A Study to Examine the Role Perception of Selected Principals of Nongraded Schools in DuPage County, Illinois

Dale F. Zorn

Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation
Zorn, Dale F., "A Study to Examine the Role Perception of Selected Principals of Nongraded Schools in DuPage County, Illinois" (1975). Dissertations. 1530.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1530

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1975 Dale F. Zorn
A STUDY TO EXAMINE THE ROLE PERCEPTION OF SELECTED
PRINCIPALS OF GRADED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND
SELECTED PRINCIPALS OF NONGRADED SCHOOLS
IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

BY
DALE P. ZORN

A Dissertation
Submitted to
the Faculty of the School of Education
Loyola University
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

June
1975
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his gratitude to Drs. Heller, Valenti, Smith and Bailey, all of Loyola University, for their suggestions, encouragement and continued support throughout the preparation of this study.

The moral, as well as the practical, support of the staff of Indian Trail Junior High School at Addison, Illinois is greatly appreciated.

An especial acknowledgment must be given to his family, Leanne, Wendy, Dan and Bob, for being so tolerant of a part time Dad while completing this study; his wife, Marlene, who so diligently supported this work with continual positive support and encouragement in preparation of the final copy. They each graciously in their own way contributed more than they will understand and for this the author is extremely grateful.
Dale F. Zorn was born in Chester, Montana on May 22, 1935.

He was graduated from Chester High School, Chester, Montana in May, 1953. He received the degree of Bachelor of Science from Northern Montana College, Havre, Montana in June, 1957 and the degree of Master of Education in administration from the University of Montana, Missoula, Montana in August, 1967.

From 1957 to 1961, he taught Social Science and coached at Hinsdale High School, Hinsdale, Montana. From 1961 to 1964, he taught social science and coached at Superior High School, Superior, Montana. From 1964 to 1966 he served as elementary principal in Superior and from 1966 to 1968 he served as superintendent of Superior, Montana School District #3. In 1968-69, he served the Eastern Illinois Development and Service Unit as an administrative intern. Since 1969, he has served as principal of Indian Trail Junior High School in Addison School District #4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. THE PROBLEM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Null Hypotheses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Definition of Terms</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Delimitation of the Study</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Assumptions Made in the Study</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Organization of Remainder of Dissertation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING THE INVESTIGATION</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Formulating the Administrative Function Instrument</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Selection of Participants in this Study</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. IN-DEPTH STUDY OF FOUR NONGRADED SCHOOLS</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Analysis of the Data</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX E</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX F</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

The elements necessary for providing an educational climate which is conducive to learning may vary with each critic, but one element which is common to all lists is quality instruction. Quality instruction becomes an individual matter with each teacher, but the organizational structure of the school affects the role of the principal in supporting the efforts of the teacher. Although it is possible for teachers to initiate change in classroom practice, the role perception of the principal in his attitude towards his position as educational leader of the school dictates the total educational climate of the school. The changes in organizational structure of schools in recent years might have an effect upon the way a principal views his position.

Contemporary writers in educational administration have been concerned with the principal's increasing burden of duties in organization and management. They are apprehensive of this shift from the concentration on supervision to organization and management and remain firm in their emphasis on supervision as the primary function of the principal.
Studies from 1939 to the present provide evidence that organization and management are taking up forty percent of the principal's time. Students of educational administration would like to see a good portion of this time given to improvement of instruction.¹

Melton² reported in a 1968 study that the elementary principal role perception has changed little since 1958. He concluded that ideal and actual percentage time spent on curriculum and instructional leadership was quite disparate in that actual time spent in performing these functions was eighteen percent while the ideal would dictate thirty-one percent.

This California study replicated a 1958 Michigan study and showed little, if any, difference in ten years in actual and ideal time spent by the principal in the areas of curriculum and instructional leadership, personnel guidance, school-community relations, administrative responsibility, evaluation responsibility, and professional improvement.


Melton concluded that "although the principals expressed impressive ideals throughout the studies, it is time for situational analysis and for rethinking."³

The issues and problems which face the principal of today are not to be resolved easily. However, there is a need for a studied appraisal of his role, responsibilities and functions in light of the organizational changes resultant from the challenges of today's society.

Nongrading a school may have far reaching implications for the principal. Melton's suggestion of situational analysis and performance of the specific day to day functions facing the elementary school principal may be affected by the nongraded structure.

Glogau⁴ concluded in her study of principal leadership style in relation to nongraded schools that there was a correlation between bringing about change and being effective in decision making and that there is a correlation between bringing about change and being high in the peer esteem leadership style. This study, however,

³Ibid.

was limited to five schools and the case study approach since the literature had not revealed sufficient instrumentation or procedures already developed to study the complex relationships between organizational change and leadership style.

Studies by Back⁵ and Robinson⁶ conclude that principals of innovative programs are more willing to and through necessity must share decision making with teachers. These administrators also perceived themselves as having greater responsibility and authority and consequently delegated more authority to teachers than administrators of traditional structures.

In studying major change efforts of the last seventy-five years, Orlansky and Smith⁷ have concluded that nongrading a school is a result of internal origin within the field of education rather than being instituted as a result of external pressures. They further conclude


that nongrading focuses on organization and administration rather than on instruction or curriculum and is a change that has been successfully installed to the degree that it is sufficiently present that instances of the change are obvious.

If these conclusions are to be accepted in regard to the existence of nongraded schools nationwide, the identification and substantiation of the existence of nongraded schools in a specific area should be easily established. As noted in Chapter III, this did not prove to be true in DuPage County, Illinois which made it difficult to analyze the perceptions of administrative tasks of principals in nongraded structures.

The investigator, through the examination and documentation of data gathered in relation to the problem selected for this study, attempted to measure the perceptions of principals of selected nongraded and selected graded schools in DuPage County, Illinois, pertaining to leadership functions of the elementary school principal. The study established the relative importance placed upon each leadership function by the selected groups and further established whether there was a difference between the two groups in terms of their perceptions of management functions, as opposed to instructional functions as defined
in the study.

Through the interview technique and a questionnaire, the study established which functions were perceived as being most important to the success of both groups of principals; further, which functions were perceived as least important to the success of each group of principals, and determined the different priority of the groups in their perceptions of the importance of elementary school leadership functions.

Although the literature contains many studies about academic achievement of students in nongraded organizational structures and other studies investigated the characteristics of innovative principals, there was no evidence of studies being done to investigate the role perception of nongraded school principals and compare them with the role perceptions of principals of graded schools.

NULL HYPOTHESES

As a result of a lack of studies on role perceptions of nongraded school principals and through discussions with practicing principals and interested college personnel the following hypotheses were developed for study in this dissertation.
1. There are no significant differences in the leadership functions which are perceived as most important to their work by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and the principals of graded elementary schools.

2. There are no significant differences in the leadership functions which are perceived as least important to their work by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and the principals of graded elementary schools.

3. There is no significant relationship in the emphasis placed upon management functions by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and principals of graded elementary schools.

4. There is no significant relationship in the emphasis placed upon instructional functions by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and the principals of graded elementary schools.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The definition of terms to be used in this study are:

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - An elementary school is any
school which has students in grades Kindergarten through eight or any combination of students in grades Kindergarten through eight. For example, a school having only grades one through four will be considered an elementary school for the purpose of this study.

GRADE - In the traditional plan, grade indicates that certain achievement standards have to be met by the child, irrespective of individual differences, in a specified period of time or one year.

HETEROGENEOUS GROUPING - Heterogeneous grouping is the grouping of children, usually by chronological age with no concern for ability.

HOMOGENEOUS GROUPING - Homogeneous grouping is the grouping of children according to ability. This applies primarily to reading at the first grade level, determined by a reading readiness test, and to all subjects in other grades. This grouping is determined by achievement test scores.

LEVEL - A level indicates a group of sequential skills which may be achieved and mastered by the child with no reference to time. Demands
made upon a child because he is of a certain age or in a certain grade, are eliminated or are replaced with an individual program of skills.

NONGRADED ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE - Nongraded Administrative structure is an administrative structure for school organization which permits each child to move through school at his own learning rate. The child's educational program is tailored to his own needs and not to those of someone else. The brighter child is not held back by slower classmates and the student who needs more time to develop skills is allowed the needed time without fear of failure.

NONGRADED PRIMARY - The nongraded primary is an organizational plan of placement of primary students which recognizes individual differences and helps the child to grow in a series of skills in a learning situation suited to his maturity, ability, and experience. The child goes through a series of levels at his own rate of learning.

PRINCIPAL - The term, as used in this study, applies to all men and women employed as the chief
administrator of a public elementary school reporting directly to and being responsible to an elementary school superintendent. Also, in this study, the term principal is limited to those administrators working in a school district with grades kindergarten through eight.

LEADERSHIP - Leadership is a set of acts by the principal designed to guide and direct others toward the accomplishment of a particular goal.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP - Instructional leadership is a set of acts by the principal designed to guide and direct others to the performance of an effective program of instruction.

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP - Educational leadership is a set of acts by the educational leader designed to guide and direct others to the accomplishment of effective educational goals.

MANAGEMENT FUNCTION - A management function is defined as one which is performed by the principal which is not directly related to the instructional program; i.e., a function which is related to the facility, non-instructional personnel, community relations, peer relation-
ships, and professional organizations.

INSTRUCTIONAL FUNCTION — An instructional function is defined as a function which is performed by the principal and is directly related to the improvement of instruction through the modification of teacher behavior or any action by the principal which directly influences the instructional program.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted among a selected sample of principals in nongraded elementary schools and graded elementary schools in DuPage County, Illinois. DuPage County, Illinois was selected as the area of study primarily because this affluent area generally personifies the areas which are sighted as being able to encompass and finance the emerging patterns of organization. Additionally, DuPage County has recently felt the influx of city migration of people seeking a new way of life and consequently seems to be generally accepted by educators as an area marked by its willingness to innovate. The schools in DuPage County were readily accessible to the investigator for examination of reported nongradedness and in the final case study interview this accessibility
afforded the investigator the opportunity to establish the personal contact necessary to elicit responses and perceptions to administrative tasks established for study (see appendix A).

The nongraded schools used for investigation were determined by the interview technique from a list of schools reporting nongradedness to the DuPage County Superintendent of Schools (see appendix B). The principals of all reported nongraded schools were surveyed using an interview technique developed by the investigator according to the Goodlad and Anderson\(^8\) criteria for identifying nongraded schools (see appendix C). Through this technique, four schools were identified as being nongraded and since each was located in a relatively large school district, these schools were match paired with schools of similar size in the district who were identified by the central office personnel in these districts as being the most traditionally organized.

Confining this study to schools in DuPage County, while making the study expedient to the investigator and bringing an analyzed result for that area, brought about a limiting factor in developing generalizations from the

study. However, this limiting factor was alleviated through an in-depth study, using the interview and questionnaire technique, of the four nongraded schools in the study.

ASSUMPTIONS MADE IN THE STUDY

For the purpose of the study, it was assumed that the investigator would be able to determine through the interview technique based on the Goodlad and Anderson\(^9\) criteria, the authenticity of reported nongradedness. It was further assumed that through the case study technique and personal contact of the investigator with the principals selected for study that honest evaluation and reactions could be elicited to the administrative functions established for study.

ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE DISSERTATION

Chapter II, "Review of Related Research," presents an account of the literature pertinent to the problem. The chapter includes a review of the related research on nongraded schools, as well as an account of studies relative to the role of the principal.

Chapter III, "Procedures for Conducting the Investigation," describes the development and implementation of the research scheme for this study. Specifically, it explains the development and validation of the data gathering devices, selection of the population and the procedures for the collection of these data. Chapter III will further define the Chi Square and the rank order correlation statistical techniques.

Chapter IV, "Analysis and Interpretation of the Data," presents a compilation of the data into a practical form and an interpretation of these data for the practitioner.

Chapter V, "In-Depth Study of Four Nongraded Schools," describes four nongraded schools relative to program initiation, process of implementation, operation, organizational functions relative to decision making, role perceptions and role changes, and attitudes toward the program.

Chapter VI, "Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations," contains a general summary of the study conclusions derived from these data and further, makes recommendations for the practitioner and future researcher.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

According to Francis Keppel, former commissioner of education in 1966, the most publicized and fastest spreading innovation in school organization was the non-graded school. The theoretical foundation of the nongraded school is an attempt to facilitate continuous progress and individualized instruction through a school organization which eliminates grade barriers.

Variations of this plan of school organization have been tried in the past, but they did not withstand the test of time.\(^1\) The nongraded program has recently re-emerged and is making a strong bid to replace the traditional graded classroom or lockstep pattern of school organization, particularly in the primary unit. Stuart Dean in 1961 showed the following school organizational patterns by regions in the United States.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) M. Dawson, Editor, "Point of View About School Organization," National Elementary Principal, XLI (December, 1961), pp. 20-47.
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At the present time, indications from the federal government and from NEA and other sources suggest that about one school system in every four is known to be engaged in a serious effort to develop nongraded practices in one or more schools. Probably an even larger number of schools have been moving without fanfare in the direction away from gradedness.  

The nongraded school represents an endeavor to meet the individual student differences in mental, physical, social and emotional growth. This continuity is not impossible in the graded classroom, but the nongraded organizational pattern creates an atmosphere of cooperation which encourages the school staff to promote flexibility in dealing with student needs. The proponents of the nongraded program are attempting to meet the needs of a child's total development through a change in the school's organizational pattern.

It is difficult to define the nongraded program because of the unusually large number of variations of the program, however the investigator will use an interview technique in an effort to establish an authentic

---

sample of nongraded schools in DuPage County, Illinois. Essentially, this type of organizational pattern is founded on the premise that a sequential development of skills exists, and it is important that these skills be mastered at each level. This organizational pattern also recognizes that each child will master these skills at a different rate and consequently offers a solution to the dilemma of whether to promote a pupil who has fallen behind the others in his grade. It is not uncommon to find an accelerated student in one area, such as reading, working with a slower group in another area, such as mathematics.

One reason for the uncertainty that surrounds the concept of nongradedness is that its vocabulary is both imprecise in meaning and negativistic in tone. "Nongradedness" is a clumsy and unsuitable term, since it refers primarily to what it is not rather than to what it is. Furthermore, the label "nongraded" has often been applied to programs which have made only very limited departures from conventional gradedness (for example, only the reading program has been rendered more flexible), or are merely a version of homogeneous grouping or even departmentalization. Often, too, visitors to so-called nongraded classes discover that terms such as "first grade" and "third grade" are still in common use and pupils may still be confronted by conventional A-B-C-D-F report cards, as well as the administrative machinery of promotion and non-promotion. In the absence of agreement concerning its meaning, and because of the carelessness with which it is used, "nongradedness" is therefore a term for which the profession desperately needs alternatives. For the moment, however, we must struggle along with it as best we can.

Nongradedness refers to at least two dimensions of the school and its atmosphere: 1) the philosophy (or,
if you will, the value system) that guides the behavior of the school staff toward the pupils, and 2) the administrative-organizational machinery and procedures whereby the life of the pupils and teachers is regulated and facilitated. It is, in short, both an operational mechanism and a theoretical proposition. It is not a new staffing pattern, as is team teaching. It is not a technological innovation, as is educational television. It is not as such, a component of the curriculum reform movement, though it may very well be the chief inspiration behind curriculum reform. Rather, it is a concept of what is right and a plan for implementation of that concept.

Many definitions have been offered and for the most part they differ in the elegance and the comprehensiveness with which their authors have stated them, rather than in conceptual meaning. Without exception, the emphasis is upon individualizing instruction and upon developing each individual up to his full potential for physical, social, intellectual and civic accomplishment. Without exception, too, there is reference to the fact that provision should be made for both differentiated rates of pupil progress and variations in the kinds of programs offered to this child and that. Many, though not all, refer to the need for more suitable forms of evaluating and reporting pupil progress, and most make some reference to the various means for individualizing instruction via pupil group, independent study, and other procedural arrangements. The titles of nongraded programs vary, many using phrases like "Continuous Progress Plan" or "Continuous Growth Plan" but others simply refer to the name of the school or city in a phrase such as "The Middletown Project".

Although most publications on nongradedness and an overwhelming number of pilot programs are at the early elementary level, the movement is in fact inclusive of all school levels from nursery schools through the university.  

Goodlad and Anderson\textsuperscript{5} have made the following

\textsuperscript{4}Anderson, op. cit., pp. 4-9

comparison between the graded and nongraded structure:

**Graded and Nongraded Schools Compared**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graded Structure</th>
<th>Nongraded Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A year of progress in subject matter is seen as roughly comparable with a child's year in school.</td>
<td>A year of school life may mean much more or much less than a year of progress in subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each successive year of progress is seen as comparable to each past year or each year to come.</td>
<td>Progress seen as irregular; a child may progress much more rapidly in one year and quite slowly in another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A child's progress is seen as unified; advancing in rather regular fashion in all areas of development; probably working close to grade level in most subject areas.</td>
<td>A child's progress seen as not unified; he spurts ahead in one area of progress and lags behind in others; may be working at three or four levels in as many subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific bodies of content seen as appropriate to successive grade levels and so labeled; subject matter packaged grade-by-grade.</td>
<td>Bodies of content seen as appropriate over a wide span of years; learnings viewed vertically or longitudinally rather than horizontally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of progress determined by comparing child's attainment to coverage deemed appropriate to the grade.</td>
<td>Adequacy of progress determined by comparing child's attainment to his ability and both to long term view of ultimate accomplishment desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate progress made up by repeating the work of a given grade; grade failure the ultimate penalty for slow progress.</td>
<td>Slow progress provided for by permitting longer time to do given blocks of work; no repetitions but recognition of basic differences in learning rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid progress provided for through enrichment; encouragement of horizontal expansion rather than vertical</td>
<td>Rapid progress provided for both vertically and horizontally; bright children encouraged to move ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded Structure</td>
<td>Nongraded Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement in work; attempt to avoid moving to domain of teacher above.</td>
<td>regardless of the grade level of the work; no fear of encroachment on work of next teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather inflexible grade-to-grade movement of pupils, usually at end of year.</td>
<td>Flexible pupil movement; pupil may shift to another class at almost any time; some trend toward controlling shifts on a quarter or semester basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The champions of the nongraded organizational pattern have certain convictions concerning the graded, self-contained classroom, namely: 1) teachers, for fear of encroaching on the domain of the teacher in the next higher grade or for lack of time, hesitate to teach advanced work to fast learners; 2) teachers, in their enthusiasm for preparing everyone for the next grade, frequently push slow learners too rapidly for efficient learning and produce anxiety and frustration on the part of the pupils and of the teachers; 3) teachers have to create so many groups in order to provide for individual differences that a great deal of seatwork activity is necessary to keep the groups busy, thus precluding the opportunity for immediate feedback and permitting re-enforcement of incorrect responses; 4) teachers are usually willing to provide one level for slow learners, but the wide range of ability in the typical classroom would
involve several groups below grade level; 5) in actual
practice, teachers do not group pupils with notable
frequency in subjects other than reading.

In addition, financial costs of grade failure
can be gauged fairly accurately. From numerous studies
we can estimate that in 1963-64 at least one million
children were required to repeat a grade in order to
'catch up'. The average cost of educating each child
for the same year was $455. The failure therefore
cost the nation approximately 455 million dollars.6

The advocates of the graded, self-contained class-
room have been critical of many aspects of the nongraded
program. They frequently assert that in this pattern of
school organization, level standards have been substituted
for grade standards,7 provisions for integrated learning
are reduced,8 and ability grouping has been resurrected.9

In actual practice, the difference between graded
and nongraded patterns of school organization are not as

---

great as many people believe. Lobdell and Van Ness\textsuperscript{10} and Wilhelms\textsuperscript{11} have been extremely critical of the operation of many nongraded programs because they felt that curricular change has been overlooked and that concentration has been devoted solely to organizational change. However, Goodlad and Anderson\textsuperscript{12} say that organizational reform is but a beginning and not an end in itself. To move into a nongraded pattern without simultaneously or subsequently giving attention to fundamental questions of school function, curriculum design, teaching and evaluation is to court chaos or at least to create a school that is nongraded in name only.

The research relative to the superiority of one of the organizational patterns over the other is limited. Most of the proponents of the self-contained classroom cite the insignificant differences found between pupils taught in homogeneous and heterogeneous classes as illustrative of the lack of efficiency of the nongraded


\textsuperscript{11}F. T. Wilhelms and Gibson D. Westby, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 410-413.

program. However, in many of these studies, the students were not in a nongraded organizational pattern but were ability grouped within the graded structure.

Goodlad has surveyed the literature on the nongraded pattern of organization up to 1960. His conclusions are that there have been few valid studies conducted in this area and that the few that have been done favor nongraded over graded patterns of organization.

A number of studies by Hart, Hillson, Ingram

---


Skapski, Halliwell, Bloom and Buffie have made achievement comparisons between graded and nongraded students and have found a significant advantage for students in the nongraded pattern over those in the graded pattern of instruction. Carbone and Moore, in similar studies, found an advantage for the graded pattern over the nongraded.

Hart made an achievement study comparison in arithmetic between students who had spent three years in a


graded program and students who had spent three years in a
nongraded program. The results showed the nongraded
students achieving one half year above the graded group,
which is reported as being significant at the .02 level of
confidence. 25

The Hillson study compared the reading achievement
score of fifty-two pupils who were taught reading in
either a graded or nongraded organizational pattern. After
one and one half years, grade level achievement of those
in the nongraded pattern was found to be significantly
superior to those students in the graded program. 26

Ingram made a comparison of reading achievement
scores of pupils in the Flint, Michigan nongraded primary
cycle with pupils in the traditional program at the comple-
tion of the primary cycle. The results revealed on mean
scores showed the nongraded pupils superior at the .01
level of significance in paragraph meaning, word meaning,
spelling, and language. The results of a parent survey
included in the study disclosed that 97% of the parents of
the nongraded pupils favored the program. 27

26 Maurie J. Hillson, ERIC Bibliography (Bureau of
Educational Research, College of Education, University of
27 Ingram, op. cit., pp. 76-80.
Skapski compared achievement of students grouped in a nongraded pattern for reading instruction in the primary unit with students in a similar graded program and found significance at the .01 level of confidence in favor of the nongraded group. Similar results were found when a comparison was made between students classified as average, superior, and very superior. Another significant finding was that less than half as many children spend four years in a primary program in a nongraded pattern as in a graded pattern of organization.28

Halliwell compared the achievement of 149 graded and 146 nongraded pupils. He found a significant difference in favor of the nongraded students at the .01 level of confidence in word knowledge and reading comprehension at the first grade level, and spelling and computation at the third grade level. He found a significant difference in favor of the nongraded students at the .05 level of confidence in total arithmetic at the second grade level and problem solving at the third grade level.29

Bloom made a reading achievement comparison of students in two nongraded schools with those of students


in control schools. His results showed an approximate one
year superiority for the nongraded students.30

Buffie made a comparison between two school systems.
One had a nongraded primary unit while the other utilized
the traditional graded primary school pattern. He reports
the "children attending schools under the rationale of the
nongraded primary plan seem to be clearly superior to
graded pupils in the areas of language and work study
skills, as well as in the overall academic composite
score."31

A study which has been most seriously considered by
the proponents of the graded organizational pattern is one
by Carbone in which he studied 244 randomly selected inter-
mediate grade students. Half of these students had
attended a graded primary school. The students were
matched on the basis of sex and age, and the analysis of
covariance technique was used to hold constant the influ-
ence of mental ability. A significant difference was
found in favor of the graded group in all achievement
areas. In addition, there was no significant difference
found in four of five mental health characteristics which

30 Bloom, op. cit., pp. 1.
were compared. A significant difference was found in favor of the graded group in the fifth characteristic, that of social participation.32

The major findings of the Moore study are: 1) the mean score of pupils enrolled in graded classes exceeds the mean score of pupils enrolled in ungraded classes in nearly all measures of achievement; 2) it appears that within the confines of one academic school year the idea of greater flexibility is not a unique attribute of the ungraded organizational pattern; 3) the study strongly suggests that the provision for the variability of pupils can be met as adequately in the conventional organizational pattern as in the nongraded pattern; 4) the nongraded pattern is largely an arrangement that attempts to provide for the individual differences of pupils along a single dimension, that of rate of pupil progress.33

Goodlad has maintained that the apparent conflict may not be real, and that it is possible investigators have simply compared pupils in two differently labeled "graded schools."34 Furthermore, Goodlad asserts that Carbone's study is valuable to the nongraded proponents.

32Carbone, op. cit., pp. 82-88.
33Moore, op. cit., p. 5.
By not finding significant superiority for the nongraded group, it has demonstrated "what organization by itself cannot possibly achieve."\textsuperscript{35} If one accepts the hypothesis that Carbone's nongraded groups may not have differed from graded groups other than in organization, it becomes rather obvious that the significant superiority of the graded pupils cannot be attributed to the curriculum or instructional practices but must be attributed solely to organization, the very point that Goodlad felt he had refuted. This notion would seem to be corroborated by Ingram's study in which the nongraded groups were found to be significantly superior to the graded groups despite explicit statements to the effect that the only change was in organization.\textsuperscript{36}

A basic assumption of the nongraded organization is the exciting hypothesis that the full performance of the human mind has not yet been tapped. Its creative power is infinite. Once schools concede that there is no limit to the human mind, the next step is to lift the restraining limits on the processes which cultivate that great mind. In the past, the emphasis in the learning process has been on memory for storage purposes. The new

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{36}Ingram, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 61-62
curriculum suggests that retrieval, not storage, is the major problem of human memory. These are the boundaries which must be broken as the quest for learning extends to infinity. This thesis may seem a bold concept for educational organization, but this is a bold era -- one in which the role of education will change from a mere concern with facts to an emphasis on unbounded intellectual inquiry.37

Traditionally many studies have been done on the role of the elementary principal. These studies have included the broad activities of the school principal as well as investigations relating to specific areas of job responsibility. Recently several studies have been conducted which have investigated the role of the principal in and the effect of the principal upon innovative schools.

Wiggins investigated leader behavior characteristics of elementary school principals and examined their characteristics as they related to the organizational climate of the school. The general hypothesis of the study was that there exists a significant relationship between leader, behavior characteristics of elementary principals and the

organizational climate of the schools within which they serve. Generally, leader behavior and organizational climate were not shown to be significantly related.  

Brunetti, in a study of teacher role perception in open space schools, found that open schools seem to hold implications for changing the decision making and task responsibilities of the teacher and for changing the role of the principal who must function in a position with reduced influence and authority.  

Reese examined the role perceptions of teachers and administrators in highly innovative and less innovative schools. The results of the study concluded that teachers and administrators in highly innovative schools were significantly more oriented toward the idiographic dimension of behavior.  

38 \text{Thomas W. Wiggins, "Leader Behavior Characteristics and Organizational Climate" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School and University Center, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts.}  


Shinn, in examining the role perceptions of superintendent, principal and curriculum director in the educational program, found that the principal's role was perceived as four types: 1) supervision of the use of the buildings, equipment and facilities, 2) enforcement of district policies, 3) working with pupil behavior problems and 4) assistance with classroom management.41

Hansen concluded in his study of the innovative principal's effect on morale that teachers who work for innovative principals are significantly more concerned with factors of satisfaction with teaching and teacher status. He further concluded that these teachers are more greatly concerned about community support of education than their traditional counterpart. The second conclusion could have far reaching import on the profession in this day of demanded accountability.42

Bargman made the following conclusions concerning the role of the elementary school principal:


1. Theory can provide a set of criteria through which a more scientific approach of administration can be attempted. Elementary school principals can direct and control the decision-making processes through administrative theory.

2. The role of the elementary principal was described as that of coordinator, evaluator, innovator and interpreter. The principal is a strategist who takes particular human and material components of the community and school and combines them into a functioning unit.

3. Organization, innovation, and technology are changing the principal's role to that of a coordinator of teams of staff members working within sub-systems in the attendance units. The elementary school principals have to develop sound and viable participatory techniques at the building level when the staff is participating in professional negotiations.

4. The elementary school principal cannot hope to bring about innovative changes without consideration of the organized forces of the school community.

5. Machines will play an important part in processing and analyzing school records. The use of machines in the decision-making process adds new technology for choosing among alternatives.

6. Seventy-five percent of all supervising principals are located in communities classified as urban or suburban. Sixteen and seven-tenths percent of the supervising principals report a student body with many disadvantaged pupils.

7. Individual schools will become larger in structural size and enrollment, especially in urban and suburban communities. Significant organizational changes in which elementary principals must be orientated are: team teaching, differentiated staffing, campus schools, and programmed learning.

8. Increased certification and specialization will be required of individuals applying for the principalship. They will need to be scholars in the field of administration and leadership. Special training in human relations, group dynamics, and interaction analysis will be necessary.
9. The average age of supervising elementary school principals will remain about the same. The proportion of men in the elementary principalships will steadily increase.43

Of major significance to this study is the conclusion that organization, innovation and technology are changing the role of the principal. Bargman further recommended in his study that future studies should be made to analyze the role components and expectations of the elementary school principal in the leadership role.

The problem selected for study in this dissertation will specifically examine the principal's role perception of one innovation, the nongraded school, and will compare this role perception with the role perception of principals in graded structures.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING THE INVESTIGATION

Formulating the Administrative Function Instrument

In this investigation, the initial instrument was a Job Responsibility Survey developed from the literature by the State of Illinois, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in January of 1969. Klein indicates that this instrument gained its function from an extensive review of educational and administrative literature and was validated through repeated surveys of practicing educators.¹ The way these leadership functions were developed into final form occurred in the following manner:

1) the original instrument (see appendix D) was mailed to practicing principals (six) and college professors (six) along with a cover letter (see appendix E) and the following instructions:

Please respond to the items in the following questionnaire by indicating +, -, or 0 in the first column and M or I in the second column.

+ in the first column indicates that

---

you feel that the principal must always perform this function.
- in the first column indicates that you feel that the principal need not perform this function.
0 in the first column indicates that you feel that the principal sometimes performs this function.
M in the second column means that this function is more a management function performed by the principal rather than a function directly related to improvement of instruction in the building.
I in the second column means that this function performed by the principal is directly related to the improvement of instruction in the building.

Should you feel that there are functions of great importance that have been omitted from this questionnaire, please list them at the end of the questionnaire and respond to them in like manner.

Management Function - A management function for the purpose of this study is defined as one which is performed by the principal which is not directly
related to the instructional program, i.e., a function which is related to the facility, non-instructional personnel, non-instructional behavior of instructional personnel, community relations, peer relationships, and professional organizations.

Instructional Function - An instructional function for the purpose of this study is defined as a function which is performed by the principal which is directly related to improve instruction through the modification of teacher behavior or any action by the principal which directly influences the instructional program.

Responses were received from all twelve people asked to respond.

2) the results were tabulated and all plus items were included in the final instrument along with those items which gained predominantly + and 0 responses. No - items were included.

In the final analysis, the educational authorities included the following leadership functions to be performed by principals:

1. The principal attends board of education meetings and reports the proceedings to the staff members. Manage-
ment function.

2. The principal creates a "climate" in which individual staff members are encouraged to try out new ideas. Instructional function.

3. The principal assigns teachers to their rooms, students and programs. Management function.

4. The principal plans and organizes with the superintendent the most effective means of passing a district referendum. Management function.

5. The principal evaluates the work performance of individual teachers. Instructional function.

6. The principal maintains a desirable standard of behavior in students outside the classroom; e.g., corridors, playground, washrooms. Management function.

7. The principal works with specialists; e.g., social workers, psychologists, speech therapists to plan more effective school programs for individual students. Instructional function.

8. The principal explains to parents the school's position when controversial issues develop. Management function.

9. The principal participates with the superintendent on district wide planning and co-ordinating committees; e.g., educational advisory council, educational policy committees. Management function.
10. The principal co-ordinates school activities; e.g., programs, special services, extra-curricular activities. Management function.

11. The principal suggests to the superintendent school building budget allocations and priorities. Management function.

12. The principal visits areas outside the school; e.g., other districts, professional meetings, educational materials displays to obtain new ideas for the building. Instructional function.

13. The principal orients new teachers to school policies, practices and procedures. Management function.

14. The principal acts as a mediator in a work oriented problem; e.g., teacher conflict with parent, student or other teacher. Management function.

15. The principal determines conditions of work; e.g., working hours, arrangement of sessions, free time. Management function.

16. The principal suggests an instructional method to make a lesson more effective or remediate an individual learning problem. Instructional function.

17. The principal determines the qualifications for selection of a new teacher. Instructional function.

18. The principal develops policies for the grade placement
of students. Instructional function.

19. The principal informs staff members of professional growth activities; e.g., workshops, journal articles, university courses. Instructional function.

20. The principal prepares, organizes and implements district-wide curriculum innovations; e.g., sex education, initial teaching alphabet, Afro-American history. Instructional function.

21. The principal writes administrative and/or supervisory bulletins. Management function.

22. The principal modifies and adapts the district curriculum in terms of the school's individual needs. Instructional function.

23. The principal participates in the local teacher professional organization. Management function.

24. The principal structures the school environment so that effective teacher conferences take place; e.g., arrangement of time, providing space. Instructional function.

25. The principal recommends to the superintendent the necessity for employment of non-teaching personnel; e.g., lunchroom supervisors, clerical help. Management function.
26. The principal communicates to parents the importance of successful academic achievement in their children. Instructional function.

27. The principal selects instructional materials; e.g., equipment, textbooks and achievement tests needed for school programs. Instructional function.

28. The principal stimulates in children an enthusiasm for and interest in their school work. Instructional function.

29. The principal fosters a cooperative atmosphere between staff members and the parents of the community. Management function.

30. The principal proposes, organizes and implements inservice and/or teacher-faculty meetings. Instructional function.

31. The principal proposes, organizes and implements school instructional innovations; e.g., team-teaching, learning centers, ungraded primaries. Instructional function.

32. The principal determines the qualifications for selection of a new building principal. Management function.

33. The principal recommends special children for testing; e.g., slow-learners, gifted, maladjusted.
Instructional function.

34. The principal clarifies the school programs to the parents of the community. Management function.

35. The principal writes news reports and articles to improve school community relations; e.g., district-wide and/or school publications. Management function.

36. The principal assigns non-teaching activities, e.g., school assemblies, money collections, special lectures. Management function.

37. The principal works with community school organizations such as the Parent-Teacher organization. Management function.

38. The principal suggests means for improving the school's physical facilities; e.g., recommending furnishings for a classroom, helping to design an addition. Management function.

39. The principal maintains lines of communication with parents; e.g., notes, letters, bulletins, telephone calls. Management function.

40. The principal works with a parent to solve an individual pupil behavioral problem. Instructional function.

41. The principal explains to the superintendent why a
given decision was made. Management function.

42. The principal participates in the projects and activities of school oriented groups such as student councils. Management function.

The response and reaction to the original instrument resulted in forty-two of the original fifty-five functions being included in the final instrument. Of the forty-two items identified as functions of the elementary principal by the educational authorities, twenty-four were classified as management functions and eighteen were identified as instructional functions according to the definitions set forth in the instructions for treating the instrument.

Selection of Participants in This Study

An accurate identification of the nongraded schools used in this study was essential to the validity of the study. Consequently a survey which was made by the DuPage County Superintendent of Schools to identify innovative practices in DuPage County schools was screened to identify those districts which reported nongraded practices. The survey revealed sixteen districts in DuPage County reporting nongradedness. The reporting official was contacted to verify nongradedness, to identify individual schools in
the districts which were nongraded and to elicit permission to contact the individual principals to further verify the extent of nongradedness. Twenty-one individual schools were identified in this manner as being nongraded.

A questionnaire was developed reflecting the thinking of Goodlad and Anderson\(^2\) (see appendix C) and an interview technique was used to verify nongradedness. Although most of the twenty-one were using continuous progress in one, two or three subject areas, usually mathematics and/or reading, only four were operating under a Goodlad-Anderson philosophy of nongradedness. These four schools were match paired according to enrollment with another school within the same district which was more traditionally organized for the purpose of statistical analysis.

In addition to the statistical analysis, an in-depth study of these four schools was made.

The traditionally organized schools were identified by again contacting central office personnel who were advised of the purpose of the study.

Enrollments of the schools in the four districts

were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graded</th>
<th>Nongraded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District #1</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District #2</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District #3</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District #4</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These eight principals were then interviewed in depth using the instrument items as previously identified. Each principal was asked to respond to each item by ranking it 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 with a rank of 1 indicating that the performance of the function was perceived as being critical to the success of the principal and a ranking of 5 was a perception that the performance of the function was of no significance to the success of the principal. Follow-up questions were then asked of each function to determine how the practitioner achieved the implementation of the function. In addition, each interviewee was asked to rank order ten functions (five management and five instructional) to determine whether the two groups differed in the perceived importance of the two classifications of administrative functions.

Each interview was held in the office of the principal interviewed and the average time per interview was
one hour and thirty-five minutes. The experience range of the eight principals was three years to twenty-two years. The principals of the nongraded schools had experience ranging from three years to twenty-two years with an average of 7.5 years. The principals of graded structures had experience ranging from three years to twelve years and averaged 6.75 years. Average experience for the total group was 7.1 years.

Statistical Technique

The hypotheses set forth in this dissertation were analyzed in the following manner: (1) the principal responses to each question were listed numerically; (2) the principals of nongraded schools and the principals of graded schools were analyzed together with each administrative function; (3) chi-square was used in rating each of the respective administrative function questions; the chi-square value appears in a separate column next to each of the functions; (4) a brief summary follows each question telling how and to what extent each function is performed; (5) a rank order correlation was used in rating the instructional function-management function instrument in testing hypotheses three and four.

Most statisticians insist that before beginning a statistical study, a single standard of significance be
established. Consequently, a significance level of .05 was established as the point for rejection of the null hypotheses. Further, the statistical information in this study had to be strengthened due to the lack of identifiable nongraded schools in DuPage County, Illinois. Consequently, follow-up questions on each administrative function relative to how and to what extent each function was performed by each principal were utilized. The statistical information was further strengthened by doing an in-depth study of the four nongraded schools selected for this study. Conclusions from the in-depth study were used to corroborate and strengthen the statistical data conclusions because of the small sample of nongraded schools available for study in DuPage County, Illinois. The in-depth study conclusions were not used in accepting or rejecting the hypotheses. However, the conclusions were incorporated into the conclusions for the study in Chapter Six.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

In this investigation forty-two leadership functions were analyzed to test the hypotheses set forth in this dissertation.

The hypotheses tested were:

1. There are no significant differences in the leadership functions which are perceived as important by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and the principals of graded elementary schools.

2. There are no significant differences in the leadership functions which are perceived as least important to their work by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and principals of graded elementary schools.

3. There is no significant difference in the emphasis placed upon management functions by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and principals of graded elementary schools.

4. There is no significant difference in the emphasis placed upon instructional functions by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and principals of graded elementary schools.
schools and the principals of graded elementary schools.

From the data collected, the following results were established.

ITEM 1. The principal attends Board of Education meetings and reports the proceedings to the staff members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>( x^2 ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graded: 0 0 3 1 0

Nongraded: 0 1 1 0 2

The graded school principals attended board meetings from one to six times per year with an average attendance of 2.5 per year. They indicated that they were rarely involved as a participant and when they did participate it was in a reporting capacity on curriculum matters pertaining to their school. As far as reporting to the staff, these data indicate that the graded school principals felt this was a central office responsibility and in all cases the reporting was done by the central office through a staff news bulletin or a distribution of board minutes.
The nongraded school principals attended board meetings from one to twenty times per year with an average attendance of seven per year. These data indicate that the nongraded school principals perceived themselves as more of a participant in the board meetings not only in curriculum areas but they were called upon by the board as resource persons and advisors particularly in the areas of conflict such as justifying the elimination of grades. Reporting to the staff yielded the same information that was obtained from the graded school principals.

The chi-square value for this item was 5.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that there is any difference in the perception of the importance of this function to the principals.

ITEM 2. The principal creates a climate in which individual staff members are encouraged to try out new ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2  2  0  0  0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>4  0  0  0  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both groups perceived this function as important to their success with the nongraded principals giving it a slightly more critical rating. Both groups performed this function by reading and conveying information to the staff, by recommending articles for staff reading, by encouraging the implementation of individual teacher ideas, and by encouraging all teachers to visit other schools.

These data indicate that the nongraded principals placed emphasis on staff buzz sessions, in-service meetings, and team planning sessions in performing this function.

The overriding theme from both groups in performing this function was communication and human relations.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.67 which is not statistically significant.

ITEM 3. The principal assigns teachers to their rooms, students and programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>( X^2 ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graded

\( X^2 = 8.00 \)

Nongraded
All graded school principals felt that the performance of this function was critical to their success. The graded school principals did not delegate this function, but rather they developed the assignment criteria themselves. The only staff involvement was through grade level meetings.

The nongraded school principals perceived the performance of this function as being of average importance. The nongraded principals delegated this responsibility, but not totally, to the staff. The assignment criteria was developed by the staff through brainstorming sessions with the principal and a great deal of emphasis for student assignment was placed upon matching student and teacher personality.

The graded school principals completed their assignments for the next year in June. An overall plan was developed by the nongraded school principals by June, but there was continual reassignment of students throughout the year.

The chi-square value for this item was 8.00, which approaches but did not reach the .05 level of significance.

ITEM 4. The principal plans and organizes with the superintendent the most effective means of passing a district referendum.
The time involved by each individual in both groups in this activity varied greatly, but all agreed that the activity was important enough that they would put in the time necessary to pass a building referendum or a tax rate increase.

The principals reported that the activity they should be involved in would be reporting the status of the school in terms of enrollment and the effect of enrollment on specific educational programs. There was a consensus of opinion that principals were in the best position to do this, because they were closer to their building communities and had better rapport with the public than central office personnel. They also felt that although teachers were even closer to the community, they would tend to become too specific in presenting the issue to the public.

The chi-square value for this item was 5.334 which is not statistically significant.
ITEM 5. The principal evaluates the work performance of individual teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graded school principals revealed that they spent an average of thirty minutes each day in formal observation of teacher performance while these data indicate that the nongraded school principals spent two hours each day performing this function. These data indicate that the principals of graded schools in their observations placed a great deal of emphasis upon the teaching act and professional performance while the principals of nongraded schools placed their emphasis upon evaluating student performance and involvement with the on-going activity.

In performing this function, each group indicated that it made more formal evaluations of non-tenure teachers than tenure teachers. In each case there was a district requirement of principals for formal evaluations of teachers each year, usually four for non-tenure teachers and two for tenure teachers. All principals in each group followed
up each observation in a conference with the teacher of five minutes to thirty minutes in length.

In addition to formal observations, each principal in both groups made informal observations of a shorter duration which were used in an over-all evaluation but not necessarily followed by a conference.

When asked where they got their authority to evaluate, all principals in each group reported that it came by reason of the position, although several cited the school code, board policy, teacher contract, and respect for the teachers.

The chi-square value for this item was 0.00 which is not statistically significant. Both groups saw the performance of this function as critical to their success.

ITEM 6. The principal maintains a desirable standard of behavior in students outside the classroom; e.g., corridors, playgrounds, washrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>3 0 1 0 0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data indicate that both groups agree on the relative importance of this function and they achieve it through making themselves noticeable throughout the building, setting procedures for teachers to follow in achieving the desired behavior, establishing desired behavior patterns in discussions with students, and establishing in students a feeling of pride in their school.

Serious deviate behavior in students always brought about parent contact and although none of the principals had used it, suspension was the ultimate action which would be taken.

The chi-square value for this item was 1.20 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 7. The principal works with specialists; e.g., social workers, psychologists, speech therapists, to plan more effective school programs for individual students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1 2 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graded school principals all rated this function as critical to their success and these data indicate that they average about one hour per day in some form of this activity, such as filling out referrals, discussions with specialists, parent contact, and staffings. The nongraded principals did not perceive the performance of this function as critical as the principals of graded schools. However, they too averaged one hour per day in similar activities.

These data indicate that the principals of graded schools felt that teachers tended to spend more time than the principal involved in this function while the nongraded principals felt that the principal had more involvement than teachers.

The chi-square value for this item was 4.80 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 8. The principal explains to parents the school's position when controversial issues develop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There was perfect correlation on this item and these data indicate that the principals agreed that personal contact and communication with the home were essential to their success. All principals used regular school publications, newsletters to the home, group meetings and, in two districts, a district public relations person. Parent-teacher associations were perceived as vital to the operation of the principal in performing this function.

The chi-square value for this item was 0.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 9. The principal participates with the superintendent on district-wide planning and coordinating committees; e.g., educational advisory council, educational policy committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data indicate that the principals spent two to three hours in meetings of this nature every two weeks. The groups also agreed that the time they spent in these
meetings was divided in emphasis between problems of an administrative nature and problems of a curriculum nature.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 10. The principal coordinates school activities; e.g., programs, special services, extra curricular activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>2 1 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals of both groups performed this function and coordinated such activities. However, all principals delegated most of the actual activities to teachers and/or specialists for program performances and club activities.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.
ITEM 11. The principal suggests to the superintendent school building budget allocations and priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2 2 0 0 0</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graded school principals gave this function a slightly higher priority rating than the nongraded principals. Although both groups were in general agreement that this function was important to their role, there was generally no specific guideline for establishing school building budget allocations and central office personnel arbitrarily set a limit on building expenditures without first establishing at what dollar amount expenditures would be curtailed during the year.

In establishing purchasing requisitions for the building, teachers were consulted by all principals in establishing priorities to be presented to the central office.

The chi-square value for this item was .534 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.
ITEM 12. The principal visits areas outside the school; e.g., other districts, professional meetings, educational materials displays, to obtain new ideas for the building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graded 1 2 1 0 0

Nongraded 2 1 1 0 0

The principals were in general agreement that the performance of this function was important to their success. Only one principal in each group established written objectives prior to each visitation. The rest of the principals felt that by establishing objectives they would go to the visitation with a mind set and an evaluation of the visit preconceived.

These data indicate that all principals believed they did not know how much was budgeted for their travel. Although none had been refused a reasonable amount of travel, all felt that there would be a budget saturation point at which the central office personnel would refuse a request for visitation.
The chi-square value for this item was .668 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 13. The principal orients new teachers to school policies, practices, and procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data indicate a perfect correlation between the groups on the perception of the importance of the performance of this function to the success of the principal. There was also agreement in the method of orientation. All of the principals used a verbal orientation procedure in explaining to new teachers the policies of the district by using a district teachers handbook, individual school handbook and the master contract.

The principals of graded schools stated that they did not have a written building philosophy which they used in this process while the principals of nongraded schools indicated that they did have such a philosophy.

The chi-square value for this item was 0.00 which
is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 14. The principal acts as a mediator in a work-oriented problem; e.g., teacher conflict with parent, student, or other teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>( X^2 ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>3 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>2.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1 3 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals of the graded schools gave this a slightly more critical rating than the nongraded school principals. The overriding theme dealing with the problems in performing this function was communication between the people involved.

The graded school principals placed emphasis upon becoming involved in resolving the dispute for the purpose of keeping the conflict from affecting the total school program. The principals of the nongraded schools based their rating more on a teacher-parent or teacher-student conflict and the need for principal support of the teacher.

In case of a serious conflict in any of the areas, the principals said that they would use other people such
as the superintendent, assistant superintendent, special service personnel, or specialists in resolving the conflict. One principal of a nongraded school stated that other people would never be used in resolving a conflict.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 15. The principal determines conditions of work; e.g., working hours, arrangement of sessions, free time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$x^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the four principals of the nongraded schools stated that they made the arrangement of sessions and free time. All of the principals of graded schools stated that they did not make the decisions on any of the items.

In making the determinations on working hours, arrangement of sessions, and free time the principals who did not make the decision believed that the determinations
were made by board policy, central office personnel, administrative regulations, and the negotiated teacher contract.

The three nongraded principals who made the decisions used a considerable amount of teacher involvement in arrangement of sessions and establishment of free time to encourage team planning sessions. The other five principals felt that the only teacher involvement in this function was through their local association participation in the negotiations process.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

**ITEM 16.** The principal suggests an instructional method to make a lesson more effective or to remediate an individual learning problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graded</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nongraded</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals of the graded schools viewed this function as more critical to their success than did the principals of nongraded schools. To learn of the need for
involvement in this function, the principals of the graded schools relied more heavily on teacher request, parent contact, special service personnel, progress reports, and record and test result review.

The principals of the graded schools generally performed this function by making recommendations to the teacher of an alternative method, the principal demonstrating for the teacher, or having a consultant work with the teacher. The principals of nongraded schools performed this function by conferring with the teacher and presenting alternatives, demonstration teaching, having another teacher do a demonstration lesson, having the teacher observe another teacher either in the school or another school, or by discussing the problem in a team meeting to elicit possible procedures to be followed in remediating the situation.

The chi-square value for this item was 5.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 17. The principal determines the qualifications of a new teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data indicate that the principals of the graded schools rated this function as more critical than the principals of the nongraded schools. All principals in both groups initially told the assistant superintendent for personnel what they desired in an individual after which the assistant superintendent did the initial screening of candidates and compiled a list from which the principals could screen to the number of candidates they wished to interview. Most of the principals did their own interviewing and then recommended the person they wished to have on their staff to the assistant superintendent who in turn recommended hiring to the board of education. One graded school principal indicated that he was seldom involved in any area of employing a new teacher for his building.

In employing a new teacher, the principals of graded schools put their emphasis in order of importance upon work record, references from previous employers, number of years experience, and scholastic record. From this list, the nongraded principals ranked their priorities on references from former employers, number of years experience, work record, and scholastic record. The nongraded principals indicated that the list of priorities was not complete and one said that he placed his emphasis on personality, and another on how the teacher reacted in simulated role
playing activities. A third principal based his judgement more on the interviewees general knowledge of child growth and development.

The chi-square value for this item was 4.80 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 18. The principal develops policies and procedures for the grade placement of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$x^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graded

Nongraded

All of the principals of graded schools indicated that the procedures for placement of students were developed prior to their employment, that they had not made any modification in them, that the procedures that were followed were district procedures and that they could change them if they gained prior approval from the central office.

Three of the four principals of the nongraded schools indicated that the procedures for placement of students in their school were not developed prior to their
employment, that the present placement procedures were major modifications in the procedures which were established prior to their employment, the procedures now used in their building are not district procedures, and that they were free to change them if they saw fit to do so. These data indicate that the present procedures were developed through extensive staff research.

The chi-square value for this item was 6.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level. However, the graded school principals saw the performance of this function as more critical to their success than did the principals of nongraded schools.

ITEM 19. The principal informs staff members of professional growth activities; e.g., workshops, journal articles, university courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graded school principals and the nongraded school principals agreed that teacher involvement in these
activities had had an effect upon their organizational pattern in either improvement of communication within the staff or improvement of classroom performance.

Of the items suggested, the principals of the graded schools believed that university courses for their teachers had the greatest effect upon their program. The nongraded school principals believed that workshops had the greatest effect on their program.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.668 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 20. The principal prepares, organizes and implements district-wide curriculum innovations; e.g., sex education, initial teaching alphabet, Afro-American history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2 2 0 0 0</td>
<td>1.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two principals in one of the districts believed that the responsibility for initiation of such innovations was the responsibility of the principal. The principals
in the other three districts saw this initiation as the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of instruction.

All of the principals saw the implementation of such innovations as their responsibility which caused them to rank it higher on the critical list than if the word implementation had been left out of the question.

The chi-square value for this item was 1.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 21. The principal writes administrative and/or supervisory bulletins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>success of the principal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 0</td>
<td>3.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>0 2 1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graded school principals perceived this function as being more critical to their success than did the principals of nongraded schools, although the nongraded school principals wrote them more often than did the graded school principals. The graded school principals indicated that they wrote a preponderance of the administrative type
bulletin while the nongraded school principals indicated that the bulletins written were divided between the administrative and supervisory type.

The nongraded school principals volunteered that they used oral communication whenever possible with the total staff or through dissemination of information through team leaders to the staff.

The chi-square value for this item was 3.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 22. The principal modifies and adapts the district curriculum in terms of the school's individual needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals of nongraded schools were in agreement that they had complete freedom in adapting the district curriculum in terms of their individual school needs. They knew they had this flexibility because they were encouraged to do so by the central office or because
they had never been challenged for changes and adaptations they had made.

The principals of the graded schools were not as sure of the flexibility which they had and stated that they must receive prior central office approval before making a change.

Neither group felt that they could adopt a textbook series in any area outside the one recommended by the central office.

The chi-square value for this item was 1.142 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 23. The principal participates in the local teachers professional organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>0 0 2 1 1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>0 0 2 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was perfect correlation of the perception of the two groups in this item with the groups seeing this function as relatively unimportant.

Only one principal of the eight stated he was a
member of the local teacher's association and his reasons for being a member were predicated upon the insurance which was available by maintaining membership.

All but one of the principals were no longer members of the local teacher's association, the Illinois Education Association, and the National Education Association due to the desires of the IEA and NEA to exclude administrators.

They did not feel that their lack of involvement in these organizations had any effect upon their staff relations.

The chi-square value for this item was 0.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 24. The principal structures the school environment so effective teacher-parent conferences take place; e.g., arrangement of time, providing space, recording outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>3 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>3 0 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All principals reported that parent-teacher conferences were regularly scheduled during the school year and that the overall scheduling was formulated by the principal. These regularly scheduled conferences varied in length from fifteen to thirty minutes and the major purpose was for reporting pupil progress.

In addition to the regularly scheduled conferences, parents and teachers were encouraged by the principals to hold conferences as problems arose. The irregularly scheduled conferences were utilized primarily to discuss problem areas such as lack of achievement or discipline cases.

The principal was not utilized as a resource person in these conferences except in cases of extreme problems or conflict.

Follow-up reports were used in two districts, both with the graded and nongraded schools while a nongraded school in another district had developed a follow-up report to be used in discussing the conference with other teachers in the team.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.
ITEM 25. The principal recommends to the superintendent the need for employment of non-teaching personnel; lunchroom supervisors, clerical help, teacher aides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>3.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two groups of principals differed slightly in their perception of the importance of this function, with the graded school principals viewing this function as slightly more important.

The principals were in general agreement that central office personnel, assistant superintendent for personnel or business manager wrote the job specifications for these positions and when the person was hired the supervision responsibility rested with the principal of the building to which they were assigned.

The principals were in agreement that fifty percent of the non-teaching positions were created as a result of demands made by teachers through negotiations with the
board of education.

The chi-square value for this item was 3.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 26. The principal communicates to parents the importance of successful academic achievement in their children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>3 1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This function was performed in most cases by teachers through conferences, report cards and progress reports.

Three of the four principals of graded schools indicated that they rewarded outstanding academic achievement through publication of honor rolls and/or end of the year awards assemblies. One principal of a nongraded school rewarded achievement through the use of an honor roll, while another used an end of the year awards assembly.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.
ITEM 27. The principal selects instructional materials; e.g., equipment, textbooks, and achievement tests needed for school progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 0</td>
<td>2.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1 3 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the principals reported that they shared this function and responsibility with their teachers. Each also indicated that there was a definite district procedure in purchasing these items which called for cooperating with teachers in purchasing these items, usually through district committees.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 28. The principal stimulates in children an enthusiasm for an interest in their school work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2 2 0 0 0</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>3 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graded school principals perceived this function as important and they attempted to foster this attitude in students with a positive attitude of their own and through the encouragement of co-curricular activities such as clubs, intra-mural sports, school assemblies, music programs, and cross grade tutoring programs. Each encouraged student participation in these activities by publicizing any outstanding performance in PTA Newsletters, local newspapers and assemblies.

The nongraded school principals also perceived this function as important and performed it in much the same way as the principals of the graded schools.

The chi-square value for this item was .534 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 29. The principal fosters a cooperative atmosphere between staff members and the parents of the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded 4 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded 4 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was perfect coorelation on this item with the principals perceiving the importance of this function as critical to their success. The major area of concentration in accomplishing this function was through working with Parent Teacher Association groups, although two districts called this a Home and School group. In working with these groups the principals concentrated on promoting parent-teacher luncheons and teas and encouraging teachers to serve on the advisory board for the Parent-Teacher group along with parents.

They also felt that it was imperative in performing this function that they develop a well organized orientation program for teachers in conferencing parents.

The chi-square value for this item was 0.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 30. The principal proposes, organizes, and implements inservice and/or faculty meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1 3 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the principals of the graded schools saw this function as critical to their success while only one principal of nongraded schools saw this function as critical. All principals, however, performed this function and they saw inservice meetings as being designed to improve instruction while faculty meetings were designed more to handle general school organizational problems.

Written agendas, made available to the staff prior to the meetings, were used by all of the nongraded school principals while the graded school principals used them frequently although not always.

Inservice meetings were scheduled in all districts and the responsibility for organizing and implementing these meetings was equally divided between central office personnel and the building principal.

The chi-square value for this item was 4.80 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 31. The principal proposes, organizes and implements school instructional innovations; e.g., team teaching, learning centers, nongraded primaries.
(Refers to Item 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graded</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nongraded</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the principals felt that this function was their responsibility and they performed this function with staff cooperation through inservice meetings, workshops, arranging for speakers, having teachers make visitations to other schools, and reading.

One of the nongraded school principals felt that a good portion of the success of his program was due to a weekend retreat which his staff scheduled each year in Wisconsin.

The chi-square value for this item was .668 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

**ITEM 32.** The principal determines the qualifications for selection of a new building principal. Management function.
ITEM 32. The principal determines the qualifications for selection of a new building principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two groups of principals differed slightly in their perception of the importance in performing this function with the graded school principals viewing the performance of this function as slightly more critical than the nongraded school principals.

The graded school principals who rated this item as critical to their success explained their ranking by expressing concern for developing qualifications which would result in the hiring of a principal who would complement the total principal group.

The nongraded school principals stated that they felt this was more a central office function, except that in the one district principals were involved in the hiring process with central office personnel.

The chi-square value for this item was 3.334 and indicates no statistically significant difference in the perception of the importance of this function.
ITEM 33. The principal recommends special children for testing; e.g., slow learners, gifted, maladjusted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>3 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>2.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1 2 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals of the graded schools gave this function a slightly more critical rating than the principals of the nongraded schools who believed this was more of a teacher function.

All of the principals agreed that it was their responsibility to communicate with parents regarding testing procedures to insure parental support and confidence of the process involved.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 34. The principal clarifies the school programs to the parents of the community.
Critical to the success of the principal | Of no significance to the success of the principal | $X^2$ Value
--- | --- | ---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
Graded | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.142
Nongraded | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0

The nongraded school principals perceived this function as slightly more critical than the principals of the graded schools. Both groups used initially the same media in accomplishing this function, including oral PTA reports, grade level parent meetings, newspaper articles, newsletters, informal parent discussion groups and parent visitations.

The chi-square value for this item was 1.142 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 35. The principal writes news reports and articles to improve school community relations; e.g., district-wide and/or school publications.

Critical to the success of the principal | Of no significance to the success of the principal | $X^2$ Value
--- | --- | ---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
Graded | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .534
Nongraded | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0


Both groups gave this function a relatively high rating with the graded school principals perceiving this function as slightly more critical. The graded school principals indicated that they wrote on a regular basis about their school once a month. The nongraded principals were not as consistent in writing about their schools and only one indicated that he wrote about his school as consistent as once per month.

None of the principals wrote regularly about the district.

The chi-square value for this item was .534 which is not statistically significant at an accepted level.

ITEM 36. The principal assigns non-teaching activities; e.g., school assemblies, money collections, special lectures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals were in general agreement that this function was necessary, but that the performance of the
function was relatively unimportant. They justified their involvement in this activity by saying that anything affecting the total school program was ultimately their responsibility.

The chi-square value for this item was 1.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 37. The principal works with community school oriented organizations; e.g., Parent Teacher organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graded

Nongraded

The principals of graded schools considered this function as slightly more important than the principals of the nongraded schools. The principals agreed, however, that the major value in performing this function was communication between the school and its parents and the establishment of rapport, understanding and trust between the home and school.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.666 which
is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 38. The principal suggests means for improving the schools physical facilities: e.g., recommending furnishings for a classroom, helping to design an addition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>( X^2 ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>2.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals of graded schools gave this a slightly higher rating than the principals of nongraded schools. All of the principals performed this function, but each indicated that decisions in this area had an effect on the teachers in their dealings with students, so teacher ideas and recommendations were solicited prior to making building suggestions to central office personnel.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.668 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 39. The principal maintains lines of communication with parents: e.g., notes, letters, bulletins, telephone calls.
(Refers to Item 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>3 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was perfect correlation between the groups on the perception of the importance of this function with the principals agreeing that this function was critical to their success. All of the principals had a plan of contact, relying most heavily upon school newsletters. They all felt that this communication was vital in an age in which accountability is constantly demanded by the public.

The chi-square value for this item was 0.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 40. The principal works with a parent to solve an individual pupil behavioral problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>4 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principals agreed that this function was critical to their success. They also agreed that their knowledge of a behavior problem came from teacher communication and at this point parents were informed of the problem in eliciting parent help in solving the problem. If the problem persisted, parents were asked to come to the school for a conference to discuss alternative actions by the home and school in dealing with the problem.

The ultimate disciplinary action to be taken in cases of behavior problems was suspension from school.

The chi-square value for this item was 0.00 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 41. The principal explains to the superintendent why a given decision was made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graded school principals saw this function as considerably more critical than the nongraded school principals.
The graded school principals responded that they rated the item as they did because of respect for the superintendent, that explanations were required in a line relationship, and that communications between the superintendent and principal were essential. They also responded that they were very secure that a given decision would be backed because the decision wasn't made until approval for the decision was obtained from the superintendent.

The nongraded principals responded that they rated the item as they did because they were not concerned about their ability to defend the decision and that they would give up the position rather than their principles. The nongraded school principals were not as secure that their decisions would be backed.

The chi-square value for this item was 2.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

ITEM 42. The principal participates in the projects and activities of school oriented groups such as student council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical to the success of the principal</th>
<th>Of no significance to the success of the principal</th>
<th>$X^2$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>1  0  2</td>
<td>0  0</td>
<td>3.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraded</td>
<td>0  0  1</td>
<td>0  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graded school principals perceived this function as more critical than the nongraded school principals. However, the graded school principals indicated that they made themselves available in student council, club, and recess activities while the nongraded school principals indicated that they spent five percent to fifty percent of their day involved with students in teaching, helping, arranging parties, counseling, speaking to classes, and serving as adviser to the student government.

The chi-square value for this item was 3.334 which is not statistically significant at an acceptable level.

In analyzing these statistical data in Chapter four, hypotheses one and two can be accepted. In no case on any item did the chi-square value reach the significance level of .05 which was established as the significance level which would be used as the point of rejection of the null hypotheses. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that there is any difference in the perception of importance of these administrative functions to the principals of the graded schools and the principals of the nongraded schools.
CHAPTER V

IN-DEPTH STUDY OF FOUR NONGRADED SCHOOLS

An in-depth study of four nongraded schools in DuPage County was conducted. The techniques used in the in-depth study included visitations, interviews, observations and questionnaires. The in-depth study concentrated on six areas which included:

1. Program Initiation
2. Process of Implementation
3. Operation
4. Organizational Functions Relative to Decision Making
5. Role Perception and Role Changes
6. Attitudes Toward the Program

So that candid information might be obtained, the administrators and teachers in these schools were assured that their identities, as well as the identities of the schools they represented, would not be revealed in the study. The four elementary schools selected for the study will be referred to as schools "A", "B", "C", and "D".
SCHOOL "A"

School "A", located in a middle socio-economic area of mainly single-family dwellings, had a student enrollment of four hundred seven in grades kindergarten through five and employed thirteen classroom teachers. The rectangular shaped facility was of the open-space design with carpeted floors throughout. There were no interior walls in the building; however, movable bookcases were utilized to allow more flexibility in designing work areas for class and small group activities.

PROGRAM INITIATION

The nongraded program concept was initiated in school "A" through a co-operative effort of teachers, administration and the board of education. The members of the board demonstrated their commitment to the innovative program by approving the design for a building which would enhance a nongraded program and by lending their support to the personnel involved in planning the program. The staff for the new school, composed of teachers who were committed to the nongraded concept, was gleaned from other schools in the district as well as from new applicants. The principal was chosen for his desire and willingness to implement the nongraded program. The board members continued to work closely with the administrative
and teaching staff on design alteration in an effort to best meet the needs of the program to be housed within the building.

In addition to the commitment of board members, administration and teachers involved in the planning of the program, it was deemed essential to solicit parental and community support in the initial stages of the program's conception. Parental commitment was gained through the use of open meetings involving parents and staff, through coffee meetings conducted by the principal, and through written articles sent to the parents describing the program.

PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Throughout the initial planning time, the handpicked staff met weekly in planning sessions. The professional staff was involved in gathering information on the nongraded concept through readings, workshops and visitations to other schools. Professional consultant aid was provided to assist the staff in their planning. In addition, the staff was involved in group-dynamic activities for the purpose of promoting unity among the members of the team and gaining professional commitment to the concept of a teaching team. As a result of their involvement in these activities, a philosophy of education
for the school was developed.

The principal of school "A" indicated that the most cogent professional involvement during the initial stages of implementation of the nongraded program were visitations to other schools. However, the staff indicated that the most pertinent and meaningful activities revolved around the group-dynamics sessions which allowed them to become more aware of their academic and social strengths and weaknesses as well as becoming aware of the personal feelings toward education of all of those to be involved in the program.

Materials for the program relative to the individualization of instruction, were evaluated by the members of the teaching team. Learning goals for students were established and the team members directed their emphasis for accomplishment of these student learning goals toward the selection of learning materials relative to specific learning tasks. The final decision concerning the materials to be used was based upon three considerations: 1) the teaching-learning devices which had been previously used by the teachers, 2) The observation of the use of materials in other schools, and 3) the evaluation of the student-use factor of existing learning materials in the other schools observed. The final listing of desired materials was then
put on a priority basis and the principal purchased them as his budget would allow.

OPERATION

In every day operation, the students were organized into two units, a primary unit and an intermediate unit, with a team of teachers working with each unit. Teachers used two to three hours of planning time each week in team meetings to plan schedules and unit-wide activities. Another hour per week was spent in mini-team meetings for the purpose of planning unit-level activities. Within this framework, students planned their daily activities in reading, mathematics, language arts and social studies with skill work in all areas. All student planning was accomplished under the guidance of the teacher. The major restrictions to this student planning was that the student was required to make his goals realistic, and the learning goals had to be defined. The curriculum no longer dictated the program, but rather the program and the individual needs of the students dictated the curriculum. Periodic assessment was conducted through written tests or verbal reports to the teacher. The student and the teacher attempted to design learning activities that would meet the needs of the individual student.

Evaluation of individual student goal attainment
was achieved through student-teacher discussions and the formal established evaluation techniques built within each area of study. Reporting the progress in learning activities to the parents was a shared responsibility between the teacher and student.

ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS RELATIVE TO DECISION MAKING

The role of the principal in decision making, as a result of the organizational pattern, evolved as one of shared responsibility with the teaching team. However, the principal set the major administrative regulations for the building and made the ultimate decisions on any new programs or major changes in the curriculum.

The teaching team was responsible for decision making regulations that applied to the unit as a whole. The teacher, as an individual, made decisions which complied with team regulations. The teacher was relatively independent within the team make-up to make decisions on the manner in which the program was to be developed and implemented to best meet the individual needs of the students directly under the teacher's supervision. The teacher's role was perceived by the staff as being that of a diagnostician for each student's needs, a co-planner with the student for activities to meet the student's needs and the evaluator of the outcome of these learning
needs. Students were perceived by the staff as being responsible for their own learning. Students were expected to progress at their own rate through activities determined by the student himself in cooperation with his teachers.

The total staff understood that the central office and the board of education must set policies regarding the total operation of the district, but felt that the board should have little influence for decision-making at the building level as long as the decisions were within the parameters set by board policy. The central office staff and the members of the board shared the view that local building decision making should be expanded. The mutual agreement between the central office and the total staff concerning building autonomy helped build confidence in the nongraded program. Decision making at the building level was achieved through consensus during team meetings and discussions among the team members. However, the principal remained the ultimate authority when consensus regarding building policy could not be reached and conflict emerged.

ROLE PERCEPTIONS AND ROLE CHANGES

Upon assessing the most important role function of principal, teachers, students, and parents, the teachers and principal found themselves to be in agreement in their
perceptions. The result of the assessment showed that the principal had many distinct roles: 1) a liaison between the teaching team and the central office, 2) a liaison between the teaching team and the parents, 3) leader of the school's curriculum program, and 4) budget co-ordinator. The staff indicated that the organizational pattern was such that it afforded the opportunity for the staff to act as professionals in meeting the common objective of providing a curriculum goal to facilitate the individual needs of the students.

As a result of the organizational pattern at school "A", role changes became evident. The principal, as perceived by himself and his staff, changed to a more democratic leader as opposed to his former autocratic orientation. As a result, he no longer relied totally on his own initiative, but rather put more reliance on teacher initiative in achieving the educational goals of the building.

The teacher's role changed from that of a giver of information to one of diagnosing and prescribing learning activities on an individual basis. The teacher was no longer an isolated individual with a set number of students, but rather a contributing member of a team of teachers, responsible for the learning of a unit of students.
The student's role as perceived by the principal and teachers had changed from passive involvement in learning to active participation. The student, instead of being totally dependent upon teacher-direction, became more independent in selecting alternative learning activities in achieving his goal. He proceeded from total group activities to an individual plan within the framework of the group.

Parents showed enthusiastic support for the program, as evidenced by more numerous parent visits to the school and the successful recruitment of volunteers to assist teachers with various clerical duties. Further, the parents were actively involved in the student's educational assessment through conferences held with parent, student and teacher.

**ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PROGRAM**

The total teaching staff of school "A" was pleased with the particular and varied roles of the principal, teachers, students, parents, and curriculum as the program became a reality. The principal, however, indicated that the students' role in accepting responsibility for their own learning needed to be strengthened. The greatest problem indicated by the teachers as a result of the organizational pattern was a lack of time for team planning
sessions to implement ideas generated through team work. All of the participants in the program indicated, however, that they were more satisfied working under a nongraded organizational structure than under a traditional structure which they had previously experienced.

**SCHOOL "B"**

School "B" was located in a residential apartment area and had an enrollment of four hundred thirty four students in grades kindergarten through six and the school employed seventeen classroom teachers. The building was circular with three pods built around a learning center. Each pod housed a team of teachers and students who were grouped by age. Student movement was permitted between pods on an individual student need basis. The pods had partial walls, but openness, movement and flexibility had been achieved through the establishment of interest areas and student ability grouping within each pod.

**PROGRAM INITIATION**

The building was designed to house a nongraded program. However, the concept of nongradedness was not initiated until the third year of the school's operation under the third principal in that school.

Initially, the third principal in the school intro-
duced the concept of nongradedness to the first grade teachers and the program grew from their efforts in teaming to involve the total building in the fourth semester of the principal's tenure. As the concept grew, the teachers were involved in workshops on nongradedness and were encouraged to peruse the research and articles related to the concepts of nongradedness. The principal and the teachers indicated that visitations to other schools would have been extremely helpful had released time been afforded them by central office. Since visitation time was not provided, background on the nongraded concept was gained by the teachers from attendance at workshops and course work as well as a considerable amount of independent reading on the concept of nongradedness. The principal and many of the teachers believed that workshop activities were the most valuable of all of the activities in the training of personnel to implement the nongraded program.

Public involvement was considered to be critical to the success of the program and the principal was perceived by central office staff and local building staff as a key person in dealing with the public. Several techniques were used to inform the public including coffees at the school and in the homes of the local
community, newspaper articles and surveys of the parents after the program was operational.

PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION

The general planning for the implementation of the program included staff involvement in grouping of students, establishing learning goals for students, curriculum development, the selection of materials and decision making relative to the make-up of teaching teams.

In grouping the students, the staff moved from the initial single grade placement to a split-grade level placement in order to obtain a multi-aged group. Using this multi-aged grouping, sub-groups were later established through diagnostic testing and involvement in social science interaction groups.

Learning goals were established by the staff for the various areas of study. Curriculum development took the form of faculty team-meetings with the principal in an effort to establish goals for each level of student ability. Activities were then developed for individual students, within the student ability levels, to facilitate the realization of these goals.

The development of materials to meet the particular needs of the students in relation to their individual abilities was reported by the staff of school "B" to be
a process in which flexibility was the most important criterion. Materials were gathered from individual elementary buildings within the district and samples from the curriculum director's library were utilized. Individual learning packets were then made by reproducing selected materials from these various sources. Teacher-made materials were developed to supplement the commercial materials and to further meet the needs of the program.

The establishment of teaching-teams at the onset of the program was an outgrowth of the co-operative effort of the first grade teachers to establish a team to teach groups of students having common interests. Three teaching teams were formed with each team in charge of a unit of students. Each of the units was organized with broad ability levels having mini-levels within the broad level.

**OPERATION**

The students were grouped through a series of teacher-evaluation meetings in the day to day operation of the program. A student's past performance in school was the main criteria used for grouping in the evaluation meetings. Flexibility was provided in the placement of students by continual evaluation and discussions concerning individual students throughout the year. This flexibility allowed for errors in judgement on the part of the teachers.
and allowed for erroneous test results on the part of the students.

Depending upon the students' willingness and their abilities to accept responsibility, students were allowed to plan their individual programs, ranging from a one day plan to a plan for an entire month. Since chronological age and social and emotional maturity were factors of considerable importance in the students' individual planning, the norm was a plan which lasted from one day to a week. A very few students were able to make plans for an entire month.

Limitations were placed upon the students in the form of a requirement to include in their daily plans an activity in the major areas of reading, mathematics, social science and science. It was recognized that this restriction in planning was meeting the teachers' need to ensure that students acquired basic skills.

Evaluations of student progress were made through student-teacher conferences, which were held on a daily to weekly basis, as well as through students' self evaluation in written form.

Whenever it became necessary to replace a team member or to add another member to the team, the established team was consulted concerning their preference for desirable
personality, special skills, and capabilities needed within the team. This information was then utilized by the assistant superintendent for personnel and by the principal in the interviewing and hiring process. This process was felt by the teachers to be essential to the success of the teaching team because of the way each individual team member complemented the other members in their day to day planning for the students.

ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS RELATIVE TO DECISION MAKING

The decision making process, as a result of the nongraded organizational pattern, placed heavy emphasis upon teacher input. Usually the decisions affecting the program and the school were made by the staff with the principal serving as a consultant and moderator in areas of conflict. Students were allowed to express their opinions through surveys on decisions which would affect them. There were some negative feelings by the staff concerning central office involvement in the decision making process. At times, dictates coming from the central office affected the program in the school. For instance, any new curriculum changes or textbook adoptions for the district as a whole did not always fit into the nongraded program. At these times, the staff had to be extremely flexible in adapting these ultimatums to the school's philosophy.
ROLE PERCEPTION AND ROLE CHANGES

The teachers and the principal agreed that the most important function of the principal under the nongraded organizational pattern was to become an active supporter of teacher efforts. It was expected that the principal would provide support for the teachers with the central office staff, the board, and the parents and would also facilitate mutual support among teachers. Teachers did not, however, interpret the principal's support to imply agreement and support of every teacher action. The teachers did expect the principal to be the educational leader in providing constructive criticism and viable alternatives in all educational endeavors.

The principal and teachers were in agreement that the chief function of the teacher was to be able to know and understand the students on a personal level in order to allow for individual needs to be recognized and met. These needs could best be met through the teacher's ability to prescribe alternative methods of learning within the usual limits of the school board's policy, the school's rules and regulations, and limited in most cases only by the teacher's creativity.

The chief function of the student was perceived by the staff as one of learning to become more responsible
to himself in recognizing his learning needs and then to be responsible enough to elicit help from any source available to meet these needs.

During the interview with the principal and the teachers, the viewpoint was expressed that the nongraded organizational pattern created a change in the functions and roles of the principal, the teachers, the students, the parents, and the curriculum.

The role of the principal was no longer perceived by teachers as one of ultimate authority, but rather, the principal became more of an equal with teachers in the decision making process and a facilitator of the teachers' work. The principal was perceived by the total staff as spending more time in the support of quality instruction, rather than being hindered by time-consuming managerial functions.

Many of the teachers perceived their role to be one of taking on a guidance function in providing learning alternatives for students. As a result, the teachers became more sensitive to the individual needs of the students and had a better understanding of the principles of child growth and development, as demonstrated by their observed rapport with the students.

Parent involvement under the new organizational
structure increased in the opinion of the staff due to the constant communications between school and home.

The expectations of the staff relative to the curriculum had changed. The curriculum was not expected to be the answer for each student, but rather a starting point in the recognition of individual student needs. The program was built around a core curriculum of reading and mathematics. From this initial effort, according to the principal and teachers, the curriculum began to facilitate rather than dictate student learning experiences and outcomes.

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PROGRAM

The nongraded organizational pattern was seen by teachers and by the principal as one that helped students gain the understanding that the responsibility for learning was their own and that the teachers were a resource for facilitating their learning. The staff indicated that it seemed that the frustration level of the students had diminished as a result of the students establishing their own learning goals in co-operation with the teacher.

The principal and the teachers indicated very positive attitudes toward their nongraded program. The total staff expressed the view that the most important feature
of the school as a result of the nongraded organizational pattern, was that students were more self-directed and responsible for their learning. Furthermore, they believed that as a result of the nongraded organizational pattern the staff in the building knew one another better relative to strengths and weaknesses and that there was a closer relationship among the professionals. The principal and teachers believed that communication at all levels had improved in that all concerned were able to speak more freely and openly in their efforts to improve the learning environment.

SCHOOL "C"

School "C" was located in a residential area of single dwelling homes and had an enrollment of eight hundred thirty three students in grades kindergarten through five. The school employed thirty-two classroom teachers. The school building was a traditional "egg crate" structure.

PROGRAM INITIATION

The nongraded program at School "C" was developed through a cooperative effort between the principal and the teachers, although the original impetus was with the principal. The principal first discussed the idea with
a small group of interested teachers, who agreed to test an individualized program for a small group of students on a pilot basis. Success in improved student achievement and enthusiasm became apparent and the enthusiasm of this small group of teachers seemed to the teachers to generate interest among other teachers in the school. Once the interest in the total staff had been sparked, teachers were encouraged to observe the program and to participate in workshops as they became available in preparation for future implementation of the program on a building level.

The program initially had the support of the curriculum director. However, other central office personnel did not commit themselves to the concept. After five years of involvement in the program, there was still no commitment from central office and the program was perceived by the principal and the teachers as being ignored by central office personnel relative to expanding the nongraded concept to the total school system.

Commitment to the program was gained from parents by utilizing evening meetings for orientation and by follow-up question and answer sessions. Arrangements were also made for numerous parent visitations to the school during school hours for the purpose of observing the students and the program in operation.
Attempts had been made to gain commitment to the concept from the board members through informational leaflets and discussion. Although the board had not committed itself to the nongraded philosophy on a district wide basis, some board members had visited the school and appeared to appreciate the efforts of the staff.

**PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION**

The building had been operating on a traditional program and due to the lack of support and commitment from the central administration and the board to the nongraded philosophy, implementation time was not afforded the staff. The program evolved from a group of teachers who believed that they were ready to be involved in dealing with students in a continuous progress program. Teachers took part in several in-service type activities in the process of implementation. These activities included extensive reading, participation in workshops and visitations to schools utilizing various individualized programs. The principal and the teachers indicated that visitations along with staff brain-storming sessions and discussion were of the utmost value in implementing the program.

Learning goals were established by the teachers
through discussions involving total staff. Teacher committees then developed specific goals within each subject area in addition to establishing a record keeping system and a plan for parent-teacher communication.

In the initial grouping of students for the new program, the students were grouped heterogeneously through a random selection process to achieve two units of multi-aged groupings. Students were then assigned to units within this general framework by matching the personalities of students with teachers.

Without a commitment from the board or central office, obtaining materials to implement the program was perceived as a problem by the staff. In solving the problem, existing materials were gathered together and the teachers acquired whatever they were able to obtain from other teachers and schools. Free materials from publishing companies were gathered and teacher-made teaching devices were very much in evidence. These materials were then organized and reorganized by the staff.

As the parents became interested in the program, they made efforts to raise money to purchase programmed materials as well as equipment for individual student use to facilitate the program. Even after five years of operation, most of the basic materials used had been
developed by the staff of School "C" with the obvious exception of basic textbooks approved by the district.

OPERATION

Operationally, School "C" had incorporated modified team teaching. The teachers spent three to four hours weekly in team-planning sessions. These team meetings concentrated on student progress, on goal attainment and on the use of materials. The meetings also served as "brain storming" sessions for the purpose of improving teaching methods in the individualized program.

Students were allowed to plan their own programs on a daily, weekly or monthly basis depending upon their ability to do so. Cooperative planning between students and teachers was done in all instructional areas. All of the students were required to do daily work in reading, mathematics, and language arts by the teachers, however students were allowed more flexibility in areas such as science and social studies. The success of this cooperative planning was evaluated through individual student-teacher conferences, as well as through the use of standardized testing.

The evaluation of the student's performance was an ongoing process between teacher and student. Diagnostic testing, formal post-testing, performance testing
and informal observation were the components of the evaluation procedure utilized by the teachers. Student-teacher conferences were held on a daily to weekly basis.

Progress of the student in the attainment of goals was evaluated with the parents, student, and teacher in a conference held twice a year, or more frequently if desired by any of the three. Further, written evaluations were sent home relative to individual skill development at each level.

**ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS RELATIVE TO DECISION MAKING**

As a result of the organizational pattern in School "C", the decision making process had been decentralized. Decisions were perceived by both the principal and the teachers as being reached through consensus. This process, although time consuming, was considered a more positive contribution to the educational program, because once a decision had been reached there was total staff commitment to the decision. It was felt that staff commitment to any given decision was a result of total staff involvement and the resultant vested interest each individual had in the decision making process.

In the district in which school "C" was located, the board of education was perceived by the staff as being the broad policy maker and made decisions which
established the parameters within which adequate instruction and learning experiences were provided and the central office personnel made decisions which supported the board's policies. However, at the building level in school "C", instructional decisions were perceived as becoming a cooperative effort of the principal, teachers and students. Previously, the principal was perceived by the teachers as being the most influential decision maker. Under the nongraded program, the most influential people in the process of decision making were the teachers. The principal and the teachers felt that this decision making process was a result of the nongraded organizational structure. The staff indicated that another reason for this change was that teachers were given more responsibility and greater trust was placed upon their judgement by the administrator.

ROLE PERCEPTION AND ROLE CHANGES

The actual roles of the principal, teacher, students, and curriculum were perceived similarly by the principal and the teachers.

The principal's function was perceived as that of a support person for teachers' and students' efforts, while promoting the program with parents and community and contributing ideas to stimulate students and staff
as well.

The teacher's function was perceived by the teachers and principal primarily as that of a diagnostician of individual student needs and of preparing the learning environment with materials and equipment which were conducive to individualized learning. Further, the teacher's role was perceived as being that of a humanitarian, so that the teacher could positively interact with students by being a good listener, a guide, an advisor, and a friend. Finally, the teacher's role was viewed as a role which required positive communication skills, which would enable them to relate to parents any information relative to student progress and problems.

The student's function was perceived by the educational community as one in which the students individualized their own work methods and habits and organized time to fulfill their learning needs.

The curriculum role, which evolved from the non-graded program was perceived as providing broad alternatives while simultaneously building necessary skills.

Role changes had been evidenced in school "C" since the advent of the nongraded program. The principal in the traditional structure was perceived by the teacher as a boss and evaluator. Under the nongraded pattern,
he was perceived by himself and teachers as a democratic leader who was available to facilitate the work of the teachers and students in a team situation. Additionally, he was perceived by the teachers as providing expertise, knowledge, and constructive criticism in the planning and implementation of quality education.

The teachers and principal perceived the teacher's role as having been changed from that of a lecturer and imparter of knowledge to that of a counselor, resource person and student-teacher team member.

The student role was perceived by the principal and teachers as being changed from that of a receiver of controlled experiences and a follower of externally given directions to that of an active participant in the learning process. This new role for the student was designed to help the student become a self-directed, self-initiating individual within a responsible, free atmosphere.

According to the teachers, parents became more involved in the nongraded program since its whole orientation was so innovative and without active involvement in the program, the parents claimed that they could not know or understand the educational objectives or evaluative criteria set for the education of their children.
unless they actually visited school in an observer or helper capacity. The parents also indicated to the teachers that they felt more welcome and free to be a part of the ongoing program with the nongraded plan than they had with the traditional program.

The curriculum was perceived by the principal and teachers as being a flexible tool to be used as a resource for teachers and students, rather than as a rigid program of instruction which was subject-centered rather than child-oriented.

**ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PROGRAM**

The principal and the teachers were satisfied with the roles that they perceived for themselves, their students and the curriculum in the new program.

The staff indicated that the strongest feature of the program was that it allowed students to have alternatives and a voice in the ways and means in which they achieved their educational goals. The program also allowed each student the freedom to progress academically at a rate compatible with his mental, emotional and social maturity.

The fact that the program required a great deal of time in planning and preparation was perceived by the staff as a weakness. The teachers indicated that
curriculum guides designed for the overall district were a limiting factor in that the guides were not as flexible as the nongraded program demanded. The lack of the commitment to the program from the central office and the board of education was perceived to have been detrimental to the program. For example, on institute or inservice days the staff of school "C" was not permitted to use the time to work on local concerns. Guest speakers or district presentations were given priority and the teachers indicated that this time could have been used in a more valuable way for the purpose of planning for the nongraded program. A final weakness was felt to be the lack of facilities and a lack of sufficient materials to provide a wide variety of learning experiences for the students.

SCHOOL "D"

School "D" was located in a single dwelling residential area. The school had an enrollment of three hundred students in grades kindergarten through five and employed twelve classroom teachers. The building was of the traditional design in structure.

PROGRAM INITIATION

The continuous progress, nongraded program was initiated through a cooperative effort between the principal
and the teachers, most of whom had expressed an interest in the program and a desire to work toward a nongraded plan for their school. Many discussions were held by the teachers and principal and from these discussions they concluded that commitment from the central office personnel, the board of education and parents was critical to the success of the nongraded program. Consequently, local building committees were established to meet with, discuss and spark interest in each of these groups.

The central office administration and the board members agreed to support the principal and teachers in their innovative plan and allowed the staff one full year of lead time before the program was implemented throughout the school.

**PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION**

The year of planning time was used by the principal and teachers for a series of meetings and discussions preparatory to the operation of the program. Professional consultants conducted teacher workshops on the nongraded concept and on individualized instruction. Visitations were made to other schools that were attempting individualization to gain insight into their programs. Course work and independent readings gave the staff background on the concepts of individualization and continuous
progress.

The teachers indicated that the workshops were the most valuable of the activities because of the broad background provided on the concept of the nongraded school.

The staff met often to discuss the various types of student groupings that would be possible in a nongraded situation. Initially, it was decided to group the students homogeneously within a single grade level. From this framework, the teacher would work toward multi-aged grouping for the students in an attempt to achieve individualized instruction.

Student learning goals were established by teachers on each grade level in the separate fields of study. The goals became the guide for the development of specific objectives for the students. Pre-tests, teaching work folders and a device for record keeping were developed by the teachers. The multi-text approach was adopted by the teachers as the method which would most enhance the individualized concept in its early stages. Teacher-made materials such as games, learning aids, and learning packets were an essential component in the program.

Materials selection for the program as a whole was handled through administrator-teacher committees.
The building was organized into planning units with grades kindergarten and one designated as Unit A, grades two and three designated as Unit B, and grades four and five designated as Unit C. Weekly meetings were held on a unit teacher level for the purpose of planning for the unit. The staff of school "D" incorporated a plan which they called "cooperative teaching". This term was used to define the cooperative planning accomplished by the unit teachers rather than a teaming approach to teaching.

The curriculum was designed by the staff to be child-centered rather than subject-oriented. The teachers indicated that they believed the curriculum had to be flexible if it was going to meet the needs of the individuals involved in the learning process.

Students were allowed to plan their own programs in all areas and this planning was done through a teacher-student conference on a daily or weekly basis. The only restriction was that students set goals for themselves upon which they and the teacher agreed. Goal setting became a cooperative effort between student and teacher which required the teacher to know the needs and abilities of each student. Formal and informal diagnostic testing was employed by the teachers for this purpose. Teachers
shared the responsibilities necessary in satisfying the needs of the various academic programs for differing groups of students. Each unit designated one teacher to serve as chairman of each of the academic areas. Vertical meetings were held in the building for each subject area in an attempt to assure continuous planning throughout the school.

**ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS RELATIVE TO DECISION MAKING**

Decision making as a result of the nongraded organizational pattern came about through staff consensus. The principal assumed the role of guiding the staff in decisions by encouraging them to think critically regarding various alternatives before arriving at a final decision. The staff itself made all major instructional decisions for the building. Central office personnel did not participate in the building instructional decisions, once the program was included as a part of the district's curriculum plans.

Students made decisions relative only to the rate of progress in their own learning program and this decision making was done with teacher guidance.

**ROLE PERCEPTION AND ROLE CHANGES**

In the opinion of the staff of school "D", roles
had changed since the traditional program was converted to a nongraded pattern. The principal's role had changed from that of an autocratic style dealing with large groups of students and staff to that of a more democratic style in which the principal spent more time in discussions with individuals, small groups of staff and small groups of students. The teachers under the new organizational pattern worked cooperatively with students in developing learning materials to meet individual needs rather than being textbook-oriented and depending totally upon teacher's manuals for a guide to quality teaching. The students no longer were perceived as being given information within large groups, but now developed their own styles of learning on an individual basis. Parents had become involved in the program as active participants in the volunteer helper program. They became actively involved in understanding how well their children were meeting their learning potentials through parent-teacher-child conferences. The curriculum had changed from a textbook orientation to a method providing for a variety of materials and approaches to learning. The curriculum was continually changing as it related to individual student needs.
ATTITUDES TOWARD THE PROGRAM

The staff of school "D" had a positive attitude toward the program although it was felt that the roles of the principal, teachers and curriculum needed further development and clarification. The staff was only moderately satisfied with the role of the student and indicated that this role could and would be strengthened as the program matured.

The primary role of the principal was perceived by the teachers as being one in which the principal supported the staff in judgement decisions and as serving as a liaison in dealing with the public relations aspect relative to the school and the program.

The diagnosing of individual student needs and the prescription of the proper instructional programs to meet those needs was perceived by the staff as the major role of the teacher within the framework of the nongraded structure.

The most important function of the student in performing under a nongraded organizational structure was to learn to achieve at a rate commensurate with his ability. The inability of the students to recognize this goal and operate within its structure was perceived by the principal and the teachers as an inherent weakness in the
program. The teachers explained that the reason for this weakness derived from the fact that the student goals had been determined by the teachers without student involvement.

The most salient features of the program as perceived by the staff in school "D" were that teachers were more inspired as a result of the challenge to their creativity by the needs arising from the continuous progress program and by observing students mature both academically and socially as they grew in their ability to accept the responsibilities which were inherent with the program.

The staff, in assessing the greatest weakness of the program, felt that it was extremely difficult to motivate students who were not progressing at a realistic rate commensurate with their ability, as determined by the teachers using as evidence the students' past performance and their formal test results. As a consequence, a great deal of one-to-one teacher-student time was necessary to accomplish realistic student-learning goals.

The staff offered the opinion that the new perspective of the roles of the principal, teachers, students and curriculum under the nongraded organizational structure, made a unique contribution to the total learning process.
CONCLUSIONS OF THE IN-DEPTH STUDY OF
FOUR NONGRADED SCHOOLS

As a result of the in-depth study utilizing interviews, observations, and questionnaires in four nongraded schools in DuPage County, the following conclusions are offered:

1. There is no single best way to implement a nongraded program. Each of the four schools had implemented the program in a somewhat different way.

2. Building design does not forbid the incorporation of a nongraded program. Two of the buildings in the study were of traditional structure, one was round with partial open space, and the fourth was rectangular in shape, with total open space.

3. The principals and teachers in these schools perceived that communications within the staff as well as between the administration and the staff had improved under the nongraded organizational structure. This would seem to be verified by the reported hours spent each week in team planning sessions.

4. Reportedly, the process for decision making at the building level had become a consensus activity with the teachers having an active role in decision making as a result of the implementation of the nongraded program.
During the interviews with the teachers, they indicated in all cases that the decision making process within the nongraded structure was much different, and that they were more involved than they had been within other organizational structures they had experienced. However, although the process of decision making had changed, each agreed that the principal was the final authority and decision maker when consensus could not be reached or conflict arose relative to building policy.

5. Students were perceived by all principals and teachers as being more self-directed and responsible for their own learning as a result of the incorporation of the nongraded organizational structure. Although this was confirmed by observation of the students, there were concerns of several teachers and principals relative to students being able to accept responsibility for their own learning.

6. There is no single best source of materials to be used in facilitating a nongraded program. A variety of materials from many different sources were utilized in each school. Relative to materials to augment a nongraded program, it would seem that a variety is necessary and that a single source or text would hinder the program. Teacher developed learning materials from a variety of
sources to meet individual learner needs seemed to be prevalent in all of the schools.

7. Time was a limiting factor in all of the schools. Certain components of the program such as pupil-planning conferences, one to one teaching, parent conferences, unit planning, and the making of materials would seem to be very time consuming. Under these circumstances, the teachers' concern in all cases for not having enough planning time as a result of incorporating the nongraded program would seem to be verified.

8. In implementing the nongraded programs, the staff did not have to be hand picked, however, staff commitment to the nongraded philosophy was essential to the success of the organizational pattern.

9. Vital to the success of the nongraded program was the principal's commitment to the concept as well as his willingness to accept a more equal role with teachers in the decision making process as opposed to an authoritarian role in decision making. This conclusion would seem to corroborate the Brunetti study, where he concluded that open schools seem to hold implications for changing the decision making and task responsibilities of the teacher and for changing the role of the principal who must function in a position with reduced influence and
10. In the four schools studied, the nongraded programs were initiated as a result of a cooperative effort between the principal and teachers. This conclusion supports the Orlansky and Smith conclusion that nongrading a school is a result of internal origin within the field of education.\(^1\) In each school studied, external pressures from community, school board, or central office was not seen as the initiating forces in establishing the nongraded program.


CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been the purpose of this study to determine whether or not selected principals of graded elementary schools and selected principals of nongraded elementary schools in DuPage County perceive their roles differently in respect to the importance of selected instructional and selected management administrative functions which are performed by principals. Using these administrative functions as a basis for the study, four basic hypotheses were tested. The statistical significance level .05 was established as the point of rejection of the null hypothesis. The choice of a standard of significance depends very much upon the amount of risk that is to be taken in a study, when making the decision to accept or reject the tested hypothesis. Accepting a significance level of .05 means that there are five chances in a hundred of being wrong in rejecting the null hypothesis.

Due to the relatively small sample of nongraded schools studied, a relatively small rejection level was selected to avoid making the statistical error of rejecting an hypothesis when in fact it is true.

The small sample of nongraded schools also dictated
that research techniques other than the statistical technique be used in gathering information relative to role perceptions of graded school principals and nongraded school principals. Consequently, an in-depth study technique of research was used for the nongraded schools as reported in Chapter V. The statistical data obtained was further strengthened by utilizing the interview technique as reported in Chapter IV relative to how and to what extent each administrative function was performed by each principal.

The following is a summary of the statistical results relative to the four hypotheses tested:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the leadership functions which are perceived as most important by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and principals of graded elementary schools.

From the results of these data which were gathered on each individual leadership function and through the application of the chi-square statistical technique to these data, the first hypothesis can be accepted. On only two items did the chi-square value approach statistical significance. In item 3, "the principal assigns teachers to their rooms, students, and programs," the chi-square value resulted in a statistical significance level of .10.
with the graded school principals perceiving the importance of this function as considerably more significant than the principals of nongraded schools. In item 18, "the principal develops policies and procedures for the grade placement of students," the chi-square value resulted in a statistical significance level of .20 with the graded school principals again perceiving this function as considerably more critical to their success than the principals of nongraded schools.

It would seem that the general philosophy of a nongraded structure would support the nongraded school principal's perceptions of the unimportance of items numbered 3 and 18 in as much as flexibility, easy movement of students from one level to another and matching students with teachers rather than rooms are synonymous with nongradedness as described by Goodlad and Anderson, \(^1\) and therefore grade placement criteria are not necessary.

On the five items listed below, the principals of nongraded schools perceived the performance of these functions as more critical to their success than did the principals of the graded schools. However, in no case did the

difference in perceptions between the two groups approach statistical significance.

Item 2. The principal creates a climate in which individual staff members are encouraged to try out new ideas.

Item 12. The principal visits areas outside the school; e.g., professional meetings in other districts, educational materials displays in order to obtain new ideas for the building.

Item 26. The principal communicates to parents the importance of successful academic achievement in their children.

Item 28. The principal generates in children an enthusiasm for and interest in their school work.

Item 34. The principal clarifies the school programs to the parents of the community.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the leadership functions which are perceived as least important to their work by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and the principals of graded elementary schools.
From the results of these data gathered on each individual leadership function and through the application of the chi-square statistical technique to these data the second hypothesis can be accepted.

Once again, on items three and eighteen, the results show a statistical value which approaches, but does not reach significance. The principals of the nongraded schools perceived these functions as less critical to their success than the principals of the graded schools.

In analyzing all of the administrative functions there was no statistical significance in perception of the importance of each between the graded school principals and nongraded school principals. However, the graded school principals perceived all administrative functions except two, twelve, twenty-six, twenty-eight and thirty-four as more critical to their success than the nongraded school principals.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant relationship in the emphasis placed upon management functions by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and the principals of graded elementary schools.

In analyzing this hypothesis, a rank order correlation coefficient was applied to the gathered data using an instrument (see appendix F) developed from the results
of the survey by the panel of experts on management and instructional functions.

The rank order value of .591 shows a significance level of beyond the .05 level with, therefore, the rejection of the third hypothesis.

In analyzing the rejection of the hypothesis, these data indicate that the principals of the graded schools perceived the management functions as more important than did the principals of the nongraded schools.

The results of these perceptions in the instrument show that the principals of the graded schools ranked the ten functions in the following order:

8. Evaluating the work performance of individual teachers. (Instructional function)

6. Creating a climate in which individual staff members are encouraged to try out new ideas. (Instructional function)

1. Proposing, organizing and implementing inservice and/or teacher faculty meetings. (Instructional function)

2. Communicating to the parents the importance of successful academic achievement in their children. (Instructional function)

3. Assigning teachers to their rooms, students
and programs. (Management function)

5. Orienting new teachers to school policies, practices and procedures. (Management function)

4. Explaining to the superintendent why a given decision was made. (Management function)

9. Informing staff members of professional growth activities; e.g., workshops, journal articles, university courses. (Instructional function)

7. Recommending to the superintendent the necessity for employment of non-teaching personnel; lunchroom supervisors, clerical help, teacher aides. (Management function)

10. Suggesting means for improving the school's physical facilities; e.g., recommending furnishing for a classroom, helping to design an addition. (Management function)

Although the principals of the graded schools placed instructional functions as the top four priority functions, the fifth instructional function was ranked eighth with three management functions perceived as more important than this instructional function.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant relationship in the emphasis placed upon instructional functions by the principals of nongraded elementary schools and the
In analyzing this hypothesis, a rank order correlation coefficient was applied to the gathered data using an instrument (see appendix F) developed from the results of the survey by the panel of experts on management and instructional functions.

The rank order value of .591 shows a significance level of beyond the .05 level, with therefore, the rejection of the fourth hypothesis.

In analyzing the rejection of the hypothesis, these data indicate that the principals of the nongraded schools perceived the instructional functions as more important than did the principals of the graded schools.

These data would seem to corroborate Bargman when he states, "organization, innovation, and technology are changing the principal's role to that of a coordinator of teams of staff members working within sub-systems in the attendance units. The elementary principals have to develop sound and viable participatory techniques at the building level when the staff is participating in professional negotiations."²

The results of these perceptions from the instrument show that the nongraded school principals ranked the ten functions in the following order.

6. Creating a climate in which individual staff members are encouraged to try out new ideas. (Instructional function)

9. Informing staff members of professional growth activities; e.g., workshops, journal articles, university courses. (Instructional function)

2. Communicating to parents the importance of successful academic achievement in their children.

1. Proposing, organizing and implementing inservice and/or teacher faculty meetings. (Instructional function)

8. Evaluating the work performance of individual teachers. (Instructional function)

5. Orienting new teachers to school policies, practices and procedures. (Management function)

3. Assigning teachers to their rooms, students, and programs. (Management function)

10. Suggesting means for improving the school's physical facilities; e.g., recommending furnishing for a classroom, helping to design an
addition. (Management function)

7. Recommending to the superintendent the necessity for employment of non-teaching personnel; lunchroom supervisors, clerical help, teacher aides. (Management function)

4. Explaining to the superintendent why a given decision was made. (Management function)

The principals of the nongraded elementary schools ranked the five instructional functions as the five most important functions to be performed with the five management functions being perceived as less important than any of the five instructional functions. This conclusion would seem to differ from the conclusion of Wiggins "that generally leader behavior and organizational climate are not related." 3

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were derived from the statistical treatment given to each of the administrative functions, the follow-up questions developed to determine the extent to which each administrative function was

performed by each principal, and the in-depth study of four nongraded schools.

1. One important finding of the study resulting from the preparation of the dissertation relates to claims concerning nongradedness. While the term "nongraded" is popular in educational circles, the actual number of nongraded programs identified for this study in DuPage County is appreciably lower in incidence than stated claims. It appears that the districts which were initially contacted are educationally sensitive to the rather strict and inflexible nature of assigning students to a grade number and had attempted to remove the numerical name. However, rather than truly abandoning the numerical assignment the districts referred to their program as multi-age, continuous progress units or other similar terms. In reality, numerical assignments were made and kept on file for the purpose of promotion to the new classroom setting.

2. In analyzing the results from each individual administrative function, these data indicate that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of importance of each function by the principals of the two groups. The two groups were in general agreement as to which functions were perceived as critical to their success
and as to which functions were least important to their success.

3. In analyzing the results of the chi-square treatment of the perceptions of importance of the management functions, as a total group, the principals of the graded schools perceived them as more important than did the principals of the nongraded schools. However, statistical significance was not found.

4. In analyzing the results of the chi-square treatment of the perceptions of importance of the instructional functions, as a total group, the principals of the nongraded schools perceived them as more important than did the principals of graded schools. However, statistical significance was not found.

5. In interpreting three and four above, it can be concluded that the principals of the graded schools perceived all administrative functions as more important than did the principals of nongraded schools. This conclusion could be interpreted to mean that the principals of graded schools perceive the principalship as a position that is critical to the success or failure of the individual school, while the principals of nongraded schools look upon the position differently. It may be that the principals of nongraded schools see their roles differ-
ently because of a differently perceived role for students, teachers and parents as verified in Chapter V.

This study conclusion is supported by the in-depth study conclusion number four where it was concluded that decision making tended toward a consensus activity with teachers having an active role as a result of the non-graded program. It is further supported by conclusion eight from the in-depth study which states that the principal of a nongraded school must be willing and able to take and accept the more equal role with teachers in decision making. Further, this conclusion corroborates the Brunetti study where he concluded that open schools seem to hold implications for changing the role of the principal who must function in a position with reduced influence and authority.

However, although the process of decision making was different and less autocratic on the part of the principal in the nongraded schools studied, he remained the ultimate authority and final decisions at the building level rested with him.

---

6. From analysis of the data obtained from the rank order instrument, it can be concluded that the principals of the nongraded schools perceived the instructional functions as more important than the principals of the graded schools. Significantly, the principals of nongraded schools perceived the instructional function of informing staff members of professional growth activities as much more important than the principals of the graded schools. It can be assumed from this conclusion that an innovation such as nongradedness does not detract from an over-all educational goal of staff development through professional growth activities, but rather strengthens the need to accomplish this goal.

7. In analyzing information gathered from item twenty-two, the principal modifies and adapts the district curriculum in terms of the school's individual needs, and from item forty-one, the principal explains to the superintendent why a given decision was made, it can be concluded from the latter and the in-depth interviews that principals of the nongraded schools are more secure in their positions and are more willing to take risks than the principals of graded schools. This was also supported by a number of statements by teachers who have worked with principals in graded and nongraded settings. In addition,
this conclusion is supported by conclusion number three from the in-depth study where heavy emphasis is placed upon building communication rather than communication with central office personnel. Further, this conclusion supports the Reese conclusion that teachers and administrators in highly innovative schools were significantly more oriented toward the idiographic dimension of behavior.\(^5\)

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. As a result of the nongraded organizational pattern, decision making becomes a shared activity with the staff. Therefore, principals of schools utilizing this structure must develop strategies to involve teachers in the decision making process.

2. A comparison of the nongraded concept with more recent individualization concepts such as Individually Guided Education, Individually Prescribed Instruction and Multi-Aged Grouping is merited.

3. More emphasis is being placed upon innovation and change in our schools which alter the educational and


---
organizational atmosphere of these schools. Consequently, colleges and universities should place a heavier instructional emphasis upon providing the aspiring administrator with means of adapting the traditional administrative functions to a changed role perception of the principalship as a result of this changed atmosphere.

4. There is a need for a companion study utilizing a more easily identifiable innovation as the experimental group so that a larger population can be used in analyzing the correlation of the similarities and differences of the performance and the perceptions of the administrative functions by principals of innovative schools and principals of traditionally organized schools.

5. Further study is needed to verify that principals of nongraded and/or innovative schools do spend more time and effort and place greater emphasis upon instructional administrative functions rather than the management administrative functions.

6. More study is needed concerning an appropriate training format for teachers and administrators who move from the traditional settings to a nongraded setting.

7. Further study is needed in terms of the relationship between a board of education commitment to a nongraded organizational pattern and relative success or
failure of implementation or operation of the nongraded program.

8. More study is needed in the area of community influence on the success of nongraded programs. In this area, the Hansen study concluded that teachers in the innovative structures are more greatly concerned about community support of education than their traditional counterpart.6

In this day of demanded accountability such a study would be valuable not only in terms of community influence on success or failure of the program, but also to determine whether the Hansen conclusion generates a more positive attitude from parents.

A study of this nature would also tend to support or reject the Bargman conclusion that the elementary school principal cannot hope to bring about innovative changes without consideration of the organized forces of the school community.7

---


7 Bargman, op. cit.
9. Further study is needed in terms of cost effectiveness in relationship to nongraded and traditional programs with special emphasis upon differing cost of instructional materials.

10. More study is needed to determine whether academic and social success results from nongraded programs as was so frequently stated in the literature and during the interviews.
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APPENDIX A

CASE STUDY INSTRUMENT

1. Attending Board of Education meetings and reporting the proceedings to the staff members.

   1. Critical to
   2. the success
   3. of the principal
   4. Of no significance
   5. to the success of
   6. the principal

   a. How often do you attend?
   b. Are you a participant? What is your role?
   c. How do you report to the staff?

2. Creating a "climate" in which individual staff members are encouraged to try out new ideas

   1. Critical to
   2. the success
   3. of the principal
   4. Of no significance
   5. to the success of
   6. the principal

   a. How is this accomplished?

3. Assigning teachers to their rooms, students and programs

   1. Critical to
   2. the success
   3. of the principal
   4. Of no significance
   5. to the success of
   6. the principal

   a. When is this done? Is this task completed by June?
   b. How is your staff involved?
   c. Who develops the assignment criteria?
4. Planning and organizing with the superintendent the most effective means of passing a district referendum

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Critical to the success of the principal
3. Critical to the success of the principal
4. Of no significance to the success of the principal
5. Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. How much school time is spent in performing this function?
b. How much extra time is spent in performing this function?
c. What activities in this area should a principal be involved in?
d. Why did you rank it as you did?

5. Evaluating the work performance of individual teachers

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Critical to the success of the principal
3. Critical to the success of the principal
4. Of no significance to the success of the principal
5. Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. How much time each day is spent in observation?
b. Are all observations followed with a conference? How much time is spent in each conference?
c. How many formal evaluations are made on each teacher? What is looked for?
d. How many informal evaluations are made on each teacher? What is looked for?
e. Which of the above is most valuable? Why?
f. Who supervises and how is their authority upheld?
6. Maintaining a desirable standard of behavior in students outside of the classroom; e.g., corridors, playground, washrooms

1. Critical to
2. the success of
3. the principal
4. Of no significance
to the success of
5. the principal

   a. How is this accomplished?

   b. Is there immediate personal follow-up on deviate behavior?

7. Working with specialists; e.g., social workers, psychologists, speech therapists, to plan more effective school programs for individual students

1. Critical to
2. the success of
3. the principal
4. Of no significance
to the success of
5. the principal

   a. How much time is spent in the activity?

   b. Is there more contact with specialists by the principal or individual teachers?

8. Explaining to parents the school's position when controversial issues develop

1. Critical to
2. the success of
3. the principal
4. Of no significance
to the success of
5. the principal

   a. What media do you use?

   b. To what extent are students used in this area?

9. Participating with the superintendent on district-wide planning and coordinating committees; e.g., educational advisory council, educational policy committee

1. Critical to
2. the success of
3. the principal
4. Of no significance
to the success of
5. the principal
a. How much time is spent in meetings of this kind?
b. Are these meetings more educational or administrative?

10. Coordinating school activities; e.g., programs, special services, extra curricular activities

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.  
Critical to the success of  
the principal  

a. Are these activities delegated? 
b. Why or why not?

11. Suggesting to the superintendent school-building budget allocations and priorities

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.  
Critical to the success of  
the principal  

a. What is the building budget procedure? 
b. Is there a definite student allocation? 
c. What restrictions are there on spending? 
d. Are purchasing allocations passed on to the teachers?

12. Visiting areas outside the school; e.g., other districts, professional meetings, educational material displays, to obtain new ideas for the building

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.  
Critical to the success of  
the principal  

a. Are written objectives developed for each visit?  
b. How much time does district allow for the performance of this function?  
c. Is there a budgeted amount? How much is allowed?
13. Orienting new teachers to school policies, practices, and procedures

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to
the success of
the principal

a. How is this accomplished?

b. Do you use a district handbook?

c. Do you use a school handbook?

d. Do you use your master contract?

e. Do you have a well defined building philosophy?

14. Acting as a mediator on a work oriented problem; e.g., teacher conflict with parent, student, or other teacher

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to
the success of
the principal

a. Why did you rate this item as you did?

b. How do you handle teacher-parent conflict, teacher-student conflict, teacher-teacher conflict?

c. Is other personnel ever involved?

15. Determining conditions of work; e.g., working hours, arrangement of sessions, free time

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to
the success of
the principal

a. Do you make these decisions?

b. How are you involved in making these determinations?
c. What or who is the major determining force?

d. Is staff involved? Why or why not?

e. How are students involved?

16. Suggesting an instructional method to make a lesson more effective or to remediate an individual pupil learning problem

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Critical to the success of the principal

Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. How do you find out the need for either?

b. Once need is determined, what methods would you use in helping the teacher remediate the situation?

17. Determining qualifications for selection of a new teacher

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Critical to the success of the principal

Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. What is your role in this area?

b. Do you do your own screening, interviewing, and hiring?

c. Where do you place your emphasis; i.e., scholastic record, references, work record, experience, first year teacher

18. Developing policies and procedures for the grade placement of students

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Critical to the success of the principal

Of no significance to the success of the principal
a. Were these developed prior to your employment?
b. What modifications have been made since?
c. Are the present procedures district procedures?
d. Could you change them?

19. Informing staff members of professional growth activities; e.g., workshops, journal articles, university courses

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to the success of the principal

a. Has this had an effect on your present organizational pattern?

b. Has any one thing been more influential on your program?

20. Preparing, organizing, and implementing district-wide curriculum innovations; e.g., sex education, Initial Teaching Alphabet, Afro-American history

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to the success of the principal

a. Who is the initiator in your district?

b. What is your role in district-wide innovations?

21. Writing administrative and/or supervisory bulletins

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to the success of the principal

a. With what frequency do you write bulletins?

b. Which type do you most frequently write?

c. What do you use in lieu of writing bulletins?
22. Modifying and adapting the district curriculum in terms of the school's individual needs

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Of no significance to the success of the principal

   a. How much flexibility do you have?
   b. How do you, or don't you, know you have this flexibility?
   c. Could you adopt a series in an area other than the one recommended by central office?

23. Participating in the local teacher educational professional organization

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Of no significance to the success of the principal

   a. Why did you rate this as you did?
   b. Do you participate? Why or why not?
   c. How does this affect your staff relations?
   d. How would you evaluate this involvement or lack of same?
   e. Who's fault is it that the involvement is lacking? Why?

24. Structuring the school environment so effective teacher-parent conferences take place; e.g., arrangement of time, providing space, recording outcomes

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Of no significance to the success of the principal

   a. Are conferences regularly scheduled?
b. When they are not scheduled, how is the teacher made available?

c. What is the major purpose of regularly scheduled conferences?

d. What is the major purpose of conferences which are not regularly scheduled?

e. Is administration included in parent-teacher conferences?

f. What conference follow-up reports are developed?

25. Recommending to the superintendent the necessity for employment of non-teaching personnel; e.g., lunchroom supervisors, clerical help, teacher aides

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to Of no significance
the success of to the success of
the principal the principal

a. Who writes the job specifications?

b. Who supervises the personnel listed above?

c. How many of these kinds of positions are a result of teacher recommendations or negotiations?

26. Communicating to parents the importance of successful academic achievement in their children

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to Of no significance
the success of to the success of
the principal the principal

a. How is this accomplished?

b. Is outstanding achievement of a student rewarded? How?

c. How are standardized test results used?
27. Selecting instructional materials; e.g., equipment, textbooks, and achievement tests needed for school programs

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to
the success of
the principal
Of no significance
to the success of
the principal

a. What is your involvement in the selection of these materials?

b. Is there a district procedure? Elaborate.

28. Stimulating in children an enthusiasm for and interest in their school work

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to
the success of
the principal
Of no significance
to the success of
the principal

a. What extra activities are used to involve students?

b. Is outstanding student performance publicized? How?

29. Fostering a cooperative atmosphere between staff members and the parents of the community

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to
the success of
the principal
Of no significance
to the success of
the principal

a. Why did you rate it as you did?

b. How do you accomplish this?

30. Proposing, organizing, and implementing inservice and/or teacher-faculty meetings

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to
the success of
the principal
Of no significance
to the success of
the principal
a. Is a written agenda used? Is it made available to staff prior to the meetings?

b. What is the major emphasis of inservice meetings? Of faculty meetings?

c. Is inservice your responsibility, or does central office personnel plan and organize?

31. Proposing, organizing, and implementing school-wide instructional innovations; e.g., team-teaching, learning centers, ungraded primaries

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to the success of the principal
Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. Are these your responsibility to determine and present to staff for consideration? How is this done?

b. How is the staff encouraged to implement?

32. Determining qualifications for the selection of a new building principal

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to the success of the principal
Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. Why did you rate it as you did?

b. Is this function more of a central office function?

33. Recommending "special" children for testing; e.g., slow learners, gifted, maladjusted

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to the success of the principal
Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. What is your role in dealing with parents?

b. What is your role in performing this function?
34. Clarifying the school programs to the parents of the community

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. What media is used?

35. Writing news reports and articles to improve school-community relations; e.g., district-wide and/or school publications

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. Do you write on a regular basis about your school? How often?
b. Do you write on a regular basis about the district? How often?

36. Assigning non-teaching activities; e.g., school assemblies, money collections, special lectures

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. How do you justify your involvement in this function?
b. How much involvement is there by staff in this function?

37. Working with community school oriented organizations; e.g., Parent-Teacher Organization

1. Critical to the success of the principal
2. Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. What is the major value of this activity?
38. Suggesting means for improving the school's physical facilities; e.g., recommending furnishings for a classroom, helping to design an addition

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Critical to the success of the principal
Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. How is the need determined?

b. What staff involvement is there in performing this function?

39. Maintaining lines of communication with parents; e.g., notes, letters, bulletins, telephone calls

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Critical to the success of the principal
Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. With what degree of frequency do you communicate with parents? How?

b. Do you have a definite plan of personal contact with parents? Elaborate.

40. Working with a parent to solve an individual pupil behavior problem

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Critical to the success of the principal
Of no significance to the success of the principal

a. How do you become aware of a pupil behavior problem?

b. What is the ultimate disposition?

41. Explaining to the superintendent why a given decision was made

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Critical to the success of the principal
Of no significance to the success of the principal
a. How often have you had to explain a decision?

b. Why did you rate it as you did?

c. How secure are you that your decision will be upheld by the superintendent?

42. Participating in the projects and activities of school oriented groups such as student councils

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Critical to Of no significance the success of to the success of the principal the principal

a. How much time do you spend with students?

b. In what activities do you spend time with students?
## Appendix B

### Survey of Dupage Public School Programs

**District Name:** ___________________________  **Number** __________

**Informant:** ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Grade levels</th>
<th>Open Classroom of Instruction</th>
<th>Accept Visitors</th>
<th>New Program</th>
<th>Well established Program-Continue</th>
<th>Well established Program-Expand</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory Discontinue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Grouping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. homogeneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. heterogeneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. departmentalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Ungraded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Programmed Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Language Laboratories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Latin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Individualized Programs</td>
<td>Grade levels</td>
<td>Open Classroom of Instruction</td>
<td>Accept Visitors</td>
<td>New Program</td>
<td>Well established Program—Continue</td>
<td>Well established Program—Expand</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory Discontinue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Educational TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Closed Circuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Open Circuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Drug Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Consumer Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Sex Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Separate program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Part of another subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subject: ________)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Outdoor Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Continuing Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Children only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Adults only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. Learning Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Year-Round School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. Open Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### XV. Staff Utilization

a. Differentiated Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade levels</th>
<th>Open Classroom or Instruction</th>
<th>Accept Visitors</th>
<th>New Program</th>
<th>Well established Program—Continue</th>
<th>Well established Program—Expand</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory Discontinue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>use of aides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>use of student teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>use of volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>use of certified teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>use of master teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Team Teaching

c. Self-contained Classrooms

### XVI. Other Special Programs

County Staff Member __________________________
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DETERMINING NONGRADED SCHOOLS

Enrollment ______________________________

District Name and Number ________________________________

How long has the present organization been in effect?

_____________________________________________________________________

Ages of nongraded students ________________________________

1. Are provisions made for each student to pick up in the 
   fall where he left off in the spring? ______________
   
   A. If the answer is yes, how is this accomplished?
   
   B. What record keeping is necessary to accomplish this?
   
   C. Are provisions made for learning plateaus?
   
2. Is level development rather than grade placement 
   provided in all subject areas? ______________
   
   A. If the answer is no, in what subject areas is 
   level placement provided?
   
3. What kind of reporting system is used?
4. What enrichment activities are provided to allow for horizontal development?

5. Are these enrichment activities as a result of the organizational pattern?

6. Are students allowed to progress at their own rate with provisions for no failure at the one extreme and the opportunity to progress through more than one year traditional growth at the other extreme?
   A. What is the maximum amount of time a student can take to complete the nongraded unit?
   B. What is the minimum amount of time a student can take to complete the nongraded unit?

7. What techniques are used to compare attainment with ability?

8. What program evaluation techniques are used?

9. Is child movement from one class to another designed to take place at any particular time of the year?
   A. If yes, when?
   B. If no, do you find that more movement takes place at a particular time or times of the year?
APPENDIX D

Please respond to the items in the following questionnaire by indicating +, -, or o in the first column and M or I in the second column.

+ in the first column indicates that you feel that the principal must always perform this function.

- in the first column indicates that you feel that the principal need not perform this function.

o in the first column indicates that you feel that the principal sometimes performs this function.

M in the second column means that this function is more a management function performed by the principal rather than a function directly related to improvement of instruction in the building.

I in the second column means that this function performed by the principal is directly related to the improvement of instruction in the building.
Should you feel that there are functions of great importance that have been omitted from this questionnaire, please list them at the end of the questionnaire and respond to them in like manner.

Management Function - A management function for the purpose of this study is defined as one which is performed by the principal which is not directly related to the instructional program; a function which is related to the facility, non-instructional personnel, non-instructional behavior of instructional personnel, community relations, peer relationships, and professional organizations.

Instructional Function - An instructional function for the purpose of this study is defined as a function which is performed by the principal which is directly related to improvement of instruction through the modification of teacher behavior or any action by the principal which directly influences the instructional program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Working with a parent to solve an individual pupil learning problem</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Storing and distributing instructional equipment and supplies</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Attending Board of Education meeting and reporting the proceeding to the staff members</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Working on non-instructional duties; e.g. marking homework, workbook assignments and informal tests.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Helping to keep corridors, washrooms, and school grounds neat and clean</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Creating a &quot;climate&quot; in which individual staff members are encouraged to try out new ideas</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assigning teachers to their rooms, students and programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Participating in &quot;fund-raising&quot; projects within the school</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Determining the instructional method to be used in the presentation of a subject area</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Planning and organizing with the superintendent the most effective means of passing a district referendum</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Maintaining a desirable standard of behavior in students outside of the classroom; e.g. corridors, playground, washrooms</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Working with specialists; e.g., social workers, psychologists, speech therapists, to plan more effective school programs for individual students.</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Explaining to parents the school's position when controversial issues develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Participating with the superintendent on district-wide planning and coordinating committees, e.g., educational advisory council, educational policy committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Coordinating school activities; e.g., programs, special services, extra curricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Suggesting to the superintendent school-building budget allocations and priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Visiting areas outside the school, e.g., other districts, professional meetings, educational material displays, to obtain new ideas for the building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Orienting new teachers to school policies, practices, and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Acting as a referee on a work oriented problem; e.g., teacher conflict with parent, student, or other teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Determining conditions of work; e.g., working hours, arrangement of sessions, free time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Participates in the local teacher professional organization</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Suggesting an instructional method to make a lesson more effective or remediate an individual pupil learning problem</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Developing policies and procedures for the grade placement of students</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Informing staff members of professional growth activities; e.g., workshops, journal articles, university courses</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Preparing, organizing, and implementing school-wide curriculum innovations; e.g., sex education, Initial Teaching Alphabet, Afro-American history</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Functioning as a 'liaison' with the superintendent for individual teacher grievances</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Writing administrative and/or supervisory bulletins</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Determining when the community may use school facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Planning, writing, and implementing federally sponsored programs for the school building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Modifying and adapting the district curriculum in terms of the school's individual needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Personally providing guidance and counseling for individual students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Participating in the local educational professional representing the teaching faculty in collective bargaining negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Structuring the school environment so effective teacher-parent conferences take place; e.g., arrangement of time, providing space, recording outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Recommending to the superintendent the necessity for employment of non-teaching personnel; lunchroom supervisors, clerical help, teacher aides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Communicating to parents the importance of successful academic achievement in their children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39.</strong> Selecting instructional materials; e.g., equipment, textbooks, and achievement tests, needed for school programs</td>
<td>39.</td>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40.</strong> Stimulating in children an enthusiasm for an interest in their school work</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41.</strong> Fostering a cooperative atmosphere between staff members and the parents of the community</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42.</strong> Proposing, organizing, and implementing inservice and/or teacher-faculty meetings</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43.</strong> Proposing, organizing, and implementing school-wide instructional innovations; e.g., team-teaching, learning centers, ungraded primaries</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44.</strong> Determining qualifications for selection of a new building principal</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45.</strong> Recommending &quot;special&quot; children for testing; e.g., slow learners, gifted, maladjusted</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46.</strong> Clarifying the school programs to the parents of the community</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Writing news reports and articles to improve school-community relations; e.g., district-wide and/or school publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Assigning non-teaching activities; e.g., school assemblies, money collections, special lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Working with community school oriented organizations; e.g., Parent-Teacher Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Suggesting means for improving the school's physical facilities; e.g., recommending furnishings for a classroom, helping to design an addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Maintaining lines of communication with parents; e.g., notes, letters, bulletins, telephone calls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Determining working facilities; e.g., desk arrangement, location of blackboards, number of tackboards, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Working with a parent to solve an individual pupil behavioral problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54. Explaining to the superintendent why a given decision was made</strong></td>
<td>54.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55. Participating in the projects and activities of school oriented groups such as student councils</strong></td>
<td>55.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

January 6, 1972
Dale F. Zorn, Principal
Indian Trail Junior High School
222 Kennedy Drive
Addison, Illinois 60101

Dear

As a doctoral candidate at Loyola University of Chicago, I am requesting your assistance in developing and refining an instrument for use in the formulation of conclusions pertinent to the rationale of my dissertation.

Because of your association on a daily basis with the concepts and activities relevant to my study, your reactions to this instrument will be of great value. Your perceptions and insights concerning the enclosed preliminary instrument which I am field testing with college and university personnel, as well as elementary school principals, will be very significant in the final analysis.

The nature of the study necessitates and dictates that the instrument be both complex and lengthy. Your kindness in taking the required time from your heavy schedule to complete the enclosed questionnaire is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dale F. Zorn

Enclosures:
1. Questionnaire
2. Self-addressed stamped envelope
APPENDIX F

Please rank order the following Administrative functions from 1 to 10 in order of your perceptions of most important to least important; 1 being most important and 10 being least important.

1. Proposing, organizing and implementing inservice and/or teacher faculty meetings.

2. Communicating to parents the importance of successful academic achievement in their children.

3. Assigning teachers to their rooms, students and programs.

4. Explaining to the superintendent why a given decision was made.

5. Orienting new teachers to school policies, practices and procedures.

6. Creating a climate in which individual staff members are encouraged to try out new ideas.

7. Recommending to the superintendent the necessity for employment of non-teaching personnel; lunchroom supervisors, clerical help, teacher aides.

8. Evaluating the work performance of individual teachers.

9. Informing staff members of professional growth activities; e.g., workshops, journal articles, university courses.

10. Suggesting means for improving the school's physical facilities; e.g., recommending furnishing for a classroom, helping to design an addition.
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