaviour. Five or more items in each category would appear to be more analytically useful.

3. The six-point response scale utilized in this present study should be examined as to the actual separation of scalar categories. In this present research, it appeared that some ambiguity existed in the minds of the respondents in relation to the middle categories. Teachers were sometimes unsure of the distinction between barely acceptable and barely unacceptable. It might be well simply to eliminate these uncertain categories from the scale though this might involve teachers in more of a forced choice than before.

There is a need to further investigate possible relationships between teacher demographic and situational variables and teacher reactions to specific principal behaviours. Though no clear pattern of teacher response in this regard emerged in either the Zivin research or this present research, it would appear that given a more carefully validated instrument and analytical techni-

ques that were more commensurate with the complexity of social situations, some important relationships might be distinguishable.

There is a need to investigate relationships utilizing the same variables as used in the present research. There was an indication in the proportion of variance explained statistic ( $\text{Eta}^2$ ) that the variables utilized possessed (when considered together) considerable explanatory power in some instances. Despite this phenomenon, statistically significant relationships between specific items and specific demographic variables were few.<sup>5</sup>

Future research should consider the following methodological recommendations:

1. Care must be taken to ensure that adequate interview time is made available for teachers to express their opinions. Interview times must remain at the discretion of the teacher but should preferably be outside school hours when time constraints are minimal.

2. Personal contact with each potential participant soon after their receipt of an introductory request letter should be retained in future interview oriented research. This present writer found that this technique resulted in 100% participation without loss of the volunteer nature of the involvement.

3. A future methodology might gain greater experimental control by making a random selection from all teachers within the school district chosen, then analyzing the data for the effects of socio-economic status, school size, and other variables by utilizing multivariate analytic techniques capable of controlling for the interactive effects of other variables.

An examination of the principal's administrative style should be

---

<sup>5</sup>Considering the significance level accepted ( $p \leq .05$ ) and the number of significant differences occurring (6% of total possible), significance might well have been entirely random.

included as part of any future investigation of the expectations of teachers for the role behaviour of the principal. It was found in this present research that the principal's perceived manner frequently influenced the teacher's assessment of his behaviour.

A concurrent examination of the principal's perceptions of the teacher's expectations for his role would be a useful inclusion in future research. A similar interview instrument could be constructed examining principal responses in the same behavioural areas that are examined with the teachers.

Future research should attempt a statistical analysis of teacher reasons for response utilizing factor analytic techniques in an effort to discover underlying structures of response that might provide some clearer indication of teacher zones of indifference.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bidwell, Charles E. "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching," Journal of Educational Sociology, No. 29 (September, 1955).
- Boocock, Sarane N. An Introduction to the Sociology of Learning. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.
- British Columbia Teachers' Federation. Learning Conditions - In Quest of Quality Education. Vancouver, August, 1976.
- Campbell, Merton V. "Teacher-Principal Agreement on the Teacher Role," Administrator's Notebook, VII, No. 6 (February, 1959).
- Carlson, Richard D. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and its Clients," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Chase, Francis S., and Egon G. Guba. "Administrative Roles and Behavior," Review of Educational Research, XXV, No. 4 (October, 1955).
- Cohen, Jacob and Patricia Cohen. Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1975.
- Dreeben, Robert. "The School as a Workplace," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. R.M.W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.
- Getzels, Jacob W., and Egon G. Guba. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (September, 1955).
- Hemphill, David. "What is Leadership," The Canadian Administrator, VIII, No. 2 (November, 1968).
- Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn. "Organizations and the System Concept," The Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Lane, Willard R., Ronald C. Corwin, and William C. Monahan. "Professional Resources in Public Organizations," Foundations of Educational Administration: A Behavioral Analysis. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Lortie, Dan C. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, ed. Amitai Etzioni. New York: Free Press, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Observations on Teaching as Work," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. R.M.W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

- McPherson, R. Bruce, Columbus Salley, and Melany E. Baehr. "Report to Industrial Relations Center, Manpower Research and Development Division, Chicago on What Principals Do: Preliminary Implications of 'A National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship,'" University of Chicago, 1975.
- Morin, L. H. "Role Perceptions and Principals," The Canadian Administrator, IV, No. 5 (February, 1965).
- Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1970.
- Parsons, Llewelyn G. "Teachers' Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness," The Canadian Administrator, XI, No. 2 (November, 1971).
- Province of British Columbia. Administrative Guide for Elementary Schools. Department of Education, Division of Instructional Services, Curriculum Development Branch. Victoria, 1971.
- Robinson, Norman, ed. "Principal and Teacher Supervisory Relationships: Problems and Perspectives," Administrative Leadership in Schools - A Book of Readings. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University.
- Schmuck, Richard A., and others. Handbook of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto: Mayfield, 1972.
- Scott, W. Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies - Areas of Conflict," Professionalization, eds., Howard R. Vollmer and Donald W. Mills. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas G., and Fred D. Carver. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1975.
- Simpkins, W. S., and D. Friesen. "Discretionary Powers of Classroom Teachers," The Canadian Administrator, IX, No. 8 (May, 1970).
- \_\_\_\_\_ and D. Friesen. "Teacher Participation in School Decision Making," The Canadian Administrator, VIII (January, 1969).
- Smith, Edward B. "Chester Barnard's Concept of Authority," Educational Administration Quarterly, II, No. 1 (Winter, 1975).
- Travers, Robert M.W. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- Vollmer, Howard M., and Donald W. Mills, eds. Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- Ziolkowski, E. H. "Practices in Supervision of Instruction," The Canadian Administrator, V (October, 1965).
- Zivin, Reni-Zoe, "The Acceptability to Elementary Teachers of a Set of Hypothetical Principal Behaviors." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973.

LIST OF STIMULUS ITEMS

APPENDIX A

## LIST OF STIMULUS ITEMS

Item  
Number

- 1 You have a student in your room who is a bad discipline problem. One day, after many warnings, you send the child out of the room to stand by the lockers. After school, your principal comes to your room and mentions that he/she had seen the child out in the hall. The principal says that he/she does not like to see children sent from their rooms to stand in the hall and perhaps you should think of another method of handling this student.
- 2 Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching a unit on Mexico. As you conclude a discussion on the native foods of Mexico, your principal says, "May I tell you about an experience I had in a restaurant in Mexico City?" And he/she proceeds to tell a humorous story.
- 3 During the morning, your principal had observed you teaching a lesson on [Canadian Confederation] in which you discussed [the dates that various regions of Canada became part of the nation and some of the obstacles to that union.] After school, the principal comes to your room and suggests that you place more emphasis on [the significant part that the building of the C.P.R. played in relation to the entry of the western provinces into the Canadian union.
- 4 Your principal can make the final decision as to promotion or retention of individual students. After a year of successfully working with a slower student, you strongly feel that the student should be promoted. The principal admits that the child has made significant progress but still insists that he is not up to grade level standards and, thus, he will be retained.
- 5 One morning you find a carton of new readers outside your classroom door. Since you did not request any new books, you go to the office to find out if some mistake in delivery has been made. The principal tells you that he/she ordered this series of books for all rooms in your grade because he/she had been much impressed with them at a recent educational convention.



- 6 Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching a lesson on [Canadian Confederation.] As you conclude a discussion of [some of the obstacles there were to completion of that union,] your principal says, "I think we should emphasize here [the importance that the building of the C.P.R. played in the entry of B.C. and the other western provinces into Canadian Confederation,]" thus signalling to you that he/she would like to see the discussion continue along these lines.
- 7 One morning, you find a carton of new books outside your classroom door. You requested a series of readers, but upon opening the carton, you find that a different series has been delivered. You go to the office to report the mistake. Your principal tells you that your request was not approved by the superintendent so he/she substituted this other series from the approved list for your request.
- 8 You have talked to your principal many times about a particular student in your room who is a bad discipline problem. One day, you send the child out of the room to stand by the lockers. Later you find out that the principal passed by, saw the child in the hall, and took him to the office for disciplinary purposes.
- 9 Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching new math. The children have been having trouble mastering elementary formulas. Although you have several boxes of cuisenaire rods on your shelf, you have not introduced them to the children yet. Towards the end of the lesson, your principal says, "Boys and girls, I think I know something which might help you understand formulas better." And he/she gets a box of the rods and demonstrates a formula with them. Sure enough, the children seem to grasp the concept of formulas better after this example.
- 10 Your principal makes it a point to read all grade reports before they are mailed home to the parents. He/she calls you into the office and asks you to modify the report you have written about one especially troublesome student. He/she feels that the report is too negative because the child really is quite bright.
- 11 In the middle of a lesson, your principal enters the room, quietly walks to the back, and sits down in the visitor's chair. He/she stays for ten minutes and then quietly leaves the room. You had not known in advance that the principal planned to visit your class that day.

- 12 You have talked to your principal many times about a particular student in your room who is a bad discipline problem, especially during math period. The principal comes to observe your class during math period and, as usual, the student becomes disruptive. Your principal finally says, "This behaviour cannot go on. You're coming with me to the office." And the principal takes the child from your room.
- 13 Your principal had observed your class in the morning, and after school, he/she comes to your room. He/she suggests that your "habit" of "fiddling" with your watchband while talking is distracting to the children.
- 14 Your principal assigns each teacher an auxiliary duty, such as lunchroom or playground supervisor or bus duty, for 1 week every 2 months.
- 15 While your children are working at their desks, a rock suddenly hits one of your windows, shattering it, and sending glass flying. No one is hurt, but the children are terribly frightened. You send one child down to the office, requesting that the principal come immediately. He/she enters the room and begins to calm the children and dispatch messengers to the office and to the custodian.
- 16 You are walking with your class in the school hall and your class is making more noise than you would like. The principal is walking toward your group and, as you approach, he/she says to you quietly, "You really ought to do something about this noise." The children did not hear this comment to you.
- 17 One day, your children have been particularly noisy in class and, finally, you decide to give the class a firm "lecture" on classroom behaviour. As your door is open, you can see that the principal just walked past your room. After school, the principal comes to your room and he/she suggests that instead of talking to the group perhaps you should single out the several most disruptive students and send them to the office as an example for the other students.
- 18 Several months ago, you mentioned to your principal that you could really use a new set of readers. You've heard nothing else about it until one morning you find a carton of new books outside your door. Upon opening it, you discover that the new set of readers is not the set you would have liked to order. When you mention this to your principal, he/she says, "You wanted a new set of readers so I ordered these for you," and closes the discussion.

- 19 One day, your children have been particularly noisy in class and, finally, you decide to give the class a firm "lecture" on classroom behaviour (your door is open). As you conclude, you notice the principal standing in the doorway. He/she enters the room and says, "As soon as you enter the school building, I expect you all to be on your best school behaviour. Your teacher should not have to remind you of school manners."
- 20 You usually remember to send your attendance slip to the office by 9:00 a.m. (the due time)", but one morning you forget. At 9:10 a.m., the principal pops his/her head into your room and says, "Attendance," and disappears.
- 21 Your principal is observing in your classroom while you are teaching new math. The children have been having difficulty mastering elementary formulas. At the lesson's end, the children leave the room for recess. Your principal remains with you and suggests that perhaps using cuisenaire rods would help the children visualize the formulas. You have several boxes of rods in your room but you have not introduced them to the children yet.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA ANALYSES

APPENDIX B

Table XIII  
 Frequency Distribution of Teacher Responses  
 By Item

Item	Cert Accept	Mod Accept	Barely Accept	Barely Unaccep	Mod Unaccep	Cert Unaccep	Total
1	27	16	11	7	9	9	79
2	53	16	8	-	1	2	80
3	20	27	17	3	4	9	80
4	3	3	14	5	18	37	80
5	5	15	10	3	16	31	80
6	2	13	16	10	10	29	80
7	3	7	16	7	10	37	80
8	28	17	14	2	4	15	80
9	18	15	8	6	8	25	80
10	24	26	10	4	9	7	80
11	55	16	5	1	1	1	79
12	41	17	7	3	3	9	80
13	18	19	16	2	7	18	80
14	37	18	10	6	3	6	80
15	63	13	2	1	1	-	80
16	38	16	9	5	8	4	80
17	14	16	14	1	13	21	79
18	7	2	14	3	11	43	80
19	20	24	9	9	8	10	80
20	35	18	8	6	8	5	80
21	64	13	1	-	1	1	80

Table XIV

Descriptive Statistics - Preliminary Analysis  
Entire Sample

Demographic Data	n	Mean	S.E. of Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Sex	80	1.2000	0.0450	0.4025	0.1620
Age	80	35.1875	0.9952	8.9018	79.2428
Marital Status	80	1.3620	0.0667	0.5974	0.3569
Children	80	1.6000	0.0551	0.4929	0.2430
Educational Level	80	0.8250	0.0750	0.6708	0.4500
Undergraduate Major	80	1.2500	0.0487	0.4357	0.1898
Graduate Major	2*				
Years Experience	80	10.3370	0.7280	6.5161	42.4540
Years in Present School	80	3.8620	0.3112	2.7876	7.7660
Grade Taught	80	1.6000	0.0845	0.7564	0.5721
Satisfaction with Prin.	80	2.1375	0.1002	0.8964	0.8036
Satisfaction with Career	80	1.8250	0.0683	0.6115	0.3740

Table Coding Key:

Sex: 1 - female, 2 - male

Marital Status: 1 - married, 2 - single, 3 - divorced

Age, Years of Experience, Years in Present School: given in years

Children: 1 - yes, 2 - no

Educational Level: 0 - no degree, 1 - BA or BEd., 2 - BA, BEd plus  
graduate hours, 3 - MA or MEd

Undergraduate and Graduate Major: 1 - education major, 2 - non-education  
major

Grade Taught: 1 - K to 4, 2 - 5 to 7, 3 - special subjects

Satisfaction with Present Principal: 1 - best principal, 2 - better than  
most, 3 - as good as most, 4 - inferior to most

Satisfaction with Career: 1 - most satisfying career, 2 - more satisfying  
than most, 3 - as satisfying as most, 4 - less satisfying than most.

\* 2 graduate teachers did not provide a sufficient number to analyze.

Table XV

## Descriptive Statistics - Preliminary Analysis

Low Socio-Economic Status Group					
Demographic Data	n	Mean	S.E. of Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Sex	40	1.2000	0.0640	0.4050	0.1641
Age	40	34.8000	1.3784	8.7183	76.0102
Marital Status	40	1.3000	0.0891	0.5638	0.3179
Children	40	1.6500	0.0763	0.4830	0.2333
Educational Level	40	0.8500	0.0983	0.6222	0.3871
Undergraduate Major	40	1.2250	0.0668	0.4229	0.1788
Graduate Major	-	-	-	-	-
Years Experience	40	10.2525	0.9663	6.1114	37.3502
Years in Present School	40	4.0650	0.4521	2.8599	8.1792
Grade Taught	40	1.7000	0.1300	0.8227	0.6769
Satisfaction with Prin.	40	2.2000	0.1568	0.9922	0.9846
Satisfaction with Career	40	1.8500	0.0983	0.6222	0.3871

  

High Socio-Economic Status Group					
Demographic Data	n	Mean	S.E. of Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
Sex	40	1.2000	0.0640	0.4050	0.1641
Age	40	35.5750	1.4508	0.1760	84.1993
Marital Status	40	1.4000	0.1000	0.6324	0.4000
Children	40	1.5500	0.0796	0.5038	0.2538
Educational Level	40	0.8400	0.1162	0.7355	0.5410
Undergraduate Major	40	1.2750	0.0714	0.4522	0.2044
Graduate Major	2*	-	-	-	-
Years Experience	40	10.4812	1.1014	6.9661	48.5268
Years in Present School	40	3.9125	0.4344	2.7476	7.5498
Grade Taught	40	1.4750	0.1073	0.6788	0.4608
Satisfaction with Prin.	40	2.0750	0.1260	0.7970	0.6352
Satisfaction with Career	40	1.8000	0.0960	0.6076	0.3692

\* 2 graduate teachers did not provide a sufficient number to analyze.

Table XVI  
Response Item Statistics - Preliminary Analysis  
Entire Sample

Item	n	Mean	S.E. of Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
1	79	2.7721	0.1989	1.7683	3.1269
2	80	1.5750	0.1176	1.0527	1.1082
3	80	2.6375	0.1763	1.5770	2.4871
4	80	4.7875	0.1637	1.4642	2.1441
5	80	4.2875	0.1982	1.7731	3.1441
6	80	4.2500	0.1809	1.6187	2.6202
7	80	4.5625	0.1795	1.6057	2.5783
8	80	2.7750	0.2097	1.8757	3.5183
9	80	3.5750	0.2262	2.0237	4.0955
10	80	2.6125	0.1835	1.6419	2.6960
11	79	1.4810	0.1048	0.9317	0.8682
12	80	2.2125	0.1896	1.6965	2.8783
13	80	3.1875	0.2105	1.8832	3.5466
14	80	2.2250	0.1733	1.5506	2.4044
15	80	1.3000	0.0783	0.7008	0.4911
16	80	2.2625	0.1767	1.5810	2.4998
17	79	3.5822	0.2158	1.9189	3.6822
18	80	4.7250	0.1890	1.6911	2.8601
19	80	2.8875	0.1924	1.7210	2.9618
20	80	2.3625	0.1816	1.6245	2.6390
21	80	1.3000	0.0896	0.8018	0.6430

Table Coding Key:

1 - certainly acceptable, 2 - moderately acceptable, 3 - barely acceptable, 4 - barely unacceptable, 5 - moderately unacceptable, 6 - certainly unacceptable.



Table XVII

Response Item Statistics - Preliminary Analysis  
Low Socio-Economic Status Group

Item	n	Mean	S.E. of Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
1	39	2.4879	0.2721	1.6994	2.8879
2	40	1.5750	0.1787	1.1297	1.2762
3	40	2.5500	0.2400	1.5182	2.3051
4	40	4.6750	0.2516	1.5914	2.5326
5	40	4.3500	0.2898	1.8334	3.3615
6	40	4.2000	0.2459	1.5557	2.4205
7	40	4.4500	0.2629	1.6633	2.7666
8	40	3.0250	0.3131	1.9805	3.9224
9	40	3.4500	0.3261	2.0624	4.2538
10	40	2.7750	0.2569	1.6249	2.6403
11	39	1.5384	0.1677	1.0474	1.0971
12	40	2.4250	0.2928	1.8520	3.4301
13	40	3.5500	0.3099	1.9605	3.8435
14	40	2.1250	0.2353	1.4882	2.2147
15	40	1.3250	0.1097	0.6938	0.4814
16	40	2.4000	0.2650	1.6763	2.8102
17	39	3.5641	0.2911	1.8179	3.3049
18	40	4.8500	0.2668	1.6878	2.8487
19	40	2.8250	0.2628	1.6623	2.7634
20	40	2.2250	0.2333	1.4760	2.1788
21	40	1.2750	0.1339	0.8469	0.7173

Table XVIII

Response Item Statistics - Preliminary Analysis  
High Socio-Economic Status Group

Item	n	Mean	S.E. of Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
1	40	3.0500	0.2863	1.8109	3.2794
2	40	1.5750	0.1556	0.9841	0.9685
3	40	2.7250	0.2606	1.6484	2.7173
4	40	4.9000	0.2112	1.3358	1.7846
5	40	4.2250	0.2738	1.7318	2.9993
6	40	4.3000	0.2684	1.6976	2.8820
7	40	4.6750	0.2464	1.5588	2.4301
8	40	2.5250	0.2773	1.7539	3.0762
9	40	3.7000	0.3166	2.0025	4.0102
10	40	2.4500	0.2629	1.6633	2.7666
11	40	1.4250	0.1285	0.8129	0.6608
12	40	2.000	0.2401	1.5191	2.3076
13	40	2.8250	0.2770	1.7524	3.0711
14	40	2.3250	0.2566	1.6233	2.6352
15	40	1.2750	0.1131	0.7156	0.5121
16	40	2.1250	0.2353	1.4882	2.2147
17	40	3.6000	0.3218	2.0355	4.1435
18	40	4.6000	0.2698	1.7066	2.9128
19	40	2.9500	0.2840	1.7967	3.2282
20	40	2.5000	0.2796	1.7686	3.1282
21	40	1.3250	0.1208	0.5839	0.7641

Table XIX  
Comparison of Positive - Negative  
Acceptability Response Patterns

Present Study (n = 80)			Zivin Study (n = 44)**		
Ranked Item	Pos. Resp. 1-3	Neg. Resp. 4-6	Ranked Item	Pos. Resp. 1-3	Neg. Resp. 4-6
21	97.5%	2.5%	15	100%	0%
15	97.5%	2.5%	11	100%	0%
11	96.2%	3.8%	21	95%	4%
2	96.2%	3.8%	2	88%	11%
12	81.3%	18.7%	1	85%	14%
14	81.3%	18.7%	20	80%	19%
3	80.0%	20.0%	16	76%	23%
16	78.8%	21.2%	13	74%	25%
20	76.3%	23.7%	10	74%	25%
10	75.0%	25.0%	14	73%	26%
8	73.8%	26.2%	12	65%	35%
1	68.4%	31.6%	3	64%	35%
19	66.3%	33.7%	9	53%	46%
13	66.3%	33.7%	8	54%	45%
17	55.7%	44.3%	17	51%	48% *
9	51.3%	48.7% *	19	40%	59%
6	38.8%	61.2%	5	40%	59%
5	37.5%	62.5%	4	38%	61%
7	32.5%	67.5%	6	33%	66%
18	28.8%	71.2%	7	31%	69%
4	25.0%	75.0%	18	29%	70%

\* Transition point at which majority of responses become negative.

\*\* Zivin, p. 164.

Table XX

One Way Analysis of Variance of Mean Response Scores Grouped  
According to Demographic and Personal Variables

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables				F.Prob
	Teacher's Sex				
Items	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
7	Female	4.7813	1.5682	0.1960	0.013
	Male	3.6875	1.4930	0.3733	
12	Female	1.8906	1.4378	0.1797	0.001
	Male	3.5000	2.0656	0.5164	
	Teacher's Age				
	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
18	23 to 29	4.4400	1.8502	0.3700	0.013
	30 to 39	5.3056	1.2608	0.2101	
	40 to 57	4.0000	1.8856	0.4326	
	Teachers With or Without Children				
	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
5	With	3.5313	1.7958	0.3175	0.002
	Without	4.7917	1.5839	0.2286	
7	With	4.0938	1.6725	0.2957	0.030
	Without	4.8750	1.4964	0.2160	
13	With	2.6875	1.6152	0.2855	0.049
	Without	3.5208	1.9892	0.2871	
16	With	1.8125	1.2556	0.2220	0.035
	Without	2.5625	1.7124	0.2472	
	Teacher's Formal Education Level				
	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
18	No Degree	5.5200	0.9626	0.1925	0.004
	Degree	4.5333	1.8040	0.2689	
	Degree +	3.6000	1.8379	0.5812	

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables				F. Prob
Undergrad and Graduate Major					
Items	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
19	Education	2.6500	1.6655	0.2150	0.030
	Non-Education	3.6000	1.7290	0.3866	
Years of Teaching Experience					
	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
21	1 to 5 yrs.	1.0455	0.2132	0.0455	0.016
	6 to 10 yrs.	1.2500	0.5316	0.1085	
	11 to 15 yrs.	1.8235	1.4678	0.3560	
	16 to 29 yrs.	1.1765	0.3930	0.0953	
Years in Present School					
	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
19	1 year	3.6000	1.8048	0.4660	0.005
	2 years	2.8947	1.5949	0.3659	
	3 to 4 yrs.	2.0000	1.3416	0.2928	
	5 to 8 yrs.	2.7222	1.6017	0.3775	
	9 to 12 yrs.	4.4286	1.9024	0.7190	
Grade Level Taught					
	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
12	K to 4	1.5682	1.1289	0.1702	0.000
	5 to 7	3.3636	2.1054	0.4489	
	Special	2.3846	1.6093	0.4463	
Satisfaction with Principal's Performance					
	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
5	Best Prin.	3.8095	1.9396	0.4232	0.051
	Better-most	4.0606	1.7843	0.3106	
	As Good/Inferior	4.9615	1.4555	0.2854	
7	Best Prin.	4.2857	1.6475	0.3595	0.021
	Better-most	4.1818	1.6480	0.2869	
	As Good/Inferior	5.2692	1.3133	0.2575	
17	Best Prin.	3.2381	1.7862	0.3898	0.021
	Better-most	3.1250	1.9469	0.3442	
	As Good/Inferior	4.4231	1.7703	0.3472	

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables				F. Prob
Satisfaction With Teaching as a Career					
Items	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
13	Most Sat.	2.4348	1.5905	0.3316	0.039
	More than Most	3.3750	1.8864	0.2723	
	As Sat. as Most	4.1111	2.0883	0.6961	
Size of School					
	Group	Mean	S.D.	S.E.	
18	Small School	4.1500	1.8432	0.4122	0.051
	Large School	5.2000	1.4726	0.3293	
Socio-Economic Status of School					

Table XXI

## 5 Way Analysis of Variance Data

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Of	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
<u>Item 1</u>					
Main Effects	56.438	9	6.271	2.271	0.027
Age	19.943	2	9.972	3.612	0.032
Children	0.105	1	0.105	0.038	0.999
School	8.336	1	8.336	3.019	0.083
Sex	1.880	1	1.880	0.681	0.999
Yrs. Pres.	33.253	4	8.313	3.011	0.024
Explained	56.438	9	6.271	2.271	0.027
<u>Item 5</u>					
Main Effects	44.480	8	5.560	1.936	0.067
Children	15.534	1	15.534	5.409	0.022
Marital	1.213	1	1.213	0.422	0.999
Principal	6.933	2	3.466	1.207	0.305
Teacher	1.785	2	0.892	0.311	0.999
Age	1.349	2	0.674	0.235	0.999
Explained	44.480	8	5.560	1.936	0.067
<u>Item 7</u>					
Main Effects	45.372	8	5.671	2.541	0.017
Sex	8.440	1	8.440	3.782	0.053
Children	0.487	1	0.487	0.218	0.999
Principal	11.241	2	5.620	2.518	0.086
Age	6.123	2	3.062	1.372	0.259
Grade	4.144	2	2.072	0.929	0.999
Explained	45.372	8	5.671	2.541	0.017
<u>Item 12</u>					
Main Effects	57.759	7	8.251	3.738	0.005
Grade	5.626	2	2.813	1.274	0.293
Age	28.026	2	14.013	6.348	0.005
Sex	3.216	1	3.216	1.457	0.235
School	2.870	1	2.870	1.300	0.262
Size	1.324	1	1.324	0.600	0.999
Explained	57.759	7	8.251	3.738	0.005

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Of	Mean Sqaure	F	Signif of F
<u>Item 13</u>					
Main Effects	65.607	7	9.372	3.145	0.006
Teacher	19.817	2	9.908	3.325	0.041
School	4.934	1	4.934	1.656	0.199
Children	13.478	1	13.478	4.522	0.035
Marital	15.663	1	15.663	5.256	0.024
Education	9.630	2	4.815	1.616	0.204
Explained	65.607	7	9.372	3.145	0.006
<u>Item 16</u>					
Main Effects	34.864	8	4.358	1.903	0.073
Children	12.387	1	12.387	5.408	0.022
Sex	0.899	1	0.899	0.393	0.999
School	1.897	1	1.897	0.828	0.999
Teacher	7.678	2	3.839	1.676	0.193
Yrs. Exp.	11.922	3	3.974	1.735	0.166
Explained	34.864	8	4.358	1.903	0.073
<u>Item 18</u>					
Main Effects	48.571	8	6.071	2.751	0.020
Education	10.512	2	5.256	2.382	0.107
Age	12.477	2	6.239	2.827	0.073
Grade	6.864	2	3.432	1.555	0.226
Size	4.904	1	4.904	2.223	0.142
Major	0.411	1	0.411	0.186	0.999
Explained	48.571	8	6.071	2.751	0.020
<u>Item 19</u>					
Main Effects	72.078	21	3.432	1.230	0.263
Pres. School	32.592	15	2.173	0.778	0.999
Major	11.895	1	11.895	4.261	0.041
Children	0.323	1	0.323	0.116	0.999
Teacher	10.563	2	5.281	1.892	0.158
Principal	10.502	2	5.251	1.881	0.159
Explained	72.078	21	3.432	1.230	0.263



Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Of	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
<u>Item 21</u>					
Main Effects	16.233	23	0.706	1.143	0.333
Yrs. Exp.	5.113	3	1.704	2.761	0.050
Pres. School	5.187	15	0.346	0.560	0.999
Children	0.002	1	0.002	0.003	0.999
Principal	4.259	2	2.129	3.450	0.038
Age	0.958	2	0.479	0.776	0.999
Explained	16.233	23	0.706	1.143	0.333

ANCILLARY MATERIALS

APPENDIX C

PROCEDURAL INSTRUCTIONS READ TO TEACHERS  
PRIOR TO INTERVIEW

I am going to read to you, one at a time, a number of hypothetical behaviours which it is conceivable for a principal to exercise within an elementary school setting. Although there will be similarities in a number of the behaviours, it is important for you to note the differences. I realize that the situations described may not be applicable to your special subject, but from your experience and background, I hope you will be able to consider how you would feel if     acted in the way described. In order to have a consistent and valid reference point from which to consider these behaviours, I am asking you to assume that you are the teacher involved in each school situation read and that your present principal is the principal involved in the situation. This study does not require any evaluation or teacher judgment of actual principal behaviours; however, your relationship with your principal and your knowledge of his/her personality and character might influence how you would feel if he/she acted in the hypothetical manner described. The focus of this study is teacher sentiments, not principal behaviour. After listening to the descriptions of principal behaviour, please consider your feelings as to the acceptability of these behaviours and then estimate where your response would fall on this acceptability scale.

## ACCEPTABILITY SCALE

1	2	3	4	5	6
Certainly Acceptable	Moderately Acceptable	Barely Acceptable	Barely Unacceptable	Moderately Unacceptable	Certainly Unacceptable

No. \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please fill in the blanks or place an "X" in the appropriate space.

Total Years of Teaching Experience \_\_\_\_\_  
(Including this year)

Years Teaching in Present School \_\_\_\_\_  
(Including this year)

Educational Level Attained (mark "X")

No college degree _____	M.A./M.Ed or M.Sc _____
B.Ed. _____	M.A./M.Ed or M.Sc plus _____
B.A. or B.Sc _____	grad. hrs. _____
B.A./B.Sc plus grad. hrs. _____	Ph.D _____

Major in College

Undergraduate \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate \_\_\_\_\_

Marital Status \_\_\_\_\_ Children (mark "X") \_\_\_\_\_  
(yes) (no)

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Please circle the number of the statement which best describes your feelings about the following questions.

- A. How satisfied are you with your present principal?
1. He/She is the best principal I can realistically imagine.
  2. He/She is better than most principals.
  3. He/She is about as good as most principals.
  4. He/She is inferior to most principals.
- B. Speaking for yourself, how satisfying has teaching been as a career?
1. The most satisfying career I can imagine.
  2. More satisfying than most careers.
  3. About as satisfying as most careers.
  4. Less satisfying than most careers.

April 9, 1976

Dear Mr. Humphreys:

I have read your letter with great interest, and, of course, I am flattered to know that Dr. Erickson has recommended my work to you. At the time I conducted my research, there was a rising tide of rhetoric and speculation concerning the effects of such influences as "teacher militancy, unionization, specialization" etc. on the relationship between teachers and principals, most of which seemed to indicate that the elementary principal was an anachronism in contemporary education's structure. While my own experiences did not agree with this popular view, I hoped to investigate the situation as objectively as I could given certain limitations (sample availability, time constraints...). My project proved to be very satisfying to me; the interviews went quite well, and I feel I established a rapport with the teachers who participated sufficient to gain insight into their real thoughts concerning the subject of the teacher-principal relationship.

Your proposed study is much greater in scope than mine. Needless to say, I will await your results with great anticipation. I am assuming that you will be sampling your district's teacher population. I might point out that the interviews tend to consume much more time than you might anticipate since the subjects (at least mine) liked to carry on "informal" conversations before and after the interview proper. Another of the most time consuming aspects of the project was transcribing the interview tapes. Categorizations of the reasons for response required numerous reshuffling steps. I mention these aspects to you because I am sure you will be operating within a relatively structured time frame.

At the moment, my particular interest lies in publication of at least some of my dissertation data. Although I am sure that it's a future concern for you at the moment, I would hope that, pending the results of your study, we might collaborate on one or more articles based on our research (similarities? differences? implications?). Please keep me informed on how things are progressing.

I am looking forward to seeing Dr. Erickson at the AERA meetings in San Francisco April 19-23. If Dr. Erickson does not mind being an "intermediary," I would be happy to discuss your project with him and give any help I can.

Best wishes for a successful study.

Sincerely,

Reni Zivin

cc D. Erickson

## SUPERINTENDENT'S LETTER

March 24, 1976.

Dear Mr. Humphreys:

I acknowledge receipt of your March 22, 1976, letter in which you outline a proposed research project as part of the requirements for your M.A. degree in Administrative Leadership at Simon Fraser University.

You have the approval of this office to proceed with your study within the guidelines noted in your letter. I would appreciate seeing the results of your research when they are available.

May I take this opportunity to wish you good success.

Yours very truly,

Superintendent of Schools.

## LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

April 5, 1976

Dear Sir:

Please find enclosed a copy of a letter sent to a random sample of full-time teachers in the                      School District. The letter explains in brief the intent of a research study. The study has received the approval of                      and a copy of his letter is also enclosed.

Since the study involves the assessment of teacher sentiments in relation to hypothetical principal behaviours, the administration of the school need not be involved with the study other than to grant the approval for interviewing a staff member in the school premises if this is the location desired for the interview. Interviews would be after class hours and not interfere with school routines. If you wish any further information I would be pleased to provide it. To avoid the necessity of drafting a written reply, no response will be construed as your approval of the above request.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours very truly,

Bill Humphreys

Encl. (2)



## LETTER TO TEACHERS

April 5, 1976

Dear

I am in the initial stages of a research study in the \_\_\_\_\_ School District which has the approval of Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ and your name was selected for possible participation by means of a random sampling of all the full time elementary teachers in the district. My research provides for partial fulfillment of an M.A. degree in Administrative Leadership in Education at Simon Fraser University. I have personally taught in the \_\_\_\_\_ District for six years.

The intent of the study is to examine teacher sentiments in relation to various types of principal role behaviours, and to determine the extent of generalizability of certain rather significant findings concerning the teacher-principal relationship that have recently been reported in a doctoral dissertation out of the University of Chicago.

The study cited above was by Dr. Reni-Zoe Zivin and findings seemed significant because they ran quite contrary to many of the claims that current literature had been making regarding changes in the relationship between elementary teachers and principals. It was pointed out by Zivin that the claims were largely unsubstantiated by research and were in fact "...claims of teacher sentiment expressed not by teachers but by university professors, school principals, superintendents, and even newspaper columnists." It seems eminently reasonable to ask teachers about their own sentiments rather than necessarily accepting what others think teachers think!

The study is not individually time consuming for it involves merely a twenty to thirty minute interview, scheduled at your convenience. It is also clearly not the intention of the study to obtain an evaluation of your present principal for the teacher responses recorded are responses to hypothetical principal behaviours.

Great care would be taken in the research study to insure that all interview information remains completely anonymous and totally confidential. No school district personnel would have any access to the interview

...2

materials gathered and further, all participants would be referred to by code numbers in the data and not by name.

As mentioned above, the interview must be scheduled entirely at your convenience. This refers to both location and time. If it is preferable the interview could be conducted in your home rather than at school and if so desired it could be scheduled for an evening or weekend. I would most sincerely appreciate your co-operation in this endeavour.

Within the next few days I will be in contact with each teacher that was initially selected in order to finalize my list of participants and to make interview arrangements. If there are any questions concerning the above that you would like to ask I may be reached after school hours at

Elementary School or at my home phone number which is

Thank you for your help.

Yours very truly

Bill Humphreys