

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM
AND EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP
TO SELECTED ASPECTS OF SUPERVISION

by

Carlton Olson

B.Ed. (Secondary), University of British Columbia, 1961

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

in the
Faculty of Education



CARLTON OLSON, 1972

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

January, 1972

EXAMINING COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Dr. Glenn Kirchner
Examining Committee Chairman

Dr. Arthur H. Elliott
Examining Committee and Senior Supervisor

Dr. D. Ian Allan
Examining Committee

Dr. Karl Peter
Examining Committee

ABSTRACT

This study of British Columbia teachers was designed to examine the relationships of (1) professionalism, (2) employee orientation, (3) closeness of supervision and (4) evaluation. In addition, these four variables were analyzed on the basis of their relationship to selected biographic criteria.

The research sample consisted of 443 teachers randomly selected from those actively employed in the public schools of British Columbia. The "Professional Role Orientation Scale" was used to measure teacher professionalism. The second major variable was measured by the "Employee Orientation Scale". Selected items from "The Role Behaviour of School Principals" were used to measure closeness of supervision. The fourth major variable was measured by the total scores achieved on responses to the "Evaluation Model" items designed specifically for this study.

Of the six correlation hypotheses tested, three were supported in the predicted direction. These included:

- (1) A positive correlation between professional orientation and employee orientation.
- (2) A positive correlation between professional orientation and the evaluation model.
- (3) A positive correlation between employee orientation and closeness of supervision.

In the case of two other hypotheses, a significant correlation was found but opposite in sign to the one predicted.

These two were:

(1) A positive correlation between professional orientation and closeness of supervision.

(2) A positive correlation between closeness of supervision and the evaluation model.

Although there was a statistically significant positive correlation between professional orientation and employee orientation for the total sample, examination of the sub-samples indicated that a number of teachers who score high on professionalism are not equally employee oriented. It should also be noted that professionally oriented teachers who are most likely to be involved in the evaluation process, are the ones who give greatest support to the statistically significant positive correlation between professional orientation scores and the evaluation model scores.

The high positive correlation between employee orientation and closeness of supervision should not be misinterpreted. Examination of the responses given to the individual items on these two scales confirms the findings of previous research. Principals should realize that there is only a limited area in which they can expect to receive unquestioning support from teachers for those orders issued on the basis of administrative position. There was substantial evidence, however, that teachers in the sample were prepared to accept supervision of a supportive and constructive nature, provided it also embodied the ideas of mutual influence and mutual interaction for the improvement of classroom instruction.

TO Grant, Craig and Derek

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge with sincere appreciation the help and encouragement so willingly provided by Dr. D.I. Allen, Dr. G. Kirchner, Dr. K. Peter and most particularly that of his senior supervisor, Dr. A.H. Elliott.

To the teachers of British Columbia, who provided the data for this study, the writer is indebted for their thoughtful cooperation. The office of the General Secretary of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation has been most helpful to the writer in gathering the names and addresses of the random selection of teachers used in this study. In this connection, special thanks are expressed to Mr. D. Holden.

For all the typing necessary in the study such as this one, the writer expresses his appreciation to Mrs. Bev McEachern and Mrs. Gail Roberts.

Finally, but with deepest gratitude, the writer wishes to thank his wife, Doreen, for the many sacrifices endured while this study was being written.

Table of Contents

Chapter

I	The Problem and Definition of Terms Used.....	1
	The Problem	1
	Importance of the Study	1
	Definition of Terms	2
	Professional Orientation	3
	Employee Orientation	4
	Supervision	6
	Closeness of Supervision	6
	Evaluation Model	7
	Statement of the Problem	10
	Hypotheses	12
	Overview of the Remainder of the Study	13
	References for Chapter I	14
II	Review of the Literature and Rationale for This Study ..	17
	Literature Pertaining to Professional Orientation ..	17
	Literature Pertaining to Employee Orientation	19
	Literature Pertaining to Supervision	20
	Literature Pertaining to an Evaluation Model	23
	Summary and a Rationale for this Study	27
	References for Chapter II	29
III	Research Methodology and Data Collection	32
	Data Required	32
	Instrumentation	32

Professional Orientation	33
Employee Orientation	33
Closeness of Supervision	33
Evaluation Model	34
Scoring	34
The Population and Sample	35
Collection of Data	36
References for Chapter III	38
IV Results, Analysis, and Discussion of Hypotheses	39
Analysis of Relationship's Between Professional Orientation and Employee Orientation	39
Analysis of Relationship's Between Professional Orientation and Closeness of Supervision	44
Analysis of Relationships Between Professional Orientation and Evaluation Model	51
Analysis of Relationship Between Employee Orientation and Closeness of Supervision	56
Analysis of Relationships Between Employee Orientation and Evaluation Model	61
Analysis of Relationships Between Closeness of Supervision and Evaluation Model	62
Summary	76
References for Chapter IV	78
V Conclusions, Implications, Further Research, and Summary	
Conclusions	79
Implications for Administrators	83
Further Research	89
Summary	91
References for Chapter V	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Employee Orientation Scores Examined on the Basis of Sex	40
II. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Employee Orientation Scores Examined on the Basis of Age	41
III. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Employee Orientation Scores Examined on the Basis of Marital Status	42
IV. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Closeness of Supervision Scores Examined on the Basis of Sex	46
V. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Closeness of Supervision Scores Examined on the Basis of Marital Status	47
VI. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Closeness of Supervision Scores Examined on the Basis of Marital Status	48
VII. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Sex	53
VIII. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Age	54
IX. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Marital Status	55
X. Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores With Closeness of Supervision Scores Examined on the Basis of Sex	58
XI. Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores With Closeness of Supervision Scores Examined on the Basis of Age	59
XII. Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores With Closeness of Supervision Scores Examined on the Basis of Marital Status	60

Table	Page
XIII. Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores and Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Sex..	63
XIV. Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores and Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Age..	64
XV. Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores and Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Marital Status	65
XVI. Correlation of Closeness of Supervision Scores and Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Sex..	66
XVII. Correlation of Closeness of Supervision Scores and Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Age..	67
XVIII. Correlation of Closeness of Supervision Scores and Evaluation Model Scores Examined on the Basis of Marital Status	68
XIX. Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores and Selected Biographic Criteria	71
XX. Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores and Selected Biographic Criteria	72
XXI. Correlation of Closeness of Supervision Scores and Selected Biographic Criteria	73
XXII. Correlation of Evaluation Model Scores and Selected Biographic Criteria	74

CHAPTER 1

I The Problem

One of the major and most perplexing responsibilities of a school principal is the supervision and evaluation of his teaching staff. The purpose of this study is to examine whether differences in the attitudes of teachers toward evaluation and closeness of supervision are related to their professionalism and employee orientation.

II The Importance of the Study

A teacher's obligations as a professional person are in several respects in conflict with the role of the teacher as an employee of a school board of education. Professions are recognized as nationwide organizations and in Canada are organized, for the most part, on a provincial level. The teacher as a professional is bound by the standards of professional behavior that are set and sanctioned outside the local community. By way of contrast, employee obligations are locally inspired and enforced. As pointed out by Corwin,¹ McEwan,² and Argyris,³ the characteristics of a bureaucracy are incongruent with the needs of peer relations and creative thinking among professionals. To compound the problem, a teacher is usually supervised and evaluated by a principal who is also appointed by the local school board. In other words, the teacher is successful or unsuccessful depending on his attitude toward his professional obligations, his attitude as an employee and the rating he receives from a locally appointed

evaluator.

In view of this situation which confronts the individual teacher, the results of two recent surveys suggest the need for further study of the problem. The National Education Association,⁴ in October 1969, published the results of a nationwide survey of teachers conducted by their Research Division in the spring of that year. In answer to the questions, "In your opinion, should teachers be evaluated regularly?" 75 percent of the teachers surveyed responded that both probationary and tenure teachers should receive regular evaluation. Furthermore, when these same teachers were asked to respond to the question: "If teachers are evaluated, by whom should the evaluation be done?" 97 percent said the principal should make the evaluation. In response to the question: "Whether or not you favour teacher evaluation, if teachers are to be evaluated, for what purpose should this be done?" 92 percent replied that it was to assist in improving teacher competence.

Although the general aim and value of evaluation seem to be upheld by the results of the survey mentioned, a second study recently reported by Clear and Seager,⁵ indicates that teachers and principals disagree strongly on the influence a principal should try to exert upon a teacher to change his teaching techniques.

If this study can help bring the problems of teacher professionalism, employee orientation, methods of supervision and evaluation into sharper perspective, it will have served its purpose.

III Definition of Terms

There are three basic areas to be surveyed in this study:

1. Professional Orientation
2. Employee Orientation
- 3 Supervision
 - (a) Closeness of supervision
 - (b) An Evaluation Model

Professional Orientation

Within the past two decades there has been considerable improvement in the professional status of teachers. For example, there has been a notable increase in the minimum training required for becoming a teacher. The statistics in the British Columbia Public Schools Annual Report ⁶ illustrate that practising teachers with degrees in this province have increased from less than forty percent of the total in 1963, to approximately fifty-five percent in 1970. Corwin ⁷ outlines that not only have requirements increased, but also noteworthy is the fact that teachers are increasingly being prepared by major educational institutions rather than minor ones as in the past. Furthermore, there has been a steady increase in the professional unity of teachers as indicated by their steadily increasing membership in teachers' associations. ⁸ Findlay ⁹ noted teachers' drive toward professionalism and their increasing capability to exercise more control over situations related to the positions they hold. Campbell ¹⁰ discussed the growing competence of teachers and also the resentments growing out of paternalistic management practices. Redfern ¹¹ focused upon the shrinking authority base of the administrator resulting from the increased amount of formal and specialized training of the teaching staff. The principal is no longer the

best educated person in the building concerning all matters and the authority base of expertise is more broadly distributed.

If this information is contrasted with that from an early study by Carr-Saunders, then these findings are significant. Carr-Saunders claimed (under conditions which prevailed) that teachers had little or nothing in common with members of the recognized professions.¹²

Professional orientation as described by Corwin¹³ includes importance of clients, professional colleagues, competence based on knowledge, decision-making authority, and control over work.

Based upon Corwin's Professional Role Orientation Scale,¹⁴ other studies to investigate the extent of teacher professionalism have been made by Robinson¹⁵ and Hrynyk¹⁶. In each case the scale was adapted and extended to study differences in educators when they were scored on the professional role orientation scale.

In view of the findings of these previous studies, it was decided that an important variable of this study should be professional orientation.

Employee Orientation

The considerable discontent within the teaching profession regarding the demands of bureaucratic school organizations appears to have its origin in a number of sources. Campbell¹⁷ cites the influx of new teachers from union oriented blue-collar families as one reason. Solomon¹⁸ observes that in a bureaucracy the superior has the right to the last word because he is the superior, while in professional matters the last word goes to the person with the greater knowledge or the more convincing

logic. In a study by Fishburn,¹⁹ he too found basic differences when he asked high school teachers to list, in order of importance, six roles which they perform. He also asked administrators to list, in order of importance, the same roles and found the variations as listed below:

	<u>Teachers'</u> <u>Ranking</u>	<u>Administrators'</u> <u>Ranking</u>
Mediator of the culture	1	6
Member of the community	2	5
Director of learning	3	2
Guidance and counselling person	4	3
Liaison between school and community	5	1
Member of the profession	6	4

Fishburn concluded that:

...either administrators and teachers have remarkably different concepts of the role of the teacher or, in discussing these problems, they ascribe different meanings to their roles.

...In either case there seems to be a need for administrators and teachers to work more closely with one another before they find themselves working at cross-purposes.²⁰

Robinson noted in his discussion of the topic that:

In schools today, we have, existing side by side two inherently contradictory forces both of which are growing in importance. On the one hand, there is the bureaucratic demand for control expressing itself in hierarchical supervision, and on the other hand, there is the growing trend towards teachers developing professional role concepts.²¹

Accepting the premise that conflict does exist between the growing professionalism of teachers and the bureaucratic structure of school organizations, it is important to examine the employee orientation of teachers. To accomplish this purpose Corwin devised a scale to measure employee orientation within the

framework of: importance of administration, loyalty to organization, competence based on experience, interchangeability of personnel, stress on rules and procedures, and public orientation. In this study Corwin's²² scale is used to measure the employee orientation of teachers.

Supervision

The Dictionary of Education²³ defines supervision as:

...all efforts of designated school officials toward providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction; involves the stimulation and professional growth and development of teachers, a selection and revision of educational objectives, materials of instruction, and methods of teaching, and evaluation of instruction.

Davis further states that:

...where there is a supervisory principal, he is almost always the chief evaluator of his teachers.²⁴

Heald affirms the idea that evaluation is a part of supervision practice when he says that:

...of the many expectations held for supervisors, among the most common is the expectation that the supervisor will evaluate the work of the teacher.²⁵

In view of these supporting statements it appears reasonable to examine supervision, in this study, under the two sub-headings of closeness of supervision and evaluation.

Closeness of Supervision

In a study of the kinds of supervision employed, Brown²⁶ found the pupil-teacher rapport, warmth and understanding, and pupil-teacher interaction suffered from stress induced by the supervisor. The technical aspects of teaching were largely unaffected.

Stress had its greatest negative impact on the performance of teachers high in neuroticism and in scholastic aptitude. By contrast he found that improved performance followed stress induced in those teachers low in neuroticism and scholastic aptitude.

When Enns²⁷ studied supervision and teacher evaluation he found that principal behaviour which was perceived as highly directive and restrictive was correlated much more highly with teacher dissatisfaction. On the other hand, leadership behaviour which was perceived as exemplary and which was personally stimulative correlated much more highly with teacher satisfaction.

Most writers agree that the improvement of instruction should be the main focus of supervision. Eye and Netzer²⁸ assert that, although there is a dichotomy of functions between administration and supervision, supervision is nevertheless a phase of administration. Heald and Moore²⁹ further maintain that lay communities expect supervision to be done by administrators.

In a later description of supervision, Heald, states that:

...the goal of supervision is to improve instruction, and it would seem logical to expect that research would centre on the effects of various supervisory practices upon instruction.³⁰

That supervision by administrators does exist is undeniable, however, the manner in which it is carried out, as related to other aspects of this study, is of major concern to both teachers and principals.

An Evaluation Model

The concept of evaluation has changed over the years and will probably continue to change.³¹ In conjunction with the

growth of new ideas on evaluation of teachers, there has been definite indication by such writers as Corwin³², Flanders³³, Mitzel³⁴, and Robinson³⁵ that the growing professionalism of teachers must be accommodated more adequately than current practice indicates. Since most innovations in teaching practice today are directed toward the goal of allowing students to learn on a more individual basis rather than as class groups, it is necessary for administrators to be able to judge the effectiveness of these techniques fairly and objectively. If the evaluation process is performed without this consideration, the professional growth of teachers is curtailed by the very fact that their teaching position is placed in jeopardy unless the effectiveness of their teaching methods lies within the perception of evaluator. Stiles supports this idea when he states:

A careful study of the matter would seem to suggest that in many instances supervisory ratings are basically not efficiency ratings, but compatibility ratings.³⁶

Furthermore, Guba and Bidwell³⁷ found that the ratings of effectiveness which principals gave to their teachers were a function of the degree to which the principal perceives that the teacher conforms to his expectations of the teacher's role.

If the evaluation process is designed to be really effective in the improvement of instruction, then teachers and evaluators must have close consultation regarding the teacher's objectives and purposes, the characteristics of the students in a class, and the desired behavioural outcomes which can determine the effectiveness of the instruction given. In support of this idea Fatu maintains that:

If one wants only to make a decision, ratings may be sufficient. If one wants to provide inservice training and upgrading, ratings are not sufficient. It then becomes necessary to search for more explicit connections between attainment of objectives, teacher behaviours, characteristics and education. The process of joint inquiry involving both teachers and administrators, has much to recommend it. Administrators and teachers can help each other clarify their thinking and knowledge, and in the process both gain something in professional fulfillment.³⁸

When Curtin examined the problem of teacher evaluation he concluded:

...It is evident...that evaluation of teaching is vital if instructional improvement is to occur. It is precisely for this reason that evaluation through formal rating is not highly regarded. In our judgement, it is not sufficient, and it has a way of defeating its own purpose. What is favoured is a diversified approach that can come only through frequent and supportive contacts with teachers; contacts which actively encourage teachers to seek supervisory help and which work toward a solution of instructional problems. When such evaluations are made part of the process of supervision and not judgmental documents, evaluations will be more comprehensive, more positive, and more directional than other narrow approaches.³⁹

Morphet, Johns and Reller⁴⁰ also stressed the idea of improved instruction as the major purpose of evaluation: Their guidelines regarding evaluation are:

1. It should be cooperative, involving the teacher and the administrator.
2. It should provide for self-evaluation.
3. It should be carefully planned in light of a definition of the desired role of the teachers.
4. It should involve the collection of many data pertaining to the services rendered by the teacher.
5. It should be seen as a constructive effort, over a considerable period of time, to assist the teacher in improving his work.
6. It should draw upon wide resources of personnel and not be seen as a principal-teacher relationship only.

Each of the points mentioned, by these previously quoted writers on evaluation, have been brought into sharper focus by Brighton and Rose.⁴¹ Their publication lists concisely the characteristics which are encompassed in successful teacher evaluation programs. (See questionnaire items 63-71).

In order to determine whether or not such an evaluation plan will meet with approval or disapproval by those people actually involved with its implementation, it is necessary to include in the questionnaire items describing a comprehensive evaluation model.

This study is an attempt to determine what relationships exist between professional orientation, employee orientation, closeness of supervision, and attitude toward an evaluation model by teachers* in British Columbia schools.

IV Statement of the Problem

The central problem of this study is an investigation of the relationships existing between teachers' professionalism, their employer orientation, their attitude toward close supervision and an evaluation model. The problem arises from a situation where a teacher's status as an employee has been reinforced by a long tradition of local, lay control over educators. Added to this situation has been the growth of complex school systems which in turn have required more admin-

*This term refers to all certified teachers, vice-principals, and principals employed in the public schools of British Columbia as of April, 1971.

istrative control to maintain coordination. Concurrently, the growth of systematic knowledge in teaching and a definite sense of responsibility for students' welfare are characteristics which support a teacher's claim to professional growth. Within this context, a teacher's obligations as a professional person are in several respects in conflict with the role of the teacher as an employee of a school board of education.

This problem is compounded many times for the school principal. He is a locally appointed professional-employee who has, as one of his responsibilities, the task of supervising and evaluating a staff of professional-employees.

From these circumstances a number of questions arise: Do teachers differ in their degree of professionalism? Are some teachers able to reconcile their position as employees better than others? Which teachers accept and which ones reject the concept of close supervision? If evaluation is for the improvement of instruction, is there an acceptable model?

Beyond answers to these questions, an attempt is made to determine whether or not other selected criteria are influential in determining the types of relationships existing among the main areas of this study. Included in the background variables taken into consideration, when classifying teachers, are sex, marital status, present position, teaching level, academic and professional training, age, the number of school districts each has taught in, the number of years in their present school, and the length of teaching experience. When examining the main problem of this study, it was determined that an exploration of

how and why these selected criteria are related to professional orientation, employee orientation, supervision and evaluation would be enlightening.

V Hypotheses

From the foregoing background it was determined to test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1

Teachers' total professional scores show a positive correlation with scores on the employee orientation scale.

Hypothesis 2

Teachers' total professional scores show a negative correlation with scores on the closeness of supervision scale.

Hypothesis 3

Teachers' total professional scores show a positive correlation with scores on the evaluation model.

Hypothesis 4

Teachers' total scores on the employee orientation scale show a positive correlation with scores on the closeness of supervision scale.

Hypothesis 5

Teachers' total scores on the employee orientation scale show a negative correlation with scores on the evaluation model.

Hypothesis 6

Teachers' total scores on the closeness of supervision scale show a negative correlation with scores on the evaluation model.

VI Overview of the Remainder of the Study

In the first chapter the problem is stated and arguments are advanced to suggest the importance of the study. The terms are defined and a statement of the problem with questions following from this statement are proposed. From these questions the hypotheses to be tested were determined. Chapter II is devoted to a review of the literature and previous research related to this study followed by a summary and a rationale for this study. Chapter III will outline the research methodology and data collection employed in the study. Chapter IV will be devoted to reporting, analysis and discussion of the findings concerning professional orientation, employee orientation, closeness of supervision and an evaluation model. Chapter IV will also report, analyze and discuss how the findings of the four scales are affected by the selected background criteria. The last chapter will be devoted to the summary, conclusions and implications of this study.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER I

1. Corwin, R.G., "Professional Persons in Public Organizations", Educational Administration Quarterly, 1, (Autumn, 1965), p. 4.
2. McEwan, W.J., "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1, (September, 1956), pp. 208-224.
3. Argyris, C., "The Individual and the Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustments", Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, (June 1, 1957), pp. 1-24.
4. _____, "Evaluation of Teaching Competence," NEA Research Bulletin October, 1969), J.E. Heald et al., (ed.), Selected Readings on General Supervision, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1970), pp. 292-302.
5. Clear, D.K., and Seager, R.C., "The Legitimacy of Administrative Influence as Perceived by Selected Groups," Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, (Winter, 1971), pp. 46-63.
6. Superintendent of Education, Ninety-ninth Annual Report of the Public Schools of British Columbia, (Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1971), p. 15.
7. Corwin, R.G., A Sociology of Education, (New York, Appeton-Century-Crofts, 1965), p. 223.
8. Ibid., p. 224.
9. Findley, D., "The Secondary Principal: Evaluation and Supervision", Contemporary Education XXXIX, (May, 1968), pp. 276-277.
10. Campbell, R.F., "The Changing Role of the Superintendent," Contemporary Education, XXXIX, (May, 1968), pp. 249-254.
11. Redfern, G.B., "Negotiation Changes Principal-Teacher Relationships", National Elementary Principal, XLVII, (April, 1968), pp. 20-25.
12. Carr-Saunders, A.M. and Wilson, P.A., The Professions, (London, Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1964), p. 259.
13. Corwin, op. cit., reference 1.
14. Corwin, R.G., The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1964).

15. Robinson, N., "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organization," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
16. Hrynyk, N.P., "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
17. Campbell, op. cit., pp. 249-254.
18. Solomon, D.N., "Professional Persons in Bureaucratic Organizations", Symposium on Preventive and Social Psychiatry, (Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958), pp. 253-266.
19. Fishburn, C.E., "Teacher Role Perception in the Secondary Schools", N.L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, (Chicago, Rand McNally & Co., 1965), Ch. 10.
20. Ibid., p. 450.
21. Robinson, N., "Principal and Teacher Supervisory Relationships: Problems and Perspectives", The Alberta School Principal, 1965, p. 57.
22. Corwin, op. cit. reference 14.
23. Good, C.V., (ed.) Dictionary of Education, (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1945), p. 495.
24. Davis, H., "Evaluation of Current Practices in Evaluating Teacher Competence", B.J. Biddle and W.J. Ellena (ed.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964). pp. 41-66.
25. Heald, J.E., "Supervision", C.W. Harris (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th Edition, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1969), p. 1396.
26. Brown, A.F. "Exploring the Human Element in Supervision", Toronto, Canadian Education and Research Digest (June 1962) pp. 178-184.
27. Enns, F., "Rating Teacher Effectiveness: The Function of the Principal", Educational Administration, (March, 1965) pp. 81-95.
28. Eye, G.G. and Netzer, L., Supervision of Instruction, (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1965), p. 400.

29. Heald, J.E. and Moore, S.A., The Teacher and Administrative Relations in School Systems, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 304.
30. Heald, op. cit., reference 25, p. 1394.
31. Guba, E. and Bidwell, C., Administrative Relationships, (Chicago, Midwest Administrative Center, University of Chicago, 1957)
32. Corwin, op. cit., reference 1.
33. Flanders, N.A., "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement", B.J. Biddle and W.J. Ellena (ed.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 224.
34. Mitzel, H.E., "Teacher Effectiveness", C.W. Harris (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3rd ed., (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1960), pp. 1451-64.
35. Robinson, op. cit., reference 21, p. 57.
36. Stiles, L.J. et al., Teacher Education in the United States, (New York, Ronald Publishing Co., 1960). p. 150.
37. Guba and Bidwell, op. cit., p. 14.
38. Fattu, N.A., "Research on Teacher Evaluation, " J.E. Heald et al., (ed.), Selected Readings in General Supervision, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1970), p. 291.
39. Curtin, J., Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1964) p. 251.
40. Morphet, E.L. et al, Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959) p. 354.
41. Brighton, S. and Rose, G., Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965) p. 36.

CHAPTER II

Review of The Literature and Rationale For This Study

Literature Pertaining to Professional Orientation

A mature profession is an organized work group that has legal monopoly to establish procedures for recruiting and policing members and for maximizing control over a body of theoretical knowledge and applying it to the solution of social problems.¹

Kornhauser² in his description identifies four criteria of a profession: specialized competence having an intellectual component; extensive autonomy in exercising this special competence; strong commitment to a career based on a special competence. Goode³ reduced the term to two dimensions which include training in a body of abstract knowledge which is prolonged and specialized enough that a monopoly can be obtained, and a collectivity with a service association.

Colombotos⁴ went beyond description and examined how the social backgrounds of teachers are associated with their professional orientations using an "index of professionalism" based on the teacher's emphasis on technical competence, autonomy, and the service ideal. He found that the more professional teachers come from higher social class backgrounds, and that academic males are more professional than men teaching in nonacademic areas. He also found that teachers' professionalism correlated with the school's professional "climate".

When Robinson⁵ studied teacher professionalism in schools

he administered an adapted form, of the Professional Role Orientation Scale developed by Corwin⁶, to teachers and principals in 29 schools randomly selected from all British Columbia schools having ten or more teachers. He found there was not a significant over-all difference between schools in staff professionalism, but there was an indication that certain schools more frequently attract and retain professionally oriented teachers. Teachers with a university degree collectively exhibit more professionalism than those without degrees. He also found that married teachers had higher professional scores than single personnel and that female married teachers as a group had the highest scores.

Hrynyk⁷ modified, adapted, and extended Corwin's scale to include five dimensions; namely knowledge, service, organization, colleague and autonomy subscales. It was on the basis of the consensus expressed by some twenty-three writers that Hrynyk proposed a model for the "ideal profession" based on these five dimensions. He found no basic contradictions involved in their definitions of professionalism. Only minor variations were observable in what was stressed, included or omitted.⁸ His study indicated that principals and vice-principals scored higher than classroom teachers on the dimensions of knowledge, service, organization, and colleague orientation but lower on the student-autonomy subscale.

From the literature reviewed, there seem to be adequate indications that professionalism in teaching has been defined and, furthermore a teacher's professional orientation can be measured on the scale developed by Corwin and revised by Hrynyk.

Literature Pertaining to Employee Orientation

One of the major characteristics of a good employee is his willingness to suspend his own judgment and follow the directives of superiors, whose primary claims to authority are the official positions they hold.⁹ According to Gouldner¹⁰, in bureaucracies, specialists of distinction are evaluated by administrators who may or may not be fully skilled and knowledgeable in new procedures and developments in a particular field. However, it should be acknowledged as Corwin¹¹ points out that many people believe that there is a general set of teaching principles which can be applied regardless of field specialization. By contrast, others feel that competence to teach depends more upon knowledge and procedures specific to the subject matter being taught. It is this latter situation that produces strain between specialized teachers and the administrators who evaluate them.

Professional-employee role conflicts have been identified by a number of writers in a variety of public organizations. Brown¹², found that professional employees in a government laboratory resisted rules made for them by persons outside the professional group. McEwan¹³ noted that the incongruities, between the professional researchers and the bureaucratic roles of military persons, stemmed from the fact that the professional research person's self-concept, as an individual capable of critical ability and original thought, could only be superficially followed in the structure of a military organization. He felt that standardization and subordination by rank are incongruent with the need for creative thinking and equality

relations which are necessary among professionals.

Sorenson¹⁴ developed scales modeled after Corwin's for the measurement of professional and employee role concepts among accountants employed in twenty-four offices of four national accounting firms. He found direct increases in bureaucratic orientations and decreases in professional orientations followed with rank from junior member to senior partner in the firm. Less experienced persons in lower positions felt there was too much bureaucracy, while more experienced people in higher positions felt that there was too little. In Corwin's study of employee orientation he found that a strong employee orientation seems to have its greatest effect on the reduction of conflict in the most professionally oriented schools.¹⁵

That employee orientation is a factor, in the role conflict of professional employees, has been demonstrated from previous research in this area. Corwin's Employee Orientation Scale has been designed and validated to give a measurement of this dimension within the teaching profession, and will be used in this study to measure the employee orientation of teachers in British Columbia schools.

Literature Pertaining to Supervision

In a survey of principals, Rose found they repeatedly said that:

...the effects of supervision and evaluation on teachers can be constructive, that most teachers will accept the process, and that teacher-principal rapport will be good when the appropriate combination of circumstances obtain.¹⁶

Writers such as Harris¹⁷, Curtin¹⁸, Crosby¹⁹, and Heald²⁰ all

state that the fundamental role of supervision is to bring about improved instruction. The conclusions from Trask's²¹ study indicate that many principals are not taking advantage of their position regarding supervision. They have arrived at this position because teachers' desire for professional autonomy tends to lead to a rejection of the classroom visitation as unprofessional. However, according to Erickson, teachers tend to be ambivalent about supervision.

It is possible, for example, that teachers sometimes deny the competency of the principal to rate their performance for tenure purposes and simultaneously crave his recognition for a job well done. In difficult neighbourhoods, some teachers may both demand the administrator's help with classroom control and resent his suggestions concerning their instructional methods.²²

In an experimental study, Brown²³ examined the effects of negative criticism of teaching performance upon a sample of seventy-eight practice teachers. He found that pupil-teacher interaction, warmth and understanding, and pupil-teacher rapport suffer when stress was introduced by the supervisor. This stress had its greatest negative impact on the performance of teachers high in neuroticism and in scholastic aptitude. Improved performance followed when stress was induced in the one quarter of the group who were low in neuroticism and scholastic aptitude. When Kong and McMurray²⁴ studied teacher reactions to communications advocating teaching method innovations their conclusions were as follows: (1) teachers should be prepared for innovations by having them become aware of their problems, (2) personal contacts, rather than written communications, should be used, (3) the needs of teachers should be

determined before changes are planned, and (4) anyone in a supervisory position should recognize that changes in teaching method are likely to meet resistance because of a high degree of ego involvement.

Ziolkowski²⁵ attempted to determine which supervisory practices differentiated between high schools classified as being superior or inferior. He found that the use of staff meetings which focused on classroom teaching problems and hard-working, considerate behaviour by principals was emphasized more in the superior schools. Another conclusion from his study indicated that classroom visitation and demonstration lessons were being almost completely neglected. By contrast, a longitudinal study by Egnatoff²⁶ found that, in the same province, during the period 1954-65 an increase occurred in the emphasis placed on the supervisory aspects of the principal's role.

In a survey of teacher attitudes toward supervisory personnel in Quebec schools, Young²⁷ found those characteristics which teachers disliked most included such items as: not helpful, no constructive criticism, interrupts lessons, officious superior attitude, critical of the teacher in front of the class, petty (fussy about minor details) and arrives unexpectedly. In other words, negative criticism and negative behaviour on the part of any supervisory personnel resulted in negative reactions on the part of teachers.

It appears evident from the literature regarding supervision that it is not the existence of supervision which causes the

greatest problems, but instead, the manner in which it is sometimes practised.

In order to gain some measure of teacher attitude toward close supervision techniques, the items included in this study were selected from Gross²⁸ Principal Role Questionnaire. The particular items selected coincide closely with those items from Young's²⁹ study which evoked a negative reply by teachers. These items are also similar to Hamilton's³⁰ description of "autocratic inspection".

The purpose for inclusion, of these items in this study, is to determine how professional teachers regard close supervision.

Literature Pertaining to an Evaluation Model

When examining those attributes which teachers themselves consider to be worthwhile goals and objectives of evaluation, the results of some previous surveys are enlightening. Some idea of teacher reaction to evaluation practices can be gained by studying Young's³¹ Survey of Teacher's Attitudes Toward Certain Aspects of their Profession. His surveys were conducted between 1957 and 1963 (inclusive) among teachers attending summer school at Macdonald College of McGill University. Although evaluation as such is not mentioned in his survey, it would seem fair to conclude, that very high on the list of teacher expectations, from administrators in evaluative positions, they rank helpfulness and constructive criticism as very important. In addition, the evaluator must be one who possesses good facility in the area of human relations.

In their studies, Abbott and Bradfield³² found that teachers classified the informal individual conference very high in the evaluative process. In addition to this information, Cornell³³ found that teachers wish to share in policy decisions. Those most adversely affected, by lack of opportunity to participate in decision-making, are those who are above average in professional attitude on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, and that teacher satisfaction with participation in administrative decision-making is positively related to teacher classroom performance.

The foregoing descriptions suggest strongly that administrators have decided upon a criteria for evaluative judgments, but teachers would be more satisfied with the practices if they were involved in planning the evaluation procedures.

Traditionally, the performance of the teacher has been central in the evaluation of instruction. Corwin explains the rationale of this situation when he states:

Employees are evaluated for their efficiency in performing given tasks and have no particular responsibility for the total product; professionals, on the other hand, are evaluated for their service to clients and do have responsibility for the over-all objectives....Within the limit of his competence, a professional is responsible for any facet of a client's life that has a bearing upon the outcomes of his administration. Yet, as schools have become specialized, fewer teachers know the whole student. The problem, which is greater for the higher grades, makes it difficult to hold individuals responsible for the total development or failure of students as persons. It is easier to evaluate a teacher's specific teaching procedure, his or her ability to cover material, maintain discipline, and operate a smoothly run and efficient classroom, than to assess his impact on his students' character development.³⁴

Competence of practising teachers has been regarded as one or more abilities of the teacher to produce certain educational effects. Many abilities, properties, or traits such as intelligence, age, length of education, scholarship and professional attitude have been the subject for research studies. Undoubtedly, good teachers possess many of these traits, properties, or abilities in good measure; none, however, has been identified as indispensable. No single ability or group of abilities correlates significantly with a criterion of competence.³⁵ When considering teacher evaluation, Bryne³⁶ indicates two factors which must be considered; the actual effectiveness of the teacher and the expectations of the administrator making the evaluation. Too often, it has been the assumption that the possession of certain personal and professional qualities will result in good instruction, regardless of the classroom setting. If teaching, however, is a social process, and the school is a social system, then the classroom becomes a sub-system of the total school. Some characteristics of the smaller unit will resemble those of the school itself. Others will be created by the variety of social interrelationships which make that classroom a unique society. Furthermore, it must be realized, if each school is distinctively unique as suggested by Halpin and Croft³⁷, then the organizational climate of the school will undoubtedly influence the classroom climate, providing the teacher with either support or lack of support. Pursuing further the premise that each classroom is unique, it is possible for a teacher to be judged competent in

one situation and by the same criteria be considerably less effective in another organization setting. The qualities and abilities which produce effectiveness with students from a middle class neighbourhood, do not necessarily create success with a group of culturally deprived youngsters.

The concept that teacher evaluations can be influenced by the expectations of the evaluator also receives support. Rosencranz and Biddle³⁸ found that there are significant differences in the roles held for the teacher and about the outcomes of teacher behaviour, by teachers, parents, and school board members. If the administrator who evaluates a teacher is greatly influenced by his perceived local expectations, then teacher competence will be viewed from this perspective. Brown supports this concept when he states:

...the effective-rated teacher to the system-centred principal is quite different from the effective rated teacher perceived by the individual centred principal.³⁹

It is evident that the problem of teacher evaluation is extremely complex and even beyond reasonable solution. Rose, however, points out two important reasons why it must be pursued:

- (1) It fits within the larger context of an evaluation of the total school operation to which the public is entitled. The public employs professionally trained individuals to run its schools. It is entitled to and should demand an accounting of their efforts. The public should know what goals are being sought by schools and to what extent these goals are being reached. It is impossible to render a true and complete account without evaluating the teaching and its effects.

- (2) Teaching must be evaluated so it can improve and reach its potential. ...A profession must be analytical about its own quality, and self-correcting in terms of both the present and future members and their practices. A group which does this only in terms of upgrading certification and degree requirements is dealing with only a part of the problem.⁴⁰

To achieve these aims successfully, both Rose⁴¹ and Andrews⁴² place the school principal at the centre of this responsibility. Only when he functions as a leader, assisting teachers to more closely realize their own potential, does he truly fulfill the obligations of his position. To meet this objective a workable plan must be devised. As referred to earlier, such writers as Fatu⁴³, Curtin⁴⁴, Morphet⁴⁵, and Rose⁴⁶ have each devised plans for a successful teacher evaluation program. Brighton⁴⁷ encompassed the strengths of these ideas into one scheme. It is one of the purposes of this study to determine the reaction of teachers and principals to the "Evaluation Model" delineated below:

- (1) Involve teachers in the design and development of the evaluation program.
- (2) Define the educational goals and teaching as they apply to each specific school.
- (3) Schedule the evaluation cycle.
- (4) Provide time and training for evaluators to perform observations and interviews properly.
- (5) Evaluate on the basis of classroom performance of teachers.

(6) Anticipate problems and provide for resolving of any possible disagreements between teachers and evaluators.

(7) Evaluate the evaluation process periodically.*

Summary and a Rationale for this Study

If the main premise, for the supervision and evaluation of teachers, rests upon the goal of improved instruction, then the school principal, as a central figure in this process, must pursue this objective in an enlightened manner. From the literature reviewed, it appears there is a trend toward a higher degree of professionalism among teachers. At the same time the advance of bureaucratic organization within complex school districts cannot be denied. The problem of reconciling these two major trends can be viewed pessimistically. However, if this problem is seen as not just one of professionalism versus bureaucracy, but rather as just a special case of the real problem of bureaucracy versus humanization, then the perspective is different.

One of the main areas, where close human relations are vital to its success, is that of supervision and evaluation of teachers. If the results of this study are able to assist teachers and school principals in the solution of this aspect of the larger total problem, it will have served its purpose.

*The writer's adaptation of Brighton's model based on other research discussed above.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER II

1. Corwin, R.G., Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools. (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 43.
2. Kornhauser, W., Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodations, (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1962), p. 8.
3. Goode, W., "The Librarian: From Occupation to Profession?" Library Quarterly 31, (October, 1961), p. 306-320.
4. Corwin, op. cit., reference 1, p. 50.
5. Robinson, N., "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organization," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
6. Corwin, R.G., The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1964).
7. Hrynyk, N.P., "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
8. Hrynyk, op. cit., p. 21.
9. Parsons, T., "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organization", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1, (September 1956), pp. 54-63.
10. Gouldner, A.W., "Organizational Tensions", R. Merton (ed.), Sociology Today, (New York, Basic Books, 1959), pp. 400-428.
11. Corwin, op. cit., reference 1, p. 58.
12. Ibid., p. 59.
13. McEwan, W.J., "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1, (September, 1956), pp. 208-224.
14. Sorenson, J.E., "Professional and Bureaucratic Organizations in Large Public Accounting Firms", (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1965).
15. Corwin, op. cit., reference 1, p. 303.

16. Rose, G.W., "The Effects of Administrators Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 2, (November, 1963), p. 51.
17. Harris, B., Supervisory Behaviour in Education, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 577.
18. Curtin, J., The Teacher and Administrative Relations in School Systems, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 302.
19. Crosby, M., Supervision as a Cooperative Action. (New York, Appleton-Century-crofts, 1957), p. 334.
20. Heald, op. cit., reference 18.
21. Trask, A.E., "Principals, Teachers, and Supervision: Dilemmas and Solutions", Administrators Notebook, (December, 1954).
22. Erickson, D.A., "Some Misgivings Concerning a Study of Leadership", Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, Autumn, 1965).
23. Brown, A.F., "Exploring the Human Element in Supervision", Toronto, Canadian Education and Research Digest (June 1962) pp. 178-184).
24. Kong, S.L and McMurray, J.G., "Teacher Reactions to a Communication Advocating Educational Change", Canadian Education and Research Digest, (December, 1965), pp. 285-296.
25. Ziolkowski, E.H., "Practices in the Supervision of Instruction", The Canadian Administrator, (October, 1965).
26. Egnatoff, J.G., "The Changing Status of Saskatchewan's School Principals", Canadian Education and Research Digest, (December, 1968) pp. 354-65.
27. Young, J.E.M., "A Survey of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Certain Aspects of Their Profession", Canadian Education and Research Digest, 2, (June 1957), pp. 112-129.
28. Gross, N. and Druben, R., The Role Behavior of School Principals, Cambridge, Harvard University, 1965).
29. Young, op. cit., reference 27.
30. Hamilton, W.L., "An Analysis of North American Ideas on School Supervision", The Council on School Administration Bulletin, 3, (April, 1966), pp. 3-29.
31. Young, op. cit., reference 27.

32. Wiles, K., "Supervision", C.W. Harris (ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3rd Edition, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1960), p. 1445.
33. Ibid., p. 1445.
34. Corwin, op. cit., reference 1, p. 58.
35. Byrne, T.C., "Evaluation: Is Your Infallability Showing?", Canadian Education and Research Digest, 4, (December, 1965), pp. 297-308.
36. Ibid., p. 297-308.
37. Halpin, A.W. and Croft, D.B., The Organizational Climate of Schools, (Chicago, The Midwest Center, University of Chicago, 1963).
38. Biddle, B.J., and Ellena, W.J., (ed.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), Ch. 8.
39. Heald, J.E., et al., (ed.), Selected Readings in General Supervision, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1970), p. 103.
40. Rose, G.W., "Performance Evaluation and Growth in Teaching", Phi Delta Kappan, (October, 1963). p. 53.
41. Ibid., p. 53.
42. Andrews, J.H.M., "The Principal - A Unique Supervisor", A.W. Reeves et al (eds.), The Canadian School Principal, (Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1962).
43. Fatu, N.A., "Research on Teacher Evaluation," J.E. Heald et al., (ed.), Selected Readings in General Supervision, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1970), p. 291.
44. Curtin, J., Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 251.
45. Morphet, E.L., Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959) p. 354.
46. Rose, op. cit., reference 16.
47. Brighton, G. and Rose, G., Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 36.

CHAPTER III

Research Methodology and Data Collection

I Data Required

The following data were obtained:

- 1) Teacher identification
 - personal background
 - educational background
- 2) Scores of teachers on the Professional Orientation Scale
- 3) Scores of teachers on the Employee Orientation Scale
- 4) Scores of teachers on the Closeness of Supervision Scale
- 5) Scores of teachers on the Evaluation Model Scale

All information was incorporated into an omnibus questionnaire. The instruments used to measure professional orientation, employee orientation, and closeness of supervision were reviewed with respect to reliability and validity of the instruments. The evaluation model was based on the items outlined by, Curtin, Fatu, Morphet, Rose and Brighton.

II Instrumentation

Personal Data

This section of the questionnaire was constructed to gain the following information on each teacher: age, sex, marital status, present position, teaching level, academic and professional training, number of school districts taught in since starting to teach, length of time in present school, years of teaching experience, and commitment to teaching. The information

gained from this section will not be used to test the main hypotheses, but will be useful in the analysis of sub-groups.

Instrument on Professional Orientation

The Professional Role Orientation Scale used in this study was first devised by Corwin¹. He found that teachers differed in their degree of professional role orientation. Hrynyk² proposed a model for the "ideal profession" based on the dimensions of (1) knowledge, (2) service, (3) core-organization, (4) colleague-profession, and (5) client-autonomy.³ The results of Hrynyk's study confirmed the reliability and validity of the Professional Role Orientation Scale. No major changes were made in Hrynyk's instrument, to measure the professional orientation of teachers, with the exception of the modification of terms or phraseology which it was considered might be unfamiliar to British Columbia teachers.

Instrument on Employee Orientation

These questions were selected from Corwin's Employee Orientation Scale.⁴ The total employee orientation scale possessed a $r_n \approx .84$ on the corrected split half reliability of the scale and subscale items. The sub-scales used in this study are (1) administrative orientation, (2) loyalty to the organization, and (3) rules and procedure orientation. No changes were made to the sub-scales selected from Corwin's scale.

Instrument on Closeness of Supervision

These items were selected from Gross' Principal Role Questionnaire.⁵ The validity and reliability of these items were verified by Gross, Herriott and McEachern in their study of The Role Behavior of School Principals. No changes were

made to the items selected from Gross' scale.

Instrument on An Evaluation Model

The items included in this scale are a composite of the evaluation plans devised by Curtin⁶, Fatu⁷, Morphet⁸, and Rose⁹. Brighton¹⁰ encompassed the strengths of these ideas into one scheme. On the basis of this latter plan, the "Evaluation Model" was devised and included in the questionnaire.

Scoring of the total questionnaire

Following the procedures described in this chapter and in order to test the hypotheses in Chapter 1, an ombibus questionnaire was prepared and sent to all the survey sample members. The questionnaire incorporated into one instrument the various measuring devices described previously and the items were classified as follows:

- A. Personal background variables
Items 1, 2, 3, 10
- B. Educational background variables
Items 4,5,6,7,8,9
- C. Professional Orientation
Items 11 - 40 (inclusive)
- D. Employee Orientation
Items 41 - 55 (inclusive)
- E. Closeness of Supervision
Items 56 - 62 (inclusive)
- F. Evaluation Model
Items 63 - 71 (inclusive)

(See Appendix A)

Scoring of the total questionnaire

The questionnaires were scored by assigning values from one (for expressions perceiving the least positive reaction)

to five (for the most positive reaction) on each of the sixty-one items. These sixty-one five-point Likert-type items applied to the four areas of professional orientation, employee orientation, closeness of supervision and the evaluation model. On the thirty items dealing with the professional orientation scale the scores could range from 30 to 150. On the fifteen employee orientation items, the scores could range from 15 to 75. On the seven items on closeness of supervision a score from 7 to 35 was possible while scores the evaluation model could range from 9 to 45.

III The Population and Sample

The Population

The population for study consisted of regular certified teachers employed in the public schools of British Columbia in April, 1971. At that time, membership in the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, was an automatic condition of employment, therefore, authorization was sought and obtained from the Office of the General Secretary of the B.C. Teachers' Federation to gain access to their complete alphabetical file of all active teachers in the public schools of the province. (see appendix C)

The Sample

The sample of teachers was chosen on a quasi-random basis from the approximately twenty-three thousand active teachers in British Columbia. The method employed was that advocated by Moser¹¹ and Kish¹². It is achieved by calculating the

desired number needed for the sample where $k = N/n$ and every k^{th} teacher is selected throughout the alphabetical listing after starting with a randomly chosen number between 1 and k inclusive.* The seven hundred and fifty teachers selected had a k of 29. A random number of less than 30 was chosen to represent the first sample number. This random number was seventeen, consequently the second number was forty-six ($17 + 29$) and then seventy-five ($46 + 29$) until 755 selections were made from the population of approximately twenty-three thousand.

IV Collection of Data

A covering letter and a questionnaire was mailed to each of the seven hundred fifty-five teachers in the sample chosen for this study. A stamped, addressed envelope was included for convenience of return. Ten days later a follow-up postcard was sent to all teachers in the sample. (See appendix C)

A total of 524 questionnaires were returned (70 per cent). Fifty-three of these were incomplete and twenty-eight were returned too late for use as they arrived after the data had been analyzed. It was therefore possible to use 443 (59 per cent) returns in this study. The returns used were checked for relative proportion with the statistical tables published by the British Columbia Department of Education¹³. It was found that the sample numbers corresponded closely with the actual

* k = the interval; N = the population; n = the sample population.

number of teachers according to certification and also in relation to the number teaching at primary, intermediate, junior secondary and senior secondary levels.

Treatment of Incomplete Questionnaires

Upon return of the questionnaires, they were inspected for incomplete responses. Questionnaires with more than five items not completed were considered unusable and discarded. In cases where fewer than five item responses were missing, the median response to that item was assigned.

Computer Analysis

The responses on each acceptable questionnaire were transferred to Fortran Coding Sheets and then key punched and verified on IBM cards.

A computer program was written to give the following analyses of the data:

- 1) Intercorrelation matrices for the fourteen variables in the study. (Probability levels were one-tailed because a positive or negative prediction had been made on each hypothesis).
- 2) Intercorrelation matrices for the sub-groups in the personal and educational background variables. (Probability levels were one-tailed for the same reason as above).
- 3) In order to solve the problem of the variability of scores on each of the scales used in the questionnaire (each scale had a different possible total), the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was

calculated to show the relationship between each of the variables used.

...The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is simply a measure of the slope after the X and Y scores have been transformed to Z scores (standard scores).¹⁴

Computational formula (using raw scores)

$$r = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

- 4) The values of the correlation coefficients obtained in this study were tested at the .01 level of significance. The tables used for this purpose are found in Popham.¹⁵

...the notion of statistical significance for r is, sensibly enough, tied to the size of the sample. Since a larger sample will provide a more representative index of the nature of a relationship, smaller values of r become statistically significant as the size of the sample increases.¹⁶

As an example when a t-test is applied to the correlation between professional orientation scores and evaluation model scores for single teachers, the correlation is significant at the .01 level.

(Summary Table III)

$$t = r \sqrt{\frac{N-2}{1-r^2}} = .288 \sqrt{\frac{68-2}{1-.0829}}$$

$$= .288 \times 8.49 = 2.445$$

From the table, 2.390 is required for .01 level of significance on a one-tailed test.¹⁷

The program for the analysis of the data was written by Angelique Kopp of Simon Fraser University, under the supervision of Misa Gratton, Program Consultant, of Simon Fraser University Computing Centre.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER III

1. Corwin, R.G., The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1964).
2. Hrynyk, N.P., "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
3. Ibid., pp. 22-25.
4. Corwin, op. cit., reference 1, Appendix II e.
5. Gross, N., and Druben, R., The Role Behavior of School Principals, (Cambridge, Harvard University, 1965).
6. Curtin, J., Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1964), p. 251.
7. Fatu, N.A., "Research on Teacher Evaluation," J.E. Heald et al., (ed.), Selected Readings in General Supervision, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1970), p. 291.
8. Morphet, E.L., Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 354.
9. Rose, G., "The Effects of Administrators Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 2, (November, 1963), p. 51.
10. Brighton, S., Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 36.
11. Moser, C.A., Survey Methods in Social Investigation, (London, William Heinemann, 1958), p. 76.
12. Kish, L., Survey Sampling, (New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1965), pp. 113-122.
13. Superintendent of Education, Ninety-ninth Annual Report of the Public schools of British Columbia, (Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1971), p. 16.
14. Schoeninger, D.W., and Insko, C.A., Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 71.
15. Popham, W.J., Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation, (New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1967), p. 398.
16. Ibid., p. 76.
17. Ibid., p. 398.

CHAPTER IV

Results, Analysis, and Discussion of Hypotheses

I Analysis of Relationships Between Professional Orientation and Employee Orientation

Results: The first problem to be investigated was an attempt to determine the relationship between total scores by British Columbia teachers on the professional orientation and employee orientation scales. This problem was formally stated as Hypothesis I: teachers' total professional scores show a positive correlation with scores on the employee orientation scale.

The results of a Pearson Product Moment correlation between total professional orientation scores and employee orientation scores show a correlation coefficient of .174 on the total population (Table I). This figure is actually statistically significant beyond the .01 level. This difference was found when the sample was subdivided into male and female subsamples. The correlation between scores for each group is significant at the .01 level.

Although a great deal has been said in recent years regarding the difference between the attitudes of people over age thirty and under that age, Table II shows similar significance for the correlation coefficients for both age groups of teachers.

When examined on the basis of marital status it is interesting to

TABLE I

CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF SEX

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Male	221	.155*
Female	222	.200*
Total	443	.174*

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE II
CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF AGE

Age	Number	Correlation Coefficient
30 + under	173	.193*
31 + over	270	.143*

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE III
CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF MARITAL STATUS.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Single	68	.215
Married	340	.160*
Other	35	.243

*Significant at the .01 level.

note (Table III) that only married teachers show a significant correlation between professional orientation and employee orientation. Although the relationship is stronger for the other two groups, the number in each of these sub samples was too small for the correlation to be significantly different from zero. Since there is a distinct correlation between age and employee orientation (TABLE XX), these results are not surprising. This observation is also consistent with the results of previous research. Corwin¹ noted that younger teachers had lower employee orientations than did older members. (note also the correlation between age and marital status, Appendix A).

Discussion: The Professional Role Orientation Scale used in this study was designed to measure an individual's attitude toward the five professional dimensions of knowledge, service, core-organization, colleague-profession, and client-autonomy. The Employee Orientation Scale measured a teacher's orientation to rules and procedure, administration, and loyalty to the organization. Since the characteristics measured, in these two scales, are in many ways a contradiction to one another, it would be presumed that a negative and not a positive correlation should exist between the two. It must be noted, however, that Moeller² found that teachers frequently prefer standardized systems because they reduce particularism and increase predictability. Therefore, teachers demand rules, especially in dealing with other groups. Another aspect is noted by Peabody³ when he found that although elementary teachers attached considerable

importance to the professional basis for their authority, they typically acquiesced to authority of administrative position when conflict arose.

As predicted in this study, there was a significant positive relationship between professional orientation and employee orientation. Hypothesis I was supported. This significant trend will be given further examination in Chapter V.

II Analysis of Relationships Between Professional Orientation and Closeness of Supervision.

Results: The second problem to be investigated was an attempt to determine the relationship between the total scores of teachers on the professional orientation scale and their total scores on the closeness of supervision scale. This problem was formally stated as Hypothesis 2: teachers' total professional scores show a negative correlation with scores on the closeness of supervision scale.

The results of a Pearson Product Moment correlation between these two areas are shown in Tables IV, V, and VI. It was predicted that a negative correlation would exist between professional orientation and closeness of supervision. However, as it can be seen from Table IV, when examined on the basis of sex, there is a positive relationship significant at the .01 level. If examined on the basis of age there is a slight variation between those under thirty and those over that age. The correlation coefficient of the older group, while not significant at the .01 level, falls short of significance by

only a few points. It is only when the population is examined on the basis of marital status that a difference exists. The married teachers show a significant positive correlation between professional orientation and closeness of supervision (Table VI), whereas single teachers show a tendency to support the negative correlation predicted in the second hypothesis.

Discussion: Hypothesis two was not supported. This finding would indicate that not all aspects of classroom supervision are rejected by teachers. When Enns⁴ studied supervision of teachers, he found that principal behaviour which was perceived as highly directive and restrictive was correlated with teacher dissatisfaction. Furthermore, Trask's⁵ assertion that principals in many instances have abandoned classroom visitations, on the basis that teachers reject this behaviour as unprofessional, lends additional support to the predicted negative correlation of hypothesis two. Upon examination of the individual items on the closeness of supervision scale it becomes evident why teachers do not reject all aspects of close supervision. As illustrated in Table VI A, there are certain phases of close supervision such as assistance to teachers experiencing difficulty, which teachers in this sample did not reject. Furthermore, it can be seen from Table VI B that only those acts of supervision, such as unexpected evaluations, which could be interpreted as punitive, were rejected by the majority of teachers. Although examination of the tables in Appendix A will show that principals and vice-principals teaching half time or more, intermediate grade teachers, and those teachers with a B.Ed.

TABLE IV
 CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
 WITH CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
 EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF SEX.

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Male	221	.143*
Female	222	.170*
Total	443	.154*

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE V
CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF AGE.

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
30 + under	173	.186*
31 + over	270	.120

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE VI
CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF MARITAL STATUS.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Single	68	-.026
Married	340	.199*
Other	35	.038

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE VI A

<u>Scale Items</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Sample Responding to Each Alternative (N = 443)</u>				
<u>Closeness of Supervision</u>	SA	A	U	E	SD
56. Principals should be prepared to closely supervise new teachers in the school.	14.4	43.6	14.7	23.5	3.8
60. It is essential that principals closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	5.4	47.6	20.8	21.9	4.3
61. Principals should know what is taking place in most of the school's classrooms during most of the day.	9.7	53.7	11.7	22.4	2.5
62. Principals should insist that they be consulted prior to teachers taking problems to higher authorities in the school system.	21.4	54.2	11.7	11.3	1.4

TABLE VI B

<u>Scale Items</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Sample Responding to Each Alternative (N = 443)</u>				
<u>Closeness of Supervision</u>	SA	A	U	D	SD
57. Evaluators should require that teacher's classroom behaviour conform to the principal's standards.	.5	17.6	11.5	53.7	16.7
58. Principals should always visit classes on a regular schedule to determine how well teachers are carrying out their jobs.	3.4	23.7	8.6	52.1	12.2
59. Any evaluation scheme should include a check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans and previews of the work they intend to cover.	3.4	20.8	11.5	42.6	21.7

(secondary) Degree all tend toward support of the negative correlation predicted between professional orientation and closeness of supervision.

III Analysis of Relationships Between Professional Orientation and Evaluation Model

Results: The third problem to be investigated was an attempt to determine the relationship between the professional orientation of British Columbia teachers and their acceptance or rejection of the evaluation model. This problem was restated as Hypothesis 3: teachers' total professional scores show a positive correlation with scores on the evaluation model.

The results of a Pearson Product moment correlation between total professional orientation scores and evaluation model scores show a correlation coefficient of .180 on the total population for this study. (Table VII). This figure is statistically significant at beyond the .01 level. Table VII also illustrates that both male and female populations show positive correlations which are significant.

When examined on the basis of age, the resulting correlations between professional orientation and the evaluation model are quite revealing. Those teachers of age thirty or under support the positive prediction of the hypothesis. The correlation coefficient for this group is .359 which is statistically significant at beyond the .01 level. On the other hand, those teachers

age thirty-one and over show a correlation coefficient of .095 which is not significant.

When examined on the basis of marital status, it was found that both single and married teachers showed support for the positive relationship predicted in hypothesis three. However, those teachers grouped on the basis of separated, divorced or widowed show a correlation coefficient of $-.090$, which is not significantly below zero but is nevertheless negative. In spite of these two deviations, it could be safely stated that hypothesis 3 was supported.

Discussion: An explanation of the deviations of different groups of teachers from the positive correlation predicted in hypothesis three can be found by the examination of other data.

Table XXII illustrates these findings:

- 1) Age and evaluation model scores are negatively correlated and this correlation is significant at the .01 level.
- 2) The number of years of teaching and evaluation model scores are negatively correlated and this correlation is significant at the .01 level.
- 3) Teaching level and evaluation model scores are negatively correlated but not to a significant level.

In addition, examination of the tables from Appendix C indicates that of the four levels of teaching only teachers of primary grades have scores which correlate positively with professional orientation scores and scores on the evaluation model at a

TABLE VII
CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF SEX

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Male	221	.149*
Female	222	.220*
Total	443	.180*

*Significant at the .01 level

TABLE VIII

CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF AGE

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
30 under	173	.359*
31 over	270	.095

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE IX
CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF MARITAL STATUS.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Single	68	.288*
Married	340	.177*
Other	35	-.090

significant level. Furthermore, from the same tables it may be noted that only teachers with ten years or less teaching experience show scores with a positive correlation between professional orientation and the evaluation model at a significant level. Another interesting fact is shown when teachers are examined on the basis of present position. Regular classroom teachers support the prediction of hypothesis three with a correlation coefficient of .215 which is significant beyond the .01 level.

That hypothesis three was supported, is evident. The discrepancies found will be given further examination in Chapter V.

IV Analysis of Relationships Between Employee Orientation and Closeness of Supervision

Results: The fourth problem to be investigated was an attempt to determine the relationship between employee orientation and closeness of supervision scores. This problem was formally stated as Hypothesis 4: teachers' total scores on the employee orientation scale show a positive correlation with scores on the closeness of supervision scale.

The results of a Pearson Product Moment Correlation between employee orientation and closeness of supervision scores revealed significant correlations in most areas examined (Tables X, XI, XII and Appendix A). Interesting is the fact that all correlation coefficients examined on the basis of total population, sex, age and marital status were significant beyond the .01 level. It is further revealing to note the positive

correlations between employee orientation and age, number of years in present school and teaching experience (Table XX).

Discussion: Although hypothesis 4 was supported, any interpretation suggesting that teachers are loyal, compliant employees should be made with considerable reservation. Close examination of the percentage of teachers answering the individual items on the employee orientation scale is quite enlightening. Half the teachers or more in the sample feel that they should be obedient, respectful, and loyal to the principal. They would also feel that his judgement should be followed regarding controversial textbooks or speakers permitted in the school. In addition, they would agree that teachers should be completely familiar with the written descriptions of rules and procedures necessary for running the classroom.

More than half of the teachers in the sample oppose the suggestion that teachers who openly criticize the administration should be encouraged to go elsewhere. Approximately the same number disagree that schools should have manuals of rules and regulations which are to be followed seriously. More emphatic are the more than two thirds of the sample who do not feel that the administration of a school is better qualified than the teacher to judge what is best for education. They would not follow the wishes of the top administration in order to keep out of "hot water", nor would they put the interests of the school above their own personal interests. The strongest disapproval was shown toward those statements which suggested that teachers' behaviour as employees, could

TABLE X
CORRELATION OF EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF SEX.

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Male	221	.527*
Female	222	.595*
Total	443	.553*

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XI

CORRELATION OF EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF AGE

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
30 + under	173	.504*
31 + over	270	.580*

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XII
CORRELATION OF EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
WITH CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF MARITAL STATUS.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Single	68	.427*
Married	340	.540*
Other	35	.820*

*Significant at the .01 level.

be controlled by a series of rules. For example, at least eighty percent do not wish to have their time of arrival and departure from school strictly enforced. A similar number do not want rules to cover numerous problems which might arise in the school situation. Lastly, eighty-seven percent of the teachers in the sample would not avoid the controversy which could arise from the varied interpretation of school rules. The implications of these findings will be examined more closely in Chapter V.

V Analysis of Relationships Between Employee Orientation and Evaluation Model

Results: The fifth problem to be investigated was an attempt to determine the relationships between the scores obtained by British Columbia teachers on the employee orientation scale and the evaluation model. The problem was formally stated as Hypothesis 5: teachers' total scores on the employee orientation scale show a negative correlation with scores on the evaluation model.

The results of the Pearson Product Moment correlation for the two above mentioned variables does produce a negative relationship as predicted in the hypothesis. However, this relationship is not significant. Examination of the scores on the basis of sex produced a similar result. Although both male and female teachers show a tendency to support the hypothesis by a negative correlation, in neither case was the

relationship significant at an acceptable level. (Table XIII). When the population is examined on the basis of marital status, none of the three groups single, married or other as shown in Table XV reveal negative correlations of a significant value. The results of correlations examined on the basis of age indicate a negative direction to the relationship between employee orientation and the evaluation model for those over thirty but a very low, positive direction for those under thirty.

Discussion: Hypothesis 5 was not supported. The examination of the results indicates that an individual's employee orientation score is not a valid predictor of his acceptance or rejection of the evaluation model.

VI Analysis of Relationships Between Closeness of Supervision And Evaluation Model

Results: The sixth problem to be investigated was an attempt to determine the relationships between the scores obtained on the closeness of supervision scale and the scores on the evaluation model. This problem was formally stated as Hypothesis 6: teachers' total scores on the closeness of supervision scale show a negative correlation with scores on the evaluation model.

The correlation coefficient obtained, when these two variables are examined on the basis of total population, is positive and significant at the .01 level, (Table XVI). Similarly, the female population reveals a positive,

TABLE XIII
CORRELATION OF EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
AND EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF SEX.

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Male	221	-.081
Female	222	-.014
Total	443	-.033

TABLE XIV

CORRELATION OF EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
AND EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF AGE.

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
30 + under	173	.016
31 + over	270	-.041

TABLE XV
CORRELATION OF EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
AND EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF MARITAL STATUS.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Single	68	-.099
Married	340	-.022
Other	35	-.012

TABLE XVI

CORRELATION OF CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
AND EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF SEX.

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Male	221	.084
Female	222	.151*
Total	443	.114*

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XVII

CORRELATION OF CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
AND EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF AGE.

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
30 under	173	.174*
31 over	270	.086

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XVIII
CORRELATION OF CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
AND EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
EXAMINED ON THE BASIS OF MARITAL STATUS

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Single	68	.072
Married	340	.135*
Other	35	-.007

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XVIII A

<u>Scale Items</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Sample Responding to Each Alternative (N = 443)</u>				
<u>Evaluation Model</u>	SA	A	U	D	SD
63. It is the overall purpose of evaluation to replace poor teaching with good teaching, not to eliminate poor teachers.	24.4	57.6	9.0	7.0	2.0
64. Teachers and principals should be actively involved in developing the evaluation plan and reviewing it periodically.	31.6	50.1	16.7	1.4	.2
65. A usable definition of teaching and a job description of each position which is appropriate to each school should be developed.	10.2	48.5	23.9	15.1	2.3
66. Evaluations should include a pre-visit informal conference between the evaluator and the teacher to determine the teacher's objectives and purposes and to determine the characteristics of the students in the class.	22.6	64.8	7.4	4.3	.9
67. Evaluations should include a post-visit informal conference between the evaluator and the teacher. All notations on the evaluation records should be initialled by the teacher and the evaluator.	26.6	60.9	8.8	3.2	.5

Scale ItemsPercentage of Total Sample
Responding to Each Alternative
(N = 443)

<u>Evaluation Model</u>	SA	A	U	D	SD
68. In the event there is disagreement between the teacher and evaluator over any item, provision should be made for other observers, acceptable to both teacher and evaluator, to participate in the evaluation.	29.4	63.4	5.2	1.8	.2
69. Provisions should be made for training the evaluators and they should be given sufficient time to do the job properly.	38.2	57.6	3.6	.2	.4
70. Evaluators should be evaluated periodically by superintendents and the teaching faculty.	33.9	57.3	7.2	1.4	.2
71. The evaluation process should itself be evaluated periodically and changed whenever improvement is possible.	45.4	52.6	1.3	.5	.2

TABLE XIX

CORRELATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCORES
AND SELECTED BIOGRAPHIC CRITERIA.

(Respondents = 443)

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Correlation With Professional Orientation</u>
Age	.127*
Teaching level	.125*
Number of years in present school	.154*
Number of years of teaching	.214*
Commitment to teaching	.168*

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XX
CORRELATION OF EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCORES
AND SELECTED BIOGRAPHIC CRITERIA
(Respondents = 443)

Criteria	<u>Correlation With Employee Orientation</u>
Age	.251*
Teaching level	.027
Number of years in present school	.180*
Number of years of teaching	.256*
Commitment to teaching	.011

*Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXI

CORRELATION OF CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION SCORES
AND SELECTED BIOGRAPHIC CRITERIA

(Respondents = 443)

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Correlation With Closeness of Supervision</u>
Age	.061
Teaching level	.027
Number of years in present school	.071
Number of years of teaching	.090
Commitment to teaching	.002

TABLE XXII

CORRELATION OF EVALUATION MODEL SCORES
AND SELECTED BIOGRAPHIC CRITERIA

(Respondents = 443).

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Correlation With Evaluation Model</u>
Age	-.134*
Teaching level	-.086
Number of years in present school	-.059
Number of years of teaching	-.126*
Commitment to teaching	.023

*Significant at the .01 level.

significant correlation. As shown in Tables XVII and XVIII, correlation coefficients for teachers under thirty years of age and for married teachers are also significant at the .01 level. The only negative correlation which appears is from the segment of population classified under separated, divorced, or widowed. The correlation coefficient obtained although negative was essentially zero ($r = -.007$).

Discussion: Hypothesis 6 was not supported. Although it was predicted that a negative correlation would exist between closeness of supervision and the evaluation model, it is not difficult to explain the positive correlation when the results of Hypothesis 2 are examined. It was illustrated in Tables VIA and VIB that only three of the seven items on closeness of supervision were rejected by the majority of teachers. Therefore, the higher number of items on this scale were answered positively and were, thereby, correlated with the positive response given to the evaluation model (Table XVIIIA).

When the correlations between the evaluation model and selected biographic criteria are examined (Table XXII), a number of interesting factors appear. Since age and evaluation model scores are negatively correlated to an acceptable level (.01), one may draw at least two conclusions. Either younger teachers express a greater desire and need for this type of evaluation scheme, or older teachers, having grown accustomed to another system, are more confident of their tenure and see less need for any change. These ideas receive further support

when it is noted that the scores on the evaluation model are also negatively correlated, at a significant level, with the number of years of teaching (Table XXII). Viewing this information, an administrator responsible for teacher evaluation must assume that either teachers as they gain age and experience accept current evaluation practices or, a younger generation of teachers expect a different set of criteria to be examined in the evaluation of their work. The implication of this topic will receive further consideration in Chapter V.

VI SUMMARY

For the purpose of testing six hypotheses, a survey was performed and the results obtained, from 443 teachers randomly selected from all active British Columbia members, were used. Of the six hypotheses, three were supported at a significant level. Two others were supported at the .01 level, but in the opposite direction to that predicted. The remaining hypothesis obtained correlations in the direction predicted, but not at an acceptable level.

With the exception of hypothesis six, (correlation between closeness of supervision and evaluation model), the results when examined on the basis of sex, revealed no significant difference. When examined on the basis of age, correlations between professional orientation and closeness of supervision reveal some difference. The younger group show a significant positive correlation, whereas the older teachers do not. The age factor is also evident when professional orientation and

evaluation model scores are correlated. Again, the younger teachers show a positive correlation, whereas, the older group does not, correlations between closeness of supervision and the evaluation model reveal similar differences. It is, therefore, evident that age is a factor to be considered in some of the relationships tested.

It is interesting to observe that although teachers are growing professionally (as previously discussed), their professional orientation scores still correlate significantly with their employee orientation. Revealing too, is the fact that teachers do not reject all aspects of close supervision. Lastly, it was most enlightening to find that with one exception, all items on the evaluation model were agreeable to between 80 and 95 per cent of all teachers in the sample.

The implications of each of these observations will receive consideration in the final chapter of this study.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER IV

1. Corwin, R.G., Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools, (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 175.
2. Moeller, G.H., "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power", Administrators' Notebook, 9, (November, 1963).
3. Peabody, R.L., "Perceptions of Organizational Authority", Administrative Science Quarterly, VI, (March 1962), pp. 463-482.
4. Enns, F., "Rating Teacher Effectiveness: The Function of the Principal", Educational Administration, (March, 1965,) pp. 81-95.
5. Trask, A.E., "Principals, Teachers, and Supervision: Dilemmas and Solutions", Administrators Notebook, December, 1964.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions, Implications, Further Research, and Summary

I Conclusions

At the beginning of this study it was stated that a major problem confronting today's school administrators is the supervision and evaluation of teachers as professional-employees. It is realized that the use of a survey research design and the analysis of the findings, are necessary procedures for understanding the problem. The basic purpose of the study, however, is to determine what implications exist for the practising school administrator in fulfilment of his responsibilities.

Before suggesting implications which may be inferred from the study, it is necessary to examine those conclusions which may be drawn from the supported hypotheses.

Conclusions in Relation to the Positive Correlation Between Professional Orientation and Employee Orientation.

From the empirical support shown for hypothesis 1 in Tables I, II, and III, there is substantial indication that the professional orientation of teachers is correlated positively with their employee orientation. Examination of the correlations found in other sub samples, prohibits the assumption of any superficial conclusions (Appendix A). On the basis of present position, regular classroom teachers support the hypothesis. However, vice-principals and principals do not indicate similar support. The interesting point to note is

that current research shows administrators, as a group, achieving higher professional orientation scores than other groups.¹ Another group revealing a significant correlation is that comprised of teachers who hold teaching certificates but no degrees. They support the positive correlation in hypothesis 1, but also score lower on the professional orientation scale. When the total sample is divided into two groups consisting of those committed to continue teaching and those who would choose another alternative, only the latter group show a significant correlation between professional orientation and employee orientation. Previous research in this area² also reveals that those committed to teaching have higher total professional orientation scores than do the uncommitted teachers.

The basic conclusion to be drawn from this information is the realization that teachers who score highest on the professional orientation scale are not necessarily employee oriented.

Conclusions in Relation to the Positive Correlation Between Professional Orientation and the Evaluation Model.

The support shown for hypothesis 3 in Tables VII, VIII and IX should be considered on the basis of information revealed by the examination of other sub-groups. This hypothesis received significant support from regular classroom teachers at the .01 level. Department Head teachers with teaching loads of half time or more also supported this positive correlation as did primary teachers and those who possess no Degree or a Bachelor of Education (elementary).

In addition, support was shown by those new to their school, those who had taught in only one district and those teachers with ten years or less teaching experience.

The basic conclusion from this information appears to centre around the fact that those teachers most likely to be involved in the evaluation process, are the ones who give greatest support to the positive correlation between professional orientation and the evaluation model.

Conclusions in Relation to the Positive Correlation Between Employee Orientation and Closeness of Supervision.

In Chapter IV (Tables VIA and VIB and the discussion on p. 57), the main concern was to avoid conclusions without careful consideration of how the respondents answered each of the items on the two scales relating to employee orientation and closeness of supervision. As mentioned at that time, the majority of teachers do not object to all aspects of close supervision; only to those which could be interpreted as punitive in nature. Regarding the items on the employee orientation scale, the majority of teachers expressed disagreement with all but three of the fifteen suggestions. These two findings are given support by two other recently published studies.

Clear and Seager³ indicate that Barnard's⁴ "zone of indifference" (the area within which a subordinate will find the orders of a superior unquestionably acceptable) is more accurately described as a "zone of acceptance". Their conclusions are enlightening.

Administrators, who must promote organizational maintenance and goal attainment should not become over-confident when teachers readily accept some amount of influence. While these initial attempts may fall within teachers' zones of acceptance, subsequent, more intensive, efforts from administrators whose feelings of legitimacy are consistently greater than teachers', may fall outside the teachers' zones and have the unanticipated consequence of precipitating resistance or hostility. This can sharply curtail the administrator's capability to do his job.⁵

In a different study, Hoy and Williams⁶ came to the conclusion that a school principal's reliance on this "zone of indifference" is unlikely to give a sufficient base for the effective operation of a school.

It seems fair to conclude, from the above mentioned observations and the findings of this study, that school principals must make themselves cognizant of the professional aspirations of their faculty members, if they wish to achieve desired educational goals with effective harmony in staff effort.

Conclusions in Relation to the Positive Correlation Between Closeness of Supervision and the Evaluation Model

As indicated in Chapter IV, this hypothesis was supported with a positive correlation and not a negative one as predicted. Scrutiny of the items on the closeness of supervision scale revealed support for four of the seven statements. It was further noted that over eighty per cent of the respondents in the sample approved all but one item on the evaluation model. Further examination of the findings indicates that regular classroom teachers, teachers of primary grades, and those with teaching certificates but no university

degree, all support the positive correlation between these two areas. In addition, it should be realized there is a significant correlation (.01 level) between age and teaching level and between age and professional training.

This information leads one to conclude that most teachers in the above mentioned areas are prepared to accept supervision of a supportive and constructive nature, provided it also embodies the ideas outlined in the evaluation model.

II Implications for Administrators

In Chapter II, two basic purposes were suggested for evaluation. First, if the teaching profession is to reach its full potential, it must be critical about quality and develop self-correcting mechanisms to upgrade the performance of members. Secondly, the public is entitled to an accounting of the efforts of the professionally trained individuals it employs in the total school operation. The public should know what goals are being sought by schools and the extent to which these goals are being reached.

Rationale for Supervision and Evaluation Change

Examination of the various sub-groups of teachers in this study indicates that a growth in professional orientation accompanies experience gained and increased academic and professional training. Concurrently, employee orientation reveals a positive correlation with age and experience (Table XX). However, those teachers with six to fifteen years of experience, show the lowest correlation between professional orientation

and employee orientation; they comprise 46 per cent of the population sample. From this information administrators may come to one of two conclusions. If they surmise that teachers usually become more employee oriented as they gain age and experience, little change in supervision and evaluation procedures will appear necessary. Conversely, if they conclude that professionalism among teachers is growing and, furthermore, this group, with currently six to fifteen years experience, will exert influence on younger teachers for at least the next decade, the administrative implications will be different.

If credence can be given to previous studies which indicate that principals and vice-principals reveal the highest scores on professional orientation scales,⁷ then they must take the responsibility of being professional leaders. To fulfil this obligation, they must have a clear concept of what is currently possible regarding supervision and evaluation in teaching. To improve instruction entails more than suggestions on how to manage a classroom. It involves acting as a mirror for the teacher to enable that individual to reflect intelligently on how the various techniques used in the classroom effect the desired behavioural changes in students.

Teachers surveyed in this study have indicated that certain aspects of close supervision are acceptable, provided their purpose is constructive in nature (Table VIA). They have also shown convincing support for the ideas presented in the "evaluation model" statements (Table XVIII A). It is now clear

that administrators who choose to carry out an effective program of supervision and evaluation must do so from a position of professional authority rather than from the position of administrative authority.⁸

When changing the formal procedures of supervision and evaluation, it seems likely that those most affected by these procedures would have much to contribute to their improvement. Changes in policy, however, frequently produce anxieties among teachers. It is then the responsibility of those implementing the changes to be certain that effective communications exist to minimize this teacher anxiety. To achieve success (particularly in the area of supervision and evaluation) the communications between teachers and administrators must possess certain characteristics. They should encompass a mutual determination of goals, a spirit of inquiry, mutual interaction and a mutual influence system.⁹

The concept of mutual influence is most fundamental to understanding communication. The idea is not new. More than fifty years ago Mary Follett¹⁰ recognized the psychological aspects of administration. Her main contribution to organizational theory lay in her understanding that conflicts between members of an organization do occur and that if they are properly resolved these conflicts can be beneficial. She emphasized that human reaction is circular and not linear. Her theory of integration requires the understanding that employees react not just to employers, but also to the anticipated reactions of other employees. She felt that true integration of

conflicting views was successful when it negated that feeling of sacrifice by either side.

More recently, Gellerman summarizes this concept of mutual influence when he says:

...the sender, to be certain that his message will be accepted by the receiver, must be prepared to let the receiver influence him. He must even be prepared to let the receiver alter or modify the message in ways that make it more acceptable to the receiver. Otherwise it may not be understood, or it may not be accepted, or it may simply be given lip service and ignored.¹¹

The message, therefore, is communicated best when it encompasses within its content the sender's willingness to consider the receiver's reaction to his message as relevant and important.

To those administrators who accept the challenge of enlightened supervision and evaluation, the implications may appear overwhelming. The need for autonomy, which educational participants express, is based on the principle of self-government, self-control, and self-determination. Teachers, in particular, display numerous credentials in terms of professional expertness as justification for the expression of this need.

Before pursuing the topic further an examination of professional needs, on the basis of lower-order and higher-order needs, appears relevant. When Sergiovanni¹² examined Maslow's¹³ hierarchy of needs as they applied to teachers, he came to the following conclusions;

1. The lower-order needs are those which become available to teachers when they make the decision to become a member and remain a member of a school

faculty. The school system in return exchanges money, benefits, position, friendship, protection, and interpersonal gratification for satisfactory membership by teachers. These fundamental needs must now be supplied in order for teachers to function adequately as persons. They now feel entitled to security and social need fulfillment by virtue of membership in a school system.

2. The higher-order needs are those which should become available when a teacher decides to do that which is beyond maintaining membership in the school faculty. This increase in commitment is exchanged for rewards such as recognition of competency and autonomy, opportunities for assuming responsibility and participating in decision making, and opportunities for experiencing success.

Teachers will not be concerned with higher-order needs of esteem, autonomy and self-improvement until lower-order needs are recognized as assured.¹⁴

In a materialistic society, many of the esteem needs are met as a result of increased salary benefits derived through efforts of teacher organizations. With these needs satisfied, teachers move to effect autonomy and self-realization needs. The implications for administrators are now clear that teachers wish to be provided with opportunities to make independent educational decisions and administrators are expected to provide these opportunities and also encourage personal and professional development.

It would be wrong for administrators to assume that all teachers operate at the same level of needs. A large number seem ready, willing, and able to respond to the intrinsic rewards in schools if given the genuine opportunity to do so. Another sizable group would like to respond similarly if they had the confidence to do so. There is undoubtedly a small

group who are too emotionally immature to be able to respond to this type of participation, partly as a result of less than rewarding school organizational experiences.

It seems reasonable to suggest that teachers expect fair and adequate supervision and evaluation, supportive school policies and administrative directives, friendly interpersonal relationships and pleasant working conditions. When supervision and evaluation procedures build upon this foundation by providing opportunities for teachers to experience self-improvement, success, recognition of efforts, meaningful responsibility, and intrinsic rewards, then a better school system is assured. The goal is accomplished when human participants in schools are given the opportunity to own shares in the school enterprise. The reward is the development of better teachers and thereby better service to the parents and children of our society.

It must be remembered, however, that the public is not necessarily appreciative of the professional aspirations of teachers. There is a growing demand from the taxpayer for greater accountability by educators.¹⁵ Teachers want more latitude in educational decisions and greater monetary reward for the professional services they render. Taxpayers, by their reluctance to pass operating referenda, have shown their feelings regarding increased educational costs.¹⁶ The two points of view, under present circumstances, are not compatible.

Educational administrators, teachers and school boards must take steps to demonstrate to the public that education deserves

the position of the largest consumer of public monies.¹⁷ If administrators use methods of supervision and evaluation which are agreeable to teachers to improve the level of instruction, teachers will become confident enough to involve the public in the development of school educational programs. In order to appreciate the goals of education, the public must be involved in the development of programs and services that are relevant and worthwhile from the point of view of citizens in their respective communities. Public education will probably receive more favourable consideration when these actual lines of communication are thus opened and continuously maintained.

• III Further Research

This study has been an attempt to gain insight into the professionalism and employee orientation of British Columbia teachers, and furthermore, how these two variables are related to selected aspects of instructional supervision. Unlike previous studies which focused on either professionalism or employee orientation, this study attempted to explore the receptivity of teachers to a plan which would enable them to participate fully in the improvement of the instructional aspects of their profession.

Although teachers in this study gave ample support for the procedures outlined in the "evaluation model", it would be unwise to make general predictive statements from these results. This study was confined to British Columbia. When Ryans¹⁸ undertook to identify teacher characteristics in his

extensive study of 6,000 teachers in 1700 schools, he found differences in the results from various geographic areas. He concluded that Midwestern teachers were more traditional in educational viewpoints, while West Coast teachers were more permissive in their educational viewpoints. Furthermore, he found that West Coast teachers scored higher in stimulating classroom behaviour, while teachers from the Midwestern states scored considerably lower in this area.

It is interesting to speculate on the correlations between professional orientation and the evaluation model. Why do teachers of thirty years of age and under reveal a higher correlation between these two variables than do older teachers? Considering growth in teacher professionalism, will this relationship remain constant or will it change with age and experience? What actually induces teachers to be desirous of improving their instructional competence? Do teachers at different career stages, different age levels, and of opposite sex vary in their concept professional improvement? Can the reward system presently used give teachers incentive to improve professionally in areas other than certification? If the goal of supervision is to improve instruction, what are the effects upon instruction of various supervisory and evaluative practices? Further research is necessary before conclusive answers can be given to these questions.

V Summary

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of British Columbia teachers toward supervision and evaluation to determine how these two aspects relate to professional orientation and employee orientation. The specific variables involved were: (1) professional orientation, (2) employee orientation and, (3) supervision (a) closeness of supervision (b) an evaluation model. In addition, an attempt was made to determine relationships between these four variables and selected biographic characteristics of teachers.

The research sample consisted of 443 teachers randomly selected from those actively employed in the public schools of British Columbia.

Survey Findings

Of the six correlation hypotheses tested, three were supported in the predicted direction at or beyond the .01 level of statistical significance. These included:

- (1) A positive correlation between professional orientation and employee orientation.
- (2) A positive correlation between professional orientation and the evaluation model.
- (3) A positive correlation between employee orientation and closeness of supervision.

Two other hypotheses were supported at or beyond the .01 level of statistical significance but in the opposite direction to that predicted. These two were:

- (1) A positive correlation between professional orientation and closeness of supervision.
- (2) A positive correlation between closeness of supervision and the evaluation model.

Certain conclusions and implications for administrators follow from these survey findings. Teachers with high professional orientations are usually employee oriented but certain sub-groups, including principals and vice-principals, although high on professional orientation scores are not employee oriented. The sub-groups to reveal the lowest correlation between these two variables were those with six to fifteen years of teaching experience. Administrators must further realize that regular classroom teachers with high professional orientation are the ones who will desire the considerations outlined in the evaluation model statements. Principals must be aware of the growing professional aspirations of their faculty members. Their latitude in administrative authority is lessening and must be replaced by the authority of professional competence, if they hope to have their schools reach desired educational goals with effective staff cooperation. They will achieve this objective if they are prepared to assist teachers to be effectively critical of the quality of teaching performance.

The results of this study should be of interest to other students of educational administration and to those administrators who hold the responsibility for the supervision and evaluation of teachers.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER V

1. Hrynyk, N.P., "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).
2. Hrynyk, op. cit., reference 1.
3. Clear, D.K., and Seager, R.C., "The Legitimacy of Administrative Influence as Perceived by Selected Groups," Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, (Winter, 1971), pp. 46-63.
4. Barnard, C.S., The Functions of the Executive, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938), p. 68.
5. Clear and Seager, op. cit., reference 3.
6. Hoy, W.K., and Williams, R.C., "Loyalty to Immediate Superior at Alternate Levels in Public Schools", Education Administrative Quarterly, 7, (Spring, 1971), pp. 1-11.
7. Hrynyk, op. cit., reference 1.
8. Etzioni, A., Modern Organization, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964).
9. Bennis, W.G., Changing Organizations, (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966), Chapter V.
10. Gross, B.M., The Scientific Approach to Administration, D.E. Griffiths (ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part II), (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964), Chapter III.
11. Gellerman, S., Management by Motivation, (New York, American Management Association, 1968), p. 46.
12. Sergiovanni, T.J., and Starratt, R.J., Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives, (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971), p. 135.
13. Sergiovanni, op. cit., reference 12., p. 132.
14. Ibid., p. 145.
15. Robinson, N., "Voter Control of School District Expenditures", The Canadian Administrator, (October, 1971).

16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Getzels, J.W., and Jackson, P.W., "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics", in Gage, N.L., Handbook of Research on Teaching, (Chicago, Rand McNally and Co., 1963) p. 569.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Barnard, C.S., The Functions of the Executive, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938).
- Bennis, W.G., Changing Organizations, (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966).
- Biddle, B.J., and Ellena, W.J., (ed.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964).
- Brighton, S., and Rose, G., Increasing Your Accuracy in Teacher Evaluation, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965).
- Carr-Saunders, A.M. and Wilson, P.A., The Professions, (London, Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1964).
- Corwin, R.G., A Sociology of Education, (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965).
- Corwin, R.G., Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools, (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970).
- Crosby, M., Supervision as a Cooperative Action, (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957).
- Curtin, J., Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1964).
- Etzioni, A., Modern Organization, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964).
- Eye, G.G. and Netzer, L., Supervision of Instruction, (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1965).
- Gage, N.L., (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, (Chicago, Rand McNally & Co., 1965).
- Gellerman, S., Management by Motivation, (New York, American Management Association, 1968).
- Good, C.V., (ed.) Dictionary of Education, (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1945).
- Griffiths (ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part II), (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964).

- Guba, E. and Bidwell, C., Administrative Relationships, (Chicago, Midwest Administrative Center, University of Chicago, 1957).
- Halpin, A.W. and Croft, D.B., The Organizational Climate of Schools, (Chicago, The Midwest Center, University of Chicago, 1963)
- Harris, C.W., (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th Edition, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1969).
- Harris, B., Supervisory Behavior in Education, (Englewood-Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963).
- Heald, J.E. and Moore, S.A., The Teacher and Administrative Relations in School Systems, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1968).
- Heald, J.E., et al., (ed.), Selected Readings on General Supervision, (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1970).
- Kish, L., Survey Sampling, (New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1965).
- Kornhauser, W., Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodations, (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1962).
- Merton, R., (ed.), Sociology Today, (New York, Basic Books, 1959).
- Morphet, E.L. et al, Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues, (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959).
- Moser, C.A., Survey Methods in Social Investigation, (London, William Heinemann, 1958).
- Reeves, A.W., et al (eds.), The Canadian School Principal, (Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1962).
- Sergiovanni, T.J., and Starratt, R.J., Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives, (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971).
- Solomon, D.N., "Professional Persons in Bureaucratic Organizations", Symposium on Preventive and Social Psychiatry, (Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958).
- Stiles, L.J. et al., Teacher Education in the United States, (New York, Ronald Publishing Co., 1960).

B. ARTICLES

- Argyris, C., "The Individual and the Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustments", Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, (June 1, 1957).
- Brown, A.F. "Exploring the Human Element in Supervision", Toronto, Canadian Education and Research Digest (June 1962).
- Byrne, T.C., "Evaluation: Is Your Infallability Showing?", Canadian Education and Research Digest, 4, (December, 1965).
- Campbell, R.F., "The Changing Role of the Superintendent," Contemporary Education, XXXIX, (May, 1968).
- Clear, D.K., and Seager, R.C., "The Legitimacy of Administrative Influence as Perceived by Selected Groups," Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, (Winter, 1971).
- Corwin, R.G., "Professional Persons in Public Organizations", Educational Administration Quarterly, 1, (Autumn, 1965).
- Egnatoff, J.G., "The Changing Status of Saskatchewan's School Principals", Canadian Education and Research Digest, (December, 1968).
- Enns, F., "Rating Teacher Effectiveness: The Function of the Principal", Educational Administration, (March, 1965).
- Erickson, D.A., "Some Misgivings Concerning a Study of Leadership", Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, (Autumn, 1965).
- Findley, D., "The Secondary Principal: Evaluation and Supervision", Contemporary Education XXXIX, (May, 1968).
- Goode, W., "The Librarian: From Occupation to Profession?" Library Quarterly 31, (October, 1961).
- Hamilton, W.L., "An Analysis of North American Ideas on School Supervision", The Council on School Administration Bulletin, 3, (April, 1966).
- Hoy, W.K., and Williams, R.C., "Loyalty to Immediate Superior at Alternate Levels in Public Schools", Education Administrative Quarterly, 7, (Spring, 1971).
- Kong, S.L. and McMurray, J.G., "Teacher Reactions to a Communication Advocating Educational Change", Canadian Education and Research Digest, (December, 1965).

- McEwan, W.J., "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1, (September, 1956).
- Moeller, G.H., "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power", Administrators' Notebook, 9, (November, 1963).
- Parsons, T., "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organization", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1, September 1956).
- Peabody, R.L., "Perceptions of Organizational Authority", Administrative Science Quarterly, VI, (March 1962).
- Redfern, G.B., "Negotiation Changes Principal-Teacher Relationships", National Elementary Principal, XLVII, (April, 1968).
- Robinson, N., "Principal and Teacher Supervisory Relationships: Problems and Perspectives", The Alberta School Principal, 1965.
- Robinson, N., "Voter Control of School District Expenditures", The Canadian Administrator, (October, 1971).
- Rose, G.W., "The Effects of Administrators Evaluation," The National Elementary Principal, 2, (November, 1963).
- Rose, G.W., "Performance Evaluation and Growth in Teaching", Phi Delta Kappan, (October, 1963).
- Trask, A.E., "Principals, Teachers, and Supervision: Dilemmas and Solutions", Administrators Notebook, (December, 1964).
- Young, J.E.M., "A Survey of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Certain Aspects of Their Profession", Canadian Education and Research Digest, 2, (June 1957).
- Ziolkowski, E.H., "Practices in the Supervision of Instruction", The Canadian Administrator, (October, 1965).

MISCELLANEOUS

- Corwin, R.G., The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1964).
- Gross, N. and Druben, R., The Role Behavior of School Principals, (Cambridge, Harvard University, 1965).
- Hrynyk, N.P., "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).

Robinson, N., "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organization," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966).

Sorenson, J.E., "Professional and Bureaucratic Organizations in Large Public Accounting Firms", (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1965).

Superintendent of Education, Ninety-ninth Annual Report of the Public Schools of British Columbia, (Victoria, Queen's Printer, 1971).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY TABLES

SUMMARY TABLE I

Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Employee Orientation Scores.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Total Population</u>	443	.174*
<u>Sub-groups</u>		
<u>Sex:</u>		
Male	221	.155*
Female	222	.200*
<u>Marital Status:</u>		
Single	68	.215
Married	340	.160*
Other	35	.243
<u>Age:</u>		
30 and under	173	.193*
31 and over	270	.143*
<u>Present Position:</u>		
Classroom Teacher	302	.197*
Dept. Head teaching more than half-time	40	.214
Dept. Head teaching half-time or less	4	-.878
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching more than half-time	25	-.140
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching half-time or less	32	.240
Other	40	-.006
<u>Teaching Level:</u>		
Primary grades	106	.243*
Intermediate grades	145	.148*
Jr. Secondary grades	104	.099
Sr. Secondary grades	88	.205*

*Significant at the .01 level.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Academic & Professional Training:</u>		
Letter of Permission	7	.269
Teaching Certificate (no degree)	159	.309*
B.Ed. (elementary)	74	.072
B.Ed. (secondary)	39	.042
Bachelor's and Teacher Training and Bachelors and old B.Ed.	123	.104
Masters Degree	22	.189
<u>No. of Districts Taught in:</u>		
1	167	.083
2	108	.290*
3	75	.163
4-7	81	.195
8-10	10	.270
10 or more	2	-
<u>Years in Present School:</u>		
1	97	.312*
2	106	.018
3	51	.044
4	54	.290
5	30	.180
6-15	84	.139
16-25	18	.032
26 or more	3	-.901
<u>Years of Teaching:</u>		
0-5	137	.152
6-10	126	.060
11-15	76	.082
16-25	72	.221
25 or more	31	.241

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Commitment to Teaching:</u>		
Not committed	154	.344*
Committed	289	.085

SUMMARY TABLE II

Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Closeness of Supervision Scores.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Total Population</u>	443	.154*
<u>Sex:</u>		
Male	221	.143*
Female	222	.170*
<u>Marital Status:</u>		
Single	68	-.026
Married	340	.199*
Other	35	.038
<u>Age:</u>		
30 and under	173	.186*
31 and over	270	.120
<u>Present Position:</u>		
Classroom Teacher	302	.137*
Dept. Head teaching more than half-time	40	.383*
Dept. Head teaching half-time or less	4	-.263
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching more than half-time	25	-.263
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching half-time or less	32	.327
Other	40	.063
<u>Teaching Level:</u>		
Primary grades	106	.231
Intermediate grades	145	-.026
Jr. Secondary grades	104	.160
Sr. Secondary grades	88	.393

*Significant at the .01 level.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Academic and Professional Training:</u>		
Letter of Permission	7	.924
Teaching Certificate (no degree)	159	.186
B.Ed. (elementary)	74	.168
B.Ed. (secondary)	39	-.269
Bachelor's and Teacher Training and Bachelor's and old B.Ed.	123	.251
Master's Degree	22	.260
<u>No. of Districts Taught in:</u>		
1	167	.073
2	108	.334
3	75	.131
4-7	81	.137
8-10	10	.169
10 or more	2	-
<u>Years in Present School:</u>		
1	97	.032
2	106	.150
3	51	.014
4	54	.265
5	30	-.069
6-15	84	.393
16-25	18	.098
26 or more	3	.210
<u>Years of Teaching:</u>		
0-5	137	.152
6-10	126	.121
11-15	76	.153
16-25	72	.202
25 or more	31	.395

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Commitment to Teaching:</u>		
Not committed	154	.352*
Committed	289	.052

SUMMARY TABLE III

Correlation of Professional Orientation Scores With Evaluation Model Scores.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Total Population</u>	443	.180*
<u>Sex:</u>		
Male	221	.149*
Female	222	.220*
<u>Marital Status:</u>		
Single	68	.288*
Married	340	.177*
Other	35	-.090
<u>Age:</u>		
30 and under	173	.359*
31 and over	270	.095
<u>Present Position:</u>		
Classroom Teacher	302	.215*
Dept. Head teaching more than half-time	40	.371*
Dept. Head teaching half-time or less	4	.723
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching more than half-time	25	-.093
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching half-time or less	32	.077
Other	40	.042
<u>Teaching Level:</u>		
Primary grades	106	.361*
Intermediate grades	145	.145
Jr. Secondary grades	104	.112
Sr. Secondary grades	88	.224

*Significant at the .01 level.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Academic and Professional Training</u>		
Letter of Permission	7	.302
Teaching Certificate (no degree)	159	.243*
B.Ed. (elementary)	74	.330*
B.Ed. (secondary)	39	-.078
Bachelors' and Teacher Training and Bachelor's and old B.Ed.	123	.183
Masters Degree	22	.049
<u>No. of Districts Taught in:</u>		
1	167	.169*
2	108	-.007
3	75	.431*
4-7	81	.221
8-10	10	.094
10 or more	2	-
<u>Years in Present School:</u>		
1	97	.237*
2	106	.065
3	51	.306
4	54	.135
5	30	.411
6-15	84	.136
16-25	18	.370
26 or more	3	.901
<u>Years of Teaching:</u>		
0-5	137	.204*
6-10	126	.351*
11-15	76	.048
16-25	72	.141
26 or more	31	.185

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
--	---------------	------------------------------------

Commitment to Teaching:

Not committed

154

.346*

Committed

289

.087

SUMMARY TABLE IV

Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores With Closeness of Supervision Scores.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Total Population</u>	443	.553*
<u>Sex:</u>		
Male	221	.527*
Female	222	.595*
<u>Marital Status:</u>		
Single	68	.427*
Married	340	.540*
Other	35	.820*
<u>Age:</u>		
30 and under	173	.504*
31 and over	270	.580*
<u>Present Position:</u>		
Classroom Teacher	302	.568*
Dept. Head teaching more than half-time	40	.458*
Dept. Head teaching half-time or less	4	.639
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching more than half-time	25	.603*
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching half-time or less	32	.463*
Other	40	.548*
<u>Teaching Level:</u>		
Primary grades	106	.431*
Intermediate grades	145	.491*
Jr. Secondary grades	104	.603*
Sr. Secondary grades	88	.688*

*Significant at the .01 level

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Academic and Professional Training:</u>		
Letter of Permission	7	.539
Teaching Certificate (no degree)	159	.459*
B.Ed. (elementary)	74	.474*
B.Ed. (secondary)	39	.347
Bachelors' and Teacher Training and Bachelor's and old B.Ed.	123	.640*
Masters Degree	22	.782*
<u>No. of Districts Taught in:</u>		
1	167	.520*
2	108	.530*
3	75	.573*
4-7	81	.601*
8-10	10	.750*
10 or more	2	-
<u>Years in Present School:</u>		
1	97	.508*
2	106	.628*
3	51	.438*
4	54	.527*
5	30	.338
6-15	84	.636*
16-25	18	.717*
26 or more	3	.500
<u>Years of Teaching:</u>		
0-5	137	.464*
6-10	126	.596*
11-15	76	.451*

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
16-25	72	.704*
26 or more	31	.759
<u>Commitment to Teaching:</u>		
Not committed	154	.542*
Committed	289	.560*

SUMMARY TABLE V

Correlation of Employee Orientation Scores With Evaluation Model Scores.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Total Population</u>	443	-.033
<u>Sex:</u>		
Male	221	-.081
Female	222	.014
<u>Marital Status:</u>		
Single	68	-.099
Married	340	-.022
Other	35	-.012
<u>Age:</u>		
30 and under	173	-.016
31 and over	270	-.041
<u>Present Position:</u>		
Classroom Teacher	302	.0003
Dept. Head teaching more than half-time	40	.011
Dept. Head teaching half-time or less	4	-.649
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching more than half-time	25	-.224
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching half-time or less	32	-.238
Other	40	-.018
<u>Teaching Level:</u>		
Primary grades	106	.046
Intermediate grades	145	.048
Jr. Secondary grades	104	-.155
Sr. Secondary grades	88	-.029

*Significant at the .01 level.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Academic and Professional Training:</u>		
Letter of Permission	7	.265
Teaching Certificate (no degree)	159	-.003
B.Ed. (elementary)	74	.054
B.Ed. (secondary)	39	-.177
Bachelors' and Teacher Training and Bachelor's and old B.Ed.	123	-.064
Masters Degree	22	.038
<u>No. of Districts Taught in:</u>		
1	167	-.095
2	108	-.011
3	75	.094
4-7	81	-.076
8-10	10	-.012
10 or more	2	-
<u>Years in Present School:</u>		
1	97	-.038
2	106	-.163
3	51	-.046
4	54	.156
5	30	.004
6-15	84	.0003
16-25	18	.184
26 or more	3	-1.000
<u>Years of Teaching:</u>		
0-5	137	-.079
6-10	126	.038
11-15	76	-.066
16-25	72	.033
26 or more	31	.126

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Commitment to Teaching:</u>		
Not committed	154	.062
Committed	289	-.079

SUMMARY TABLE VI

Correlation of Closeness of Supervision Scores With Evaluation Model Scores.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Total Population</u>	443	.114*
<u>Sex:</u>		
Male	221	.084
Female	222	.151*
<u>Marital Status:</u>		
Single	68	.072
Married	340	.135*
Other	35	-.007
<u>Age:</u>		
30 and under	173	.174*
31 and over	270	.086
<u>Present Position:</u>		
Classroom Teacher	302	.123*
Dept. Head teaching more than half-time	40	.327
Dept. Head teaching half-time or less	4	-.528
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching more than half-time	25	.130
Vice-Principal or Principal teaching half-time or less	32	.044
Other	40	.118
<u>Teaching Level:</u>		
Primary grades	106	.206*
Intermediate grades	145	.086
Jr. Secondary grades	104	.034
Sr. Secondary grades	88	.156

*Significant at the .01 level.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Academic and Professional Training:</u>		
Letter of Permission	7	.153
Teaching Certificate (no degree)	159	.163*
B.Ed. (elementary)	74	.140
B.Ed. (secondary)	39	.081
Bachelors' and Teacher Training and Bachelor's and old B.Ed.	123	.118
Masters Degree	22	.196
<u>No. of Districts Taught In:</u>		
1	167	.089
2	108	.169
3	75	.111
4-7	81	.159
8-10	10	-.111
10 or more	2	-
<u>Years in Present School:</u>		
1	97	.095
2	106	-.053
3	51	.139
4	54	.227
5	30	.339
6-15	84	.157
16-25	18	.208
26 or more	3	-.500
<u>Years of Teaching</u>		
0-5	137	.122
6-10	126	.130
11-15	76	.098
16-25	72	.077
26 or more	31	.143

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
<u>Commitment to Teaching:</u>		
Not committed	154	.236*
Committed	289	.053

SUMMARY TABLE VII

<u>Scale Items</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Sample Responding to Each Alternative (N = 443)</u>				
<u>Professional Orientation</u>					
11. It is vital to his effectiveness that the teacher should possess a thorough knowledge of his subject matter.	SA	A	U	D	SD
	52.1	39.7	.9	6.6	.7
12. Persons should be evaluated primarily of the basis of their ability to communicate knowledge.	SA	A	U	D	SD
	12.2	46.0	9.5	27.8	4.5
13. Schools should hire no one to teach unless the person holds at least a bachelor's degree in education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
	4.0	13.3	7.5	50.8	24.4
14. A teacher's practice should be based primarily on his acquaintance with educational literature and research.	SA	A	U	D	SD
	.9	13.5	21.2	48.6	15.8
15. Persons who do not meet the present British Columbia certification requirements should be allowed to teach when there is a teacher shortage.*	SA	A	U	D	SD
	6.3	47.2	15.8	21.4	9.3
16. Knowledge of educational theory is vital for effective teaching.	SA	A	U	D	SD
	8.1	39.1	12.0	35.6	5.2
17. Teachers should be expected to give after-hours instruction to pupils who are not doing well in their school work.	SA	A	U	D	SD
	7.4	32.3	10.8	36.6	12.9
18. I would rather teach than do anything else for a living.	SA	A	U	D	SD
	23.5	33.8	21.7	16.5	4.5

*Scored negatively

19.	Because of what I am able to do for society, I would continue to teach even if I could earn more money at another vocation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		11.5	35.0	28.4	21.7	3.4
20.	A teacher should be prepared to devote the whole of his working lifetime to the occupation to teaching.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		4.3	13.3	11.7	47.9	22.8
21.	A teacher should encourage as many of his students as possible to enter teaching as a vocation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		.5	5.2	8.8	55.5	30.0
22.	A teacher should promote what he deems to be needed social changes through his contact with students in schools.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		6.3	24.4	19.0	36.3	14.0
23.	Membership in the British Columbia Teachers' Federation should be more important to teachers than membership in most other organizations to which they belong.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		14.4	36.3	16.5	26.0	6.8
24.	I do not feel that I am a real integral part of the provincial Federation.*	SA	A	U	D	SD
		6.8	33.0	15.1	34.3	10.8
25.	If I had the choice I would not belong to the British Columbia Teachers' Federation at the provincial level.*	SA	A	U	D	SD
		3.4	2.9	9.0	44.5	40.2
26.	Only the British Columbia Teachers' Federation should speak for all teachers on professional matters.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		12.2	37.5	18.5	25.3	6.5
27.	In case of a dispute between the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, at the provincial level, and some other provincial authority or agency, the teacher owes his prime loyalty to the B.C.T.F.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		20.8	47.6	17.2	11.5	2.9

28.	The British Columbia Teachers' Federation is the best body to oversee the enforcement of a code of ethics for teachers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		25.1	58.2	11.0	4.1	1.6
29.	Teachers should try to live up to what they think are the standards of the profession even if the administration or the community does not seem to respect these same standards.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		30.9	56.0	9.5	2.5	1.1
30.	One primary criterion of a good school should be the degree of respect that it commands from other teachers around the province.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		6.3	38.8	19.9	28.9	6.1
31.	Teachers should subscribe to and read the major professional journals.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		11.1	62.5	13.1	12.4	.9
32.	A teacher should not try to put what he believes to be standards and ideals of good teaching into practice if the procedures of the school prohibit them.*	SA	A	U	D	SD
		2.9	14.7	15.8	49.0	17.6
33.	A teacher should be a member of at least one specialist association and should take an active part in it.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		9.0	52.2	18.7	17.6	2.5
34.	A teacher should not give more consideration to the views of other teachers than to those of the public.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		1.8	28.7	26.0	39.7	3.8
35.	Unless a teacher is satisfied that it is best for the student, a teacher should not do anything which someone else tells him to do.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		16.9	49.7	13.3	18.3	1.8
36.	A teacher should not do anything that may jeopardize the interests of his students, regardless of who gives the directive or what school rules state.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		14.9	38.8	27.8	17.4	1.1
37.	Small matters should not have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		36.1	59.1	1.8	2.5	.5

38.	The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions should be exercised by qualified teachers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		31.4	45.6	9.0	12.6	1.4
39.	Decisions concerning textbooks, references and courses of study should be made by teachers or groups of teachers and not by the Department of Education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		40.6	43.8	7.9	7.0	.7
40.	Teachers should not be any more concerned than they are at present about the adequacy of the schools' programs for all students.*	SA	A	U	D	SD
		.9	4.7	6.1	49.0	39.3

Employee Orientation

41.	Teachers should adjust their teaching to the administration's views of good educational practice.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		2.0	17.8	19.9	43.4	16.9
42.	Typically, the school administration is better qualified to judge what is best for education than is the teacher.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		1.1	12.9	16.9	45.2	23.9
43.	Teachers should be obedient, respectful, and loyal to the principal.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5.2	41.8	28.0	19.6	5.4
44.	In case of a dispute in the community over whether a controversial textbook or controversial speakers should be permitted in the school, teachers should look primarily to the judgement of the administration for guidance.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5.4	47.2	16.9	24.8	5.7
45.	Personnel who openly criticize the administration should be encouraged to go elsewhere.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		4.5	25.3	18.7	40.9	10.6
46.	A teacher should not allow herself or himself to be influenced by the opinions of those teachers whose ideas do not reflect the thinking of the administration.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		1.6	13.1	15.6	58.7	11.0

47.	The only way a teacher can keep out of "hot water" is to follow the wishes of the top administration.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		3.8	19.4	12.2	53.5	11.1
48.	What is best for the school is best for education.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		.7	10.8	21.4	52.2	14.9
49.	A good teacher should put the interests of his school above everything else.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		2.5	15.6	15.6	52.1	14.2
50.	In case of doubt about whether a particular practice is better than another, the primary test should be what seems best for the overall reputation of the school.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		1.6	21.7	16.9	48.1	11.7
51.	A teacher should be required to be completely familiar with the written descriptions of the rules, procedure manuals and other standard operation procedures necessary for running the classroom.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		10.4	52.1	10.9	22.1	4.5
52.	The school should have a manual of rules and regulations which are to be followed seriously.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		4.5	24.6	16.9	42.2	11.8
53.	Rules stating when teachers should arrive and depart from the building should be strictly enforced.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		1.8	8.4	5.0	51.2	33.6
54.	To prevent confusion and friction among the staff, there should be a rule covering almost every problem that might come up at the school.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		1.1	9.0	4.1	49.0	36.8
55.	When a controversy arises about the interpretation of school rules, a teacher should not "stick his neck out" by taking a definite position.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		.9	4.3	7.2	56.7	30.9

Closeness of Supervision

56.	Principals should be prepared to closely supervise new teachers in the school.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		14.4	43.6	14.7	23.5	3.8

57.	Evaluators should require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		.5	17.6	11.5	53.7	16.7
58.	Principals should always visit classes on a regular schedule to determine how well teachers are carrying out their jobs.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		3.4	23.7	8.6	52.1	12.2
59.	Any evaluation scheme should include a check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans and previews of the work they intend to cover.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		3.4	20.8	11.5	42.6	21.7
60.	It is essential that principals closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		5.4	47.6	20.8	21.9	4.3
61.	Principals should know what is taking place in most of the school's classrooms during most of the day.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		9.7	53.7	11.7	22.4	2.5
62.	Principals should insist that they be consulted prior to teachers taking problems to higher authorities in the school system.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		21.4	54.2	11.7	11.3	1.4

Evaluation Model

63.	It is the overall purpose of evaluation to replace poor teaching with good teaching, not to eliminate poor teachers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		24.4	57.6	9.0	7.0	2.0
64.	Teachers and principals should be actively involved in developing the evaluation plan and reviewing it periodically.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		31.6	50.1	16.7	1.4	.2
65.	A usable definition of teaching and a job description of each position which is appropriate to each school should be developed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
		10.2	48.5	23.9	15.1	2.3

	SA	A	U	D	SD
66. Evaluations should include a pre-visit informal conference between the evaluator and the teacher to determine the teacher's objectives and purposes and to determine the characteristics of the students in the class.	22.6	64.8	7.4	4.3	.9
67. Evaluations should include a post-visit informal conference between the evaluator and the teacher. All notations on the evaluation records should be initialled by the teacher and the evaluator.	26.6	60.9	8.8	3.2	.5
68. In the event there is disagreement between the teacher and the evaluator over any item, provision should be made for other observers, acceptable to both teacher and evaluator, to participate in the evaluation.	29.4	63.4	5.2	1.8	.2
69. Provisions should be made for training the evaluators and they should be given sufficient time to do the job properly.	38.2	57.6	3.6	.2	.4
70. Evaluators should be evaluated periodically by superintendents and the teaching faculty.	33.9	57.3	7.2	1.4	.2
71. The evaluation process should itself be evaluated periodically and changed whenever improvement is possible.	45.4	52.6	1.3	.5	.2

APPENDIX B: TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Q U E S T I O N N A I R E

INSTRUCTIONS

The following items are relevant to the study and were designed so that your anonymity might be assured and yet certain self-descriptive information could be gained from your answers. Please respond by indicating a check mark in the blank of the one response which most closely identifies you.

Section A

- | | | |
|--|-----------|-------|
| 1. Your sex: | Male | _____ |
| | Female | _____ |
| 2. Marital Status: | Single | _____ |
| | Married | _____ |
| | Separated | _____ |
| | Divorced | _____ |
| | Widowed | _____ |
| 3. What is your age? (Check the appropriate blank) | under 20 | _____ |
| | 20 - 30 | _____ |
| | 31 - 40 | _____ |
| | 41 - 50 | _____ |
| | 51 - 60 | _____ |
| | over 60 | _____ |

Section B

4. Present Position:
- | | |
|--|-------|
| Regular classroom teacher | _____ |
| Department head teaching more than half-time | _____ |
| Department head teaching half-time or less | _____ |
| Vice-Principal or Principal teaching more than half-time | _____ |
| Vice-Principal or Principal teaching half-time or less | _____ |
| Other (specify): _____ | _____ |
5. Teaching level (if you are involved in more than one level check only your major responsibility).
- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Primary grades | _____ |
| Intermediate grades | _____ |
| Junior secondary grades | _____ |
| Senior secondary grades | _____ |

6. Academic and Professional Training (Check only one of the following blanks)

- Letter of permission _____
- I hold a teaching certificate but do not hold a university degree _____
- B.Ed. (elementary) _____
- B.Ed. (secondary) _____
- Bachelor's degree in a faculty other than education plus one year teaching training. _____
- Bachelor's degree in a faculty other than education plus old (post-graduate) B.Ed... _____
- Master of Education degree _____
- Other (specify): _____

7. How many school districts have you taught in since you started teaching?

- 1 only _____
- 2 _____
- 3 _____
- 4 - 7 _____
- 8 - 10 _____
- more than 10 _____

8. Number of years in your present school (count the present year as a full year)

- | | | | |
|---------|-------|------------------|-------|
| 1 year | _____ | 5 years | _____ |
| 2 years | _____ | 6 - 15 years | _____ |
| 3 years | _____ | 16 - 25 years | _____ |
| 4 years | _____ | 26 years or more | _____ |

9. How many years have you been teaching? (check one appropriate blank) (count present year as a full year)

- less than 5 years _____
- 6 - 10 years _____
- 11 - 15 years _____
- 16 - 25 years _____
- over 25 years _____

10. If you inherited enough money to live comfortably would you: (check only one of the following)

- leave teaching for a non-educational occupation?.. _____
- leave teaching for an educational administrative post?..... _____
- leave teaching for an educational consultant or supervisory post?.. _____
- leave teaching for university or college teaching? _____
- continue teaching? _____

Section C

The following section is designed to measure teachers' attitudes to their role. There are five possible answers to each statement.

STRONGLY AGREE	(SA)
AGREE	(A)
UNDECIDED	(U)
DISAGREE	(D)
STRONGLY DISAGREE	(SD)

For each statement circle the answer which indicates your attitude towards the statement.

- | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 11. It is vital to his effectiveness that the teacher should possess a thorough knowledge of his subject matter. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 12. Persons should be evaluated primarily on the basis of their ability to communicate knowledge. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 13. Schools should hire no one to teach unless the person holds at least a bachelor's degree in education. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 14. A teacher's practice should be based primarily on his acquaintance with educational literature and research. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 15. Persons who do not meet the present British Columbia certification requirements should be allowed to teach when there is a teacher shortage. * | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 16. Knowledge of educational theory is vital for effective teaching. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 17. Teachers should be expected to give after-hours instruction to pupils who are not doing well in their school work. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

*Scored negatively.

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 18. | I would rather teach than do anything else for a living. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 19. | Because of what I am able to do for society, I would continue to teach even if I could earn more money at another vocation. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 20. | A teacher should be prepared to devote the whole of his working lifetime to the occupation of teaching. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 21. | A teacher should encourage as many of his students as possible to enter teaching as a vocation. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 22. | A teacher should promote what he deems to be needed social changes through his contact with students in schools. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 23. | Membership in the British Columbia Teachers' Federation should be more important to teachers than membership in most other organizations to which they belong. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 24. | I do not feel that I am a real integral part of the provincial Federation. * | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 25. | If I had the choice I would not belong to the British Columbia Teachers' Federation at the provincial level. * | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 26. | Only the British Columbia Teachers' Federation should speak for all teachers on professional matters. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 27. | In case of a dispute between the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, at the provincial level, and some other provincial authority or agency, the teacher owes his prime loyalty to the B.C.T.F. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 28. | The British Columbia Teachers' Federation is the best body to oversee the enforcement of a code of ethics for teachers. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

29. Teachers should try to live up to what they think are the standards of the profession even if the administration or the community does not seem to respect these same standards. SA A U D SD
30. One primary criterion of a good school should be the degree of respect that it commands from other teachers around the province. SA A U D SD
31. Teachers should subscribe to and read the major professional journals. SA A U D SD
32. A teacher should not try to put what he believes to be standards and ideals of good teaching into practice if the procedures of the school prohibit them. * SA A U D SD
33. A teacher should be a member of at least one specialist association and should take an active part in it. SA A U D SD
34. A teacher should not give more consideration to the views of other teachers than to those of the public. SA A U D SD
35. Unless a teacher is satisfied that it is best for the student, a teacher should not do anything which someone else tells him to do. SA A U D SD
36. A teacher should not do anything that may jeopardize the interests of his students, regardless of who gives the directive or what school rules state. SA A U D SD
37. Small matters should not have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer. SA A U D SD
38. The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions should be exercised by qualified teachers. SA A U D SD

39. Decisions concerning textbooks, references and courses of study should be made by teachers or groups of teachers and not by the Department of Education. SA A U D SD
40. Teachers should not be any more concerned than they are at present about the adequacy of the schools' programs for all students. * SA A U D SD
41. Teachers should adjust their teaching to the administration's views of good educational practice. SA A U D SD
42. Typically, the school administration is better qualified to judge what is best for education than is the teacher. SA A U D SD
43. Teachers should be obedient, respectful, and loyal to the principal. SA A U D SD
44. In case of a dispute in the community over whether a controversial textbook or controversial speakers should be permitted in the school, teachers should look primarily to the judgement of the administration for guidance. SA A U D SD
45. Personnel who openly criticize the administration should be encouraged to go elsewhere. SA A U D SD
46. A teacher should not allow herself or himself to be influenced by the opinions of those teachers whose ideas do not reflect the thinking of the administration. SA A U D SD
47. The only way a teacher can keep out of "hot water" is to follow the wishes of the top administration. SA A U D SD
48. What is best for the school is best for education. SA A U D SD

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 49. | A good teacher should put the interests of his school above everything else. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 50. | In case of doubt about whether a particular practice is better than another, the primary test should be what seems best for the overall reputation of the school. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 51. | A teacher should be required to be completely familiar with the written descriptions of the rules, procedure manuals and other standard operating procedures necessary for running the classroom. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 52. | The school should have a manual of rules and regulations which are to be followed seriously. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 53. | Rules stating when teachers should arrive and depart from the building should be strictly enforced. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 54. | To prevent confusion and friction among the staff, there should be a rule covering almost every problem that might come up at the school. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 55. | When a controversy arises about the interpretation of school rules, a teacher should not "stick his neck out" by taking a definite position. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 56. | Principals should be prepared to closely supervise new teachers in the school. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 57. | Evaluators should require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 58. | Principals should always visit classes on a regular schedule to determine how well teachers are carrying out their jobs. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 59. | Any evaluation scheme should include a check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans and previews of the work they intend to cover. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 60. | It is essential that principals closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 61. | Principals should know what is taking place in most of the school's classrooms during most of the day. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 62. | Principals should insist that they be consulted prior to teachers taking problems to higher authorities in the school system. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 63. | It is the overall purpose of evaluation to replace poor teaching with good teaching, not to eliminate poor teachers. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 64. | Teachers and principals should be actively involved in developing the evaluation plan and reviewing it periodically. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 65. | A usable definition of teaching and a job description of each position which is appropriate to each school should be developed. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 66. | Evaluations should include a pre-visit informal conference between the evaluator and the teacher to determine the teacher's objectives and purposes and to determine the characteristics of the students in the class. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 67. | Evaluations should include a post-visit informal conference between the evaluator and the teacher. All notations on the evaluation records should be initialled by the teacher and the evaluator. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 68. | In the event there is disagreement between the teacher and the evaluator over any item, provision should be made for other observers, acceptable to both teacher and evaluator, to participate in the evaluation. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 69. | Provisions should be made for training the evaluators and they should be given sufficient time to do the job properly. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 70. | Evaluators should be evaluated periodically by superintendents and the teaching faculty. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 71. | The evaluation process should itself be evaluated periodically and changed whenever improvement is possible. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

APPENDIX C: CORRESPONDENCE

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTRE



BURNABY 2, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Telephone 291-3111 Area code 604

April 30, 1971

Mr. D. Holden
Treasurer, General Secretary's Division
British Columbia Teachers' Federation
#105 - 2235 Burrard Street
Vancouver 9, B.C.

Dear Mr. Holden:

This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation of April 28th. At that time I inquired if the British Columbia Teachers' Federation would be willing to assist in a research study which I am conducting in the Department of Professional Foundations at Simon Fraser University. Dr. Arthur Elliott is my senior advisor.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the relationships of certain characteristics and attitudes among teachers in British Columbia schools. Two important variables in the study will concern supervision and evaluation of teachers.

In order to accomplish this project I would like to send a questionnaire to a random selection of 800 teachers who are Federation members. The questionnaire is designed so that questions can be answered by a single check or circle. Precautions will be taken to ensure the anonymity of the respondents. No names will be required on the questionnaire and only composite information will be reported in the final analysis.

It would, therefore, be appreciated if you would give your authorization to conduct this study and assist me in gathering the names and home addresses of a random selection of active teachers in the B.C. Teachers' Federation.

...2

I am certain the results of the study will prove of interest to the Federation and I will be pleased to discuss them with you as soon as the analysis of the data is completed.

Very truly yours

Carlton Olson

GCO:as

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTRE



BURNABY 2, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Telephone 291-3111 Area code 604

May 6, 1971

Dear Colleague:

You are one of a number of teachers who has been chosen randomly to participate in a research study. I have obtained permission from the British Columbia Teachers' Federation and the Professional Development Centre at Simon Fraser University to conduct this survey. May I ask for a few minutes of your time and your cooperation to help me with this part of the project?

The purpose of this study is to investigate certain characteristics and attitudes of teachers throughout British Columbia. The data collected will be used for a thesis on the Master of Arts program at Simon Fraser University. Dr. Arthur Elliott is my senior advisor.

Please answer the enclosed questionnaire candidly. It is constructed for brief and easy completion. In order to ensure anonymity, you are NOT required to place your name on the questionnaire. Only composite information will be reported in the thesis.

Since you may wish to know something of the person who is imposing upon your time, I will mention my teaching background briefly. My teaching experience has covered all grade levels from three to eleven. I have taught in several districts in this province and in schools with staffs ranging in number from six to seventy. My administrative experience has been as a vice-principal and principal in elementary schools and I am currently employed as a junior secondary vice-principal in Coquitlam School District.

To make this study reasonably valid, I must have a high percentage of returns. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Please do not seal the envelope. If you would find time to complete the questionnaire within the next few days, I would be very grateful.

May I extend my thanks in anticipation of the cooperation and consideration you are giving to my request.

Yours sincerely,

CO:ms

Carlton Olson

Enclosure

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTRE



BURNABY 2, BRITISH COLUMBIA
Telephone 291-3111 Area code 604

May 28, 1971

Dear Colleague:

You recently received a letter requesting your help in a research study by completing an enclosed questionnaire.

May I thank all those who were most co-operative in completing the survey and returning it so promptly. I am indebted to you for your kind consideration.

If you have not completed the questionnaire and have not returned it, I would be sincerely pleased if you could attend to this matter at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours very truly,

Carlton Olson