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This study examined whether or not the school's mean reading score could be explained by the teachers' perceptions of the principals' supervisory behaviors and teachers' characteristics and whether each student's reading score can be explained more by the principals' supervisory behaviors or by the students' perceptions of the fifth grade class climate or by the student's selected biographic variables in a large metropolitan school system.

Ten elementary schools were selected by experts in the instructional department of a large metropolitan school system. Nine of the selected schools were Project Achievement Schools in which the students scored below the national norms on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). The students and teachers samples consisted of one hundred and seventy-eight regular classroom teachers and four hundred and twenty-five fifth grade students. The instruments used were the Student Perceptions Questionnaire.
extracted from the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument developed by the State Department of Education and the Instructional Supervisory/Behavior Questionnaire developed by Dr. Ganga Persaud. The student achievement test used was the 1985 Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Level 10) mean reading scores of individual students and mean school reading score for each of the selected schools.

In a regression analysis of the data, teachers' degree qualifications, experiences, and perceptions of principals' supervisory behaviors, in that order, predict the school mean reading score. The principals' supervisory behaviors correlated inversely with the mean reading score of the school. The overall variance, however, is small - approximately 7 percent.

In a regression analysis of the data, students' perceptions of the class climate and the principals' supervisory behaviors, in that order, predict students' reading scores. The relationships are inverse for both variables with reading scores indicating consistency between the teachers and students' perceptions. The selected biographic variables make smaller but insignificant contributions to the students' reading scores. The overall variance, however, predicted for all variables is small - just over 15 percent.

The results support the Edmonds' and Lezotte's Schools for low achievers. Support was not found for the Coleman
studies that socio-economic and environmental variables were more important than the school variables for student achievement. This was probably due to the bias of the sample in favor of low socio-economic status (SES).
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Chapter I

Introduction

While public education in American has survived over the years, the public, in general, has not been altogether satisfied with the quality of the education given. This dissatisfaction has led to myriad studies, both formal and informal, all attempting to discover why education is not effective for many students; these studies have yielded many reasons for education's ineffectiveness and have offered ways in which to improve schools and appease the public. But the public has not been appeased. Perhaps now, more than ever before, the public is clamoring for quality education for everyone in its schools. So researchers in recent years have been investigating the concept of effective schools in an effort to help educators improve the quality of education for all.

The Problem in Context

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine if the school mean reading score could be explained by the teacher's perceptions of the principals' supervisory behavior and teacher's characteristics and whether each students' reading scores can be explained more by the principals' supervisory behavior or by the students' perceptions of the fifth grade class climate or by the
students selected biographic variables in a large metropolitan school system.

**Research Questions:**

1. **Will there be a significant correlation between the mean school reading score and teachers' perception of the principals' supervisory behavior?**
2. **Will there be a significant correlation between the mean school reading score and teachers' sex?**
3. **Will there be a significant correlation between the mean school reading score and teachers' experience?**
4. **Will there be a significant correlation between the mean school reading score and teachers' degree qualification?**
5. **Will there be a significant correlation between the mean school reading score and principals' supervisory behavior as perceived by teachers than by the selected biographic variables of teachers?**
6. **Will there be a significant correlation between the individual student reading score as predicted by teachers' perceptions of the supervisory behavior than by the students' perceptions of the class climate and the students' selected biographic variables?**

**Evolution of the Problem**

School administrators are being held more accountable for their leadership styles and the directions they are
providing in the school. The State of Georgia has mandated that all of the school systems in Georgia formally assess their leadership personnel. A statewide instrument has not been provided by the state. If students' achievement is to be used as the basic criterion for the effectiveness of schools to determine the principal's instructional supervisory behaviors, then, efforts must be directed towards those teachers' behaviors which impact on students' achievement.

Former Secretary of Education, Terrell Bell, created the National Commission on Excellence in Education on August 26, 1981. It was directed to examine the quality of education in the United States as a result of the Secretary's concern about "the widespread public perception that something is seriously remiss in our educational system." The commission recommended the need to improve students' achievement on both elementary and secondary levels and emphasized the importance of improving the quality of teaching and increasing time on task towards this end.

One reason the quality of public education has become such a concern during the past twenty years is that people have become aware of the inequities in public education for minorities, the poor, and the disadvantaged. While the National Institute of Education in the 1960's declared that everyone must be provided with "an equal opportunity to
receive an education of high quality regardless of his race, color, age, handicap, national origin, and social class," it is quite apparent that a disproportionately high number of low-achieving students is disadvantaged or minorities. Some early researchers believed that the lack of resources in schools for these children accounted for their low levels of achievement. But Coleman and Campbell (1966) said that resources did not make a difference in achievement; instead, they said, family and cultural backgrounds accounted for the low levels of achievement. The Coleman Report (1966) said that resources did not make a difference in achievement; instead, the report said that variations in school facilities, curricular, and staff had little effect on achievement when they were viewed independently of family background. Later studies by subsequent researchers Lezotte and Edmonds (1975) have revealed that neither resources nor background necessarily condemns a child to low levels of achievement. The conclusion is that the school can make a difference with respect to low income students' achievement if the principal is strong on instructional leadership. The fundamental goal of supervision, according to the National Commission on Excellence in Education and Georgia's Educational Review Commission, ought to be the improvement of student performance since this is the main
concern of taxpayers, parents, and educators. On April 16, 1985, Georgia's Governor, Joe Frank Harris, signed into law the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) to achieve this goal. Student achievement is a major pertinent goal because it is the function of the state to provide the opportunities and the capacity for further learning, employment and productivity. The supervision of teachers is essential to improving students' achievement as observed by the fact that the QBE Act allocates funds for the training of principals through workshops and seminars.

Quality Instructional Supervision and Teacher Quality: Issues and Practice

The intention of the Georgia Quality Basic Education Act (1985) is also to select quality teachers through higher admission standards for the selection of teachers for training and the administration of the Georgia Teacher Certification Test for those teachers already in service. The intention to obtain quality teachers through selection, training and testing cannot be achieved in the immediate future. According to Sack (1986), "nearly two thirds of the prospective teachers from the state's traditionally black institutions failed the TCT on their first try." Further, "forty-four percent of the states' 53,370 current teachers will be accepted for the testing requirement because they either have life-time certificates or have become teachers since 1978 when the certification test was
first implemented." This means that the quality of teachers' performance in the classroom is required to be improved by other methods/strategies if students' achievement is to be increased: one strategy is to build one-year internship programs into college programs. Another strategy is to raise the quality of the college programs by rigorous state accreditation programs. These strategies, however, will not impact on current teachers. The alternative strategy, therefore, is to train the principals (as funded by the QBE Act) on the job to supervise teachers so as to improve the quality of teaching.

If teachers are to be supervised to improve their teaching quality, then what is wrong with their teaching and hence what should be the major input of the supervision process? As Sack (1966) observes:

The classroom too often is a symbol of lethargy rather than learning, a place to be endured, not enjoyed. Further, although dedicated to the professions, teachers too often emphasized obedience at the expense of independence and creativity. Lectures rarely elicit questions. Only infrequently are science experiments and history lessons made relevant to the lives of children who often never ventured beyond the county line. And again, we do not want them to think. When they start thinking, they start questioning authority. When you let them start asking questions, teachers fear they might look dumb.

John Goodlad (1963) also describes dull classrooms, boring teachers and the irrelevance of the school classrooms to the interesting experiences of students. The
standardized curricula handed down by Central Offices also encourage routine dull work, bored exercises and monotonous workbook exercises. These activities hinder the animation of classrooms. Thus, even the increase in salaries for teachers, as granted by the QBE Act, is hardly likely to improve teacher quality.

The reasonability for improving teacher quality through on-the-job supervision for growth and development lies with the principals for the supervision of teachers in the clinical supervision model. The model emphasizes rapport building on the interpersonal relationships between the teacher and the supervisor as the main mechanism whereby the teacher will improve the quality of teaching. In addition, pre-teacher conferences, observation and post-teacher conferences are used as the main mechanical steps for monitoring the teacher toward this end. Conceptually, however, if the principal does not plan for the examination of students and the re-orientation of teacher behavior, methods and curriculum content to meet the needs of students and to overcome boredom in the classrooms will hardly take place. The focus of any study, therefore, must reflect on the quality of supervision in relation to the teacher's impact on students' interests and learning.

Problems of the Target Community

According to the most recent test data on the Iowa
Tests of Basic Skills, children in several schools in a metropolitan school district scored well below national norms in the areas of reading and/or mathematics. These children do not reside in high income bracket areas. They live in the south end of the county which means this is to be expected. Numerically speaking, most of the children served by this metropolitan school district come from middle- to upper-class families residing in the populous suburban areas of a metropolitan school district.

Many of the children in the south end of the county are not as fortunate. Approximately fifteen percent of the children come from homes in an annual income bracket of $15,000 or less. These children, of course, have qualified for such programs as interrelated, Chapter I under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and Remedial Education Programs. They have also qualified for various programs under the auspices of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The educational ambitions of these students are colored by the economic deprivation of the families involved. They do not have the home environment which is conducive to ambition or the development of wholesome attitudes. Their leisure time activities are cramped into opportunity and space.

This element of the school population requires constant and vigilant attention on the part of the attendance
department and social workers. The assistance of the family services agencies and the juvenile court is often required for children in this category. It should be pointed out, however, that instances of overt misbehavior and vandalism do not occur in any greater frequency among children from these families than they do in the higher socioeconomic areas (Masser, 1964).

The general social and economic climates of the communities exert profound influences on the school and its program. This climate helps to determine needs, provide a focus and enhance or limit the school's potential.

The accumulation and analysis of data about the community are logical steps in the evaluation of the school's program. Dynamic programs should be sensitive to community needs and should be focused on positive steps toward the solution of community educational problems.

An instructional supervisor, however, if he is conscious of these factors, conducts, and stimulates teachers to analyze data on each child with respect to the home and community factors. He helps to create innovative teaching and learning strategies to resolve these problems in the classroom.

The focus of this study was to examine the intent to which the principal's instructional supervision strategies in high, middle and low achieving schools enable teachers to examine these home and community factors as they influence
their students in the classroom or whether the supervision process ignores these factors and thereby reinforce the negative influence of low parental education on students' achievement.
Chapter II
Review of Related Literature

Introduction

Chapter II presents a review of the related literature that shows how certain variables impacted on student achievement. In order to meet this objective the following topics were researched:

1. School Effectiveness Studies
2. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Hertzberg's Motivators
3. Major Components of Effective Schools
4. Student Achievement

In reviewing the literature, the writer sought to find determinants for measuring student achievement as they related to the research questions of this study and as they related to student achievement in total. The following sets forth what the literature review revealed.

In recent years, there has been an increase in the evaluation of the performance of school administrators. Attempts have been made to identify the abilities and skills necessary for school administration (Rauh, 1981).

School Effectiveness Studies

School effectiveness studies have consistently identified strong administrative (principal) leadership to be a characteristic of instructionally effective urban
These studies have suggested that principals' behaviors indirectly affect students' outcomes through their influence on teachers. The principal's efforts generally determine the quality of the school.

There is a critical need for leadership. Lipham (1981) says that the essential quality of effective leaders is that they possess a high degree of "influenced skills," which he defined as the ability to involve others and build a feeling of shared accomplishments, energy, and initiative. McGregor (1960) refers to the essence of leadership as interpersonal influence in which the influencer attempts to affect the behavior of the influenced through communication.

Senigaur (1981) examined the impact of the teacher's perception of the principal's leadership behavior and the teacher's morale on student achievement (language, reading and math). He also intended to identify those factors of the principal's leadership behavior, as perceived by the teacher, and teacher morale that impact significantly on student achievement. The sample consisted of sixty-five elementary school teachers in the Port Neches Independent School District. Requirements of the population were that teachers had to have at least one year of teaching experience and one or more years of supervision from the principals whose leadership behaviors they were describing. The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was used to provide teachers an opportunity to assess the
leadership behaviors of their principals. The Ohio Inventory of Employee Morale was used to measure the morale of teachers. Findings from this study indicated that there were no significant positive impacts found between the teacher's perception of the principal's leadership behavior, teacher morale, and student achievement.

Shultz (1983) conducted a study to determine principals' perceptions of leadership behaviors associated with school outcomes. School principals in New York State were surveyed regarding their perceptions of administrative tasks that they felt influenced student achievement. Three factors emerged on the current scale and were interpreted as school climate, assertive leadership/school climate and student testing/instrument. The principals perceived the task of assertive leadership/school climate as the more important of the two tasks on this scale. A difference was discovered between the elementary level and junior-senior high school level principals as to their perceptions of how important school climate and student testing were. Finally, two exploratory questions were included in this study. On both the current and desired scales, the principals perceived the teachers as the ones having the most effect on students' academic achievements. However, the principals perceived themselves as also having some influence on student outcomes.

Duggan (1985) investigated the effects of
principal supervisory communication style on teacher and student outcomes in the elementary schools of a large urban school district. Data for this particular study were obtained from the district's elementary schools through utilization of questionnaires, interviews, and the inspection of school records. Multiple regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses and to control the effects of school size and student socioeconomic status. Analysis of the data supported the major hypothesis of this study.

O'Day (1984) used the school "Effectiveness Program Model of Instructional Leadership" and "The School Culture Model" to test a positive relationship between principal role and behavior and student achievement.

The sample included nineteen principals, one hundred and thirty-seven teachers and seven hundred and sixty students from nineteen schools in a single suburban, middle class elementary school district.

The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (MRS) was used to measure the relationship between principal and teacher perceptions of principal instructional management behavior.

The findings of the study were not definitive. Preliminary support for the two models was justified by the findings but modifications and further testing were recommended.

Support was also found for using achievement
discrepancy scores to analyze achievements for individual students and for generalizing the effective schools' research to schools without a high proportion of urban school students.

O'Brien (1984) did an investigation of the impact of school resources on elementary students' achievement in reading and math. This study's population was non-minority and represented all socioeconomic groups. The sample included 145 third and 245 fifth grade students. Data on 82 independent variables were collected and analyzed. The students' achievement test scores in reading and math served as the dependent variables. The student-related variables that contributed toward achievement in reading/or math included the following: instructional level in reading, math, family income, father's occupation and mother's education, age, days absent, custodial parent, attitude toward subject and teacher, and years in present school. The principal-related variables contributing toward achievement included Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire production score, sex, administrative certificates and the college from which the principal's master's degree was earned. There were no recommendations for further study.

Ayers (1984) conducted a study to analyze the relationship between the factor and overall scores on the Audit of Principal Effectiveness and student achievement in
grades seven and eight as measured by gain scores on standardized achievement tests.

The null hypotheses were accepted regarding the statistical significance of these correlations. No statistically significant differences were found when the Audit of Principal Effectiveness was compared to student achievement gain data based on all standardized tests used. This sample included all middle level school principals and students in grade levels seven and eight in the Missouri School System.

Sparks (1984) investigated the relationships between current practices employed by California school districts to provide in-service training for elementary principals and pupil academic achievement.

Principals and superintendents, in a systematically selected sample of those districts, were surveyed by mail to determine practices, policies and perceptions pertaining to in-service training for elementary school principals. Content of the survey instruments was based on the recommendations from the Managers Report and the research validated characteristics of effective in-service programs. According to research, differences and relationships between the high and low achieving districts were determined using t-tests, point-biserial and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations.
The findings produced no statistically significant difference or correlation between district achievement level and the policies, practices and perceptions pertaining to principal in-service training among either the district administrators or the principals. There were implications for further study. The writer feels that there should be a replication of this study based on the identification of the high and low achieving schools throughout the state rather than districts.

Heffelfinger (1983) conducted a study that addressed the issue of whether there are school-related variables which exert significant effects on student achievement. This study replicated aspects of a research project done by Brookover (1984) in which he found that factors attributable to the social system of the school account for a significant portion of the variance in student achievement. The sample involved 789 students, 343 teachers, and 27 principals in 27 elementary schools.

Variables studied were principal climate, teacher climate, the percent of poor students, percent of minority students and achievement.

The findings indicated that there were variables under the control of the school which significantly influenced student achievement. The school climate exerted a statistically significant effect on student achievement.

The study has important implications for school
administrators since the data indicated that factors under the control of the school do in fact exert significant effects on student achievement.

Brown (1983) conducted a study that was designed to determine which factor relating to leader behaviors contribute most to high school achievement in urban inner city high schools.

The measures of leader effectiveness used in this investigation were those ratings taken from instruments developed by the New York School Improvement Project, the National Study of School Evaluation and a Study of Principals' Performance in High Priority Competency Areas, University of Texas.

The descriptive findings revealed that, generally, leader behaviors were not related to higher levels of student achievement.

Using the chi-square test for independence indicated that teacher satisfaction and the expectation that all students can master the basic objectives were associated with the leader behavior of the principal. The inferential findings revealed that, with two exceptions, achievement and "maintaining declining achievement" were approximately the same.

The six principals involved in this study from St. Louis Public School System were found to have generally the same instructional leadership profile. No recommendations
were included in this study.

Leahy (1984) conducted research to determine if there was a statistically significant correlation relationship between teachers' scores on the Teacher Perceiver Interview and students' gain scores on mathematics, language arts, and reading tests for grade five. The sample included thirty-two fifth grade teachers. They were selected at random. The method used included audio taped interviews and eight SRA tests administered to students of these teachers in the fall and again in the winter. Various tests were administered. Class mean scores were calculated for each test, pre and post. Finally, a mean gain score was calculated for each achievement test in each class. The statistical analysis of the data was completed through the use of multiple regression. Six hypotheses were tested.

The study concluded that the correlation between TPI scores and student gains in achievement was few in numbers and somewhat contradictory in nature, which leads one to believe that further study should be done, which was not implicated or recommended in this study. Also, if teachers possess high TPI scores, one cannot predict that the students of these teachers would have correspondingly high gains on their language arts, reading, and math achievement test from one test date to the next.

March (1984) did an exploratory study which
proposed to answer three questions: (1) What is the impact on indicators of school effectiveness of instructional related assistance provided by principals to teachers? (2) What is the nature of principals' expectations of instructional leadership for themselves? and (3) What is the impact of principals' efforts and perceived efficacy (to influence school effectiveness indicators) on their role consistency? Three pretested questionnaires (principal, teacher, student) were used and 28 principals, 51 teachers, and 280 students sent useful data.

The major findings of this study were as follows: There was no statistically significant correlation relationship between principals' high beliefs and close role consistency (with teachers) taken together and any of the four indicators of school effectiveness (student reading achievement scores, student reading attitudes, percentage of students above grade level in reading and teacher perceived school effectiveness). Teacher perceived student impact (SI) was negatively related to "what principals actually do (according to teachers and principals with the same school)" (PA), which, in turn, was negatively related to teacher perceived school effectiveness (TPSE). With PA influences removed, there was no relationship between SI and TPSE.

Whitelaw (1984) conducted a study to examine the processes through which the implementation stage of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Project was taking place in
two elementary schools. Qualitative, including interviews, observations, and document analysis, were employed to determine each school's level of receptivity towards change. School Effectiveness Questionnaires and Achievement Tests were used to determine the level of school effectiveness. Each school's level of receptivity to change was compared with and found to be positively related to this level of effectiveness, and also to the level of implementation and the quality of the school improvement action plans.

The findings suggested that developing the capacity of each school staff to change and improve may be critical to the successful implementation of schools' effectiveness.

Olsen, (1984) identified personal and organizational variables that were related to levels of burnout among school principals in the State of California.

A four-part questionnaire was mailed to 500 California school principals. Variables were compared to the Maslash Burnout Inventory (MBI). The Administrative Stress Index (ASI) was also utilized.

There was a statistically significant correlation between one or more of the burnout dimensions and these variables: sex, age, health, experience, hours worked, grade levels supervised, number of employees supervised, and the mental attitude and management skill techniques coping strategies.

Olsen recommended that the findings should be utilized
in pre-service and in-service training of principals. Additional research should be undertaken on coping strategies, and on the underlying reasons why certain variables are related to burnout.

There is a critical need for effective leadership in education today. Many researchers have sought methods of improving leadership effectiveness because it has been found to be a major factor in a successful school. Much of what has been written about school effectiveness of school administrators has been directed toward a definition of the functions and the responsibilities of the particular position. It has been assumed that if one fulfills his responsibilities and properly manages the functions of the organization, one will be perceived as an effective school administrator (Robinson, 1985).

Emphasis has shifted to the identification of abilities and skills that administrators need in order to be effective in an ever-changing environment. An effective principal is expected to provide instructional leadership (Robinson, 1985).

Dublin (1961) stressed the democratic approach to school administration. He emphasized that the principal must work with and through the professional staff to develop his leadership potential. The effectiveness of the principal depends upon his skills in group processes and interpersonal relations. These areas can be analyzed
according to the major competencies that are required of an effective school principal.

Some people, we are told, are born leaders. In reality, most successful leaders emerge after years of education, training, and experience. Schools require outstanding leadership.

Some leaders also cannot create an open school climate. At best, they can set the tone for their staff to create an open climate. That tone may be described best as "morale" and "work motivation" for school personnel and students. Positive morale and work motivation promote echoes that promote higher achievement by teachers and students.

The writings of prominent motivational theorists, Maslow (1954), McGregor (1954) and Hertzberg (1968) have strongly influenced educational practice and research. Maslow describes the forces that drive people to goals in terms of a "hierarchy of needs." The theory, simply stated, is that people have a series of sequential needs, which, when the most basic ones are fulfilled, activated them to strive to fulfill the next higher need in the sequence.

Maslow's theory has been extended to examine the hygienic and psychological factors that motivate workers. Research by Hertzberg (1968) of Case Western University suggests that factors involved in producing job satisfaction
and motivation are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfactions. He has found that work achievement and responsibility are among the leading factors that motivate a worker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Fulfillment Needs</th>
<th>Work Itself, Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Needs</td>
<td>Advancement, Status Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Needs</td>
<td>Supervision, Company Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Needs</td>
<td>Job Security, Working Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological Needs</td>
<td>Salary and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maslow's Hierarchy of Human Needs</td>
<td>Hertzberg's Motivators and Non-Motivators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**

**Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Hertzberg's Motivators**

In spite of the tremendous amount of energy expended by researches of school climate, the exact effect of school climate on student achievement has yet to be determined, according to Silver (1980). There is, however, enough evidence to convince professors and school leaders that administrators can promote and sustain a more positive school climate to improve student achievement by:
1. Conducting surveys to measure school climate.
2. Developing long-range goals for climate improvement.
3. Working patiently to help other administrators and teachers implement sound classroom management.
4. Believing in the strengths and talents and good intentions of staff members.
5. Creating an open communication network through frequent personal contact to keep informed about personal and professional concerns and needs.

These examples of leadership will pay off in higher levels of student achievement and higher staff morale (English, 1982). School leaders must continue to investigate how students and teachers feel about themselves, their tasks, and their school environments. Top performers need an open supportive climate.

Reported studies on effective schools support the conviction that administrators set the tone for creating a school climate conducive to learning with clear goals free from disciplinary problems and embody high expectations for teachers and students (Hojak, 1984).

**Instructional Management**

Implementing the curriculum -- to deliver it effectively to the intended recipients -- is the administrator's responsibility. To succeed in implementing
the curriculum, administrators must acquire these skills in instructional management:

1. Curriculum design and instructional delivery strategies.
2. Instructional and motivation psychology.
3. Alternative methods of monitoring and evaluating student achievement.
4. Management of change to enhance the mastery of educational goals.
5. Use of instructional time and resources.
6. Cost effectiveness and program budgeting.

Edmonds and others (1982) have stated that the goals and objectives of an organization must be written down, understood by faculty, and must serve as a goal to instructional planning.

The first skill of instructional management speaks to an administrator's ability to assess the match between the curriculum as it is written and the curriculum as it is taught. The administrator must determine if the curriculum is being implemented in the most effective way. And, if the curriculum is not effectively implemented, the administrator must be able to assess the students, their needs, and learning styles, and to assess the teachers, their strengths, preferred teaching styles, and their areas of weaknesses (Lewin and Long, 1981). The administrator,
proficient in curriculum design and instructional development, will be able to answer questions that deal with tests, placement procedures, grouping practices, instructional strategies employed by the teaching staff, etc.

Administrators cannot answer questions related to the above-mentioned without being familiar with all aspects of an instructional program. A myriad of instructional strategies is available to teachers. Too often a teacher-directed method of presenting facts and tests are predominant. If this is the case, the challenge is for the administrator to help teachers change their behavior. To be persuasive in changing teachers' behavior, it is important that administrators work toward the goal of improving student achievement (Lewin and Long, 1981).

Guagulwong (1981) conducted a study to determine if a relationship existed between the leadership styles of the principals, the maturity levels, and the job satisfaction of the elementary teachers, and to determine if the linkage between the leadership styles and the maturity levels of the principals was important. The leadership styles and the maturity levels, the leadership styles and the job satisfaction, the maturity levels and the job satisfaction were not shown to be statistically significantly related. The principal's leadership behavior does not contribute to and is not influenced by the maturity levels of school
teachers. Also, neither the skills, motivation, and experience of the teachers nor the behavioral characteristics of the principals seem to have an impact upon teachers' job satisfaction.

Calhoun (1981) investigated the role of elementary school principals in planned programs aimed at improving instruction. The central question was: What specific actions of elementary principals do teachers identify as being illustrative of leadership behaviors that lead to improved teaching-learning situations?

The findings indicated that teachers perceive decisive actions by principals on suggestions in the areas of scheduling time, space, and people as being leadership behavior. Teachers consider actions that support curricular innovation at the classroom level as illustrative of leadership behavior.

They identify actions of principals that encourage innovation and creative teaching as leadership behavior. Principals' behaviors that supported the curriculum planning process were identified most often by teachers as behaviors illustrative of leadership behaviors that lead to improve teaching-learning situations.

Williams (1982) conducted research to explore the relationship in one school district of the following variables: Principal performance and student achievement;
school climate and student achievement, and principal performance and school climate. Some of the major findings included: (1) no dependent of principal performance; (2) principal performance correlated highly with teacher perceptions of climate; and (3) teacher experience and training correlated statistically significantly with student achievement.
Major Components of Effective Schools

Faced with rising expectations from the public and often inadequate budgets for reform, American educators are turning with increasing frequency to a new school strategy for improvement that advocates and puts old-fashioned good sense into a cost-effective plan of action. The approach gains its power from one deceptively simple idea: that a set of school practices shown to promote learning in one school can do the same in any school environment.

In little more than a decade, the "effective-schools" concept has burgeoned from a description of successful inner city elementary schools what some are promoting as a blueprint for improving all schools. Tests show that both the theoretical and practical boundaries of effective-schools nations remain elusive (Olson, 1985).

Brookover (1971), who is considered to be a founder of the effective schools movement, says "American education for three-quarters of a century has been dominated by a belief that what children learn is a result of what children have in themselves and what they bring from their family. Typical explanations of student failure never mention teaching. They never mention the school."

In the early 1970's, a group of educational explorers set out upon uncharted territory. Their goal: to find schools that had broken the link between poverty and low
achievement.

The research of others, according to Olson, most notably, Coleman, Jencks, and Jensen, had been widely interpreted to mean that schools could not make a difference for poor children. But over the course of a decade, these new investigators would prove otherwise. They identified a handful of inner city schools in which the majority of students regardless of socioeconomic background had mastered the basic skills. Moreover, in these schools the researchers found, although test scores above the minimum level were distributed along a continuum, it was impossible to predict who was poor and who was not by looking at the results. Such exceptions to the rule became known as the "effective schools." At a time of great disillusionment in the power of education, they were held up as glowing examples of what was possible (Olson, 1971).

Researchers studied these successful schools to try to understand what they had done that had made them different. The features they were found to share in common "from a clear school mission and high expectations for achievement, to a safe orderly climate and strong instructional leadership, formed the basis of what is known as effective school research."

Edmonds (1979), whom many cite as the first leader of the effective schools movement, found five characteristics that effective schools shared. They are: A pervasive and
broadly understood academic focus or school mission; careful monitoring of student achievement as a basis for program evaluation; teachers who believe in and exhibit high expectations that all students can master the curriculum; a safe and orderly school climate conducive to learning; and a principal who is an instructional leader, paying particular attention to the quality of learning and teaching in his school. A number of other researchers have added positive home-school relations or strong parent involvement to the list of important components of effective schools (Cuban, 1985).

Monitoring Progress

An essential part of a strong effective school program and one that is missing from current efforts researchers say is a system for monitoring student progress. The better known programs measure student achievement on a regular basis and rely heavily on the use of test score data to determine how their curricula and practices should be changed. They also "disaggregate" test results by race and income to see whether specific groups of children are consistently doing worse than others in school (Purkey, 1985).

Many researchers contend that many of the existing effective schools' projects have failed to disaggregate test data or even to use it. Test data should not be the only
measure of a school's success (Joan Shoemaker, 1986). The traditional focus on test scores is still very, very important because it is in opposition to: "Let's not look at test scores at all."

A study of effective schools conducted in 1983 by E. Farrar and B. Nuefeld, found that only about half of 39 effective school projects actively used data of any kind to evaluate or guide their programs. The federally funded study, completed as background for "A Nation At Risk," concluded that although many of the programs claimed to have a strong impact, careful evaluation and documentation of school changes was lacking.

Focus on Instruction

Miles (1983) did an effective school program study. His 1983 study found that fewer than one third of the 39 projects surveyed were linked directly to changing or improving school curricula. Without such a tie, he contends, the programs are unlikely to have an enduring impact.

Efthim (1983), a research associate for the Pontiac, Michigan school district and co-author of creating effective schools: An In-Service Program for Enhancing School Learning Climate and Achievement, concurs. Whether or not schools are able to focus on curriculum and instructional issues, she says, is "the difference between success and failure."
High Expectations

According to Brookover (1979), it is not enough simply to express through words that school's expectation that all students can achieve a minimum level of mastery. Staff members, he says, must show through norms, behaviors, and practices of the school that they believe this to be true.

A Safe and Orderly Environment

In his often city study of effective schools, Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effect on Children, Michael Rutter (1973) found that the age of the school's physical plant made little difference in learning but the neatness and pleasantness of the building did.

But effective schools' researchers define "climate" as more than a school's physical environment. It encompasses, they say, a positive, orderly learning environment, one in which teachers feel safe and free from distractions and have a sense of shared pride, collegiality, and team spirit.

Parental Involvement

Parental participation is also a controversial factor in the effective school's research. The initial research found little evidence that parent involvement's contribution to school effectiveness, and, according to the Institute for
Responsive Education's: A Citizen's Notebook for Effective School's observations to date support the notion that "parents and citizens are not very much involved in most effective school projects."

But such researchers as Michigan State's, Brookover (1979), still maintain that effective school studies have failed to verify that, in general, parent involvement makes a difference. Programs that include it as an effective school characteristic do so primarily for "political reasons," Mr. Brookover says.

Wilson (1982) conducted research to determine if a relationship exists between the amount of parental involvement and the amount of achievement gains of third grade students who had participated in an early intervention program and students who had not been exposed to an intervention program. The control group of 24 third graders was not involved with their parents in this kind of program. The experimental group consisted of third graders who participated in an early intervention program that involved their parents. The instrument data used was the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. The experimental group did not surpass the control group at any time. The results showed support for early intervention. The data showed very little correlation between the amount of parental involvement and the amount of achievement gains for the third graders involved in the study. It, however, did show
that parents who did participate in the early intervention program continued to show a high level of involvement.

School Climate

The importance of school climate is now generally accepted by authorities in school improvement. Recent research has been especially productive. Generally speaking, (1) school climate has a direct bearing on student achievement, (2) effective schools share a climate that is instructionally effective for all of their students, (3) effective schools appear to be characterized by a positive climate which is conducive to learning (Manatt, 1985).

Rutter (1985) and his associates at the Greater London Educational Authority concluded that improvement of climate is a first step toward more effective schools and that a "good" school climate is associated with high productivity and job satisfaction. On the other hand, it appears that "poor" climate leads to student alienation, job dissatisfaction, complaining, frustration and lack of productivity.

Climate, as measured in educational settings, is usually defined as the norms and expectations held by members of the group.

The Principal's Role in an Instructionally Effective School

According to Hunter (1983), the principal as
an instructional leader needs to be knowledgeable about those principles of learning that have a direct impact on student outcomes. The research clearly delineates certain basic elements of learning and teaching behaviors that make a difference.

It is the instructional leader's responsibility to understand these processes, assist teachers in their applications, and monitor and supervise their implementations. The principal's role in the instructional process has been the object of numerous research studies across the nation over the past ten years. One of the findings common in the more important studies is that instructional leadership by the principal has a positive impact on student achievement (Robinson, 1985).

Recent research studies summarized by Block (1975) found the following:

Studies indicate that principals who are strong instructional leaders; who emphasize educational goals; who communicate high expectations for achievement to students, staff and parents; who work to maintain a good learning environment; and who support the instructional process lead higher achieving schools.

Goodlad (1979) wrote extensively while researching characteristics of effective schools and pointed to the principal as playing the key role in providing autonomy in the school unit itself; providing a sense of mission, identity, wholeness and ownership that pervade every aspect of the school's functioning; and providing the support,
encouragement and resources required for effective teacher performance. The leadership skills common to the principals of schools with high academic student achievement are learned.

Teacher Expectations

It has been widely demonstrated that teacher expectations have a significant impact on student performance (Rosenthal and Rubin, 1978); Smith (1980); and Cooper (1979). Three student characteristics that may influence teacher expectations are gender, social class, and racial group. This background information about students is easily obtainable through record cards or first encounters, whereas other information may not be available to teachers prior to observing student performance. Further, teachers appear to weigh student background equally with other sources of information in predicting achievement, even though they realize that background factors are relatively unreliable sources of information (Cooper, 1979).

Effects of Student Background on Teacher Expectation

Sex

According to Good and Findley (1983), studies of differential teacher expectations based on student sex have been rare. They reviewed five studies that examined sex differences in teacher expectations, only one of which
reported a significant main effect. Instead, student sex was sometimes found to affect teacher expectations in interaction with other variables such as the teacher's sex, the subject matter, and the school community (urban versus rural). These interactions, however, were inconsistent with regard to which gender was favored by teachers. It, thus, appears teachers favored white students, one reported results that favored blacks, and 6 studies did not report the direction of their findings. Across all 16 studies, the average white student was expected to outperform 58% of the black students.

**Teacher Authoritarianism**

According to Robinson and Shaver (1973), "the concept of authoritarianism represents an attempt to link deep seated personality dispositions with ..adherence to a rigid and domineering ideology and discrimination against outgroups." Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1960) postulated several cognitive elements underlying the authoritarian personality. These included ethnocentrism, anti-introspection, concern for status, rigid cognitive style, and intolerance of ambiguity. Because methods of measuring authoritarianism as a global trait have been criticized (Kirschet and Dillehay, 1967), researchers interested in studying authoritarianism have developed measures of its constituent elements.
Student Achievement

Student achievement is the desired outcome of educational institutions. Many variables, however, influence student achievement. The learning styles of students are among the variables to be taken into consideration in studying student academic achievement.

Calvano (1985) conducted a study to: (1) compare learning styles of high and low mathematics achievement students to determine if significant differences exist between achievement groups in respect to environment, emotional, sociological, and physical learning style characteristics, (2) examine learning styles of high and low achievement students to determine if significant differences exist which are attributable to students' grade level and gender, and to (3) determine whether developmental changes in learning styles occur across grade levels for high or low mathematics achievement students. The study indicates that differences in learning styles have implications for curriculum organization and planning.

This study involved 290 sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students enrolled in a public middle school during the 1984-85 school year. The Learning Style Inventory was administered to each subject. "High (N=12) and low (N=66) mathematics achievement students were identified according to the SRA Achievement Series. The data from the study on these students were analyzed utilizing one-way analysis of variance at the .05 alpha level of significance.
The major findings of this study demonstrated that significant differences exist between the learning styles of high and low mathematics achievement students at the middle school level. Specifically, these differences were as follows: (1) High achievement students show a stronger preference for responsibility, persistence, intake, and warmth during educational activities. (2) Low achievement students prefer tactile learning experiences, teacher motivation, the presence of authority figures, and mobility while studying. (3) High and low achievement students also differ significantly by grade level in their learning style preferences for persistence, intake, responsibility, teacher motivation, tactile learning experiences, temperature, and the presence of authority figures while studying. (4) The two achievement groups differ by gender in their learning style preference for light, tactile kinesthetics, temperature, motivation, persistence, responsibility, raise, mobility, and teacher motivation.

Summary of the Review of Related Literature

This review of related literature was comprised of several areas. The first area discussed was relative information about the school effectiveness studies. The second area included the major components of effective schools. The last area discussed was student achievement.
Chapter III gives the theoretical framework upon which this study is based.
Chapter III
Theoretical Framework

Research Focus

The writer proposes to determine if variable in the principals' supervisory behavior as perceived by teachers will explain the mean school reading score or whether the teachers' sex, qualifications and experiences will explain the school mean reading score. Further, the writer will also attempt to determine if the individual student reading score can be explained more by the teachers' perceptions of the principal's supervisory behavior or by the student's perceptions of the fifth grade class climate, sex, age, occupational choice, and parental occupational choice for the student, mother's education and father's education. These relationships are shown in the following diagram (Figure 2) in order to identify and clarify the variables to be defined.

Independent Variables

1. Principal's Supervisory Behavior (Teachers' Perceptions)
2. Teachers' :
   a. Sex
   b. Qualifications
   c. Experience
3. Fifth Grade Class Climate (Student's Perception)

Dependent Variables

Mean School Reading Score
Student's Reading Score
Independent Variables Cont'd

4. Students':
   a. Sex
   b. Age
   c. Student Occupational Choice
   d. Parental Occupational Choice for Student

5. Mother's Education
6. Father's Education

Figure 2 Reading Achievement in relation to principal's supervisory behavior, class, climate, and teachers' and students' biographic variables.

Definitions of Variables

The following definitions of variables were used for the purpose of the study.

1. **Students' Reading Score** is measured by the results of performance on the Iowa Reading Achievement Tests.

2. **School Mean Reading Score** is measured by the mean score of all students on the Iowa Reading Test.

3. **Teacher's Sex** is measured by their self-rating of their male or female biological characteristics on the Instructional Supervision/Behavior Questionnaire (ISBQ).

4. **Teacher Experience** is measured by their self rating of their numbers of years of teaching experience on the ISBQ.

5. **Teacher's Qualifications** is measured by academic degrees earned.

6. **Student's Sex** is measured by their self-rating of their male or female biological characteristics.

7. **Student's Mother's Education** is measured by the number of years of education of mother.

8. **Student's Father's Education** is measured by the number of years of father's education.
9. **Fifth Grade Class Climate** is measured by the perception of teacher behavior by fifth grade students on the Student Perceptions Questionnaire (SPQ).

Specifically, class climate is measured in terms of the degree to which the teacher is closed and criticizes students, rejects students answers, asks questions of a few students or is open and explains issues pleasantly, asks questions, all accept answers, praise students, makes sure all students understand and has high expectations of all students (See Appendix A).

10. **Instructional Principal Supervisory Behavior** is measured by the degree to which teachers see the principal on two dimensions: (a) quality of instructional supervisory behavior and (b) quality of interpersonal behavior on the ISBQ.

   a. **Instructional Supervisory Behavior** is measured by the degree to which teachers see the principal or supervisor as discussing the relationship between student's achievement and the social background of students and getting the teachers to utilize this information in planning the curriculum, teaching methodology and evaluation on the ISBQ (See Appendix B).

   b. **Quality of Interpersonal Behavior** is measured by the degree to which teachers see the principal/supervisor as closed or open in communication. The principal/supervisor is closed if he/she is opinionated and rejects -- alternative opinions in the decision-making process and intrigues and commends teachers. The principal/supervisor is open if he/she seeks and accepts alternative opinions in the decision-making process and praise teachers.

11. **Iowa Tests of Basic Skills** - tests of achievement, both norm - and criterion-referenced test designed to assess board general functioning rather than specific facts and content.
Explanation of Assumptions and Relationships
Among Variables

The principal plays the most important role in the school in charge of the supervision process. As the instructural supervisor, he sets the tone of what is to be taught, how, when and to what purpose in the classrooms. While he sets the qualification for teacher behavior in the classroom, he cannot be there every minute to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the performance (Bidwell, 1965). Consequently, the method he/she uses to get teachers to work in the classrooms is important for effective implementation. Participation Theory suggests that if he/she instructs or commands teachers, resistance will result (Koch and French, 1973), while if he/she obtains their active participation and consensus in decision-making, teachers will have an interest in implementing such decisions (Kurt and Lewin, 1980). These relationships can best be seen by referring to Getzelo and Guba's model of the social and administrative process (see Figure 3). In this model, the principal is in charge of the school as a social system. If he/she tells the teachers their roles and expectations of teaching quality in the classroom, commandingly, the teachers might agree at a face-to-face level but ignore the instructions in the teaching-learning process in the classroom. This is because the teachers, as individuals, have different personalities, needs for
Fig. 3. Structural elements (subsystems) using the Getzels-Guba Systems Model.
acceptance, and self-actualization in accordance with Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1955). When the principal commands, he/she actually rejects the teachers' needs to make contributions and to self-actualize. Hence, the principal's commands, instructions, and expectations might not match the actual observed behavior of teachers in the classroom.

If the principal ask for teachers' opinions and accepts and praises teachers for such opinions in a collaborative decision-making process, then, the teachers' needs for self-actualization will be satisfied. The resulting decisions will be closer to what the teachers also expect to do; and hence, the observed teachers' behaviors. In the post-teachers conference, the principal is expected to discuss, in a collaborative style, only those aspects which were observed by mutual agreement. If the agenda is by mutual agreement and the interpersonal communication one of acceptance, then, if the principal imposes his/her perceptions and rejects alternative opinions, he will be seen by the teacher as having a closed quality interpersonal behavior. Such teachers are likely to ignore the principal's commands in his/her absence. Open communication is likely to elicit greater teacher compliance.

The question arises as to whether collaborative clinical supervision is enough to ensure quality teaching in the classroom. If participatory decision-making is enough
to obtain quality decisions, then, the teacher will implement quality curriculum behaviors which will impact effectively on students' achievement.

The nature of participation becomes an important defining and determining characteristic. The way we define participation becomes predictive of the degree of effectiveness. In this regard the expression of opinions is not enough to ensure quality of opinions. The expression of alternative opinions and the choices made as a result of the evaluation of the alternatives will serve as an error-correcting mechanism which will ensure a degree of effectiveness (Blau and Scott, 1962). If the principal uses the teachers in a truly colloquial group atmosphere, then, the school climate and intentions will further reinforce the positive implementation of individual and group decisions.

The Clinical Supervision Model of Cogan and Goldhammer (1980) utilizes these conceptual linkages in the supervisory and decision-making processes. In the pre-teaching conference stage, therefore, the principal is expected to develop a collaborative interpersonal behavior with the teacher in the planning of classroom teaching. In the observation stages, the principal is also expected to observe only mutually agreed upon behaviors, thereby establishing good rapport with the teachers. Further, if the generation of alternatives follows the curriculum
planning cycle and uses all the factors which might inhibit teaching and learning so as to counteract their negative effects, then, teaching effectiveness might be provided to a greater degree. The supervision process not only utilizes a collaborative interpersonal behavior but also makes effective curriculum choices; therefore, their students' achievement will also be impacted.

If the teachers in the classroom are influenced by the quality of the supervision process, thus, the open supervision process is likely to influence open classrooms as perceived by students and closed supervision is likely to lead to closed classrooms as perceived by students. A students' perception scale ought to measure this and show a positive relationship between open-closed supervision and open-closed teaching climates.

Teachers' sex, experiences, qualifications and students' sex and parental education level ought not make separate contributions to students' achievement. While variations in the characteristics of teachers and students are expected to influence students' achievement by imparting variations in social and psychological needs, these different needs are accepted and used positively in the decision-making process by a participatory approach. The separate influences of teachers' and students' characteristics, therefore, are likely to be less significant than the quality of the supervision process.
Hypotheses

1. The mean school reading score will not be statistically significantly related to the teachers' perceptions of the principal's supervisory behavior.

2. The mean school reading score will not be statistically significantly related to the teachers' sex.

3. The mean school reading score will not be statistically significantly related to teachers' experiences.

4. The mean school reading score will not be statistically significantly related to teacher degree qualification.

5. The mean school reading score will not be predicted more correctly by the principals' supervisory behaviors as perceived by teachers than by the selected biographic variables of teachers.

6. The individual student reading score will not be predicted significantly by teachers' perceptions of the supervisory behaviors of principals than by the students' perceptions of the class climate and the student's selected biographic variables.

SUMMARY

This chapter provided the theoretical framework which served as the basis for this research. The definitions of the variables, relationships among the variables, and the hypotheses were stated. The next chapter discusses the methodology used in this study.
Chapter IV
Methodology

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine students' reading scores and principals' supervisory behaviors, class climate, and teacher and student characteristics in selected fifth grades in a large metropolitan school system.

Selection of Population

Ten elementary schools were selected randomly from a population of 52 elementary schools in a metropolitan system to participate in this study. Nine of the schools were selected from a population of 31 Project Achievement Schools. Elementary schools scoring lower than the national average in reading or mathematics on the 1984-85 Iowa Tests of Basic Skills were designated as Project Achievement Schools in this large metropolitan school district. The additional school selected in the study is a non-Project Achievement School. The schools were randomly selected by experts in the instructional department in the metropolitan school system. One hundred and seventy-eight regular classroom teachers and four hundred and twenty-five fifth grade students served as subjects for this study.

The schools in the district serve students from all socio-economic levels; from urban, suburban, and rural areas; and a variety of ethnic backgrounds.

52
Administration of the Instruments

With the approval of the school system's superintendent, ten schools were randomly selected to assess each subject. Two packets containing the materials listed below were prepared for each of the subjects:

1. Student Perceptions Questionnaire
2. Instructional Supervisory/Behavior Rating Scale

Included also in the packets were letters to the principal and to the teachers collecting the student data (see Appendix B), copies of Form T and Form S, and envelopes to protect confidentiality. The principal from each school assumed the responsibility for distributing to and collecting the questionnaires from the appropriate teachers and students.

Collection of School Data

Both school data and individual data were collected. School data included individual reading test scores and mean school reading scores. Individual data consisted of the Student Perceptions Questionnaire, which measured how students perceived the performance of their classroom teachers in selected areas and their attitudes toward learning and the Instructional Supervision/Behavior Rating Scale, which was designed to rate supervision general effectiveness and behaviors in the area of instructional supervision.
The Student Perceptions Questionnaire (SPQ)

The SPQ was selected explicitly for this investigation and consisted of 56 statements. Because of the complexity and multiplicity of the constructs involved, assessment by direct observation in most schools was impractical; therefore, the items were placed on a questionnaire with a summated Likert-type scale.

Numerous studies to determine the optimal number of points for numerical rating scales have been reported with conflicting results (Mayor, 1961). Mattell and Jocoby (1971), however, found no systematic relationship between the number of points on the rating scales and the reliability and validity of the scales. They concluded that this type rating measured direction, not intensity, and conversion to a trichotomous scale did not reduce reliability and validity. Items on the rating scales (SPQ), therefore, were placed on five point scales using the same clues as those on the instructional supervision rating scale, the criterion instruction.

The terms, "Always," "Often," "Most Times," "A Little," "Seldom," and "Never" were used to describe the points on both the SPQ and Rating Scale for Instructional Supervision which denote how frequently the subjects engaged in the behavior. An assumption basic to the instruments was that the more frequently the subject demonstrated the behaviors, the more effective was his job performance. The integers 1
to 5 were assigned to the clues for scoring: Always = 5, Often = 4, Most Times = 3, A Little = 2, and Never = 1.

Although Remmaro (1964) and Guilford (1964) were in agreement on the utility and effectiveness of rating scales in educational research, Guilford emphasized the need to be alert to certain general weaknesses in ratings. In addition to the randominization of items, several devices were employed to minimize the effect of constant rating errors on the Instructional Rating Questionnaire. Temporal clues (Always, Often, Sometimes, A Little, and Never) were used in lieu of value-loaded terms such as "Inadequate," "Poor," or "Superior." Some of the raters had educational and professional backgrounds similar to the raters. Results of ratings were strictly confidential and the raters were aware of this confidentiality.

A Description of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Salvia, 1975) are tests of achievement, both norm and criterion, referenced tests designed to assess broad general functioning rather than specific facts and content. It serves as continuous measures of growth in fundamental skills necessary to academic and later life success. It is designed to be used for multiple purposes, among which are (1) determination of students' developmental levels to assist in adapting instruction, (2) identification of specific qualitative
strengths and weaknesses, (3) provision of data to assist in grouping students, (4) evaluation of strengths or weaknesses in entire group performance, and (5) evaluation of individual pupil progress.

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) measure skills in reading, listening, language, vocabulary, word analysis, work study, and mathematics. Two supplementary tests measure skills in science and social studies. The ITBS tests are used in grades K-9. There are 10 levels of the tests (levels 5-18). The reading test assesses skill development in literal and inferential reading comprehension by requiring students to read paragraphs and then answer specific questions about the content of the paragraphs.

Reliability

Internal consistency reliabilities for the 1977, 1978, and 1979 standardizations of the ITBS were reported separately for fall and spring standardizations. Reliabilities range from .75 to .96 at the kindergarten and first grade levels and from .74 to .96 at the first and second grade levels. Otherwise, reliabilities for major parts of the battery all exceed .87.

Equivalent forms reliabilities are reported in the 1979-78 standardization. These range from .82 to .96 for major skill areas assessed. The authors also report long term stability of grade equivalent scores over one, two and
three, and four year intervals.

Validity

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) by Thondike (1977) measure 264 skill objectives grouped in 96 categories. They argue, again correctly, that the extent to which content validity is achieved is a matter of personal evaluation.

Predictive validity is reported for parts of the Early Primary Battery. In assessing the extent to which fall performance on the ITBS predictors spring reading achievement, the authors report validity coefficients ranging from .45 to .67.
Chapter V
Data Analysis

Introduction

The data are reported in the order of the hypotheses. Overall, the data show that while teachers' qualifications, experiences and perception of the principals' supervisory behaviors are all significantly correlated with the school's mean reading score. The order of prediction in the regression analysis of data is: teachers' qualifications, experiences and perceptions of principals' supervisory behaviors. Principals' supervisory behavior experienced by teachers correlate negatively indicating that directive behaviors more than non-directive behaviors are significant for higher mean school reading scores. The amount of variance predicted, however, is just above 7 percent. In a regression analysis of the data using each student's reading score as the dependent variable, the students' perceptions of the class climate, followed by the principals' supervisory behaviors were the significant predictors.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 states that the mean school reading score will not be statistically significantly related to teacher perception of the principals' supervisory behaviors. The data with respect to this hypothesis are stated in Table I.
In Table 1, the principals' supervisory behaviors (PRINSUP) as perceived by the teacher has a Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient Correlation of \(-0.16527\) which is significant beyond the \(0.05\) level of significance (\(n=184/r=0.159\) at \(0.05\) level of significance). The null hypothesis, therefore, is rejected in favor of a statistically significant relationship. Since the correlation coefficient is negative, it means that when the reading is high, the teachers see the principal as low in supervision and vice versa.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 states that the mean school reading score will not be significantly related to the teachers' sex. The data with respect to this hypothesis are state in Table 1. In Table 1, reading has a low and statistically insignificant correlation of \(0.02870\) with sex, therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 states that the mean school reading score is not statistically significantly related to teachers' experiences. The data with respect to this hypothesis are stated in Table 1. In Table 1, reading has a correlation of \(0.16776\) with experience which is statistically significant beyond the \(0.05\) level. The null hypothesis, therefore, is rejected in favor of a relationship.
Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 states that the mean school reading score will not be related to the teachers' degree qualifications. The data with respect to this hypothesis are stated in Table 1. In Table 1, reading has a statistically significant correlation of .20625 with degree qualifications at the .05 level; hence, the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of a relationship.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 states that the mean school reading score will not be predicted more by the principals' supervisory behaviors as perceived by teachers than by the selected biographic variables of teachers.

To test this hypothesis, a regression analysis was conducted using the school building reading scores as the dependent variable and the following variables as independent: principals' supervisory behaviors as perceived by teachers (PRINSUP), teachers' qualifications (DEGREE), teachers' experiences (EXPER), and teachers' sex (SEX). The data are stated in Table 2. In this table, teachers' degree qualifications (Beta=.175163), teachers' experiences (Beta=.16787) and principals' supervisory behaviors (Beta=.151781) significantly .05, in that order, predict the mean school reading score. The null hypothesis for principals' supervisory behaviors as the first prediction of school
reading score therefore is accepted. It should be observed that the overall adjusted R square change is only .07420 indicating that the selected variables have not accounted for much of the change in reading. Only 7 percent change is predicted indicating that 93 percent change is unaccounted for. The variables selected are not the key predictors of reading scores and other variables need to be examined.
Table 1

Correlation Matrix: Reading, Principal Supervisory Behavior and Other Variables for N-184, r=.159

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>EXPER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>READ</th>
<th>PRINSUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.0574</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPER</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINSUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Regression Analysis of the Data Using Reading as the Dependent Variable and all Other Variables as Independent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPER</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINSUP</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Constant) 492.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta In Partial</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Min Toler</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.0686</td>
<td>.0706</td>
<td>.9632</td>
<td>.9399</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MULTIPLE REGRESSION

Table 3

Regression Analysis of the Data Using Individual Students' Reading Scores as the Dependent Variable and Students' Characteristics and Principals' Supervision as Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINCSUP</td>
<td>-3.535</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-3.155</td>
<td>.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-3.236</td>
<td>.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POCCHOIC</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-1.283</td>
<td>.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.3395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTHED</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>.1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCCHOIC</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.6017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHED</td>
<td>-.849</td>
<td>11.578</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.9417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.5166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1089.6</td>
<td>186.9</td>
<td>5.829</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 3.78259 Signif F = .0006
Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 states that individual students' reading score will not be predicted significantly by teachers' perceptions of the principals' supervisory climate than by the individual student's perception of the class climate and the student's biographic variables. This hypothesis is tested by a regression analysis of the data with the individual student's reading score as the dependent variable and all other selected variables as independent. The results are shown in Table 3. In the Table, each student's perception (SPQ) of the class climate in the first significant (.0016) predictor of the teacher perception of the principals' supervisory behaviors (PRINSUP) is the second significant (.0020) predictor with a beta coefficient of -.276428. Since both variables are significant predictors of students' reading scores, the null hypothesis in favor of principals' supervision is rejected. The negative beta coefficient in each case suggests an increased relationship with the reading score. When the teacher is perceived by a student as closed, that student has a high reading score and vice versa. Similarly, when the principal is perceived by teachers as closed, that school has a high reading score and vice versa. The selected biographic variables include: parental occupational choice for students (POCCHOIC), sex of the students' (SEX), mothers' education (MOTHED), students' occupational choices (SOCCHOLC), fathers' education
(FATHED), and age (AGE) of students make smaller and insignificant contributions to the change in each student's reading score.

The total amount of adjusted R Square change produced by all the variables is .15220 (approximately 15 percent) indicating that approximately 85 percent of the variance in student reading score is not explained by these variables.

Statistical Analysis

The teachers' biographic variables significantly correlate with the school's mean score in reading. They include teachers' qualifications and experience. Schools with higher reading scores have teachers who are more qualified and experienced. The principals' supervisory behaviors as perceived by teachers correlate significantly but inversely with the school mean reading score indicating that principals are directive (who run a tight ship) seem to have high mean reading scores. This finding seems to support the effective school literature (Edmonds and Lezotte, 1979), and indicates that strong instructional leadership and orderly classrooms are necessary for student achievement of lower social class students. It does not support the human relations school of thought. On the other hand, the overall variances predict approximately only 7 percent, indicating that the main predictor variables have been omitted from this analysis and the findings should be taken with caution. When each student's reading score is
the dependent variable and a regression analysis is conducted with the student's biographic variables as the independent variable but including the principals' supervisory behaviors, the order of prediction is: students' perception of the class climate and principals' supervisory behavior as perceived by teachers. The variance predicted is just over 15 percent, indicating that again the main predictor variables have been omitted from this study. The small variance explained suggests the need for caution and interpretation. The negative beta coefficient for both variables, however, support the inverse relationship found for principals' supervisory behaviors in the teachers' profile.

There is consistent behavior in the teachers and students' profiles with respect to the school mean reading score and each student's reading score. It may well be, therefore, that the sample size is too small (ten schools) and hence, the range in each variable too small to account for more variance in the reading score. At the same time, since teachers' qualifications and experiences are positively correlated with the reading score, it might indicate what possible variable should be included in another study to explain the reading score. Teachers' qualifications and experiences explain only a small amount of variance in reading, but they imply curriculum and methodological differences. Teachers who are qualified and
experienced probably spend more time enriching the curriculum in the delivery processes. Differences in curriculum and methodologies due to teacher's qualifications and experiences, however, should be examined to account for variances in reading scores. Another problem is that the sample is drawn from the south end of the county, which by observation, has more project housing than in the north. Variation in student's social background as found in the Coleman Report, therefore, is not included. Further, the fifth graders self-rated their parents' educational backgrounds and, hence, accuracy is not assured. The occupations of parents are not included in the study.

Since the amount of variances predicted in reading scores by closed supervision and closed class climates is small, an experimental study is required to determine the validity of this relationship. For, it might well be that systematic implementation of closed supervision might bring about variance in reading scores. On the other hand, the small variance in the reading score predicted by closed supervision and closed class climate might have the achievement of the potentially strong students aided by qualified and experienced teachers. These students pushed to achieve and rated the teachers negatively. The weak students were not pushed to achieve (or being weak, they accepted the directiveness), positively, thereby, producing
an inverse relationship between reading score and student's perception of class climate. Similarly, when teachers who are qualified and experienced are pushed to achieve, they tend to resist as they desire more autonomy. Less qualified teachers are more likely than qualified teachers to accept directions as normal. Hersey and Blanchard (1973) argue that when subordinates are mature (qualified), the leader should give them autonomy as they would resent directiveness. On the other hand, immature subordinates (unqualified) prefer to be directed as they do not know the task.

Summary

Teachers' qualifications (DEGREE), experiences (EXPER) and their perceptions of the principals' supervisory behaviors predict the school mean reading score, in that order, though the amount of variance predicted is just over 7 percent. Teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership behaviors are also inversely related to the school mean reading score. When the teachers' perceptions of the principals' supervisory behaviors are placed on the students' files, it is also inversely related to each student's reading score. The student's overall perception of the class climate, however, is the first predictor of his/her reading score. Again, the relationship is inverse. The amount of variance predicted is only 15 percent, approximately.
Chapter VI
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this study is to determine if the school mean reading score could be explained by the teachers' perceptions of the principals' supervisory behaviors and selected teacher characteristics and whether each student's reading score could be explained more by the principals' supervisory behavior or by the students' perceptions of the fifth grade class climate or by the students' selected biographic variables.

The Georgia Quality Basic Education Act emphasizes the need for supervisory basic skills. The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills has emerged as the important measure of reading scores. On August 26, 1981, the National Commission on Excellence in Education emphasized the need to examine the principals' leadership, quality of the teachers, and time-on-task for their students' achievement.

The Georgia Quality Basic Education Act, by emphasizing teacher certification tests for both teachers and principals, seems to imply that the quality of these personnel is important for students' achievement. On the other hand, Goodlad (1983) and Sack (1986) suggest that it is not the emphasis on certification that is important but the quality of interaction between teachers and students in
the classroom. They suggest that classrooms should become a place of fun as well as thinking rather than the current, boring authoritarianism of the teacher.

A review of the literature suggests that the Coleman Report emphasizes the impact of parental socio-economic background more than school characteristics on students' achievement. Edmonds and Lezotte (1979) however, have shown that if two schools have the same socio-economic characteristics, but have different student achievement levels, then, the difference could be explained by the quality of the principals' supervisory behaviors.

The Main Hypotheses are:

1. The mean school reading score will not be statistically significantly related to the teachers' perceptions of the principals' supervisory behavior.
2. The mean school reading score will not be statistically significantly related to the teachers' sex.
3. The mean school reading score is not statistically significantly related to teacher.
4. The mean school reading score will not be statistically significantly related to teachers' degree qualifications.
5. The mean school reading score will not be predicted more correctly by the principals' supervisory behaviors as perceived by teachers than by the selected
biographic variables of teachers.

6. The individual student's reading score will not be predicted significantly by teachers' perceptions of the supervisory behaviors of principals than by the students' perceptions of the class climate and the students' selected biographic variables.

The research methods involved the following procedures:

A random selection of 10 elementary schools was made by school experts in a large metropolitan school system. Nine of the schools selected to participate in the study are Project Achievement Schools. The additional school selected to participate in the study is a non-Project Achievement School.

The sample consisted of one hundred and seventy-eight regular classroom teachers and four hundred and twenty-five fifth grade students. The instruments used in this study were the Student Perceptions Questionnaire extracted from the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument developed by the State Department of Education and the Instructional Supervisory/Behavior Questionnaire developed by Dr. Ganga Persaud.

The test used in this study was the 1985 Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Level 10) mean reading scores of individual students and mean school reading score for each school selected to participate in this study.
Findings

1. In a regression analysis of the data, teachers' degree qualifications, experiences and perceptions of principals' supervisory behaviors in that order, predict the school mean reading score. The principals' supervisory behaviors correlate inversely with the mean reading score of the school. The overall variance, however, is small - approximately 7 percent.

2. In a regression analysis of the data, students' perceptions of the class climate and the principals' supervisory behaviors, in that order, predict students' reading score. The relationships are inverse for both variables with reading scores indicating consistency between the teachers and students' perceptions. The selected biographic variables make smaller, but insignificant contributions to the students' reading scores. The overall variance, however, predicted for all variables is small - just over 15 percent.

Conclusion

The main conclusions are:

1. Teachers' qualifications, experiences, and perceptions of the principals' supervisory behaviors are correlates of school mean reading scores and possibly, the updating of teacher's qualification can marginally make a
difference. This aspect of the findings support the Georgia Quality Basic Education Act. The variance predicted, however, is small.

2. Each student's reading score correlates inversely with the principals' supervisory behaviors (teachers' perceptions) and the students' perceptions of the class climate. There is consistency between the teachers' perceptions of the principals' supervisory behaviors and the students' perceptions of teachers' behaviors in the classroom, lending support to Edmonds and Lezotte's (1979) findings that strong instructional leadership and orderly classroom environment are important for students in low social class environments. Again, however, the variance predicted by all variables is small, just over 15 percent.

3. The data could also be interpreted to mean that when the principal is directive to qualified and experienced teachers, they perceive this negatively as they probably feel they are mature. On the other hand, less qualified and immature teachers tend to accept this directiveness. This conclusion stems from the arguments of Hersey and Blanchard (1973). In a similar way, high achieving students would score directive teachers negatively. While low achieving students in the same class would probably score the teacher positively, hence, accounting for the inverse
4. The sample of 10 schools is small and further studies are recommended using both survey and experimental methods.

Recommendations

1. Another survey study should be conducted with a larger sample of schools and more variables to account for the unexplained 84 percent (approximately). In this study the sample size could be increased to over 30 and to include rich and poor neighborhoods so as to give more content in socio-economic variations. Different grade levels should also be included to account for differences in achievement. The curriculum and methodological strategies of the qualified versus non-qualified teachers should also be examined to determine if it was only the maturity - immaturity factor of qualified teachers which account for the inverse relationship with reading scores or whether it was the differences in the curriculum, strategies as a result of increased qualification. Teachers' interactions with students should also be measured by observations, possibly using the Flauders' interaction schedule.

2. An experimental study should be conducted with negative and positive principals' supervisory and teachers'
styles while controlling for socio-economic differences of students', teachers' qualifications and experience predictions.

3. The results support the Edmonds and Lezotte's schools for low achievers. The results do not support the findings of the Coleman studies that socio-economic and environmental variables are more important than school variable for student achievement.

4. The above recommended strategies should be viewed with great caution: strict monitoring of teachers and students might be resented by qualified and experienced teachers. The "bright" students, while achieving, might observe the negative behavior, thereby accounting for the inverse relationships between reading and supervision styles. The weak students and less qualified teachers might view authoritarianism positively, as being insecure, they might want to see it as done for their benefit. Principals and teachers should, therefore, experiment with different supervisory and teaching styles, respectively, and measure their impacts to determine the relative effectiveness - at the same time they ought to introduce more variables in the school to interact with teaching and learning because the selected variables have explained only 15 percent of the reading variance.
May 3, 1986

Dear Teacher:

I am a doctoral student at Atlanta University in the Department of Administration and Policy Studies. I am conducting a study to investigate students' reading scores, principals' supervisory behavior, class climate and teacher and student characteristics in selected fifth grades in your school district. In order to get the information needed it is necessary for me to ask questions of teachers and students. Separate questionnaires have been prepared for each.

This questionnaire has been especially prepared for you. The information that you give is completely confidential. Your answers will be used along with answers received from other teachers. Once your answers are used, all questionnaires will be destroyed. The results will not identify anyone by name or by responses.

After completing the questionnaire, please place it in the envelope provided and seal it.

Than you kindly.

Sincerely,

Fran S. Reeves
APPENDIX B
May 3, 1986

Dear Superintendent:

I am presently a doctoral student at Atlanta University in the Department of Administrative and Policy Studies. I am conducting a study to investigate students' reading scores, principals' supervisory behavior, class climate and teacher and student characteristics in selected fifth grades in your school district.

I am requesting permission to randomly select ten elementary schools to participate in my study. Also, I am requesting permission to select all fifth grade students in the selected ten schools and all regular classroom teachers in grades K-7 to complete questionnaires for this study.

Thank you for any consideration given to this matter. Your favorable response will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Fran S. Reeves
On the attached system analysis of Principal's Instructional Supervisor Behavior Rating Scale rate your principal relative to how frequently you have observed him/her perform the behaviors listed on the instrument. Print the number which best reflects your assessment of him/her on each item.

5  — Always
4  — Often
3  — Occasionally
2  — Seldom
1  — Never

IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT YOU RESPOND TO EVERY ITEM!

ALL RESPONSES WILL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE.

Thank you.
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISOR'S BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

Section A

1. The principal/instructional supervisor asks me to break down each student's reading and math scores by sex, conduct, aspirations, and parental backgrounds.

2. The principal/instructional supervisor discusses with me how the students' social backgrounds are related to their achievement scores.

3. The principal/instructional supervisor in conferences asks me to prioritize the factors which inhibit/block students' achievement in my class.

4. The principal/instructional supervisor in conferences asks me to improve the achievement scores of students' at the bottom of the class (bottom group).

5. The principal/instructional supervisor asks me to create alternative curriculum materials to resolve the learning problems of students at the bottom of the class (bottom group).

6. The principal/instructional supervisor asks me to examine the learning style of the low achievers and to choose a more creative strategy for teaching this group than for high achievers.

7. The principal/instructional supervisor encourages teachers' self appraisal with respect to teaching methods and students' achievements.
8. The principal/instructional supervisor in conferences gets teachers to follow learning objectives and teaching strategies that he/she likes.

9. The principal/instructional supervisor encourages teachers to determine learning objectives and teaching methodologies from their own assessment of learning problem.

10. The principal/instructional supervisor, when observing classroom teaching, makes teachers feel that they are being evaluated.

11. The principal/instructional supervisor is judgemental and critical when observing classroom teaching.

12. The principal/instructional supervisor sets an approving climate when observing classroom teaching.

13. The principal/instructional supervisor, in observing teachers, is concerned more with behaviors which control students than with creative approaches.

14. The principal/instructional supervisor asks teachers to conduct role playing, discovery learning, drawing, picture studies, model building, etc., for students who give discipline problems.

15. The principal/instructional supervisor prefers teachers to conduct creative activities such as role playing, discovery learning, drawing, picture studies, model building, etc., for his/her classroom observations.
16. The principal/instructional supervisor prefers teachers to explain lessons and do questions and answers sessions for his/her classroom observations.

17. The principal/instructional supervisor prefers teachers to do creative teaching than to maintain strong tight discipline.

18. The principal/instructional supervisor is concerned more with covering the syllabus and administering the tests than with the relevance of the syllabus and tests to students' needs.

19. The principal/instructional supervisor asks me to stop teaching the syllabus and do alternative learning modules when the students can not cope with the syllabus.

20. The principal/instructional supervisor, in post-teaching conferences, is often critical of what he/she observes in the classroom.

21. The principal/instructional supervisor, in post-teaching conferences, makes judgements on whether the teacher is ineffective.

22. The principal/instructional supervisor, in post-teaching conferences, focuses on all the errors he saw in the classroom than in showing his/her appreciation of the good things.

23. The principal/instructional supervisor, in post-teaching conferences, emphasizes the weaknesses he/she sees than how teachers see the problems.
24. The principal/instructional supervisor, in the post-teaching conferences, asks the teachers to analyze the teaching and learning problems and to develop their own strategies to resolve them.

25. The principal/instructional supervisor asks me to choose my own strategy for improving the learning levels of slow learners.

26. The principal/instructional supervisor asks me in conferences to show if the students who were at the bottom of the class (bottom group) at the beginning of term/year have moved up at the end of term/year.

27. The principal/instructional supervisor, in conference, asks me to give reasons why students who are at the bottom of the class (bottom group) have not achieved.

28. The principal/instructional supervisor, in conference, asks me to set achievement targets for students at the bottom of the class (bottom group) and to choose alternative curriculum strategies for the attainment of the set targets.

Section B

29. The principal/instructional supervisor does not give in when you disagree with him.

30. The principal/instructional supervisor criticizes teachers in front of others.

31. The principal/instructional supervisor asserts that everything be done as he/she instructs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The principal/instructional supervisor asks for your opinions but prefers his/her own views.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor changes policies without consulting teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor accepts new approaches to teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor lets teachers do their work in ways they think best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor decides for teachers what shall be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor is always lecturing teachers on the importance of this or that rule and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor praises teachers for giving ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor does not give reasons for asking you to do things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor explains why certain instructional activities are preferable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal/instructional supervisor accepts your alternative instructional strategies if you disagree with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The supervision process enables all teachers to develop their creative talents in teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>The supervision process enables teachers to develop understanding and skills of teaching which could not have been developed otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>The supervision process enables the teachers to relate to parents in ways which help to improve student's achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>The supervision process enables the teachers to utilize the experiences of the parents of low achieving students to improve the students' test scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>The supervision process enables the parents of low achieving students to contribute to their students' achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>The supervision process enables the interests and experiences of the low achieving students to influence the teachers' instructional methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>The supervision process enables the teachers to improve the discipline/conduct of low achieving students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>The supervision process provides workable strategies for improving students' conduct/discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>The supervision process provides essential information necessary for the teacher to improve student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Students at the bottom of the class make progress as a result of information gained in the supervision conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>The supervision process stifles teacher growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. The supervision process forces the teacher to keep to the regular syllabus.  

54. The supervision process provides for teacher self-evaluation.  

55. The supervision process provides information essential for teacher self development and growth.  

56. The supervision process provides essential information necessary for the improvement of teacher performance.  

57. The supervision process provides essential information necessary for the teacher to improve the quality of teaching.  

Please circle the correct answer.  

Degree: B.S. B.A. Masters Specialist Ed.D/Ph.D.  

No. of Years: 1-3 3-5 5-7 7-10 Above  

Sex: Male Female  

Race: Black White  

Thank you.
DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENTS

Please read each question very carefully and place a check under the number that best describes your answer. No one will see your answers.

When you have answered all the questions, fold your paper and place it in the envelope and seal it. Thank you for your prompt attention and cooperation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Perceptions</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The teacher explains the lessons in interesting and exciting ways.
   -   -   -   -   -

2. The teacher excites the imagination of all students when explaining the lessons.
   -   -   -   -   -

3. The teacher shows different examples of the same problem.
   -   -   -   -   -

4. The teacher shows films/pictures to help us learn the lesson.
   -   -   -   -   -

5. The teacher brings various objects/models to help us learn the lessons.
   -   -   -   -   -

6. The teacher gets us to draw what we feel and write about the pictures we draw.
   -   -   -   -   -

7. The teacher gets us to do role playing and drama and to write about what we do.
   -   -   -   -   -

8. The teacher places our drawings, pictures, and paintings on the walls.
   -   -   -   -   -
9. The teacher explains the lessons in different ways, until all the students learn.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

10. The teacher finds out which students do not know and helps those students to learn.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

11. The teacher asks each student to answer questions on the lessons.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

12. The teacher asks the same few students to answer questions on the lessons.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

13. The teacher uses the ideas of students as part of the lessons.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

14. The teacher asks difficult questions which most students do not know.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

15. The teacher asks easy questions which everyone answers.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

16. The teacher gets each student to give an answer in a lesson.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

17. The teacher takes answers from the same few students and forgets about the other students.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

18. The teacher takes more answers from students in the front of the class than from those at the back.

| Never | A | Some- | Most | All-
|-------|---|-------|------|------
|       |   |   3   |  4   |  5   |

19. The teacher takes more answers from students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Some-</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>times</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

at the sides than from those at the back of the class.

20. The teacher tells students off for not listening properly.

21. The teacher tells you off if your answer is not correct.

22. The teacher does not like students who do not learn.

23. The teacher is too strict.

24. The teacher tells students to ask any question we want to ask.

25. The teacher praises all the students.

26. The teacher praises some students.

27. The teacher praises a student even when the answers are not so good.

28. The teacher tells students who have low grades that they can pass the next test.

29. The teacher says that students with low grades can do just as well on tests as the brighter students.
30. The teacher says we are all equally bright students in class.

31. The teacher works very hard with students who do not know.

32. The teacher gets students who know to teach students who do not know.

33. The teacher explains how to make improvements, after grading your answers.

34. The teacher marks or grades your answers but forgets to explain what to do to improve.

35. The teacher gets you to do the test but forgets to explain how you should answer the tests.

36. The teacher explains how to answer the tests before giving the test.

37. The teacher gets us to work in groups.

38. The teacher talks to us in nice ways.

39. The teacher tells us things we do not like and hurts our feelings.

40. I am brighter than other students.

41. I am equally as good as other students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Some-times</th>
<th>Most Times</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. I feel I am not doing as well as I think I can.
43. I feel I am not doing as well as my parents think I can.
44. I do well on the tests.
45. I feel sick in me a lot.
46. I feel dizzy a lot.
47. I get tired of myself.
48. I feel bad inside of me.
49. I feel I can learn anything.
50. I ask the teacher a lot of questions.

Please give the following information:

1. The job my parents will like me to do when I grow up is ________________________.
2. The job I like to do when I grow up is ________________.
3. How many years did your mother attend school?
   elementary ____ high school ____ college ____
4. How many years did your father attend school?
   elementary ____ high school ____ college ____
5. Sex: male ____ female ____
6. Age:  9 ____ 10 ____ 11 ____ 12 ____
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