

**This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received**

69-11,050

**BROTHERS, John Everett, 1926-
THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN
OKLAHOMA 1967-1968.**

**The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1969
Education, administration**

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP
IN OKLAHOMA 1967-1968

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
JOHN E. BROTHERS
Norman, Oklahoma
1968

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP

IN OKLAHOMA 1967-1968

APPROVED BY

Fred A. Sloan Jr.
Gene Shepherd
Mary Clare Letty
Robert L. Curry

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Dedicated to:
My Mother - A Woman of
Great Courage

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to the many people who contributed to this study. Without their cooperation and assistance this study would not have been possible.

Special recognition and appreciation are due the writer's major professor and committee chairman, Dr. Fred A. Sloan, Jr., for his wise counsel and professional guidance.

Dr. Mary Claire Petty, Dr. Robert Curry, and Dr. Gene D. Shepherd gave freely of their time and were of great assistance to the writer. The writer expresses sincere thanks to them.

The Executive Committee of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the Oklahoma Education Association, who gave its endorsement to the study; the Oklahoma Education Association Staff, who supplied a list of elementary schools in the state and addressed the envelopes; and the hundreds of elementary school principals who took time from a busy schedule to respond to the questionnaire, are to be commended for their interest in improving elementary education and the elementary school principalship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
The Purpose of the Study	5
Justification for the Study	6
Method of Procedure	8
Limitations of the Study	10
Definition of Terms	11
Format for Succeeding Chapters	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE . .	13
Historical Background	14
Professional Preparation	16
Personal Characteristics	18
Participation in Professional Organiza- tions	20
Selection of Elementary School Principals	22
Role of Elementary School Principals in Decision Making	23
Economic and Professional Status of Elementary School Principals	25
The Elementary School Plant	28
Organization of the Elementary School . . .	30
The Elementary School Staff	32
III. ANALYSIS, TREATMENT, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	35
IV. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	109

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
Summary	109
Findings	110
Conclusions	117
Recommendations	119
Recommendations for Further Research	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124
APPENDIX A	131
APPENDIX B	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. College preparation of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	36
2. Elementary administrative certificates held by respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	37
3. Major field of graduate study of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	39
4. Highest degrees held by respondents when appointed to principalships, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	39
5. Advanced degree preparation of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	40
6. Preparation for the elementary school principalship, such as seminars and study sessions, provided by local school districts, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	41
7. Number of years since respondents were last enrolled at colleges or universities, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	42
8. Number of years of public school experience, including teaching, supervision, and administration, that respondents had had, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	43
9. Number of respondents who had held educational positions other than teaching, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	44

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
10. Number of years of experience as assistant elementary school principals before becoming principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	45
11. Number of different schools in which respondents had worked before becoming principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	46
12. Positions held by respondents immediately before becoming principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	47
13. Teaching experience of respondents before becoming principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	48
14. Experience as elementary school principals in districts other than the one where presently employed, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	49
15. Experience as elementary school principals in states other than Oklahoma, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	49
16. Number of different school plants in which respondents had served as principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	50
17. Number of years respondents had served in their present positions, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	51
18. Number of years of experience as elementary school principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey . . .	52
19. Populations of communities in Oklahoma served by elementary schools from which respondents responded to a 1967-1968 survey	53

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
20. Portion of the instructional day spent teaching by respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	54
21. Grades under the supervision of elementary school principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	55
22. The number of schools under the supervision of each respondent, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	55
23. Enrollment of elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	56
24. Number of Negro students enrolled in each elementary school under the supervision of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	58
25. Number of full-time teachers under the supervision of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	59
26. Number of Negro teachers under the supervision of each respondent, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	60
27. Adequacy of elementary school buildings for meeting the educational needs of students, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	61
28. Flexibility of elementary school buildings in terms of facilitating new practices, such as team teaching, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	61
29. Adequacy of instructional equipment in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	62
30. Elementary schools having instructional media centers, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	63

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
31. Adequacy of office supplies and equipment in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	63
32. Adequacy of office space in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	64
33. Elementary schools having central libraries and resource rooms, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	64
34. Adequacy of library books and materials in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	65
35. Adequacy of the neighborhood school for meeting the educational needs of students, in the opinion of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	66
36. Ages of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	67
37. Race of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	68
38. Sex of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	68
39. Marital status of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	69
40. Number of dependents of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	70
41. Degree of nongradedness in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	71
42. Degree of departmentalization in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	72

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
43. Self-contained classroom plans existing in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	73
44. Number of elementary schools with some degree of team teaching, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey . . .	73
45. Number of elementary schools having organizational plans that provide for vertical regrouping of students throughout the school term, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	74
46. Membership of respondents in professional organizations, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	75
47. Number of respondents who were permitted to attend the National Elementary School Principals' annual meetings, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	76
48. Number of respondents who received some financial help from local school districts for expenses to attend professional meetings, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	76
49. Hours per week devoted to professional activities such as conventions, conferences, college courses, professional reading, research, and writing, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	77
50. Number of respondents serving as officers or committee chairmen in professional organizations, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	78
51. Number of respondents who were employed in the same school systems where they initially became elementary school principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	79

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
52. Number of respondents required to take an examination before being appointed principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	79
53. Title of person or persons who interviewed respondents for the position of elementary school principal, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	80
54. Respondents' role in the supervision of instruction, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	81
55. Respondents' role in curriculum development, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	82
56. Respondents' role in determining teaching methods, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	83
57. Persons having the greatest influence on the selection of instructional materials, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	84
58. Feelings of respondents as to whether or not they had enough authority to carry out good educational programs in the schools where they were principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	85
59. Feelings of respondents concerning voice in selection of teachers for the schools in which they were principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	85
60. Feelings of respondents concerning the support of the administration on recommendations for dismissal of incompetent teachers, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	86

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
61. Responses of respondents as to whether or not maintenance personnel were responsible to the principal while working in the school, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	86
62. Responses of respondents regarding the principal's voice in school system policy development, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	87
63. Responses of respondents regarding the principal's voice in budget preparation for the schools of which they were principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	87
64. Responses of respondents regarding the principal's voice in the selection of instructional materials, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	88
65. Responses of respondents regarding the principal's voice in the planning of elementary school buildings, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	89
66. Authority of respondents to maintain good student discipline, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	89
67. Existence of written educational aims and objectives in school districts, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	90
68. Feelings of respondents concerning need for written educational aims and objectives, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	91
69. The existing leadership role of the elementary school principal in relation to the administration, as viewed and reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	91

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
70. The leadership role of the elementary school principal in relation to the administration as the respondents indicated it should be in a 1967-1968 survey	92
71. School systems having policies handbooks, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	93
72. Individual elementary schools having developed policies handbooks, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	93
73. Adequacy of clerical help in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	94
74. Adequacy of custodial help in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	95
75. Number of elementary schools with assistant principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	95
76. Number of respondents who felt that assistant principals were needed in the schools where they were principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	96
77. Availability of resource personnel, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	97
78. Availability of special services personnel, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	99
79. Availability of paid auxiliary personnel, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	100

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
80. Responses of respondents as to whether or not supportive personnel were responsible to the principal while working in the school, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	101
81. Adequacy of state requirements for certification of elementary school principals in Oklahoma, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey . . .	101
82. The position the elementary school principals of Oklahoma should take in regard to professional negotiations, as indicated by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	102
83. How elementary school principals' salaries should be determined, as indicated by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	103
84. School districts with minimum beginning salaries for elementary school principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	103
85. Minimum salaries in school districts, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey	104
86. Contract salaries of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	105
87. Annual gross income of respondents from work outside of the school job, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	106
88. Salary schedules for elementary school principals in school districts providing steps for graduate work above the standard certificate, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey . . .	107

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
89. Attitudes of respondents concerning formal evaluation of principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	108
90. Plans of the respondents with regard to making a career of the principal- ship, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey	108

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP

IN OKLAHOMA 1967-1968

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The elementary school principals of Oklahoma are leaders of the largest segment of the state's school population. "The elementary school is the most nearly universal of all schools."¹ In terms of educational leadership, the elementary school principalship is the position most crucial to the successful attainment of an adequate education by all of the state's children.

The elementary school is charged with building the educational foundation on which all ensuing years of the child's education will rest.² Effective leadership, a competent staff, and adequate public support at the elementary school level can produce an educational program that will

¹James E. Russell, Change and Challenge in American Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965), p. 53.

²"Constitution and Bylaws--Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, No. 1 (September, 1964), 69.

prevent many problems from developing that presently exist at higher levels of education.¹

"We have inherited a system of education whose fundamental orientation is to the past."² In the past elementary schools have been placed at the bottom of the ladder in educational expenditures. Henry J. Otto states:

As compared to high schools, elementary schools throughout our land are miserably understaffed and miserably housed with totally inadequate facilities for the job they are expected to do.

If the quest for quality in public schools is to have any meaning, it is essential that we do something drastic about improving our elementary schools.³

Elementary school principals in Oklahoma must assume much of the responsibility for convincing those who control public school budgets that elementary schools must receive at least an equal share of the money available for public education.

Broad scale and accelerated change is ahead in elementary education. Among the powerful forces sparking innovations and new approaches is the vast amount of knowledge accumulated about children and how they learn.⁴

¹Donald R. Thomas, The Wisconsin Elementary School Principal--A Study of the Elementary School Principalship in Wisconsin (University of Wisconsin: 1959), p. 1.

²James E. Russell, Change and Challenge in American Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965, p. 106.

³Henry J. Otto, "Elementary School Accreditation? Yes!" The National Elementary Principal, XLIII, No. 6 (May, 1964), 22.

⁴James B. Burr, et al., Elementary School Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1963), p. 473.

If much needed change is to take place in elementary education in Oklahoma, the elementary school principals of Oklahoma must exercise strong and knowledgeable leadership. They must become "change agents" as well as instructional strategists.¹ Principals are not likely to be viewed as true leaders merely by virtue of their positions. True educational leadership will require that principals exhibit knowledge and proficiency in many areas. Those who are educational specialists are more likely to be responsive to the "authority of competence" than they are to the authority of a position.²

The old concept of elementary school principals as head teachers, with some clerical and administrative duties, is totally inadequate.³ Today's elementary school principals should be concerned with a variety of factors influencing elementary education. Some examples are societal changes and the knowledge explosion, which have resulted in many efforts at revamping the elementary school curriculum; new knowledge about children and how they learn, which has focused attention on organization, teaching methods and early

¹Thomas C. Wood, "The Changing Role of the Teacher--How Does It Affect the Role of the Principal?" The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5 (April, 1968), 37.

²Ibid., 36.

³Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 13.

childhood education; technology and an ever increasing variety of teaching aids and materials; racial integration and the human relations aspect; involvement of the federal government and the various federally-funded programs; special pupil services; and increased staff and staff utilization. This list does not nearly exhaust the factors influencing the elementary school principalship. It merely indicates the widening range of responsibilities facing elementary school principals.

Elementary school principals can give direction to the factors influencing elementary education, or they can leave it to others. "The elementary school principalship of tomorrow will depend largely upon what today's principals do to propel the profession forward."¹

The elementary school principals of Oklahoma must take the responsibility, individually and collectively, for identifying the present role of the elementary school principalship in Oklahoma, describing what the role should be, and working to bring about needed change.

Statement of the Problem

Without exception, the literature points to increased variability of functions associated with the elementary school

¹Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 395.

principalship. The necessity for the position to be highly responsible and professional is well established. This implies, among other things, thorough professional preparation for the position and continued participation in professional activities by the person holding the principalship. It requires that local school districts recognize the importance of this key educational position and make every effort to create a set of conditions whereby elementary school principals may truly become instructional leaders.

The problem of this study, therefore, was to identify certain existing conditions pertaining to elementary schools and the elementary school principalship in Oklahoma.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to obtain information from which certain existing conditions of elementary schools in Oklahoma could be identified, as well as factors associated with the elementary school principalship in Oklahoma.

The information obtained dealt with the following broad areas pertaining to the principalship: professional preparation, professional experience, personal characteristics, participation in professional organizations, selection, role in decision making, and economic and professional status. Pertaining to schools, the following areas were investigated: school plant, organization, and supportive personnel.

It was believed that from the information obtained recommendations for needed improvements in elementary schools

and the elementary school principalship in Oklahoma could be made.

Justification for the Study

In discussing the increased responsibilities of elementary school principals, Samuel N. Block made the following statement:

The duties of elementary school principals during the past 30 years or more show a tremendous number of tasks performed by them thus indicating the scope and significance of their work.

What is the implication to the elementary schools of today? Educational leaders in some of today's elementary school districts have already recognized that the demand for services from the principal have increased beyond the ability of a single administrator to cope with these services adequately. They therefore support the view that recognition must be implemented into active assistance, if our elementary schools are to be administratively staffed on the basis of providing our children with the very best we can offer in education on the elementary level.¹

To elementary school principals who have tried to meet the present day needs in the elementary schools it is obvious that educational leaders in Oklahoma who have responsibility for budget, building planning, staffing, and equipping elementary schools, are in general unresponsive to requests that elementary schools be placed on an equal footing with secondary schools when needs are discussed. The needs and the importance of elementary schools must be forcefully called to the attention of the public, school

¹Samuel N. Block, "The Multi-Variegated Aspects of the Elementary Principalship," The American School Board Journal, CXLIX, No. 4 (October, 1964), 15.

boards, superintendents, and others who can influence educational decision making in Oklahoma.

The editor of The National Elementary Principal states:

Professional organizations of elementary school principals have an urgent responsibility to work toward the elimination of conditions which deter some of their members from doing the job they want to do--and should do. Neither the principalship nor elementary education will fulfill its responsibilities unless principals are truly principals.¹

The 1968 study by the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association indicates that 71 per cent of all elementary school principals belong to local, state, and national education associations, but that only 41 per cent belong to local, state, and national elementary school principals' associations.² Membership in professional organizations is one measure of professionalism, therefore information concerning membership of elementary school principals in Oklahoma would be useful.

The Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association, in recognition of the need to determine the existing status of elementary schools and the elementary school principalship before making recommendations for improvement, has sponsored four national

¹Mary Dawson, "Editorial," The National Elementary Principal, XLIII, No. 5 (April, 1964), 3.

²Frank W. Hubbard, "It Can Happen to Us," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 4 (February, 1968), 58.

studies. The first study was reported in 1928 and the second in 1948. The 1948 report indicated that elementary schools and the elementary school principalship were experiencing such rapid change that in order to keep abreast a study was needed every ten years; therefore, the third study was reported in 1958 and the fourth in 1968.

The National Department of Elementary School Principals recommends that similar studies be made at the state level. In recent years studies have been made in a number of states. Included among these are studies made in Kansas, Texas, Wisconsin, and Illinois. No comprehensive study has been made in the state of Oklahoma during the last fifteen years.

Up-to-date information pertaining to elementary schools and the elementary school principalship in Oklahoma must be available in order to determine the current situation and as a basis for making recommendations for improvements.

Method of Procedure

After surveying the 1928, 1948, and 1958 studies of the elementary school principalship made by the national elementary school principals' association, a questionnaire used by the Wisconsin Elementary Principals' Association in its 1963-1964 study of the Wisconsin elementary school principalship, and a study of the elementary school principalship in Oklahoma made by Walter E. Rappolee in 1953-1954,

a new questionnaire was developed for this investigation.

In October, 1967, the questionnaire was sent to a number of elementary school principals in Oklahoma with a request that they complete it and make suggestions for improvement. They were also asked to indicate the amount of time required for them to complete the questionnaire. All principals receiving the questionnaire completed and returned it with suggestions for improvement.

The questionnaire was then revised and presented to the Executive Committee of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the Oklahoma Education Association with a request for its endorsement. The committee gave its endorsement and the questionnaire was then printed for distribution.

The Oklahoma Education Association addressed envelopes so that the questionnaire could be sent to each elementary school on its mailing list. The list included 906 schools. Each elementary school principal was sent a questionnaire along with an explanatory letter. The first mailing was on November 20, 1967. By December 15, 1967, responses to the first mailing totaled 502.

The second mailing was on December 18, 1967. At that time another questionnaire along with a reminder letter was sent to all elementary school principals who had not responded to the first request. The second mailing resulted in 168 additional responses. A total of 670 responses,

representing seventy-four of the state's seventy-seven counties, was received.

The 670 responses produced a total of 641 usable questionnaires. Some of the schools had been consolidated or closed since the previous school term and forty-four of the respondents were principals of more than one school, making the total number of elementary schools somewhat less than the 906 listed on the Oklahoma Education Association's mailing list. The 641 usable returns represented 71 per cent of the 906 elementary schools on the Oklahoma Education Association's mailing list. See Table 19 for populations of communities from which responses were received.

Limitations of the Study

A study of this nature is limited to the questionnaire with its many limitations. The data received depend on the respondent being honest in his responses and on his being knowledgeable enough to give correct responses. The questionnaires were coded but unsigned, and assurance was given that they would be confidential so that there would be no predictable reason for the respondent being anything but honest in supplying data. Because of many comments written on the questionnaires by the principals and the number who voluntarily signed their names, it is felt that most of the 641 respondents felt a need for such a study and were serious in their responses.

The findings in this study are based on the 641 responses received. Since distribution of returns by school districts was not established and an accurate list of all elementary school principals in the state was not available, caution should be exercised in applying the findings of this study to the population.

Definition of Terms

Meanings of technical terms used in the study are as follows:

AASA--American Association of School Administrators.

ACEI--Association of Childhood Education International.

ASCD--Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

DESP-NEA--The Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association.

DESP-OEA--The Department of Elementary School Principals of the Oklahoma Education Association.

Elementary school--Any form of organization that includes children who fall within the traditional grades of kindergarten through Grade 8.

Elementary school principal--The person placed in charge of an elementary school or schools.

Respondents--Those 641 elementary school principals in Oklahoma who completed and returned questionnaires.

Teaching principal--A principal who teaches one-half or more of the instructional day.

Format for Succeeding Chapters

Four chapters were required to present this study. The materials were gathered and organized in this manner: Following the introductory chapter, Chapter II presents a review of related research and literature. Chapter III contains treatment, analysis, and interpretation of the data gathered. Chapter IV summarizes the study, presents findings, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations based on the findings and conclusions. Suggestions for further research are also presented.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

In the continuing search for knowledge, concerning the learning process and better ways and means of implementing the concept of universal education, the elementary school and its educational leader, the elementary school principal, have been receiving an ever increasing amount of attention.

Jacobson and others stated:

In recent years the principalship has been the focus of widespread and well-financed research.

So great is the extent of the recorded information concerning the functions of school principals that it would take many years to acquire, through personal investigation alone, the bare knowledge needed to meet the demands of the principal's position. The interpretation of this extensive body of pertinent and essential information comprises a task too great for the practicing principal.¹

Even so, principals must make a concerted effort to keep abreast of available knowledge concerning elementary education and concerning their responsibilities as educational leaders. They may in some cases contribute to that knowledge.

¹Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Reavis, and James D. Logsdon, The Effective School Principal (2d ed.; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. iii.

It would require a volume of considerable size just to list the sources of information concerning elementary schools and the elementary school principalship; therefore, this chapter is limited to historical background and selected sources of information pertaining to the elementary school principalship as related to the following areas: professional preparation and experience, personal characteristics, participation in professional organizations, selection of elementary school principals, role in decision making, and economic and professional status of principals.

Pertaining to schools, the following areas are discussed: historical background, school plant, organization, and personnel.

Historical Background

Tax-supported common schools began to appear in the 1850's. Many changes have taken place in most elementary schools since their beginning as one-room, ungraded, multi-age schools, each with a single teacher in charge. Even so, many elements in today's elementary schools could have been identified in the schools of the nineteenth century.¹

As the elementary school population began to grow, multi-classroom units and graded organizational plans, based on common ages of children, appeared. This gave rise to the

¹William D. Hedges, "Will We Recognize Tomorrow's Elementary School?" NEA Journal, LVI, No. 9 (December, 1967), 9.

position of "head teacher," but it was not until the early part of the twentieth century that the position emerged as a status position in school administration. Information pertaining to the elementary school principalship prior to the 1920's is very inadequate.¹

In February, 1921, the National Association of Elementary School Principals was organized. In July, 1921, it became a department of the National Education Association. In 1931, the Department appointed its first full-time executive secretary. As it developed programs and staff to meet the needs of elementary school principals, its membership moved steadily ahead: 1921-22, 665; 1930-31, 4,829; 1940-41, 6,392; 1950-51, 10,552; and 1960-61, 19,383. The estimate for 1967-68 is 25,457.²

The Department established a permanent office at the NEA headquarters in Washington, D. C. in 1931. In 1952, the Department's magazine, The National Elementary Principal, was revamped and enlarged, and in 1955 the Department began holding its own annual meetings.³

¹Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 341.

²The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 4 (February, 1968), 58.

³Mary Dawson, "Professional Associations of Elementary School Principals," The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study, Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958), p. 190.

The membership and activities of the Department have greatly expanded since the original fifty-one elementary school principals established the organization in 1921.¹

Hicks and Jameson state:

The elementary school principalship as a professional position has developed in the short span of about fifty years. This is, indeed, a brief period in comparison to the growth of other professions. Historically, we know that the elementary principalship was conceived rather narrowly as clerical and administrative in function. When these two early responsibilities are contrasted with all of those duties and challenges inherent in the position today, we have a fairly clear indication of how much more is expected of the principal. The differences also denote, to a great extent, the increased confidence which has been placed in the ability of principals to assume responsibility for the total curriculum in the elementary school.²

More than ten years have passed since the above statement was written, and in that time many elementary school principals have assumed even greater responsibilities.

Professional Preparation

Otto and Sanders state:

In 1920 most rural schools (about 250,000 of them) were taught by teachers who had only a short-course type of preparation taken in lieu of the senior year in high school, or had a one-year post-high school course at a teachers college. The majority of elementary school teachers had completed a two-year course at a teachers college. By 1961 nearly all teachers had Bachelor's degrees and in some states more than half of the teachers held Master's degrees.

¹Ibid., p. 191.

²William V. Hicks and Marshall C. Jameson, The Elementary School Principal at Work (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 302.

The principalship now exists in a radically different professional environment.¹

By 1960 the typical requirement for the elementary school principalship was three years of successful teaching experience plus a master's degree. Most states require special certification for elementary school principals. As early as 1928, the Department of Elementary School Principals had recommended the master's degree as a minimum amount of college preparation for the elementary school principalship.

Cunningham states that elementary school principals must create and sustain improved levels of professional performance or they may be swept aside in the maelstrom of contemporary events.²

The following recommendations are made in a 1967 publication of the Department of Elementary School Principals:

The recommendations of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, pertaining to programs for the preparation of elementary school principals should be brought more insistently to the attention of colleges and universities offering such programs and to certification officials in the various states.

The constituent parties capable of making somewhat authoritative pronouncements regarding a certain desirable, foundational, minimum core in these programs should assume that responsibility as a joint endeavor. Involved would be representatives of state certification officials, the individual college and university departments offering programs, national,

¹Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 341.

²Luvern L. Cunningham, "Continuing Professional Education for Elementary Principals," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, No. 5 (April, 1965), 60-61.

state, and regional organizations of elementary school principals, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The Master's degree program should be eliminated as a halfway step toward the achievement of desired training for elementary school principals. It should be replaced by a planned, unified two year post-baccalaureate program leading to the Specialist in Education certificate in this field.

Certain curriculum content in these programs should be given greater emphasis than it appears to receive at present. For example:

- a. Theory and process in organization and administration.
- b. Research and statistics; independent study.
- c. Procedures in elementary school curriculum development, recent trends.
- d. Field experience or internship.
- e. Democratic leadership; group behavior and processes.
- f. Instructional leadership in various subject matter fields.

The program for the preparation of elementary school principals should be consistent with the concept that the role of the incumbent in that position is one of a leader of learning rather than a maintainer of a building.

Rigorousness in selective admissions policies and practices in this program should reflect acceptance of the concept that the position is one of major significance necessitating incumbents whose personal, academic, and professional qualifications are extraordinary.¹

Personal Characteristics

Most studies of the elementary school principalship include the personal characteristics of age, sex, and marital status, but not the race of individuals.

The average age of elementary school principals in the United States is, at present, forty-six.² He is usually

¹Glaydon D. Robbins, "Preparation of Elementary School Principals--Present Practices," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI, No. 3 (January, 1967), 50-51.

²Frank D. Dorey, "The Principal in American Life Today," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 6 (May, 1968), 4.

older than most of the teachers and most of the parents with whom he deals. He has witnessed tremendous social, scientific, and technological change within his lifetime and is faced with a continuing need for change within the educational program he administers.

The percentage of elementary school principalships held by men has shown a steady increase since 1928. The first elementary school principalships were held almost entirely by men. Late in the nineteenth century large numbers of women began holding positions as elementary school principals, and by 1928, 55 per cent of the supervising principals were women. In 1948 the percentage had shifted to 59 per cent men and 41 per cent women. By 1958, 62 per cent of the supervising principals were men and 38 per cent were women.¹

In the 1968 survey, by the Department, 77.6 per cent of the supervising principals were men and only 22.4 per cent were women. Of all principals reporting, including teaching principals, 75.2 per cent were men and 24.8 per cent were women.²

¹The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study, Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, XXXVIII, No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958), 110.

²"Highlights of the 1968 Survey on the Status of Principals and the Principalship," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 2 (November, 1967), 62.

Clare Broadhead, et al., state that they doubt sincerely that the administrative behavior of an effective principal has any generic basis.

A good principal is a good principal. But the continued desire to mix professional careers with personal family responsibilities will hamper the woman as long as the social milieu of the United States continues to stress the fundamental role of the woman as a mother, wife, and companion--the essential ingredients of the social cement that keeps families together in our American society.¹

The percentage of advanced degrees is higher among men teachers than it is among women teachers. Since most states require a master's degree or a five-year college program as a minimum for certification as an elementary school principal, this is probably another factor in the decline of the percentage of elementary school principals who are women.

Pertaining to marital status of elementary school principals, the Department's 1968 survey indicates that 83.1 per cent of all principals are married.

Participation in Professional Organizations

In education, professional associations play a significant role, making a concerted drive for increased public support of the schools, upgrading the profession, and expanding the reservoir of knowledge underlying the educational program.²

¹Clare Broadhead, et al., "The Woman Principal: Going the Way of the Buffalo?" The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 5 (April, 1966), 11.

²The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study, Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, XXXVIII, No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958), 168.

For most elementary school principals there is an opportunity to participate in local, state, and national associations. In the DESP 1958 survey, about 94 per cent of the principals reported membership in at least one elementary school principals' association. But only about six in ten reported membership at all three levels. Among all elementary school principals reporting, membership in local associations was 89 per cent, in state associations 85 per cent, and in the national department 66 per cent. Professional organizations appeal most to the principal in a city of 100,000 to 500,000 population, who is in a larger school and who has considerable experience and education.

The Department of Elementary School Principals--NEA, in its 1968 study, reports that seventy-one in one hundred elementary school principals belong to local, state, and national education associations and estimates that at least 85 per cent of DESP members who are eligible also hold membership in the National Education Association.¹

Large numbers of elementary school principals are members of, and active in, many professional organizations. These professional organizations include ASCD, ACEI, NEA; specific subject matter councils such as reading, English, and mathematics; state education associations, administrative organizations; Phi Delta Kappa; and a variety of others.

¹Frank W. Hubbard, "It Can Happen to Us," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 4 (February, 1968), 58.

The typical elementary school principal is becoming very active professionally.

Selection of Elementary School Principals

Otto and Sanders state:

Leadership for the improvement of local procedures and criteria for the selection of principals should issue from the local principals association. If such leadership is not provided by the local principals group inappropriate procedures may prevail indefinitely or the board of education may adopt policies which would be disapproved by the local principals. The time is here for groups that wish to be considered professional to take the lead in setting standards for themselves. In the future principals should blush with shame if there are further examples of legislatures, school boards, or other lay groups foisting outmoded or inappropriate standards upon them.¹

The selection of principals is one of the most important decisions faced by superintendents of schools.²

Joan Claire Gordon suggests that a professional school administrator, like members of other professional fields, should find that his knowledge, his skills, his sureness and confidence are desired and sought by school districts across the nation. Boards of Education often comb the country for the best superintendent, but for elementary

¹Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 396.

²William B. Brown, et al., The Right Principal for the Right School (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1967), 6.

school principals this is not the case.¹

James Burr states that the odds for obtaining a promotion to an elementary school principalship within a system are far greater than for securing a principalship in another district.²

Other requirements, in addition to being a teacher in the district, seem to be: involvement in curriculum studies and in-service programs, continued graduate study, procurement of advanced degrees and administrative certification, and the ability to become recognized in the system.

Gordon feels that a skilled elementary school principal can operate effectively anywhere and that the intimate knowledge of the particular school district can be provided through in-service programs. Many districts select elementary school teachers through widespread recruitment. Why not elementary school principals?

Role of Elementary School Principals in Decision Making

Don E. Hamachek states:

One's role as decision-maker and change-agent is more involved than, for example, a simple listing of desirable "leadership traits." It is more involved than the human relations theory idea that leadership grows from a group's consent to grant authority. It is more complicated than the simple recognition that

¹Joan Claire Gordon, "Selection of Elementary School Principals," The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 5 (April, 1966), 62-63.

²James B. Burr, Elementary School Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1963), p. 417.

informal power organizations meet to plot, scheme, and discuss at coffee breaks, lunch time, or after school. To tell you what you must do and how you must behave to be an effective change-agent and decision-maker is to dictate. Moreover, to explain decision-making or one's role as change-agent in terms of administration theory or theories serves only to unduly abstract and impersonalize the highly personal meanings and implications of any given leadership role--not the least of which is a principalship.¹

There is growing specialization among school personnel which reflects the knowledge explosion.² Authority now comes from competence, and the principal will need to take advantage of the knowledge and skills of specialized personnel if he is to make competent decisions.

The typical elementary school principal makes dozens of decisions each day.³ Those who will be affected by the decisions should be involved in the process. By the same token, decisions that affect the school such as those made by central office personnel and school boards, should involve the elementary school principal and his staff. As teachers have become more competent, they have insisted on having a greater voice in educational decision making. Elementary

¹Don E. Hamachek, "Leadership Styles, Decision-Making, and the Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 5 (April, 1966), 28.

²Thomas C. Wood, "Changing Role of the Teacher--How Does It Affect the Role of the Principal?" The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5 (April, 1968), 36.

³Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 378.

school principals are becoming more competent and should also insist on having an appropriate voice in decisions affecting them and the elementary school.

Economic and Professional Status of
Elementary School Principals

"School principals share fully in the economic handicap that hangs over the entire teaching profession."¹

Studies made by the Department of Elementary School Principals between the years 1928 and 1958 indicate that the relative economic status of elementary school principals, as compared to classroom teachers, has dropped; however, NEA Research Division figures for the period 1958-1959 to 1965-1966 indicate that elementary school principals have made a slightly higher percentage of gain in salary than have classroom teachers for the same period of time.

Needs of elementary school principals could easily be neglected by boards of education as they struggle with the demands of militant groups of classroom teachers.

Mary Dawson states:

One of the fundamental requirements in establishing salaries for school personnel is a salary schedule. A written schedule provides an ordered structure of compensation which may be applied equitably to all personnel.²

¹"The Financial Status of Principals," The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study, Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958), p. 119.

²Mary Dawson, "Salaries of Elementary School Principals," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI, No. 5 (April, 1967), 17.

The NEA Research Division reports for 1965-1966 indicate that the smaller the school district, the less frequently are principals on a salary schedule. With 70 per cent of the nation's elementary school principals employed by districts with enrollments of under 12,000, the indication is that many principals do not have the advantage of a written salary schedule. Single salary schedules are almost universal for classroom teachers, but are the exception for principals.

In the January, 1968, issue of The National Elementary Principal, Mary Dawson makes the following recommendations pertaining to a salary schedule for elementary school principals.

Recommendation 1: The salaries of all elementary school principals should be determined in accordance with the provisions of a formal, written salary schedule.

Recommendation 2: The written schedule should include all information necessary for determining how the schedule is applied and administered.

Recommendation 3: Salary schedules for elementary school principals should be built on a ratio differential which states the base salary for principals as a ratio of teachers' salaries.

Recommendation 4: The ratio differential schedule should state the base salary for elementary school principals as a percentage of the maximum scheduled salary for teachers with a master's degree.

Recommendation 5: Salary schedules for elementary school principals should recognize a minimum of three levels of preparation: the master's degree (the base preparation level in the schedule), the sixth year, and the doctor's degree. Equivalent and relevant course hours should be accepted in lieu of a sixth year certificate and a doctorate.

Recommendation 6: The salary differentials between each preparation class recognized in the principals schedule should be in at least equal proportion to the preparation differentials for teachers.

Recommendation 7: Salary schedules for elementary school principals should recognize experience in the principalship through a series of substantial annual increments. (A maximum of six increments is suggested.) A minimum of three years of out-of-district experience in the elementary school principalship should be credited for salary purposes.

Recommendation 8: Size of school is not, of itself, an adequate measure of the difficulty of a principal's job and should not unquestioningly be used in salary schedules as a criterion for differentiating among principalships. If size of school is determined to be an appropriate factor in scheduling elementary principals' salaries in a particular school district, there should be no more than two or three size classifications in the schedule.

Recommendation 9: Grade level of school is not an adequate measure of variations in principals' responsibilities and should not be a basis for differentiating salaries of principals.

Recommendation 10: Salary recognition of differentiation in responsibilities among principalships should be based on an examination of the district's schools to determine whether there are significant differences.

Recommendation 11: Salary schedules for elementary school principals on an extended work year should provide additional compensation proportionate to the amount of time their work year exceeds that of teachers.¹

If elementary school principals expect to receive adequate salaries and to improve their overall professional image, they must concern themselves with the following: local, state, and national elementary school principals' associations must be strengthened; greater numbers of elementary school principals must become members of their professional groups; responsibility for expanded membership must be both

¹Mary Dawson, "Guidelines for Scheduling Elementary School Principals' Salaries," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 3 (January, 1968), 49-54.

individual and group responsibility.¹

Elementary school principals must display genuine professional leadership within local communities and educational leadership for school staffs. As a professional group, they must call attention to the need for adequate staff, materials, equipment, and facilities to support the instructional program of elementary schools.

The Elementary School Plant

James E. Russell made the following statement:

I have seen many communities where a new high school was built and an elementary school was moved into the old building. Where is the community that built a new elementary school and moved a high school into the old building?

When we finally treat the elementary school as our first priority, we will have a true revolution in American education.²

In far too many instances, when new elementary school buildings are planned, the people who will be using the facility are not consulted. Some superintendents of schools and boards of education consider school plant planning their sole prerogative.³ Where this is the case elementary school principals should make known their desire to become involved.

¹Mary Dawson, "Professional Associations of Elementary School Principals," The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study, Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958), pp. 168-199.

²James E. Russell, Change and Challenge in American Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), p. 62.

³James B. Burr, et al., Elementary School Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1963), p. 251.

Too often principals and their staffs have to make the school programs fit the buildings instead of the buildings being planned to fit the educational programs.¹ Buildings should be planned to facilitate the activities that are expected to be going on in the buildings. It is quite common in the planning of elementary school buildings to leave out such important areas as physical education space, a reception room, conference rooms, a teacher's workroom, a room for storage of instructional supplies, a library or instructional materials center, counseling and testing rooms, and restroom facilities for adults.

Otto reports that over 60,000 elementary school buildings have been built in the United States since 1950.² Functional designing and deviation from conventional patterns are prevalent, but far too many new buildings are not much more than a rearrangement of the old egg-carton concept with some beauty added. "If a school is to be a genuine educational center, it must have adequate and suitable facilities for accommodating all of the elements of a good educational

¹Emory Stoops and Russell E. Johnson, Elementary School Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p. 95.

²Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), p. 308.

program."¹ These elements include numerous facilities in addition to classrooms.

Organization of the Elementary School

School organization is a framework for an educational program and is designed to facilitate achievement of particular educational goals. Ideas about what constitutes an appropriate framework vary considerably--at any given point in time, as well as from one point in time to another.²

In 1848, the Quincy Grammar School began in Boston. It provided a one-teacher-per-grade organization and was the beginning of the "graded" school.³ The graded school was easy to administer, but within a few years it came under attack mainly because of its lack of flexibility. Large numbers of children were failing, bright children were not being challenged, many students were dropping out in the upper grades, and lower grades were becoming overcrowded.⁴

During the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century, many organizational plans were proposed in an effort to modify or change the graded organizational design. None of the plans proposed

¹Hollis A. Moore, et al., "Classrooms Plus," Elementary School Buildings: Design for Learning (Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1959), 123-134.

²Mary Dawson (ed.), "Elementary School Organization," The National Elementary Principal, XLI, No. 3 (December, 1961), 3.

³Ibid., 51.

⁴Ibid., 52.

provided the necessary solutions, and except for a few traces in some schools, they have disappeared.¹

It is only in this decade that a strong movement is being mounted to break the pattern of graded education. This movement brings with it an ancillary activity--the alteration of the self-contained classroom.

Current issues and findings in elementary education lead to two distinct educational movements: nongrading and team teaching.²

McLoughlin reports that research shows little superiority in either academic achievement or social adjustment for nongraded schools, but he concludes that true nongradedness has seldom been tried, although up to 30 per cent of U. S. districts report doing so. He further states that the nongraded school is defensible only because the graded school is indefensible. The justification of the nongraded school comes from its efforts to correct the instructional errors of the graded school. McLoughlin says that as long as schools try to group away differences they are not nongraded. Non-grading says: "Accept children as they are, with all their differences, and teach to these differences. Don't try to eradicate them!"³

¹Ibid., 52-59

²Maurie Hillson, "Current Issues and Research Concerning Elementary School Reorganization," Elementary Education--Current Issues and Research in Education (New York: Free Press, 1967), pp. 225-226.

³William P. McLoughlin, "The Phantom Nongraded School," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, No. 5 (January, 1968), 248-250.

Carlin states:

Team teaching goes hand in glove with nongraded organization. Most proponents of the nongraded school cite team teaching as a highly desirable, if not necessary, concomitant. These two programs grew up and went to school together.¹

Organization is important, but it should not be the first consideration of a school. The school should first establish educational goals and determine the desired activities for attaining the goals. Organization should be an outgrowth of educational goals and goal activities. It should be flexible and dynamic.²

The Elementary School Staff

The staff is the key to success in any school. A good staff can overcome many handicaps, but the best in educational facilities, equipment, materials, and programs cannot offset the effects of a poor or inadequate staff.

The Department of Elementary School Principals, in its 1967 business meeting, adopted a resolution pertaining to auxiliary personnel. The resolution contained the following statement:

The operation of an effective elementary school program involves a wide variety of activities and great diversity in the types of competence needed

¹Philip M. Carlin, "A Current Appraisal of Team Teaching," Elementary Education--Current Issues and Research in Education (New York: Free Press, 1967), p. 260.

²Mary Dawson (ed.), "Elementary School Organization," The National Elementary Principal, XLI, No. 3 (December, 1961), 19.

for directing or supporting these activities. For much too long, schools have not had a sufficiently diversified staff to cope with this wide range of activities. Time that should be spent on truly instructional and administrative responsibilities is used for clerical and routine tasks because teachers and principals do not have adequate supporting staff. The need to correct this situation increases as the school program becomes more diverse and more complex.¹

A survey by the NEA Research Division in 1967 indicated that about one in five public school teachers (19 per cent) has assistance from a teacher aide. Of these, 14 per cent share the services of one or more aides with other teachers; 5 per cent have one or more aides of their own. No striking difference existed between the proportion of teachers in small systems and the proportion in large systems who reported that they had aides. Geographically, more teachers have the services of teacher aides in the West than in other regions of the country.²

There is federal money available now for the employment of aides, and the amount will probably increase. This fact makes it urgent that teacher-preparation institutions prepare prospective teachers to work with auxiliary personnel. In addition, school districts should cooperate with colleges in planning effective preparation programs for

¹The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 1 (September, 1967), 75.

²NEA Journal, LVI, No. 8 (November, 1967), 16.

aides and for the teachers to whom the aides will be assigned.¹

With elementary school instructional programs becoming more diverse and more complex, the roles of teachers are changing. Teachers may become specialists on a team of specialists. The team may be supported by a variety of teacher aides, resource persons, consultants, and special services personnel, in addition to the supportive personnel normally available to the school. Teachers may become team leaders, managers of resources, coordinators of aides and auxiliaries, curriculum makers, innovators, specialists in methodology, or they may have some responsibilities not yet foreseen.²

We are in the midst of rapid change, and the roles of teachers will continue to change. This situation places great responsibility on those institutions preparing teachers and requires well planned in-service education programs.

Elementary school principals must exhibit multidimensional leadership moving their total staffs toward clearly identified goals. Is the task too great?

Every complex endeavor imposes cruel demands upon those charged with its development. This is, and

¹The National Elementary Principal, XLVI, No. 6 (May, 1967), 4-5.

²Alexander Frazier, "The New Elementary School Teacher," The New Elementary School (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1968), pp. 96-112.

ought to be, a challenge for those involved. One may not know everything about curriculum content, but he may know a great deal and he can continue to learn. He should not be disqualified from participating in the instructional program simply because his knowledge does not extend to the farthest limits. In this limitation he keeps splendid company. No physician knows "all" medicine; no lawyer knows "all" law; and no physicist knows "all" physics. Even within highly specialized professions (and we hold that the principalship is highly specialized), members suffer from lack of knowledge. It is this realization that makes for the spirit of inquiry which inhibits arrogance. In other words, we reject the implication that if one does not know all, he knows nothing.¹

Elementary school principals are the central figures on elementary school staffs. Elementary school programs are not likely to be effective in the absence of informed and dynamic leadership on the part of principals.

¹James Curtin and Stanley Gilbertson, "The Principal and the Instructional Program," The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 1 (September, 1965), 54-55.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS, TREATMENT, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents the data obtained from a survey responded to by 641 elementary school principals in Oklahoma during the 1967-1968 school term. The data gathered were used for the primary purposes of identifying certain existing conditions pertaining to elementary schools and the elementary school principalship in those schools. Some comparisons are made with data obtained by the Department of Elementary School Principals-NEA, in a 1966-1967 national survey, which was published in 1968.¹

Responses to the questions included in the Oklahoma survey are recorded in the following tables:

The data in Table 1 show that 84.6 per cent of the respondents (the 641 elementary school principals in Oklahoma who responded to the questionnaire) held the master's degree or higher. This was 4.7 per cent above the national figure of 79.9 per cent.

¹The Elementary School Principalship in 1968--A Research Study (Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1968).

Less than 1 per cent (0.8) of the respondents reported having doctor's degrees, while nationally the figure was 1.8 per cent.

TABLE 1.--College preparation of respondents as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Preparation	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Bachelor's degree	93	14.5
Master's degree	235	36.7
Master's degree plus 16 college hours .	183	28.5
Master's degree plus 32 college hours .	119	18.6
Doctor's degree	5	.8
No response	6	0.9
Total	641	100.0

In the national sample of the DESP-NEA 1968 study, 3.2 per cent reported preparation of less than a bachelor's degree, while in Oklahoma every elementary school principal reporting held at least a bachelor's degree.

In Oklahoma, the master's degree plus 16 college hours was required for a standard elementary administrator's certificate. If a principal taught one-half or more of the instructional day, an elementary administrator's certificate was not required. Of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting, 51.2 per cent reported preparation

below the minimum requirement for a standard certificate in elementary school administration. Of the 51.2 per cent, 14.5 per cent held only bachelor's degrees.

The data contained in Table 2 show that 57.7 per cent of the respondents reported that they held a standard elementary administrator's certificate. Undoubtedly some of those included in the 57.7 per cent received the standard certificate before 1959, at which time the requirements were raised from a master's degree to a master's degree plus 16 college hours.

The 1968 DESP-NEA study indicated that only 36.3 per cent of the elementary school principals held certificates in elementary school administration.

TABLE 2.--Elementary administrative certificates held by respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Certificates	Number Reporting	Per Cent
None	142	22.2
Elementary provisional	73	11.4
Elementary standard	370	57.7
Other	45	7.0
No response	11	1.7
Total	641	100.0

Since 42.7 per cent of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting were teaching principals, (see Table 20) and only 22.2 per cent indicated that they did not hold an administrator's certificate, a considerable number of teaching principals must have held provisional or standard elementary administrators' certificates. The 1968 national DESP-NEA study indicates that 19.2 per cent of all elementary school principals did not hold administrators' certificates.

As shown in Table 3, 94.7 per cent of the 641 respondents reported a special area of graduate study; 4.8 per cent reported no specialization or no graduate work. This is almost the same as the national figures reported in the 1968 DESP-NEA study, which were 95 per cent and 5 per cent, respectively.

Elementary school administration, as a major field of study, was reported by 47.5 per cent of the national sample in the 1968 DESP-NEA study, as compared to 45.7 per cent for the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting.

Either elementary education or elementary supervision and curriculum was the major field of study for 21.4 per cent of the respondents, while nationally these fields included 17.8 per cent.

The data in Table 4 indicate that of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting, 55 per cent held master's degrees at the time they were appointed to principalships.

TABLE 3.--Major fields of graduate study of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Major Fields of Study	Number Reporting	Per Cent
No graduate study	20	3.1
Elementary administration	293	45.7
Secondary administration	41	6.4
General administration	95	14.8
An academic subject field	22	3.4
Elementary education	126	19.7
Elementary supervision and curriculum .	11	1.7
Special field, i.e., guidance, speech, etc.	19	3.0
No specialization to date	3	.5
No response	11	1.7
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 4.--Highest degrees held by respondents when appointed to principalships, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Degrees	Number Reporting	Per Cent
None	35	5.5
Bachelor's	250	39.0
Master's	351	54.7
Doctor's	2	.3
No response	3	0.5
Total	641	100.0

The 5.5 per cent who reported having no degrees when appointed to principalships were most likely appointed before 1951, at which time all teachers in Oklahoma were required to have at least bachelor's degrees for certification. A teacher's certificate was one of the requirements for an administrator's certificate.

As shown in Table 5, 25.1 per cent of the 641 respondents reported that they were working toward advanced degrees. This is an encouraging figure when one considers that 84.6 per cent of the 641 respondents reported holding at least the master's degree (see Table 1).

TABLE 5.--Advanced degree preparation of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Degree Preparation Status	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Working toward an advanced degree . . .	161	25.1
Not working toward an advanced degree .	469	73.2
No response	11	1.7
Total	641	100.0

The figures in Table 5 indicate that quite a few of the 641 respondents were working toward doctor's degrees.

The data in Table 6 indicate that 15.8 per cent of the 641 elementary school principals reporting were provided with some kind of preparation for the principalship by local school districts.

TABLE 6.--Preparation for the elementary school principalship, such as seminars and study sessions, provided by local school districts, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Preparation	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Some preparation provided	101	15.8
No preparation provided	525	81.9
No response	15	2.3
Total	641	100.0

In the 1968 DESP-NEA national study, when asked, "What type of experience or preparation has contributed most to your success as a principal?", 1.5 per cent gave credit to in-service programs of the school system where employed. The study did not report the percentage of principals who had been involved in this type of preparation.

As indicated in Table 7, almost three-fourths (74.9 per cent) of the 641 elementary school principals reporting had been enrolled at colleges or universities within the last five years. Of the total reporting, 15.7 per cent had not been enrolled for the past ten or more years.

The median number of years of public school experience of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals responding was 20.6 (Table 8). The median for the national sample, as reported in the 1968 DESP-NEA study, was 18 years.

TABLE 7.--Number of years since respondents were last enrolled at colleges or universities, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Years	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Less than one	137	21.4
1	110	17.2
2	87	13.6
3	67	10.4
4	41	6.4
5	38	5.9
6-9	44	6.9
Ten or more	101	15.7
No response	16	2.5
Total	641	100.0

Of the 641 respondents, 15.3 per cent reported fewer than ten years of experience, while almost 40 per cent (39.3) reported having had more than twenty-five years of public school experience.

Almost 35 per cent (34.9) of the 641 respondents reported that they had held educational positions other than that of teacher (Table 9). Among the positions reported were: superintendent, secondary school principal, coach, counselor, supervisor, and consultant.

TABLE 8.--Number of years of public school experience, including teaching, supervision, and administration, that respondents had had, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Years	Number Reporting	Per Cent
1	0
2 - 5	37	5.8
6 - 9	61	9.5
10 - 13	70	10.9
14 - 17	88	13.7
18 - 21	78	12.2
22 - 25	48	7.5
26 - 29	66	10.3
30 - 33	68	10.6
34 - 37	53	8.3
38 - 41	54	8.4
42 - 45	11	1.7
46 or more	0
No response	7	1.1
Total	641	100.0
Median		20.6

The data in Table 9 also show that 62.9 per cent of the principals reporting had not held positions other than classroom teacher before becoming elementary school principals.

TABLE 9.--Number of respondents who had held educational positions other than teaching, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Positions Other than Teacher	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Have held position other than teacher .	224	34.9
Have not held position other than teacher	403	62.9
No response	14	2.2
Total	641	100.0

The figures contained in Table 10 show that 80.7 per cent of the 641 respondents had not served as assistant elementary school principals. Of the respondents who had served as assistants, only 1.4 per cent reported being assistants for more than five years. This could indicate that the position was a step on the way to the principalship rather than a professional position in its own right.

It is likely that as long as nearly half (46.5 per cent) of the respondents must teach one-fourth or more of the instructional day, the position of assistant elementary school principal is not likely to become prevalent (Table 20). Another factor may be size of school. Many elementary schools may have been too small for it to be economically feasible to provide the diversity of staff needed to support comprehensive educational programs.

TABLE 10.--Number of years of experience as assistant elementary school principals before becoming principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Years	Number Reporting	Per Cent
0	517	80.7
1	52	8.1
2 - 5	48	7.5
6 - 9	5	.8
Ten or more	4	.6
No response	15	2.3
Total	641	100.0

Fifty-eight per cent of the 641 respondents had worked in two or more schools before becoming elementary school principals (Table 11).

The largest single group reporting (33.1 per cent) had worked in only one school.

Forty-eight per cent of the 641 respondents were elementary school classroom teachers immediately before assuming the principalship (Table 12). This compares with 60.8 per cent nationally.

More than 41 per cent (41.3) of the respondents came to principalships from positions outside of elementary school education. About 7 per cent of this group reported some previous experience as elementary school teachers.

TABLE 11.--Number of different schools in which respondents had worked before becoming principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

	Number of Schools	Number Reporting	Per Cent
0		45	7.0
1		212	33.1
2		149	23.2
3		130	20.3
4		49	7.6
5		23	3.6
6		8	1.3
Seven or more		13	2.0
No response		12	1.9
Total		641	100.0

Almost 50 per cent (49.6) of the 641 respondents reported some teaching experience in Grades 4, 5, or 6. A much smaller percentage (12.3) had taught kindergarten or primary (Grades 1-3). The data in Table 13 indicate that 4.9 per cent of the 641 respondents started their public school experience as elementary school principals.

Almost two-thirds of the respondents had taught in junior highs or high schools. Many of these had also taught in elementary schools.

TABLE 12.--Positions held by respondents immediately before becoming principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Positions	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Classroom teacher (elementary)	308	48.0
Classroom teacher (jr. high)	53	8.3
Classroom teacher (sr. high)	67	10.4
Superintendent	28	4.4
Teacher and coach	38	5.9
Secondary school principal	23	3.6
Elementary school assistant principal	30	4.7
Other	55	8.6
No response	39	6.1
Total	641	100.0

Of the 641 respondents, 34.6 per cent had served as principals in more than one district (Table 14). The majority of the respondents (57.1 per cent) had served as principals only in the districts where they were presently employed. According to James Burr, most elementary school principals are selected from personnel within the districts making the selections; therefore, it was expected that the majority would not have had experience as principals in more than one district.

TABLE 13.--Teaching experience of respondents before becoming principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Grade Levels	Number Reporting	Per Cent
K - 3	79	12.3
4 - 6	318	49.6
7 - 9	229	35.7
10 - 12	195	30.4
Other	84	13.1
No experience	32	4.9
Total	938 ^a ^b

^aA number of principals reported having had teaching experience in two or more of the grade level categories listed; therefore, the total of 938 exceeds the 641 questionnaires received.

^bThe percentage is listed only for each grade level category. No total is given because it would exceed 100 per cent.

Very few of the 641 principals reporting (4.7 per cent) had served as elementary school principals outside of the state of Oklahoma (Table 15).

The general practice seems to be not only to select elementary school principals from within the state but also to select them from within local school districts.

The data in Table 16 show that 51.2 per cent of the 641 principals reporting had served as elementary school principals at more than one school.

TABLE 14.--Experience as elementary school principals in districts other than the one where presently employed, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Other School Systems	Number Reporting	Per Cent
None	366	57.1
1	95	14.8
2	46	7.2
3	39	6.1
4	15	2.3
5	6	.9
Six or more	21	3.3
No response	53	8.3
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 15.--Experience as elementary school principals in states other than Oklahoma, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Experience in Other States	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	30	4.7
No	575	89.7
No response	36	5.6
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 16.--Number of different school plants in which respondents had served as principal, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

School Plants	Number Reporting	Per Cent
1	274	42.7
2	149	23.2
3	92	14.3
4	53	8.3
5	17	2.7
Six or more	17	2.7
No response	39	6.1
Total	641	100.0

Since 57.1 per cent of the respondents reported that they had served as elementary school principals in only one district, some districts must reassign principals quite often within the district.

Nationally, 81 per cent of the principals had served in only one school in their present school systems.

The typical respondent, as determined by the median, had held his present position 5.8 years (Table 17). The national median was reported as 5 years in a survey by the DESP-NEA.

Seventy per cent of the national sample had held their present positions for fewer than ten years as compared

to 66.8 per cent of the Oklahoma Principals reporting.

TABLE 17.--Number of years respondents had served in their present positions, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Years	Number Reporting	Per Cent
1	63	9.8
2 - 5	230	35.9
6 - 9	135	21.1
10 - 13	73	11.4
14 - 17	40	6.3
18 - 21	31	4.8
22 - 25	18	2.8
26 or more	15	2.3
No response	36	5.6
Total	641	100.0
Median		5.8

Of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting, 46.7 per cent reported fewer than ten years of experience as elementary school principals (Table 18). Nationally, 52.4 per cent reported fewer than ten years.

In Oklahoma, 4.6 per cent of the 641 respondents reported thirty or more years of experience in the principalship as compared to 4.7 per cent nationally. The median for the national group was nine years as compared to 9.5 years for the Oklahoma respondents.

TABLE 18.--Number of years of experience as elementary school principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Years	Number Reporting	Per Cent
1	31	4.8
2 - 5	154	24.0
6 - 9	115	17.9
10 - 13	85	13.3
14 - 17	73	11.4
18 - 21	58	9.0
22 - 25	37	5.8
26 - 29	18	2.8
30 - 33	14	2.2
34 - 37	7	1.1
38 - 41	7	1.1
42 or more	1	.2
No response	41	6.4
Total	641	100.0

The figures contained in Table 19 show the population classes from which the elementary school principals in Oklahoma reported.

The smallest communities, under 2,500, made up the largest single group, with 27.6 per cent. The largest communities, 50,000 and over, were next with 25.9 per cent. The remainder reported from communities ranging in population

from 2,500 to 49,999. This distribution represents seventy-four of the seventy-seven counties in Oklahoma.

TABLE 19.--Populations of communities in Oklahoma served by elementary schools from which respondents responded to a 1967-1968 survey

Populations	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Under -- 2,500	177	27.6
2,500 -- 4,999	62	9.7
5,000 -- 9,999	58	9.1
10,000 -- 29,999	97	15.1
30,000 -- 49,999	43	6.7
50,000 or over	166	25.9
No response	38	5.9
Total	641	100.0

The data in Table 20 indicate that about one-half of the 641 respondents spent some of their time teaching. Of the group reporting, 46.5 per cent spent one-fourth or more of the instructional day teaching while 47.9 per cent reported that they did not have any teaching responsibilities. Of the remaining number who returned the questionnaires, 5.6 per cent did not respond to the question.

In the 1968 DESP-NEA national study, 57.7 per cent of the principals reported no teaching responsibilities. This is almost 10 per cent greater than the 47.9 per cent

reported by the Oklahoma respondents.

TABLE 20.--Portion of the instructional day spent teaching by respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Time Teaching	Number Reporting	Per Cent
None	307	47.9
One-fourth	24	3.8
One-half	115	17.9
Three-fourths	52	8.1
Full-time	107	16.7
No response	36	5.6
Total	641	100.0

As shown in Table 21, 72.5 per cent of the elementary schools of Oklahoma included in the reports from the 641 respondents were organized on a K-6 plan, or a 1-6 plan. Of the 641 reporting, 38.4 per cent reported that kindergarten was included as a part of the program as compared with 50.4 per cent nationally.

There is very little difference between the practices reported in the Oklahoma study and those nationally, concerning the number of schools under the supervision of individual elementary school principals. In Oklahoma, 87.1 per cent of the 641 respondents supervised only one school (Table 22) while the national figure was 87.7 per cent.

TABLE 21.--Grades under the supervision of elementary school principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Grades	Number Reporting	Per Cent
K - 6	222	34.6
1 - 6	243	37.9
K - 8	17	2.7
1 - 8	67	10.5
K - 3	7	1.1
1 - 3	2	.3
Other	47	7.3
No response	36	5.6
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 22.--The number of schools under the supervision of each respondent, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Schools	Number Reporting	Per Cent
1	558	87.1
2	34	5.3
3	8	1.2
Four or more	2	.3
No response	39	6.1
Total	641	100.0

It was not common practice for school districts from which reports were received, to require elementary school principals to supervise more than one school.

The enrollments of elementary schools, as reported by the 641 respondents, varied from less than 1.1 per cent with fewer than 50 pupils, to 3.3 per cent with more than 1,000 pupils (Table 23).

TABLE 23.--Enrollments of elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Enrollments	Number Reporting	Per cent
0 - 49	7	1.1
50 - 99	33	5.1
100 - 199	110	17.2
200 - 399	205	32.0
400 - 599	143	22.3
600 - 799	50	7.8
800 - 999	32	5.0
1,000 or more	21	3.3
No response	40	6.2
Total	641	100.0

The largest percentage of respondents (32.0) reported enrollments of between 200 and 399. The 641 respondents reported a total of 6.2 per cent of their schools had enrollments

of fewer than 100 pupils. Nationally, 5.1 per cent of the schools had fewer than 100 pupils.

Of the respondents reporting Negro students in attendance, 15.1 per cent reported fewer than ten. With only 1.1 per cent of the principals reporting a total enrollment of fewer than fifty (see Table 23), and with 12.5 per cent reporting fifty or more Negro students in attendance, it seems clear that the percentage of elementary schools which were integrated was very small. One must also consider that some of the schools with more than fifty students were all-Negro schools.

Slightly more than half (50.2 per cent) of the 641 respondents reported that there were no Negro students attending the elementary schools of which they were principals (Table 24). Undoubtedly many of the elementary schools with no Negro students were in areas where there were no Negro residents and of the 42.8 per cent with Negro students in attendance, some were most likely all-Negro schools.

The median number of full-time classroom teachers reported by the 641 respondents as being under their supervision was 12.4 (Table 25). This compares with a national median of 18. Slightly less than 6 per cent (5.9) of the respondents reported fewer than five teachers under their supervision, while 10.6 per cent reported twenty-five or more.

TABLE 24.--Number of Negro students enrolled in each elementary school under the supervision of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Negro Students	Number Reporting	Per Cent
0	322	50.2
1 - 9	97	15.1
10 - 19	37	5.8
20 - 29	23	3.6
30 - 49	37	5.8
50 - 69	21	3.3
70 - 99	18	2.8
100 - 199	12	1.8
200 - 399	10	1.6
400 - 599	9	1.4
600 - 799	7	1.1
800 - 999	2	.3
1,000 or more	1	.2
No response	45	7.0
Total	641	100.0

As shown in Table 26, 70.3 per cent of the 641 respondents reported having no Negro teachers on their staffs. Since 42.8 per cent reported having some Negro students (Table 24), and only 24.9 per cent reported having Negro teachers on their staffs, it would seem that student

integration had advanced more than staff integration.

TABLE 25.--Number of full-time teachers under the supervision of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Teachers	Number Reporting	Per Cent
1 - 4	38	5.9
5 - 9	127	19.8
10 - 14	173	27.0
15 - 19	108	16.9
20 - 24	69	10.8
25 - 29	32	5.0
30 - 34	18	2.8
35 - 39	10	1.6
40 or more	8	1.2
No response	58	9.0
Total	641	100.0
Median		12.4

Since only 2.2 per cent of the 641 respondents reported having fifteen or more Negro teachers on their staffs, it would seem that there were very few large elementary schools with all-Negro teaching staffs under the supervision of the respondents.

More than 30 per cent (30.6) of the 641 respondents reported that the buildings in which they served were

inadequate for meeting the educational needs of the students (Table 27).

TABLE 26.--Number of Negro teachers under the supervision of each respondent as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Negro Teachers	Number Reporting	Per Cent
0	451	70.3
1 - 4	128	20.0
5 - 9	7	1.1
10 - 14	10	1.6
15 - 19	6	.9
20 - 24	5	.8
25 - 29	2	.3
30 - 34	1	.2
35 - 39	0
40 or more	0
No response	31	4.8
Total	641	100.0

The 30.6 per cent figure represents 196 elementary school buildings. If adequate elementary school programs were defined in terms of present and future needs, it is possible that the figure would have been much higher.

Less than half (48.1 per cent) of the 641 respondents felt that the buildings of which they were principals were flexible enough (Table 28).

TABLE 27.--Adequacy of elementary school buildings for meeting the educational needs of students, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Adequacy of School Buildings	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	409	63.8
Inadequate	196	30.6
No response	36	5.6
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 28.--Flexibility of elementary school buildings in terms of facilitating new practices, such as team teaching, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Flexibility of School Buildings	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	308	48.1
Inadequate	288	44.9
No response	45	7.0
Total	641	100.0

It should be noted that only 30.6 per cent of the respondents felt that the elementary school buildings in which they were principals were inadequate for meeting the educational needs of students (Table 27), but when asked if the buildings were flexible enough to facilitate new practices, such as team teaching, 44.9 per cent reported that they were not (Table 28).

As shown in Table 29, 70.5 per cent of the principals reporting felt that the elementary schools of which they were principals were adequately supplied with instructional equipment.

TABLE 29.--Adequacy of instructional equipment in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Instructional Equipment	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	452	70.5
Inadequate	151	23.6
No response	38	5.9
Total	641	100.0

The availability of federal funds, in recent years, for the purchase of many types and items of instructional equipment, might be one explanation for the fact that more than 70 per cent of the 641 respondents reported adequate instructional equipment available.

In recent years the term "instructional media" has become quite common in educational literature. There has been much written concerning the establishment of instructional media centers in elementary schools. The data in Table 30 show that 47.3 per cent of the 641 respondents reported having instructional media centers in the schools where they were principals.

TABLE 30.--Elementary schools having instructional media centers, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Instructional Media Centers	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	303	47.3
No	290	45.2
No response	48	7.5
Total	641	100.0

Although 83.6 per cent of the 641 respondents reported having adequate office supplies and equipment (Table 31), only 70.4 per cent reported having adequate office space (Table 32).

TABLE 31.--Adequacy of office supplies and equipment in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Office Supplies and Equipment	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	536	83.6
Inadequate	79	12.3
No response	26	4.1
Total	641	100.0

Most likely the availability of new and additional office supplies and equipment had materialized more rapidly

than the availability of new and additional office space. As more clerical personnel and more modern office equipment become available to elementary schools, the need for additional office space will most likely increase.

TABLE 32.--Adequacy of office space in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Office Space	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	451	70.4
Inadequate	167	26.0
No response	23	3.6
Total	641	100.0

Less than half (48.4 per cent) of the 641 respondents reported the existence of central libraries and resource rooms in the schools of which they were principals (Table 33).

TABLE 33.--Elementary schools having central libraries and resource rooms, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Central Libraries and Resource Rooms	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	310	48.4
No	307	47.9
No response	24	3.7
Total	641	100.0

More than 70 per cent (70.5) of the 641 respondents felt that adequate library books and materials were available to the schools (Table 34).

TABLE 34.--Adequacy of library books and materials in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Library Books and Materials	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	452	70.5
Inadequate	159	24.8
No response	30	4.7
Total	641	100.0

In the schools without central libraries, there is a question as to the availability of a wide variety of library books to all students at all times.

Seventy-five per cent of the 641 respondents indicated that they considered the neighborhood school adequate for meeting the educational needs of students (Table 35).

Many educators have begun to question the adequacy of the "neighborhood school" for meeting the educational needs of children. There is some question concerning the ability of small neighborhood elementary schools to provide adequate staffs, materials, facilities, and educational programs needed to equip students for successful living in a complex and changing democratic society.

TABLE 35.--Adequacy of the neighborhood school for meeting the educational needs of students, in the opinion of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Neighborhood School	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	481	75.0
Inadequate	111	17.3
No response	49	7.7
Total	641	100.0

The data in Table 36 show that 32 per cent of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting were within the range of 51 to 60 years of age. Nearly 7 per cent (6.9) were age 30 or under, while 8.9 per cent were over 60 years of age.

The data in Table 37 show that more than 90 per cent (90.5) of the 641 elementary school principals reporting were Caucasian. The Negro race was represented by 4.5 per cent, the Indian by less than 1 per cent (.6) with no other race reported.

It would appear that either elementary school principalships in these schools had not been open to minority groups, or that minority groups had not aspired to the principalships.

In the national sample of the 1968 DESP-NEA study, 75.2 per cent of the elementary school principals were men,

while in the Oklahoma study 82.5 per cent of those responding were men (Table 38).

TABLE 36.--Ages of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Ages	Number Reporting	Per Cent
30 or under	44	6.9
31 - 35	69	10.7
36 - 40	79	12.3
41 - 45	67	10.5
46 - 50	79	12.3
51 - 55	100	15.6
56 - 60	105	16.4
61 - 65	54	8.4
66 or more	3	.5
No response	41	6.4
Total	641	100.0

According to DESP studies, the sex of elementary school principals, nationally, has changed from 55 per cent female in 1938 to 25 per cent female in 1968. The Oklahoma sample seemed to be ahead of the trend toward placing men in the elementary school principalship.

The figures in Table 39 show that 86.1 per cent of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting

were married. This was 3 per cent higher than the 83.1 per cent reported in the national study made by DESP-NEA in 1966-1967.

TABLE 37.--Race of respondents as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Race	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Caucasian	580	90.5
Negro	29	4.5
Indian	4	.6
Other	0
No response	28	4.4
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 38.--Sex of respondents as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Sex	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Female	84	13.1
Male	529	82.5
No response	28	4.4
Total	641	100.0

The 1968 DESP-NEA national study indicates that single persons were most likely to be appointed as supervising

principals in the larger school systems and in the states of the Northeast.

TABLE 39.--Marital status of respondents as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Marital Status	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Married	552	86.1
Single	58	9.1
No response	31	4.8
Total	641	100.0

Nearly 72 per cent (71.9) of the 641 respondents reported three or fewer dependents (Table 40).

Slightly more than 9 per cent (9.2) reported five or more dependents. The typical respondent had two dependents.

The data in Table 41 show that 26.4 per cent of the respondents reported some degree of nongradedness being practiced in the schools where they were principals. For some unexplained reason a large number (19.8 per cent) of the respondents did not respond to the question concerning the degree of nongradedness in the schools.

The data in Table 41 show that the most frequent segment of the elementary schools reported as nongraded was Grades 1, 2, and 3 (9.7 per cent). This situation held true

in the 1968 national study by DESP-NEA.

TABLE 40.--Number of dependents of respondents as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Dependents	Number Reporting	Per Cent
0	107	16.7
1	131	20.4
2	114	17.8
3	109	17.0
4	77	12.0
5	44	6.9
6	8	1.2
Seven or more	7	1.1
No response	44	6.9
Total	641	100.0

Of the respondents reporting some degree of departmentalization, by far the largest group (36.9 per cent) reported some segment other than those typically grouped together in organizational plans (Table 42). Many reported such plans as Grades 3-6, Grades 5 and 6, or Grade 6 only. A considerable number (38.2 per cent) reported having no departmentalized organizational plan.

TABLE 41.--Degree of nongradedness in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Nongraded Elementary Schools	Number Reporting	Per Cent
None	345	53.8
K - 3	40	6.2
1 - 3	62	9.7
K - 6	19	3.0
1 - 6	11	1.7
Other	37	5.8
No response	127	19.8
Total	641	100.0

Most (92.2 per cent) of the 641 respondents reported some segments of the elementary schools were following the self-contained classroom plan (Table 43).

The responses concerning the self-contained classroom plan followed the same pattern as did the responses concerning departmentalization. The respondents reported some combinations other than those usually grouped together. Many reported the self-contained plan in kindergarten and Grades 1 and 2, Grades 1-4, or Grades 1-5.

The responses shown in Table 44 represent the judgements of the respondents as to their understanding of the meaning of team teaching. Based on the responses, it

is apparent that team teaching was not yet widespread.

TABLE 42.--Degree of departmentalization in Oklahoma elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Departmentalized Elementary Schools	Number Reporting	Per Cent
None	245	38.2
K - 3	1	.2
1 - 3	1	.2
K - 6	0
1 - 6	17	2.6
4 - 6	87	13.6
4 - 8	0
Other	237	36.9
No response	53	8.3
Total	641	100.0

More than 10 per cent (10.8) of the 641 respondents reported that team teaching was being practiced to some degree. The study did not attempt to determine the degree to which team teaching was used or the type of organization used.

More than 40 per cent (40.1) of the 641 respondents reported that the schools' organizational plans provided for vertical regrouping of students throughout the school term (Table 45). For some undetermined reason a large number

(17.8 per cent) of the respondents did not respond to the question concerning vertical regrouping of students.

TABLE 43.--Self-contained classroom plans existing in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Self-Contained Classrooms	Number Reporting	Per Cent
0	13	2.0
K - 3	29	4.5
1 - 3	64	10.0
K - 6	126	19.7
1 - 6	135	21.0
Other	237	37.0
No response	37	5.8
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 44.--Number of elementary schools with some degree of team teaching, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Team Teaching	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Some	69	10.8
None	536	83.6
No response	36	5.6
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 45.--Number of elementary schools having organizational plans that provide for vertical regrouping of students throughout the school term, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Vertical Regrouping	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Practiced	257	40.1
Not practiced	270	42.1
No response	114	17.8
Total	641	100.0

The figures in Table 46 show memberships in professional organizations as reported by the 641 respondents. Membership in the OEA was almost universal, with 96.1 per cent. The NEA was second with 77.4 per cent, and the DESP-OEA was a distant third with 60.1 per cent.

Slightly more than 38 per cent (38.2) of the 641 respondents reported membership in the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA.

Almost one-third of the memberships in DESP-NEA was reported from one school district in Oklahoma, and nearly all of the memberships in ASCD and ACEI were reported from that same district.

Although only 38.2 per cent of the respondents reported membership in DESP-NEA (Table 46), 58.3 per cent reported that the school districts would permit them to attend the annual meeting of the DESP-NEA (Table 47).

TABLE 46.--Membership of respondents in professional organizations, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Professional Organizations	Number Reporting Membership	Per Cent Belonging to Each
None	0 ^a
OEA	616	96.1
DESP-OEA	385	60.1
Local DESP	276	43.1
NEA	496	77.4
DESP-NEA	245	38.2
ASCD	92	14.4
ACEI	81	12.6
Reading Council . . .	124	19.3
Other	119	18.6
Total	641 ^b	

^aEvery principal reporting belonged to at least one professional organization.

^bThe numeral 641 indicates the number of questionnaires returned. The figures in the column above the numeral 641 indicate the number of principals responding who belonged to each professional organization. Some principals indicated membership in only one organization while others were members of several or all of the organizations listed.

Some respondents were on a rotation plan, being permitted to attend the national elementary principals' meetings on certain years. Others reported that they had never asked to be permitted to attend.

TABLE 47.--Number of respondents who were permitted to attend the National Elementary School Principals' annual meetings, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

DESP Annual Meetings	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Attendance permitted	374	58.3
Attendance not permitted	219	34.2
No response	48	7.5
Total	641	100.0

Of the 641 principals reporting, 44.5 per cent reported help from the school district in paying expenses to professional meetings (Table 48). It appears that while some districts encouraged attendance at the national meetings, others did not permit it.

TABLE 48.--Number of respondents who received some financial help from local school district for expenses to attend professional meetings, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Expenses Paid	Number Reporting	Per Cent
All or some	285	44.5
None	304	47.4
No response	52	8.1
Total	641	100.0

Hours per week devoted to professional activities, as reported by the 641 respondents ranged from 5.9 per cent reporting "none" to 8.9 per cent reporting eleven or more (Table 49). The largest single group (16 per cent) reported devoting three to four hours per week to professional activities. Forty-five per cent of the respondents reported that they spent five or more hours per week involved in professional activities.

TABLE 49.--Hours per week devoted to professional activities such as conventions, conferences, college courses, professional reading, research, and writing, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Hours Per Week	Number Reporting	Per Cent
0	38	5.9
1 - 2	92	14.4
3 - 4	103	16.0
5	71	11.1
6	42	6.6
7	20	3.1
8	21	3.3
9 - 10	77	12.0
11 or more	57	8.9
No response	120	18.7
Total	641	100.0

It seems clear that of the respondents holding membership in professional organizations a high percentage filled leadership positions. More than 29 per cent (29.2) of the 641 respondents reported holding offices or being committee chairmen in professional organizations (Table 50). Many of the respondents reported holding offices or chairmanships in more than one professional organization.

TABLE 50.--Number of respondents serving as officers or committee chairmen in professional organizations, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Officer or Committee Chairman	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	187	29.2
No	399	62.2
No response	55	8.6
Total	641	100.0

The majority (60.7 per cent) of the 641 elementary school principals reporting were still employed in the same school systems where they initially became elementary school principals (Table 51).

It was not common practice for school districts to require applicants for the elementary school principalship to take examinations. Of the 641 respondents, 10.2 per cent reported that an examination was required (Table 52).

TABLE 51.--Number of respondents who were employed in the same school systems where they initially became elementary school principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Employed in Same System	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	389	60.7
No	202	31.5
No response	50	7.8
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 52.--Number of respondents required to take an examination before being appointed principal, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Examination Required	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	65	10.2
No	531	82.8
No response	45	7.0
Total	641	100.0

One large school district in Oklahoma had required an examination of applicants for the past several years. Principals reporting from that district account for a considerable number of the 10.2 per cent reported as having been required to take examinations.

The figures in Table 53 show that superintendents were involved in the interviewing of 65.4 per cent of the 641 elementary school principals reporting.

TABLE 53.--Title of person or persons who interviewed respondents for the position of elementary school principal, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Interviewer	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Superintendent	359	56.0
Superintendent and committee	30	4.7
Board of education	64	10.0
Superintendent and board of education	30	4.7
Director of elementary education . .	38	5.9
Other	42	6.5
No response	78	12.2
Total	641	100.0

Nearly 15 per cent (14.7) of the respondents reported that they were interviewed by the local school board or by a member of that board. General practice was for the superintendent or his designated representative to interview applicants for the elementary school principalship.

Of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting, 63.7 per cent had the primary role in supervision of instruction (Table 54). This percentage is lower than the 75.1 per cent reported in the 1968 national study made

by DESP-NEA. Twenty-eight or 4.4 per cent of the 641 respondents reported that there was no supervision of instruction in their schools.

TABLE 54.--Respondent's role in the supervision of instruction, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Principal's Supervisory Role	Number Reporting	Per Cent
There is no supervision of instruction	28	4.4
Supervisory personnel carry total load	3	.5
Supervisory personnel carry total load with some assistance from the principal	47	7.3
Principal shares supervision equally with supervisory personnel	80	12.5
Principal carries supervision load with some assistance from supervisory personnel	244	38.0
Principal carries total supervision load	165	25.7
Other	21	3.3
No response	53	8.3
Total	641	100.0

Forty-nine per cent of the 641 respondents reported that they either initiated or took part in curriculum change and development (Table 55).

More than 34 per cent (34.6) of the 641 respondents reported that they followed the local school system's curriculum program. It was not ascertained as to how the local

school system's curriculum was developed.

TABLE 55.--Respondent's role in curriculum development, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Principal's Role in Curriculum Development	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Initiates curriculum changes	57	8.9
Takes part in curriculum development	257	40.1
Follows local system's program	222	34.6
Other	55	8.6
No response	50	7.8
Total	641	100.0

The data in Table 56 show that 60.1 per cent of the respondents reported the involvement of teachers, principals, and supervisors or consultants in determining teaching methods. This indicates that in most of the elementary schools from which responses were received a cooperative approach was used in determining teaching methods.

No respondent reported that he alone determined the teaching methods, and very few felt that methods were determined by persons or sources outside of the school.

By far the largest single group of respondents (43.2 per cent) reported that teachers and principals working together had the greatest influence on the selection of instructional materials (Table 57).

TABLE 56.--Respondent's role in determining teaching methods,
as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Procedure for Determining Teaching Methods	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Each teacher determines her own methods	56	8.7
Each teacher determines her own methods after consulting with the principal and/or supervisor or consultant	167	26.1
Teachers cooperatively determine teaching methods	50	7.8
Teachers, principal, and supervisor or consultant cooperate in deter- mining teaching methods	218	34.0
Instructional supervisor or con- sultant determines teaching methods	7	1.1
Principal determines teaching methods	0
Subject area teaching manuals deter- mine teaching methods	17	2.7
Central office and/or central office guides determine teaching methods .	26	4.1
State bulletins and/or guides deter- mine teaching methods	6	.9
Other	47	7.3
No response	47	7.3
Total	641	100.0

In the 1968 national study made by the DESP-NEA, 54.2 per cent of the principals reported that faculty-principal cooperation was the major factor in selection of instructional materials.

TABLE 57.--Persons having the greatest influence on the selection of instructional materials, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Persons Making Selections	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Individual teachers	68	10.6
Teacher groups	55	8.6
Teachers and principal	277	43.2
Teacher and supervisor	24	3.7
Principal	44	6.9
Supervisor or consultant	21	3.3
Central office/district or county . .	67	10.4
Other	64	10.0
No response	21	3.3
Total	641	100.0

Eighty-six per cent of the 641 elementary school principals reporting felt that they had sufficient authority to carry out good educational programs in the schools where they were principals (Table 58).

Thirty-two per cent of the 641 elementary school principals reporting did not feel that they had enough voice in the selection of teachers for the schools where they were principals (Table 59).

Although 32 per cent of the 641 respondents did not feel that they had enough voice in the selection of teachers

(Table 59), only 10.3 per cent felt that they would not be supported by the administration if they recommended the dismissal of incompetent teachers (Table 60).

TABLE 58.--Feelings of respondents as to whether or not they had sufficient authority to carry out good educational programs in the schools where they were principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Have authority	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	551	86.0
No	64	10.0
No response	26	4.0
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 59.--Feelings of respondents concerning voice in selection of teachers for the school in which they were principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Voice in Selection of Teachers	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Have enough voice	407	63.5
Do not have enough voice	205	32.0
No response	29	4.5
Total	641	100.0

It is generally agreed that all personnel should be responsible to the principal while working at the school.

Nearly 16 per cent (15.9) of the respondents reported that maintenance personnel were not responsible to them while working at the school (Table 61).

TABLE 60.--Feelings of respondents concerning the support of the administration on recommendations for dismissal of incompetent teachers, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Support of Administration	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Would be supported	548	85.5
Would not be supported	66	10.3
No response	27	4.2
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 61.--Responses of respondents as to whether or not maintenance personnel were responsible to the principal while working in the school, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Maintenance Personnel	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Responsible to principal	515	80.3
Not responsible to principal	102	15.9
No response	24	3.8
Total	641	100.0

There is a widely held view that in a democratic society those affected by a policy should have some voice in its development. Twenty-five per cent of the 641

elementary school principals reporting felt that they did not have enough voice in the development of school system policy (Table 62).

TABLE 62.--Responses of respondents regarding the principal's voice in school system policy development, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Policy Development	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Have enough voice	454	70.8
Do not have enough voice	160	25.0
No response	27	4.2
Total	641	100.0

Less than half (49.8 per cent) of the 641 principals reporting felt that they were given enough voice in the preparation of the budgets for the schools of which they were principals (Table 63).

TABLE 63.--Responses of respondents regarding the principal's voice in budget preparation for the schools of which they were principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Budget Preparation	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Have enough voice	319	49.8
Do not have enough voice	272	42.4
No response	50	7.8
Total	641	100.0

In the 1968 national study by the DESP-NEA, 23.9 per cent of the principals reported that they planned, recommended, and defended the budgets for the schools of which they were principals.

Although only 6.9 per cent of the 641 principals reporting felt that principals had the greatest influence on the selection of instructional materials (Table 57), 82.1 per cent felt that they had enough voice in the selection (Table 64).

TABLE 64.--Responses of respondents regarding the principal's voice in the selection of instructional materials, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Selection of Instructional Materials	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Have enough voice	526	82.1
Do not have enough voice	92	14.3
No response	23	3.6
Total	641	100.0

The experienced elementary school principal is probably the most knowledgeable person with regard to what facilities are necessary for an elementary school, yet only 34.9 per cent of the 641 respondents reported having enough voice in the planning of elementary school buildings (Table 65). Many respondents stated that they were not asked to

assist nor permitted to become involved in planning of new elementary buildings and facilities.

TABLE 65.--Responses of respondents regarding the principal's voice in the planning of elementary school buildings, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Planning of School Buildings	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Have enough voice	224	34.9
Do not have enough voice	339	52.9
No response	78	12.2
Total	641	100.0

An overwhelming majority (95.5 per cent) of the 641 respondents felt that they had sufficient authority needed to maintain good student discipline (Table 66). More respondents agreed on this item than on any other item included in the survey.

TABLE 66.--Authority of respondents to maintain good student discipline, as reported by principals in a 1967-1968 survey

Authority in Student Discipline	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Have enough authority	612	95.5
Do not have enough authority	10	1.5
No response	19	3.0
Total	641	100.0

According to the 641 elementary school principals reporting, more than two-thirds (67.4 per cent) were employed in school districts which had developed written aims and objectives (Table 67).

TABLE 67.--Existence of written educational aims and objectives in school districts, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Aims and Objectives	Number Reporting	Per Cent
District has aims and objectives in writing	432	67.4
District does not have aims and objectives in writing	181	28.2
No response	28	4.4
Total	641	100.0

While only 67.4 per cent of the respondents reported the existence of written aims and objectives (Table 67), more than 77 per cent (77.7) felt that written aims and objectives were needed (Table 68).

In relation to the administration, 53.7 per cent of the 641 respondents viewed their role as that of a leader; 28.7 per cent as supporter; and 6.2 per cent as follower (Table 69). In the 1968 national study by the DESP-NEA the percentages were 51.2 as leader, 42.4 as supporter, and 6.5 as follower.

TABLE 68.--Feelings of respondents concerning need for written educational aims and objectives, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Written Aims and Objectives	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Needed	498	77.7
Not needed	86	13.4
No response	57	8.9
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 69.--The existing leadership role of the elementary school principal in relation to the administration, as viewed and reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Role of Principal	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Leader	344	53.7
Supporter	184	28.7
Follower	40	6.2
Other	38	5.9
No response	35	5.5
Total	641	100.0

A slightly higher percentage of the 641 respondents felt that their position was viewed by the administration as one of leadership than did the elementary principals in the nation as a whole.

When asked what the leadership role of the elementary school principal should be, for reasons not determined, 55.2 per cent of the 641 Oklahoma elementary principals reporting did not respond to the question (Table 70). Of those who did respond, the largest percentage (28.2) thought the role should be that of leader.

TABLE 70.--The leadership role of the elementary school principal in relation to the administration as the respondents indicated it should be in a 1967-1968 survey

Role of Principal	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Leader	181	28.2
Supporter	37	5.8
Leader-supporter	58	9.1
Leader-supporter-follower	9	1.4
Follower	2	.3
No response	354	55.2
Total	641	100.0

Of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting, 23.9 per cent stated that the districts in which they were principals had not developed policies handbooks (Table 71). It is likely that the 23.9 per cent figure contains more than one response from some districts; therefore, it appears that most school districts from which responses were received had developed policies handbooks.

TABLE 71.--School systems having policies handbooks, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

District Policies Handbook	Number Reporting	Per Cent
District has policies handbook . . .	461	71.9
District does not have policies handbook	153	23.9
No response	27	4.2
Total	641	100.0

The figures in Table 72 indicate that a sizable number (64.4 per cent) of the individual schools from which responses were received had developed policies handbooks. Information as to the procedure followed in the development of policies handbooks was not obtained.

TABLE 72.--Individual elementary schools having developed policies handbooks, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Individual School Policies Handbook	Number Reporting	Per Cent
School has policies handbook	413	64.4
School does not have policies handbook	199	31.1
No response	29	4.5
Total	641	100.0

The figures in Table 73 indicate that 53.5 per cent of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting felt that they were provided with adequate clerical help. For reasons unexplained, 16.7 per cent of the respondents did not respond to the question.

TABLE 73.--Adequacy of clerical help in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Clerical Personnel	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	343	53.5
Inadequate	191	29.8
No response	107	16.7
Total	641	100.0

It should be noted that 74.4 per cent of the 641 respondents reported adequate custodial help (Table 74), and only 53.5 per cent reported adequate clerical help (Table 73). A much lower percentage (6.4) failed to respond to the question concerning custodial help. This figure makes an interesting comparison with the 16.7 per cent who did not respond to the question concerning adequacy of clerical help (Table 73). It may be that many respondents were accustomed to performing clerical tasks and had accepted this as a legitimate responsibility.

TABLE 74.--Adequacy of custodial help in elementary schools, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Custodial Personnel	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	477	74.4
Inadequate	123	19.2
No response	41	6.4
Total	641	100.0

In this study, 7.7 per cent of the respondents reported that they had assistant principals (Table 75). Nationally, 8.4 per cent of the principals reported that they had assistants.

TABLE 75.--Number of elementary schools with assistant principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Assistant Principals	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	49	7.7
No	552	86.1
No response	40	6.2
Total	641	100.0

More than 21 per cent (21.7) of the 641 respondents indicated that they felt assistant elementary school principals were needed in their schools (Table 76). The fact that

16.1 per cent (Table 23) of the respondents reported a pupil enrollment of six hundred or more could account for the fact that only 21.7 per cent felt a need for assistant principals.

TABLE 76.--Number of respondents who felt that assistant principals were needed in the schools where they were principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Assistant Principals	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Needed	139	21.7
Not needed	446	69.6
No response	56	8.7
Total	641	100.0

As smaller schools are closed because of accreditation requirements, the need for assistant principals will probably be felt by more elementary school principals.

As was previously stated, many elementary schools have increased in size and complexity. The indications are that this is a trend which is likely to continue; therefore, the principal and his staff will probably require the services of special resource personnel. As is indicated in Table 77, a sizable percentage of the elementary schools from which responses were received did not have the full-time services of specialists at their disposal. Where services were available, they were usually on a part-time or on-call basis.

TABLE 77.--Availability of resource personnel, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Personnel		Availability of Personnel					Total
		None	Part Time	Full Time	On Call	No Response	
General curriculum consultant	Number	254	79	67	161	80	641
	Per Cent	39.6	12.3	10.5	25.1	12.5	100.0
Special music teacher	Number	105	258	194	25	59	641
	Per Cent	16.4	40.2	30.3	3.9	9.2	100.0
Special reading teacher	Number	218	166	138	50	69	641
	Per Cent	34.0	25.9	21.5	7.8	10.8	100.0
Special physical education teacher	Number	251	144	166	18	62	641
	Per Cent	39.1	22.5	25.9	2.8	9.7	100.0
Special art teacher	Number	354	98	80	39	70	641
	Per Cent	55.2	15.3	12.5	6.1	10.9	100.0
Special math teacher	Number	403	62	56	36	84	641
	Per Cent	62.9	9.7	8.7	5.6	13.1	100.0
Special social studies teacher	Number	416	52	56	31	86	641
	Per Cent	65.0	8.1	8.7	4.8	13.4	100.0
Special science teacher	Number	377	58	94	38	74	641
	Per Cent	58.8	9.1	14.7	5.9	11.5	100.0
Other ^a	Number		28	30	10		68
	Per Cent		4.4	4.7	1.6		10.7

^aShows only the number of "other" personnel listed by principals and does not include "none" and "no response."

On a part-time basis more respondents reported having special music teachers (40.2 per cent), with special reading teachers second (25.9 per cent), and special physical education teachers third (22.5 per cent).

The most frequent full-time specialists reported were the special music teachers (30.3 per cent), with special physical education teachers second (25.9 per cent), and special reading teachers third (21.5 per cent).

General curriculum consultants were the most frequent specialists available on an on-call basis (25.1 per cent). No other specialists were reported as on-call by more than 7.8 per cent of the respondents.

The data in Table 78 indicate that the same general statement could apply to the availability of special service personnel as applied to resource personnel; namely, a sizable proportion of the elementary schools from which responses were received did not have available the full-time services of special services personnel, and where services were available they were merely on a part-time or on-call basis.

Thirty-two per cent of the 641 respondents reported having no paid auxiliary personnel available to their schools (Table 79). Clerical aides were the most frequently reported (32.8 per cent), with instructional assistants for teachers next (18.4 per cent), followed by non-instructional supervisors (12.8 per cent).

TABLE 78.--Availability of special services personnel, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Personnel		None	Part Time	Full Time	On Call	No Response	Total
Guidance Counselor	Number	259	221	25	66	70	641
	Per Cent	40.4	34.5	3.9	10.3	10.9	100.0
Psychologist	Number	274	90	10	187	80	641
	Per Cent	42.7	14.0	1.6	29.2	12.5	100.0
Speech Therapist	Number	207	307	28	29	70	641
	Per Cent	32.3	47.9	4.4	4.5	10.9	100.0
Nurse	Number	109	331	32	108	61	641
	Per Cent	17.0	51.6	5.0	16.9	9.5	100.0
Librarian	Number	320	105	107	30	79	641
	Per Cent	49.9	16.4	16.7	4.7	12.3	100.0
Other ^a	Number		15	9	5		29
	Per Cent		2.3	1.4	.8		4.5

^aShows only the number of "other" personnel listed by principals and does not include "none" and "no response."

The figures in Table 80 show that in 68.6 per cent of the elementary schools from which responses were received supportive personnel were responsible to the principal while working at the school. An unusually high percentage (24.4) of the 641 respondents did not respond to the question concerning their authority over supportive personnel. Most of the questions received a much better response.

Eighty per cent of the respondents felt that the state requirements for certification of elementary school principals in Oklahoma were adequate (Table 81). As shown

in Table 2, 57.7 per cent of the elementary school principals reporting held standard certificates in elementary school administration.

TABLE 79.--Availability of paid auxiliary personnel, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Auxiliary Personnel	Number Reporting	Per Cent
None	205	32.0
Non-instructional supervisors (for hall, lunchroom, playground, etc.) .	82	12.8
Instructional assistants to help teachers in classrooms	118	18.4
Clerical aides	210	32.8
Library aides	62	9.7
Housekeeping aides	25	3.9
Audio-visual aides	31	4.8
Other	20	3.1
Total	641 ^a

^aThe numeral 641 indicates the number of questionnaires returned. The figures in the column above the numeral 641 indicate the number of auxiliary personnel reported by principals. Some principals indicated more than one type of auxiliary personnel available; therefore, the column does not add up to 641.

When the respondents were asked what position elementary school principals should take concerning professional negotiations, there was general agreement on only one

point, and that was that principals should not align themselves with principals only (Table 82).

TABLE 80.--Responses of respondents as to whether or not supportive personnel were responsible to the principal while working in the school, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Supportive Personnel	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Responsible to principal	440	68.6
Not responsible to principal	44	6.9
No response	157	24.5
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 81.--Adequacy of state requirements for certification of elementary school principals in Oklahoma, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Certification Requirements	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Adequate	513	80.0
Inadequate	41	6.4
No response	87	13.6
Total	641	100.0

The fact that 17 per cent did not respond to the question probably indicates that many of the respondents were undecided. There was about an equal split between alignment with teachers (29.2 per cent) and alignment with superinten-

dents and boards of education (27.1 per cent), with 20.3 per cent generally somewhere in between.

TABLE 82.--The position the elementary school principals of Oklahoma should take in regard to professional negotiations, as indicated by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Position	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Aligned with teachers	187	29.2
Aligned with principals only	41	6.4
Aligned with superintendent and board of education	174	27.1
Other	130	20.3
No response	109	17.0
Total	641	100.0

In a national opinion poll of representative DESP members made in January, 1968, 48 per cent reported that their school systems were using or had recently used a teacher-principal salary ratio plan. The latest official statement of the DESP-NEA recommends a ratio schedule.

The data in Table 83 indicate that 32.4 per cent of the 641 respondents favored a salary schedule based on a ratio of teachers' salaries.

About 36 per cent (35.6) of the 641 respondents reported that their school districts had established minimum salaries for principals, and many of those commented that

the stated minimum was not adhered to. Many respondents indicated they had no idea how their district determined beginning salaries for principals, and 16.7 per cent merely failed to respond to the question (Table 84).

TABLE 83.--How elementary school principals' salaries should be determined, as indicated by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Method	Number Reporting	Per Cent
By individual negotiation	50	7.8
By single salary schedule considering only years of service	77	12.0
By individual school assignments . .	101	15.8
By ratio tied to classroom teacher salary schedule	208	32.4
Other	89	13.9
No response	116	18.1
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 84.--School districts with minimum beginning salaries for elementary school principals, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Minimum Beginning Salaries	Number Reporting	Per Cent
District has minimum	228	35.6
District does not have minimum . . .	306	47.7
No response	107	16.7
Total	641	100.0

While 35.6 per cent of the 641 respondents reported that minimum salaries had been established for their school districts (Table 84), only 23.6 per cent stated the amount of the minimum (Table 85). Many indicated having a minimum, but they did not know what it was.

TABLE 85.--Minimum salaries in school districts, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Minimum Salaries	Number Reporting	Per Cent
3500 - 4499	8	1.2
4500 - 5499	26	4.1
5500 - 6499	19	3.0
6500 - 7499	16	2.5
7500 - 8499	17	2.7
8500 - 9499	65	10.1
No minimum salary	306	47.7
No response	184	28.7
Total	641	100.0

No respondent reported a contract salary above \$12,499 for the school year 1967-1968 (Table 86), while 21 per cent of the elementary school principals in the 1968 national study of DESP-NEA reported a salary of \$12,500 or above for the school year 1966-1967.

TABLE 86.--Contract salaries of respondents, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Contract Salaries	Number Reporting	Per Cent
3,500 - 4,499	0
4,500 - 5,499	13	2.0
5,500 - 6,499	85	13.3
6,500 - 7,499	124	19.3
7,500 - 8,499	142	22.2
8,500 - 9,499	77	12.0
9,500 - 10,499	59	9.2
10,500 - 11,499	30	4.7
11,500 - 12,499	9	1.4
No response	102	15.9
Total	641	100.0

Almost half (49.8 per cent) of the 641 respondents reported no income from employment other than regular salary (Table 87). This figure is lower than the 63 per cent revealed for this item in the 1968 national DESP-NEA study.

About 21 per cent (20.6) of the 641 respondents reported that steps were provided in the salary schedule for graduate work above that required for standard certification (Table 88). Less than 1 per cent (0.8) of the 641 principals reporting held doctor's degrees (Table 1).

TABLE 87.--Annual gross income of respondents from work outside of the school job, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Income	Number Reporting	Per Cent
None	319	49.8
1 - 199	0
200 - 399	6	.9
400 - 599	19	3.0
600 - 799	18	2.8
800 - 999	11	1.7
1,000 - 1,499	47	7.3
1,500 - 1,999	12	1.9
2,000 - 2,999	33	5.1
3,000 - 3,999	14	2.2
4,000 - 4,999	9	1.4
5,000 - 5,999	7	1.1
6,000 - 6,999	5	.8
7,000 or more	13	2.0
No response	128	20.0
Total	641	100.0

Sixty-one per cent of the 641 principals reporting stated that any formal evaluation of elementary school principals should be done by superintendents and/or directors of elementary education (Table 89). Nine respondents, or

1.4 per cent, stated that they should not be evaluated. Forty-nine, or 7.6 per cent, felt that a committee of teachers should evaluate principals, and 5.6 per cent felt that evaluations should be done by a committee of fellow principals.

TABLE 88.--Salary schedules for elementary school principals in school districts providing steps for graduate work above the standard certificate, as reported by respondents in a 1967-1968 survey

Steps	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Provided in schedule	132	20.6
Not provided in schedule	413	64.4
No response	96	15.0
Total	641	100.0

When asked if they planned to make a career of the elementary school principalship, 75.8 per cent of the 641 respondents answered in the affirmative, and 12 per cent stated that they did not, with 12.2 per cent failing to respond to the question (Table 90). It is likely that many of those who did not respond were undecided.

In the 1968 national DESP-NEA study, 55.5 per cent considered the principalship as their final occupational goal. Also in the national study when principals were asked whether they would become elementary school principals again

if they were starting over, 52.9 per cent stated that they "certainly would."

TABLE 89.--Attitudes of respondents concerning formal evaluation of principals, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Evaluators	Number Reporting	Per Cent
No one	9	1.4
Committee of lay people	3	.5
Superintendent and/or director of elementary education	391	61.0
Heads of departments in central office	12	1.9
Committee of fellow principals . . .	36	5.6
Committee of teachers	49	7.6
Other	63	9.8
No response	78	12.2
Total	641	100.0

TABLE 90.--Plans of the respondents with regard to making a career of the principalship, as reported in a 1967-1968 survey

Principalship as a Career	Number Reporting	Per Cent
Yes	486	75.8
No	77	12.0
No response	78	12.2
Total	641	100.0

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the purposes and procedures of the survey, statements regarding the findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, recommendations based on the study and related literature, and suggestions for further research.

Summary

After reviewing several national and state studies of the elementary school principalship, a questionnaire was developed to be used in making a study of elementary schools and the elementary school principalship in the state of Oklahoma. The questionnaire was sent to each elementary school principal on the Oklahoma Education Association's mailing list. After a reminder along with a second copy of the questionnaire had been sent, 641 usable questionnaires were returned. This figure represented a response of 71 per cent of the 906 elementary schools on the OEA mailing list. This study was based on the responses contained in the 641 usable questionnaires returned.

The information obtained dealt with the following broad areas pertaining to the principalship: professional preparation, professional experience, personal characteristics, participation in professional organizations, selection, role in decision making, and economic and professional status. Pertaining to the school, the following areas were investigated: school plant, organization, and supportive personnel.

It was believed that from the data obtained an identification of some assets and liabilities of the elementary school principalship and of elementary schools in Oklahoma could be made. This identification can contribute to planned improvement.

Findings

An analysis of the data collected for the study resulted in the major findings enumerated below:

1. More than 84 per cent of the 641 respondents had earned master's degrees or higher degrees in formal education.
2. Although 58 per cent of the 641 respondents held standard elementary school administrators' certificates, 51 per cent had not met the latest requirements for standard certification, and 22 per cent did not hold administrators' certificates.
3. At the graduate level, 46 per cent of the 641 respondents had majored in elementary school administration.
4. Nearly 55 per cent of the 641 respondents held master's degrees when appointed to the principalship.

Twenty-five per cent were working toward advanced degrees at the time of the study.

5. Very few local school districts from which responses were received provided planned preparation for elementary school principalships.

6. Three-fourths of the 641 respondents had been enrolled in colleges or universities within the last five years.

7. The median number of years of public school experience of the respondents was 20.6. Thirty-five per cent had held positions in the public schools other than teacher and 17 per cent had been assistant elementary school principals.

8. Fifty-eight per cent of the respondents had worked in more than one school before becoming principals. Forty-eight per cent were elementary school classroom teachers immediately before becoming principals.

9. Almost 50 per cent of the respondents had some teaching experience in Grades 4, 5, or 6. Sixty-six per cent had experience in junior high school or high school as compared to 12 per cent with teaching experience below Grade 4.

10. Slightly more than 57 per cent of the respondents had held principalships in only one school district, and less than 5 per cent had held principalships outside the state of Oklahoma. Nearly 43 per cent had served as principals

in only one building. The median number of years in their present positions was 5.8.

11. Slightly less than 47 per cent of the respondents had been principals less than ten years and about 5 per cent more than thirty years. The median was 9.5 years.

12. About 47 per cent of the respondents spent some of their time teaching. Of these, 17 per cent taught full-time.

13. Most elementary schools under the supervision of the respondents served children K-6 or Grades 1-6, with 38 per cent including kindergarten.

14. Nearly 7 per cent of the respondents had more than one school under their supervision.

15. Elementary schools with enrollments ranging from two hundred to four hundred were the most common, with a median of 12.4 teachers.

16. More than half (50.2 per cent) of the elementary schools had no Negro students, and 70 per cent had no Negro teachers.

17. Nearly 31 per cent of the elementary school buildings were reported by the respondents as being inadequate, and 45 per cent did not have enough flexibility.

18. Slightly less than 24 per cent of the elementary schools did not have adequate instructional equipment.

19. More than 84 per cent of the elementary schools had adequate office supplies and equipment, but only 70 per

cent had adequate office space.

20. Although 71 per cent of the elementary schools had adequate library books and materials, only 48 per cent had central libraries and resource rooms.

21. Almost 41 per cent of the respondents were over fifty years of age, 91 per cent were of the Caucasian race, and 13 per cent were female.

22. Slightly more than 86 per cent of the respondents were married, and 72 per cent had three or fewer dependents.

23. Twenty-six per cent of the elementary schools were using some degree of nongradedness, while 54 per cent practiced some degree of departmentalization. Ninety-two per cent reported self-contained classrooms as part of the organizational plan.

24. About 11 per cent of the elementary schools were involved to some degree in team teaching.

25. Over 96 per cent of the respondents were members of OEA, and 77 per cent were members of NEA; 60 per cent were members of DESP-OEA, and 38 per cent were members of DESP-NEA. Thirty-four per cent of the respondents were not permitted by local school districts to attend the annual meetings of DESP-NEA. Local districts paid all or some of the expenses of 44.5 per cent of the respondents to attend some professional meetings.

26. Forty-five per cent of the respondents spent five or more hours per week involved in professional activities, and 29 per cent held offices or chairmanships in professional organizations.

27. Nearly 61 per cent of the respondents were still employed in the school districts where they initially became principals. An examination was required of 10 per cent of the respondents when they applied for principalships. Superintendents of schools were involved in the interviewing of 65.4 per cent of the respondents, and school board members were involved in the interviewing of 14.7 per cent of the respondents.

28. Almost 64 per cent of the respondents had the primary role in supervision of instruction, and 49 per cent either took part in or initiated curriculum change. Sixty per cent of the respondents reported that teachers, principals, and supervisors or consultants were involved in determining teaching methods, while 43.2 per cent reported that teachers and principals working together had the most influence on the selection of instructional materials.

29. Eighty-six per cent of the respondents felt that they had sufficient authority to enable them to carry out good educational programs.

30. Although only 64 per cent of the respondents felt that they had enough voice in the selection of teachers, nearly 86 per cent felt that the administration would support

them if they recommended the dismissal of incompetent teachers.

31. Twenty-five per cent of the respondents did not feel that they had enough voice in policy development within their school districts.

32. Almost 50 per cent of the respondents felt that they had enough voice in the development of the budgets for their schools, and 35 per cent felt that they had enough voice in the planning of elementary school buildings.

33. Almost 96 per cent of the respondents felt that they had sufficient authority to maintain good student discipline.

34. Twenty-eight per cent of the respondents were employed in school districts that did not have written educational aims and objectives.

35. As related to the administration, about 54 per cent of the respondents viewed their roles as that of leaders.

36. Almost 24 per cent of the respondents were employed in school districts that had no policies handbooks, and 31 per cent had no policies handbooks developed for individual schools.

37. Nearly 30 per cent of the respondents did not feel that they had adequate clerical help, and 19 per cent did not feel that they had adequate custodial help.

38. Eight per cent of the elementary schools had assistant elementary school principals. About 22 per cent

of the respondents felt that assistants were needed.

39. Where special resource personnel were available, they were usually available on a part-time or on-call basis. The same applied to the availability of special pupil services personnel.

40. Thirty-two per cent of the elementary schools had no paid auxiliary personnel available to their staffs.

41. Eighty per cent of the respondents felt that state requirements for certification of elementary school principals were adequate.

42. There were widespread opinions among the respondents as to what position elementary school principals should take with regard to professional negotiations.

43. Thirty-two per cent of the respondents indicated that they favored a salary schedule based on a percentage ratio of classroom teachers' salaries. The remaining percentages of response ranged from 18 per cent not responding to the question, to 8 per cent preferring individual negotiation of salaries.

44. Nearly 48 per cent of the respondents were employed in school districts that had no stated minimum beginning salaries for elementary school principals. Minimum beginning salaries ranged from less than \$4,500 up to more than \$9,000. Contract salaries for the school year 1967-1968 ranged from under \$5,500 up to above \$11,500. About 21 per cent of the respondents received salary considerations

for college work above the requirements for standard certification. Thirty per cent of the principals reported some income from sources outside of school employment.

45. Sixty-one per cent of the respondents felt that formal evaluation of principals should be done by superintendents and/or directors of elementary education.

46. About 76 per cent of the respondents planned to make a career of the elementary school principalship.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study:

1. The existing certification procedures made it possible for 51 per cent of the respondents to hold elementary school principalships without meeting the minimum requirements for standard elementary administrators' certificates.

2. A large percentage of the respondents had not majored in elementary school administration and did not hold master's degrees when first appointed to principalships, however the findings indicate that 84 per cent held master's degrees at the time of the study and 25 per cent were working toward advanced degrees. It seems evident that the respondents were making a considerable effort to improve themselves through formal education.

3. The major responsibility of preparing the respondents for the principalship rested with colleges and

universities, since the findings indicated that pre-service preparation and assistant principalships were generally not available to the respondents within their school districts.

4. Initial appointments of the respondents to principalships were more likely to have been from junior high or high school positions than from positions in the primary grades of elementary schools.

5. Many of the respondents were unable to devote full time to administration because of teaching responsibilities.

6. The importance of kindergarten education had not been accepted to the extent of providing programs for all children.

7. The size of the typical elementary school reported by the respondents probably is a factor affecting the lack of availability of adequate facilities, materials, equipment, and staff.

8. Student integration was more likely to exist in the respondents' schools than was staff integration.

9. The self-contained classroom was the most common organizational plan used in the elementary schools of Oklahoma. Nongradedness and team teaching were not prevalent.

10. The respondents were more likely to join education associations than associations of elementary school principals. They were likely to hold offices or chairmanships in the organizations to which they belonged.

11. Even though the majority of the respondents felt that they had enough voice in decision-making concerning the schools in which they were principals, a large enough number felt that they did not to suggest that a problem existed.

12. There was not a consensus of opinion among the respondents as to what position principals should take with regard to professional negotiations.

13. The respondents were not in agreement as to how principals' salaries should be determined and many school districts did not have salary schedules for elementary school principals. Some principals were paid salaries more than \$6,000 below that of the highest paid principals. Many inconsistencies existed.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made as a result of the study and a review of related literature.

1. All elementary school principals appointed in the future should be required to meet standard certification requirements. This should include teaching principals.

2. Except in isolated areas, each elementary school should be of sufficient size to justify constructing a modern, comprehensive, and flexible building in order to staff it with a supervising principal, an assistant principal, and the supportive personnel necessary to make it

possible for teachers to do a more proficient and professional job of instruction.

3. Kindergarten education should be provided for all children in the state.

4. A concerted effort should be made to integrate the teaching staffs of elementary schools throughout the state.

5. Team teaching and nongradedness should be seriously considered as two means of utilizing teacher talents and meeting the individual needs of children.

6. Elementary school principals should join and become active in elementary school principals' associations. Improvement of both elementary education and the status of the elementary school principalship requires the cooperative effort of principals throughout the state.

7. Elementary school principals should have a strong voice in the selection of all personnel assigned to the schools of which they are principals.

8. Every school district should have written personnel policies, and those affected by the policies should have a representative voice in the development of the policies.

9. Elementary school principals, teachers, custodians, cafeteria managers, other supportive personnel, and educational consultants should be involved by the administration in the planning of elementary school buildings.

10. Each school district should develop a set of educational aims and objectives. These aims and objectives should be in writing and subject to continuous revision in the light of new knowledge.

11. The Department of Elementary School Principals of the Oklahoma Education Association should develop a policy statement concerning the role of elementary school principals in professional negotiations.

12. The Department of Elementary School Principals of the Oklahoma Education Association should develop a policy statement concerning salary schedules for elementary school principals.

13. The Department of Elementary School Principals of the Oklahoma Education Association should hold a series of statewide conferences aimed at improving the professional status of the elementary school principalship. A concerted effort should be made to involve principals from throughout the state, and conferences should be held at times when teaching principals are free to attend. Ninety-six per cent of the respondents joined the Oklahoma Education Association; the Department of Elementary School Principals of the Oklahoma Education Association should be able to secure a comparable percentage of memberships from elementary school principals.

Recommendations for Further Research

As a result of the findings in this study, the following recommendations for further research were made:

1. Studies of this magnitude should be made to coincide with future national studies made by the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association. Detailed studies relating to specific areas of responsibility of elementary school principals should be made each year in the state of Oklahoma.
2. A study is needed to determine why a high percentage of elementary school principals in Oklahoma were not members of principals' organizations.
3. A comparative study should be made for the purpose of determining how the central office administration views the leadership role of elementary school principals as compared to how principals themselves view their role.
4. Studies should be made to determine the attitudes of elementary school principals with regard to major controversies, trends, and recent changes that will most likely affect the role of elementary school principals.
5. A study should be made to determine how elementary school principals divide their time among major responsibilities, how they would prefer to use their time, and what factors seem to prevent them from using their time as they feel it should be used.

6. A detailed study of practices followed by local school districts with regard to selection and salaries of elementary school principals should be made.

As one reflects on this study, many other questions will undoubtedly come to mind. The possibilities for future study are tremendous.

It is hoped that the information contained in this study will be used by professional groups for the purpose of upgrading elementary education in the state of Oklahoma.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- AASA. Inservice Education for School Administration. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1963.
- Burr, James B., et al. Elementary School Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1963.
- Goldman, Samuel. The School Principal. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- Goodlad, John I., and Anderson, Robert H. The Nongraded Elementary School. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., Inc., 1959.
- Harris, Ben M. Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Hicks, William V., and Jameson, Marshall C. The Elementary School Principal at Work. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.
- Hillson, Maurie (ed.). Elementary Education--Current Issues and Research in Education. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- Jacobson, Paul B., Reavis, William C., and Logsdon, James D. The Effective School Principal. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Jenson, Theodore J., and Clark, David J. Educational Administration. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.
- NEA. Education in a Changing Society. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1963.

- NEA. Planning and Organizing for Teaching--Project on Instruction. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1963.
- NEA. Schools for the Sixties--Project on Instruction. New York: McGraw-Hill, Co., 1963.
- Otto, Henry J., and Sanders, David C. Elementary School Organization and Administration. 4th ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.
- Ragan, William B. Modern Elementary Curriculum. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Russell, James E. Change and Challenge in American Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.
- Spain, Charles R., Drummond, Harold D., and Goodlad, John I. Educational Leadership and the Elementary School Principal. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1956.
- Stoker, W. M., and Rascoe, John. The Elementary School Principalship in Texas. Canyon, Texas: West Texas State University Press, 1966.
- Stoops, Emery, and Johnson, Russell E. Elementary School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.
- Van Til, William. American Education Today. "Is Progressive Education Obsolete?" New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1963.

Articles and Journals

- AASA. Your AASA Official Report. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1967.
- Anderson, Robert H. "The Nongraded School--An Overview," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 2, November, 1967.
- Better Principals for Our Schools. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1961.
- Block, Samuel N. "The Multi-Variegated Aspects of the Elementary Principalship," The American School Board Journal, CIL, No. 4, October, 1964.
- Broadhead, Clare, et al. "The Woman Principal: Going the Way of the Buffalo?" The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 5, April, 1966.

- Cunningham, Luvern L. "Continuing Professional Education for Elementary Principals," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, No. 5, April, 1965.
- Dawson, Mary. "Editorial," The National Elementary Principal, XLIII, No. 5, April, 1968.
- Dawson, Mary (ed.). "Elementary School Organization," The National Elementary Principal, XLI, No. 3, December, 1961.
- Dawson, Mary. "Guidelines for Scheduling Elementary School Principals' Salaries," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 3, January, 1968.
- Dawson, Mary. "Salaries of Elementary School Principals," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI, No. 5, April, 1967.
- Dorey, Frank D. "The Principal in American Life Today," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 6, May, 1968.
- Fenner, Mildred Sandison (ed.). "News and Trends," NEA Journal, LVII, No. 2, February, 1968.
- Gordon, Joan Claire. "Selection of Elementary School Principals," The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 5, April, 1966.
- Hamachek, Don E. "Leadership Styles, Decision-Making, and the Principal," The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 5, April, 1966.
- Hamburg, Morris. "When a School Is Integrated--The Principal's Job," The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 4, February, 1966.
- Hedges, William D. "Will We Recognize Tomorrow's Elementary School?" NEA Journal, LVI, No. 9, December, 1967.
- Hubbard, Frank W. "It Can Happen to Us," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 4, February, 1968.
- Kent, James K. "The Coleman Report: Opening Pandora's Box," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, No. 5, January, 1968.
- Kyle, David G. "How Child Growth and Development Knowledge Makes a Difference," Childhood Education, XLIV, No. 5, January, 1968.

Lapchick, Joseph D. "Who Should Hire Elementary Teachers?" School Management, IX, No. 2, February, 1965.

McLaughlin, William P. "The Phantom Nongraded School," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, No. 5, January, 1968.

Mial, Dorothy. "The Principal--A Change Agent," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, No. 1, September, 1964.

Nation's Schools--Annual Design Report, Vol. XXCI, No. 1, January, 1968.

Naylor, Douglas H., and Traughber, James V. "As We See It," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5, April, 1968.

NEA Journal, LVII, No. 3, March, 1968.

NEA Research Division. "How The Profession Feels About Teacher Aides," NEA Journal, LVI, No. 8, November, 1967.

Neubauer, Dorothy. "Editorial," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI, No. 6, May, 1967.

Otto, Henry J. "Elementary School Accreditation? Yes!" The National Elementary Principal, XLIII, No. 6, May, 1964.

Robbins, Glaydon D. "Preparation of Elementary School Principals--Present Practices," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI, No. 3, January, 1967.

Stieber, Gertrude N. "Teachers' Salaries, 1966-67," NEA Journal, LVI, No. 7, October, 1967.

The National Elementary Principal, XLV, No. 1, September, 1965.

The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 1, September, 1967.

The Wisconsin Elementary School Principal. Madison: The Wisconsin Elementary School Principals' Association, April, 1965.

Wood, Thomas C. "The Changing Role of the Teacher--How Does It Affect the Role of the Principal?" The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 5, April, 1968.

Yearbooks

The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study.

Seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1928.

The Elementary School Principalship--Today and Tomorrow.

Twenty-seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1948.

The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study.

Thirty-seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1958.

The Elementary School Principalship in 1968--A Research Study. Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1968.

AASA. The Right Principal for the Right School. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1967.

"Constitution and By-Laws, Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA," The National Elementary Principal, XLIV, No. 1, September, 1964.

Frazier, Alexander (ed.). The New Elementary School. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, and the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1968.

"Highlights of the 1968 Survey on the Status of Principals and the Principalship," The National Elementary Principal, XLVII, No. 2, November, 1967.

Manolakes, George. The Elementary School We Need. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1965.

Merigis, Harry J., and Gill, Donald G. The Elementary Principal in Illinois--A Status Study. Charleston, Illinois: Eastern Illinois University, 1967.

Modeland, Lemuel Owen. "The Status of the Elementary School Principalship in Kansas, 1966-1967." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Norman, Oklahoma: The University of Oklahoma, 1968.

Pharis, William L. In-Service Education of Elementary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, April, 1966.

Rappolee, Walter E. "The Status of the Elementary School Principalship in Oklahoma in 1953-54." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Norman, Oklahoma: The University of Oklahoma, 1955.

School Laws of Oklahoma. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: State Department of Public Instruction, 1967.

Staffing for Better Schools. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Thomas, Donald R. (Project Director) "A Study of the Elementary School Principalship in Wisconsin," The Wisconsin Elementary School Principal. Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin, September, 1959.

APPENDIX A

6900 South Byers
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
October 10, 1967

Dear Principal,

The National Elementary School Principals made a nation-wide study of the principalship in 1928, 1948, and have completed one for 1968. These studies have helped to raise the standards and status of the principalship. Similar studies have been and are being made on a state level in several states.

After reviewing previous studies, I have developed the attached questionnaire with the feeling that the information gained will be significant in helping to raise the standards and professional status of the elementary school principalship in Oklahoma.

This study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Fred A. Sloan, Jr., Professor of Education at the University of Oklahoma.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will respond to the items on the questionnaire and make suggestions for improvements before I send it to principals over the state. Please furnish the following information:

1. Time required to complete _____
2. Indicate any questions that you consider superfluous

3. Indicate areas you feel need to be considered that are not _____

4. Other suggestions for improvements _____

Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John Brothers, Principal
Hayes Elementary School

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
November 20, 1967

Dear Principal,

The National Department of Elementary School Principals made a nation-wide study of the elementary school principalship in 1928, 1948, and 1958, and will publish a similar study in 1968. These studies have helped to raise the standards and status of the principalship. Similar studies have been and are being made on a state level in several states.

After reviewing the national studies and some made in individual states, I have developed the attached questionnaire with the feeling that the information gained will be significant in helping to improve the standards and professional status of the elementary school principalship in Oklahoma.

This study has been endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the Oklahoma Education Association and is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Fred A. Sloan, Jr., Professor of Education at the University of Oklahoma.

For the benefit of the profession, may I urge you to take time from your busy schedule to respond to each item on the questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed envelope by November 30, 1967. The results of individual questionnaires will remain confidential.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

John E. Brothers, Principal
Hayes Elementary School
6900 South Byers
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73118

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
December 18, 1967

Dear Principal,

On November 20, 1967, I sent the enclosed questionnaire to every elementary principal in the state. The response has been most gratifying. To date I have received about 500 returns representing 72 counties.

My records indicate that you have not as yet responded. Your response is very important to the study. As a principal I am aware of the demands on your time, however, if you can take a few minutes to complete and return this questionnaire it will make the state wide study more significant and will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

John E. Brothers

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR OKLAHOMA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Please be frank and realistic

A. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

1. College preparation to date (Check highest)
☐ 1. Bachelor's Degree
☐ 2. Master's Degree
☐ 3. Master's Degree + 16 college hours
☐ 4. Master's Degree + 32 college hours
☐ 5. Doctor's Degree
2. Elementary Administrative Certificate held (Check one)
☐ 1. None
☐ 2. Elementary Provisional
☐ 3. Elementary Standard
☐ 4. Other (specify) _____
3. Major field of graduate study (Check one)
☐ 1. No graduate study
☐ 2. Elementary administration
☐ 3. Secondary administration
☐ 4. General administration
☐ 5. An academic subject field
☐ 6. Elementary education
☐ 7. Elementary supervision and curriculum
☐ 8. Special field, i.e., guidance, speech, etc.
☐ 9. No specialization to date
4. What degree(s) did you hold when you became a principal? (Check)
☐ 1. None
☐ 2. Bachelor's
☐ 3. Master's
☐ 4. Doctor's
5. Are you working toward an advanced degree? (Circle)
Yes No
6. Did the school district provide any type of preparation for the principalship, such as seminars, study sessions, etc.? (Circle) Yes No
7. How many years since you were last enrolled at a college or university? _____

8. How many years of public school experience have you had? Count teaching, supervision, and administration. (Include this year) _____
9. Have you held educational positions other than teaching? (Circle) Yes No (list) _____

10. How many years were you an assistant elementary school principal before becoming a principal? _____
11. In how many different schools did you work before becoming a principal? _____
12. What position did you hold immediately before becoming an elementary school principal? (title of position) _____
13. How many years of classroom teaching experience did you have before becoming a principal? (Give number of years in each area)

_____ K-3 Primary	_____ 10-12 High School
_____ 4-6 Intermediate	_____ Other
_____ 7-9 Junior High	(specify) _____

B. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1. Have you ever been an elementary school principal in a system other than the one in which you are now employed? (circle) Yes No If yes, how many? _____
2. Have you ever been an elementary school principal in a state other than Oklahoma? (Circle) Yes No
If yes, list name of state(s). _____
3. In how many different school plants have you served as elementary principal? _____
4. How many years have you held your present position? (Include this year) _____
5. Give the total number of years you have served as an elementary school principal. (Include this year)

C. SCHOOL UNIT

1. What is the population of the community in which your school is located? (Check one)

<u> </u> 1. Under -- 2,500 <u> </u> 2. 2,500 -- 4,999 <u> </u> 3. 5,000 -- 9,999	<u> </u> 4. 10,000 -- 29,999 <u> </u> 5. 30,000 -- 49,999 <u> </u> 6. 50,000 -- over
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. How much time do you spend teaching? (Check one)

<u> </u> 1. None <u> </u> 2. One-fourth <u> </u> 3. One-half	<u> </u> 4. Three-fourths <u> </u> 5. Full-time
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

3. What grades are under your supervision? (Circle all that apply) Nursery, Kindergarten, Grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

4. How many schools are under your supervision? (Circle) 1, 2, 3, more than 3.

5. What is the current enrollment of the school(s) where you are principal? _____total

6. How many of your students are Negro? _____

7. How many full-time teachers are employed at the school where you are principal? _____Men _____Women

8. How many of your teachers are Negro? _____

9. Do you consider your school building to be adequate for meeting the educational needs of the students? (Circle) Yes No (Comment) _____

10. Is your building flexible enough to allow for new practices such as team teaching? (Circle) Yes No (Comment) _____

11. Do you consider your school building to be adequately equipped to meet the educational needs of the students? (Circle) Yes No (Comment) _____

12. Do you have an instructional media center? (Circle) Yes No

13. Do you have adequate office supplies and equipment? (Circle) Yes No

14. Do you have adequate office space? (Circle)
Yes No
15. Do you have a central library and resource room?
(Circle) Yes No
16. Do you have adequate library books and materials?
(Circle) Yes No
17. Do you feel the neighborhood school can adequately
meet the educational needs of today? (Circle)
Yes No (Comment) _____

D. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Age: _____ years
2. Race: _____
3. Your sex: (Circle) Male Female
4. Are you married: (Circle) Yes No
5. Number of dependents: _____

E. ORGANIZATION

1. What part of your school is nongraded? (Circle all
that apply) None, Kg., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
2. What part of your school is departmentalized? (Circle
all that apply) None, Kg., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
3. What part of your school is of the self-contained
classroom plan? (Circle all that apply) None, Kg.,
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
4. Is there a planned program of team teaching in your
school? (Circle) Yes No (Comment) _____

5. Please describe briefly any other organizational plan
used in your school. _____

6. Please describe briefly the grouping methods used
in your school. _____

7. Does your plan provide for vertical regrouping through-
out the school year? (Circle) Yes No (Comment)

F. PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. To what professional organizations do you currently belong? (Check any that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. None	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. DESP-NEA
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. OEA	<input type="checkbox"/> 7. ASCD
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. DESP-OEA	<input type="checkbox"/> 8. ACEI
<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Local DESP	<input type="checkbox"/> 9. Reading Council
<input type="checkbox"/> 5. NEA	<input type="checkbox"/> 10. Other (list) _____

2. Does your school district permit you to attend the National Elementary School Principals' Annual Meeting? (Circle) Yes No

3. Does your district pay any of your expenses to professional meetings? (Circle) Yes No (specify) _____

4. How many hours per week (average) do you devote to professional activities such as conventions, conferences, college courses, professional reading, research, or writing? _____ hours

5. Are you an officer or committee chairman in a professional organization? (Circle) Yes No If yes, how many such positions of leadership do you now hold? _____

G. SELECTION

1. Were you employed in the same system where you initially became an elementary school principal? (Circle) Yes No

2. Did the school system require you to take an examination before you could be appointed to the principalship? (Circle) Yes No

3. Who interviewed you for the position? (Specify title) _____

H. PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN DECISION MAKING

1. Which of the following most nearly describes your role in regard to supervision of instruction? (Check one)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1. There is no supervision of instruction
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Supervisory personnel carry total load

- _____ 3. Supervisory personnel carry load with some assistance from you
- _____ 4. You share supervision equally with supervisory personnel
- _____ 5. You carry supervision load with some assistance from supervisory personnel
- _____ 6. You carry total supervision load
- _____ 7. Other (specify) _____
2. Which of the following most nearly describes your role in curriculum development? (Check one)
- _____ 1. Initiate curriculum changes
- _____ 2. Take part in curriculum development
- _____ 3. Follow local system's program
- _____ 4. Other (specify) _____
3. How are teaching methods usually determined in your school? (Most important single factor - Check one)
- _____ 1. Each teacher determines her own
- _____ 2. Each teacher determines her own methods after consulting with principal and/or supervisor or consultant
- _____ 3. Teachers cooperatively determine methods
- _____ 4. Teachers, principal, and supervisor or consultant cooperate
- _____ 5. Instructional supervisor or consultant determines methods
- _____ 6. Principal determines methods
- _____ 7. Subject area teacher manuals determine methods
- _____ 8. Central office and/or central office guides determine methods
- _____ 9. State bulletins and/or guides determine methods
- _____ 10. Other (specify) _____
4. Who makes the final decision on specific instructional material to be used - Who has the most say? (Check one)
- _____ 1. Individual teacher
- _____ 2. Teacher groups
- _____ 3. Teachers and principal
- _____ 4. Teacher and supervisor
- _____ 5. Principal
- _____ 6. Supervisor or consultant
- _____ 7. Central office-dist./co.
- _____ 8. Other (specify) _____
5. Do you feel you have sufficient authority to carry out a good educational program in your school?
(Circle) Yes No

6. Do you feel you have enough voice in the selection of teachers for your school? (Circle) Yes No
(Comment) _____
7. Do you feel you would be supported by the administration if you recommended the dismissal of an incompetent teacher? (Circle) Yes No (Comment) _____
8. Are maintenance personnel responsible to you while working in your school? (Circle) Yes No
(Comment) _____
9. Do you feel you have enough voice in policy development for your school system? (Circle) Yes No
(Comment) _____
10. Do you feel you have enough voice in budget preparation for your school? (Circle) Yes No (Comment) _____
11. Do you feel you have enough voice in the selection of instructional materials? (Circle) Yes No
(Comment) _____
12. Do you feel principals in your district have enough voice in the planning of elementary school buildings? (Circle) Yes No (Comment) _____
13. Do you feel you have enough authority to enable you to maintain good student discipline? (Circle) Yes No (Comment) _____
14. Does your district have a set of written aims and objectives? (Circle) Yes No
15. Do you feel a set of written aims and objectives is needed? (Circle) Yes No
16. In relation to the administration, what best describes the role of elementary school principals in your system? (Check one)

_____ 1. Leader	_____ 3. Follower
_____ 2. Supporter	_____ 4. Other (specify) _____

What do you think the role should be? _____

17. Has your school system developed a policies handbook?
(Circle) Yes No
18. Has your individual school developed a policies handbook? (Circle) Yes No

I. SUPPORTIVE PERSONNEL

1. How many clerical personnel do you have? part-time
full-time Is this adequate? (Circle) Yes No
2. How many custodial personnel do you have? part-time
full-time Is this adequate? (Circle) Yes No
3. Do you have an assistant principal? (Circle) Yes No
4. Do you feel an assistant principal is needed in your building? (Circle) Yes No
5. Indicate the availability of the following resource personnel. (Check)

(a) General Curriculum Consultant <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> On call	(b) Special Music Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> On call
(c) Special Reading Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> On call	(d) Special Physical Education Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> On call
(e) Special Art Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> On call	(f) Special Math Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> On call
(g) Special Social Studies Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> On call	(h) Special Science Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> On call

(i) Other (specify)

_____ None
 _____ Part-time
 _____ Full-time
 _____ On call

6. Indicate the availability of the following special services personnel. (Check)

(a) Guidance Counselor

_____ None
 _____ Part-time
 _____ Full-time
 _____ On call

(b) Psychologist

_____ None
 _____ Part-time
 _____ Full-time
 _____ On call

(c) Speech Therapist

_____ None
 _____ Part-time
 _____ Full-time
 _____ On call

(d) Nurse

_____ None
 _____ Part-time
 _____ Full-time
 _____ On call

(e) Librarian

_____ None
 _____ Part-time
 _____ Full-time
 _____ On call

(f) Other (specify) _____

_____ None
 _____ Part-time
 _____ Full-time
 _____ On call

7. Indicate the number of paid auxiliary personnel available to your school. (List number in each category)

_____ 1. None
 _____ 2. Non-instructional supervisors (for hall, lunchroom, playground, etc.)
 _____ 3. Instructional assistants to help teachers in classrooms
 _____ 4. Clerical aides
 _____ 5. Library aides
 _____ 6. Housekeeping aides
 _____ 7. Audio-visual aides
 _____ 8. Other (specify) _____

8. Are the supportive personnel responsible to you while working in your school? (Circle) Yes No
 (Comment) _____

J. ECONOMIC AND PROFESSIONAL STATUS

1. Do you feel the state requirements for certification of elementary school principals are adequate? (Circle)
Yes No

2. What should be the elementary school principal's position in regard to professional negotiations? (Check one)
- ☐ 1. Aligned with teachers
 - ☐ 2. Aligned with principals only
 - ☐ 3. Aligned with superintendent and board of education
 - ☐ 4. Other (specify) _____
3. How should salary be determined? (Check one)
- ☐ 1. By individual negotiation
 - ☐ 2. By single salary schedule considering only years of service
 - ☐ 3. By individual school assignments
 - ☐ 4. By ratio tied to classroom teacher salary schedule
 - ☐ 5. Other (specify) _____
4. Does your district have a minimum beginning salary for elementary school principals? (Circle) Yes No
If yes, what is the minimum? \$ _____
5. What is your contract salary for this year? \$ _____
6. What is your annual gross income from work outside your school job? \$ _____
7. Does your salary program provide steps for additional graduate work above the standard elementary school principal's certificate (Master's Degree + 16 hours) requirement? (Circle) Yes No
If yes, specify steps and increment amount. _____
8. Who should formally evaluate the elementary school principal? (Check one)
- ☐ 1. No one
 - ☐ 2. Committee of lay people
 - ☐ 3. Superintendent and/or director of elementary education
 - ☐ 4. Heads of departments in central office
 - ☐ 5. Committee of fellow principals
 - ☐ 6. Committee of teachers
 - ☐ 7. Other (specify) _____
9. Do you plan to make a career of the elementary school principalship? (Circle) Yes No

K. SPECIAL REQUEST

Please discuss briefly any innovative program being conducted in your school that you feel would be of interest to others.