

VITA

NAME: Russel Eugene Klein

PLACE OF BIRTH: Orafino, Nebraska

DATE OF BIRTH: January 6, 1926

UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

Kearney State College
University of Nebraska
Los Angeles State College
University of Oregon

DEGREES AWARDED:

Bachelor of Arts, 1952, Kearney State College
Master of Education, 1957, University of Nebraska

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Educational Administration
Curriculum and Supervision

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Elementary School Teacher, Frontier County, Nebraska
1947-1949

High School Teacher, Rising City, Nebraska, 1952-1955

Junior High School Teacher, York, Nebraska, 1955-1957

High School Teacher, Pomona, California, 1957-1962

English Department Chairman, Pomona, California,
1958-1962

Curriculum Director, Forest Grove, Oregon, 1962-1967

AWARDS:

National Defense Education Act Fellowship, 1967-1969

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
IN CHARGE OF INSTRUCTION

by

RUSSEL EUGENE KLEIN

A THESIS

Presented to the College of Education
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

June 1969

APPROVED

(John E. Suttle, Adviser)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A sincere acknowledgement of appreciation is hereby given Dr. John E. Suttle, my adviser and chairman of the thesis committee, for his assistance and encouragement in planning and organizing this study.

A special acknowledgement is due Dr. John M. Foskett who served on the thesis committee, and provided much needed advice regarding the methodological problems encountered.

Much valuable assistance in the development of the instrument was provided by the following administrators employed by the Eugene and Springfield public school districts: Dr. Millard Z. Pond, Dr. Erwin Julifs, David Mortimore, Raymond C. Hendrickson, George Zellick, Evert Snyder, and Robert Bushnell.

Appreciation is also extended to the members of the thesis committee, Dr. Richard O. Carlson, Dr. Kenneth A. Erickson, and Dr. Theodore B. Johannis, Jr., for their assistance and guidance throughout the study.

Finally, to my wife, Dorthy; our sons, Dennis, Joel, and Scott; and our daughters, Susan and Maureen, I wish to express my appreciation for their encouragement and patience.

R.E.K.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH	19
III. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	35
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	56
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	132
BIBLIOGRAPHY	152
APPENDIX	
A. LETTERS	159
B. INSTRUMENT	164
C. TABLES	175
D. ABSTRACT	204

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Secondary School Principals	37
II. Elementary School Principals	38
III. Item Matrix	43
IV. Number and Percentage of Respondents Included in Study	53
V. Lowest and Highest Agreement Score and Mean Agreement Scores for All Norms by Assistant Superintendents' Expectations and Their Perceptions of the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals	58
VI. Mean Agreement Scores for Assistant Superintendents' Expectations and Their Perceptions of the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Roles and Total Position	62
VII. Mean Agreement Scores for Assistant Superintendents' Expectations and Perceptions of the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals Regarding Independence of Action in Acting Toward Superintendents	64
VIII. Mean Agreement Scores for Assistant Superintendents' Expectations and Perceptions of the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals Regarding Independence of Action in Acting Toward Principals	65
IX. Per Cent Distribution of Assistant Superintendents' Expectations and Their Perceptions of Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Response Categories, Role, and Total Position . . .	67

LIST OF TABLES-continued

Table	Page
X. Per Cent Distribution of Assistant Superintendents' Expectations and Their Perceptions of Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Response Categories, Role, and Independent and Dependent Behavior Norms	70
XI. Per Cent Distribution of Assistant Superintendents' Expectations and Their Perceptions of Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Response Categories, Role, and Independent And Dependent Behavior Norms	72
XII. Lowest and Highest Agreement Scores and Mean Agreement Scores for All Norms by Superintendents and Principals	75
XIII. Mean Agreement Scores for Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Roles and Total Position	78
XIV. Mean Agreement Scores for Expectations of Superintendents and Principals Regarding Independence of Action in Acting Toward Superintendents	79
XV. Mean Agreement Scores for Expectations of Superintendents and Principals Regarding Independence of Action in Acting Toward Principals	81
XVI. Per Cent Distribution of Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Response Categories, Role, and Total Position	82
XVII. Per Cent Distribution of Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Response Categories, Role, and Independent and Dependent Behavior Norms	84

LIST OF TABLES-continued

Table	Page
XVIII. Per Cent Distribution of Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Response Categories, Role, and Independent and Dependent Behavior Norms	86
XIX. Significant Differences Between the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents	88
XX. Significant Differences Between the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	91
XXI. Significant Differences Between the Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Others for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents	97
XXII. Significant Differences Between the Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Others for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	102
XXIII. Significant Differences Between the Perceptions of Assistant Superintendents and the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents	108
XXIV. Significant Differences Between the Perceptions of Assistant Superintendents and the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	116
XXV. Per Cent Distribution of Significant Differences between Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Roles, Content Areas, and Independent or Dependent Behavior	124

LIST OF TABLES-continued

Table	Page
XXVI. Per Cent Distribution of Significant Differences between Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Roles, Content Areas, and Independent or Dependent Behavior . .	126
XXVII. Per Cent Distribution of Significant Differences between Perceptions of Assistant Superintendents and Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Roles, Content Areas, and Independent or Dependent Behavior . .	128
XXVIII. Agreement Scores (AS) and Mean Response Scores (RS) for 71 Assistant Superintendent Role Norms by Assistant Superintendents' Self Expectations, by Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals, and by the Actual Expectations of Others	176
XXIX. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Superintendents and Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent	185
XXX. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Superintendents and Elementary School Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent . .	186
XXXI. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Superintendents and Secondary School Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent . .	187
XXXII. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Elementary and Secondary School Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent . .	188

LIST OF TABLES-continued

Table	Page
XXXIII. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Superintendents for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents	189
XXXIV. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Superintendents for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	190
XXXV. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents	191
XXXVI. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	192
XXXVII. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Elementary School Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents . .	193
XXXVIII. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Elementary School Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	194
XXXIX. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Secondary School Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents . .	195
XXXX. Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Secondary School Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	196
XXXXI. Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Superintendents and the Expectations of Superintendents for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent . . .	197

LIST OF TABLES--continued

Table	Page
XXXXII. Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents	198
XXXXIII. Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	199
XXXXIV. Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Elementary School Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents	200
XXXXV. Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Elementary School Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	201
XXXXVI. Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Secondary School Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents	202
XXXXVII. Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Secondary School Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals	203

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Nature and Purpose of the Study

As the result of an increasing population, school district consolidation and reorganization, and a trend toward the expansion of school services, the superintendency of schools is no longer considered a one-man operation. In all but the smaller districts, the functions of administration are spread among various second-echelon administrative officers. While many of these officers are designated as director, coordinator, and administrative assistant, an increasing number are referred to as assistant, associate, and deputy superintendents. Such titles denote a changing conception of the office of the superintendent that envisions a team approach to the functions of the superintendency, and a changing role for the superintendent, in that one of his primary roles becomes that of coordinating and directing a corps of assistants with individual functions (Fensch & Wilson, 1967).

Some authorities in the field of educational administration are predicting that the time is rapidly approaching when there will be no more than 5,000 school

districts in the nation, and that this will mean a decrease in the number of superintendents from about 13,500 to about 5,000, and an increase in the number of subordinates, particularly directors and assistant superintendents (Campbell, Cunningham, & McPhee, 1965).

Projections of personnel needs indicate that the annual demand for newly appointed assistant superintendents is seen as growing from about 1,000 in 1963-'64 to double that number in 1975-'76 (Campbell, et. al., 1965). This increasing demand is reflected in the increase in the number of assistant superintendents employed in school districts in Oregon and Washington in recent years. In Washington, 153 assistant superintendents were employed by school districts during the 1964-'65 school year (School Statistics, 1966). During the 1965-'66 school year, Washington school districts employed 181 assistant superintendents (School Statistics, 1967). Oregon school districts employed 38 assistant superintendents in 1964-'65, and 46 in 1965-'66. In 1956-'57, 17 Oregon school districts employed 23 assistant superintendents, and in 1966-'67, 39 school districts employed 49 assistant superintendents (The Oregon School Directory, 1956, 1964, & 1966).

This increase in the number of assistant superintendents has important implications for the leadership

responsibility of superintendents. Within the framework of larger, consolidated districts, superintendents are faced with the problem of organizing a number of specialists into an effective administrative staff. In so doing, the superintendent must not only reassess his own role, but also must define and clarify roles for subordinate members of the administrative structure.

Need for the Study

Implicit in the team approach to administration is the need for defining relationships among administrative personnel, and for role understanding and clarification (Campbell, et. al., 1965). Halpin's study (1956) of the leadership behavior of superintendents in Ohio schools underscores this need. He found that the effective superintendent clearly delineated the relationships between himself and the members of the group, and established well-defined patterns of organization and communication.

The literature emphasizes that the superintendent must delegate authority to his assistants commensurate with delegated responsibility. This delegation of authority must include clarity of assignment and organization. Each person must know to whom he is responsible,

and for what decisions he is responsible (The American School Superintendency, 1952).

Despite statements by recognized authorities in educational administration emphasizing the need for role clarification, studies (Hutcheson, 1957; Weir, 1959; Abbott, 1965) have shown that the role of the assistant superintendent has not been clearly defined. With the exception of assistant superintendents in charge of business affairs, their duties, responsibilities, and organizational relationships are clouded in confusion.

In view of the growing acceptance of the team approach to public school administration, and the lack of clarity regarding the role of the assistant superintendent, there appears to be a need to initiate a study that would attempt to identify those role expectations held for the position of assistant superintendent. While recent attempts to examine the role of the assistant superintendent (MacNair, 1966) have focused on the tasks assigned to the position, it can be argued that there is a need to examine the assistant superintendent's role in terms of the social norms that regulate organizational relationships, and which, subsequently, influence and determine the manner in which the assistant superintendent conducts himself as he performs the tasks assigned to the position. The need to examine the role of the assistant superintendent in terms

of social norms that determine organizational relationships and the behavior of position incumbents is of particular importance in view of the problems that arise within a hierarchical organizational structure.

Placed within the organizational structure of the typical public school system, the assistant superintendent occupies a position that is subordinate to that of the superintendent, and is therefore subject to the limitations imposed by the superintendent. Secondly, one would also conclude, since most writers tend to support the contention that the assistant superintendency should be staff (Griffiths, Clark, Wynn, & Iannaccone, 1962), that the position is most frequently defined as a staff position. Subsequently, when contrasted with the incumbent of a position that is subordinate and line, the assistant superintendent's performance is subjected to the influence of problems arising from line and staff relationships as well as those stemming from the superior-subordinate relationship.

As the incumbent of a subordinate position, the assistant superintendent represents a position to which certain responsibilities and authority has been delegated. However, implicit in the delegation of responsibility and authority is the idea that the ultimate responsibility for his performance still rests in a superior organizational

position. The fact that this responsibility rests in a superior position creates a situation of mutual dependency wherein the superior's success is dependent upon the performance of the subordinate, and the subordinate is dependent upon the superior for approval (Lane, Corwin, & Monahan, 1967).

As the result of this dependence, the superintendent may be expected to retain control and direction of delegated responsibilities and authority. On the other hand, the assistant superintendent--since the superintendent controls the rewards--may become preoccupied with engaging in approval-seeking activities.

Line and staff relationships have generally been based on the assumptions that 1) the staff is content to function without authority over the line, 2) suggestions of the staff will be welcomed by the line, and 3) suggestions of the staff will be accepted by the line. Contrary to these assumptions, Dalton's study (1949) indicates that line and staff positions are separated by several tension-producing factors that result in line and staff relations fraught with friction.

Dalton's study (1949) would tend to support the contention that principals would be reluctant to seek or implement suggestions offered by an assistant superintendent in a staff position, and would resist any effort on

his part to enlarge his sphere of influence. This resistance on the part of principals coupled with the fact that the assistant superintendent's performance is subject to evaluation by the superintendent may lead the assistant superintendent to attempt to strengthen and maintain his position of authority.

Thus, it would seem that the most vital organizational relationships affecting the position of the assistant superintendent are those that specify the system of control over work and one person over another. Therefore, the role of the assistant superintendent must be defined not only in terms of assigned tasks, but also in terms of those standards which prescribe the extent to which he can act independently of the superintendent and principals in the performance of those tasks assigned to his position.

Failure of the school district to define clearly organizational relationships which denote appropriate conduct on the part of the assistant superintendent, or the failure of the assistant superintendent to perform assigned tasks within the framework of those relationships could seriously impair the functional effectiveness of the position and create unnecessary conflict.

Based on the assumption that a formal, organizational role definition for a given position is influenced by the

role expectations held for the position by significant role-defining groups, and by the position incumbents' perceptions of those expectations, a study of the role expectations held for the position of the assistant superintendent and of the assistant superintendents' perceptions of those expectations would, then, provide information that superintendents and school boards might utilize in defining the role of the assistant superintendent within the administrative structure of their respective districts.

Statement of the Problem

This study is focused on the position of the assistant superintendent whose primary responsibility is that of the instructional program.

Utilizing role theory as a method of representing the problem, the study attempts to determine those role expectations or normative standards that regulate the relationships between the position of the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction and those of the superintendent and principals. Specifically, the study is an effort to identify the role of the assistant superintendent in terms of the normative standards applicable to the conduct or behavior of the assistant superintendent appropriate to

each of these relationships. The study of these normative standards has been limited to those that prescribe the limitations of independent behavior and action on the part of the assistant superintendent in the performance of those tasks assigned to his position.

In terms of relational specificity, the study is concerned with two role sectors: those expectations applied to the relationship between the assistant superintendent and the superintendent, and those applied to the relationship between the assistant superintendent and principals; expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent rather than his attributes; and the obligations of the assistant superintendent rather than his rights.

While the number of role-defining groups for this position could conceivably include superintendents, assistant superintendents, directors, supervisors, principals, teachers, school board members, and lay citizens, for the purposes of this study, such groups have been limited to superintendents, assistant superintendents in charge of instruction, and principals. Therefore, the study is concerned with the role expectations held for the position by the incumbents of the focal position, superintendents, and principals; and the assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals.

The purposes of the study are three-fold: 1) to determine the degree of intraposition consensus, or agreement, within the three role-defining groups regarding their expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent; 2) to determine whether or not there are significant differences among the three role-defining groups regarding their expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent; and 3) to determine whether or not there are significant differences between the assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals and the expectations expressed by assistant superintendents, superintendents, and principals.

Specifically, that part of the study related to the investigation of intraposition consensus will seek to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent is there agreement among the members of each role-defining group regarding their expectations for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents?
2. To what extent is there agreement among assistant superintendents regarding their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents?

In addition to seeking answers to the questions listed above, the study will test the following hypotheses related to the problem of interposition consensus:

1. The assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents are similar to their own expectations for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents.
2. The assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals are similar to their own expectations for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents.
3. The expectations of superintendents for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of all principals.
4. The expectations of superintendents for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of elementary school principals.
5. The expectations of superintendents for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of secondary school principals.
6. The expectations of secondary school principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of elementary school principals.
7. The expectations of assistant superintendents for their own appropriate behavior are similar to the expectations of superintendents.
8. The expectations of assistant superintendents for their own appropriate behavior are similar to the expectations of all principals.
9. The expectations of assistant superintendents for their own appropriate behavior are similar to the expectations of elementary school principals.
10. The expectations of assistant superintendents for their own appropriate behavior are similar to the expectations of secondary school principals.
11. Assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of superintendents.

12. Assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of all principals.
13. Assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of elementary school principals.
14. Assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of secondary school principals.

Limitations of the Study

1. Despite an effort to reduce the ambiguity of items included in the instrument, the researcher can never be absolutely certain that some ambiguity is not present. Subsequently, there is the possibility that respondents may misinterpret the nature and intent of individual items.
2. A second limitation related to the elicitation of responses to the instrument is that the respondents' expression of opinions may reflect ideal rather than real attitudes.
3. Since it is not known how representative the individual items are of the universe of possible items, it is not possible to generalize beyond the specific items included in the instrument.

4. While the study includes Oregon and Washington school districts employing assistant superintendents in charge of instruction, the number of such districts is small. As a result, this also limits the number of respondents. The limited number of respondents places severe restrictions on sampling procedures and methods of data analysis.
5. The omission of such role-defining groups as directors, supervisors, teachers, school board members, and other lay citizens might also be considered as a limitation. These groups, however, were omitted for the reason that the assistant superintendents' relationships with them are much more limited than those with superintendents and principals.
6. Mailed questionnaires rarely result in 100 per cent returns. The lack of a 100 per cent return from respondents, and a lack of information about those respondents who did not return the questionnaire represent unknown factors in this study.
7. The use of Leik's measure of ordinal consensus also poses a limitation. Presently, there is no available way to estimate sampling variability. No significance tests have been developed for the measure, and confidence intervals have not been constructed.

Definitions of Terms Used

1. Superintendent: This term refers to the chief executive appointed by the school board and charged with the direction of the schools within a school district.
2. Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction: The assistant superintendent in charge of instruction is that school official, other than the superintendent, responsible for the administration, supervision, and coordination of the instructional program at the school district level. His responsibilities may include the instructional program for both elementary and secondary schools, or for only elementary or secondary schools. For the purposes of this study, he must be officially designated as an assistant, associate, or deputy superintendent.
3. Principal: A principal is defined as the administrative head of a school unit.
4. Elementary School Principal: An elementary school principal is defined as the administrative head of a school unit providing an instructional program for grades kindergarten through five or six, or grades one through five or six.
5. Secondary School Principal: A secondary school principal is defined as the administrative head of a

school unit designated as a middle school (grades six through eight), a junior high school (grades seven and eight, or grades seven through nine), or as a high school (grades nine through twelve, or grades ten through twelve).

6. Agreement: Agreement is used synonymously with the term consensus, and refers to the degree of similarity among the role expectations held for the focal position. It is also used to indicate the degree of similarity between expectations and perceptions.
7. Role: Role is defined as the behavior of a person as determined by the expectations of others and by his perceptions of those expectations. Such a definition not only includes the expectations of others, but also includes the position incumbent's interpretation of what constitutes appropriate behavior.
8. Role Expectations: Expectations are normative standards or norms which are held for the behavior of the incumbent of a position.
9. Perceptions: The term perceptions is defined as the awareness or interpretation by the position incumbent of the role expectations held for the position by others.

10. Role-defining Group: A role-defining group is defined as that group of persons occupying the focal position or related counter positions.
11. Position: This term is defined as the location of a person or group of persons within a system of social relationships.
12. Focal Position: Focal position is defined as the position upon which the study is focused. In this study, the position of the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction is considered as the focal position.
13. Counter Position: A counter position is a position within the same system of social relationships as the focal position, and to which the focal position is related. For the purposes of this study, the counter positions have been identified as those of the superintendent and principal.
14. Role Sector: A role sector is defined as a set of role expectations applied to the relationship of a focal position to a single counter position.
15. Independent Behavior: Independent behavior is defined as behavior free from restrictions and controls imposed by superintendents and principals, and which enables the incumbent of the focal position to exercise control over work and members of the organization.

16. Dependent Behavior: Dependent behavior is defined as that behavior of the incumbent of the focal position which is prescribed by controls and limitations imposed by superintendents and principals. Dependent behavior does not permit the incumbent to exercise control over work and members of the organization.

Organization of the Study

The remainder of this study is organized into the following four chapters:

Chapter II is a review of related literature and recent research. It includes a review of role theory and a review of relevant research concerned with the assistant superintendency in general and with those positions, regardless of title, to which have been assigned district-level responsibilities for the instructional program.

Chapter III describes the methodology used in the completion of the study. This chapter includes a description of the procedures used in the selection of respondents, the development of the instrument, the collection of data, and the analysis of the data.

Chapter IV presents the findings of the study. The analysis of the data has been divided into four sections: expectations and perceptions of assistant superintendents,

comparison of assistant superintendents' expectations with the expectations of superintendents and principals, expectations of superintendents and principals, and comparison of assistant superintendents' perceptions with the expectations of superintendents and principals.

Chapter V provides a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Role Theory

The application of role theory to the administrative process has been one of the comparatively recent trends in the study of educational administration. Much of the research and writing in this area has been done by Jacob W. Getzels, Egon G. Guba, and Neal Gross. They view administration as a social process dealing with the conduct of social behavior within a hierarchical setting. Structurally, administration consists of a hierarchy of subordinate and superordinate relationships within a social system. Functionally, this hierarchy is viewed as the generating element for allocating and integrating roles and facilities in order to achieve the goals of the social system.

The nature of this relationship, according to Getzels (1958), is the crucial factor in the administrative process. His research model of social behavior includes both the sociological and psychological aspects.

We shall assert that this social behavior may be understood as a function of these major elements: institution, role and expectation,

which together constitute what we shall call the nomothetic or normative dimension of activity in a social system; and individual, personality, and need-dispositions, which together constitute the idiographic or personal dimension of activity in a social system [p.152].

Getzels's principal contention is that while a sociological analysis of role on the nomothetic level is important, if we are to understand the behavior of specific role-incumbents, we must consider the psychological or idiographic aspects of the individuals inhabiting the roles and reacting to expectations.

The field of role has come to be known as role theory. Thomas and Biddle (1966) believe that this equation is unfortunate in that it implies more theory than actually exists. While there are some speculations, hypotheses, and theories about certain aspects of role, there is no grand theory. While role theory is a relatively new field of study and one that is not widely recognized, it does possess a domain of study, perspective and language, a body of knowledge, some rudiments of theory, and characteristic methods of inquiry. As its domain of study, the field deals with the real-life behavior of people as displayed in actual on-going social situations.

As Sarbin (1954) points out:

Role theory attempts to conceptualize human conduct at a relatively complex level. In a sense it is an interdisciplinary theory in that its variables are drawn from studies of culture,

society, and personality. The broad conceptual units of the theory are role, the unit of culture; position, the unit of society; and self, the unit of personality p.223 .

Thus, role theory includes the study of interactions between people whose actions have been organized into roles, and the interaction of role and self. According to role theory, all societies are organized around positions and the persons who occupy these positions perform specialized actions or roles. These roles are connected with the position and not with the person who is occupying the position. The person is characterized by an internal organization of qualities resulting from his experiences in the culture. This internal organization of traits, attitudes, and habits is conceptualized as the self.

One of the problems apparent in role theory is that of conceptual differences. Thomas and Biddle (1966) summarize the problem as follows:

But the ideal of one concept clearly defined with one verbal label has still to be attained in role theory. At present, the language of role is a partially articulate vocabulary that stands midway in precision between the concepts of the man in the street, who uses what the common language just happens to offer as terminology, and the fully articulate, consensually agreed-upon set of concepts of the mature scientific discipline p.13 .

Thomas and Biddle (1966) define position as "... a collectively recognized category of persons for whom the basis for such differentiation is their common attributes,

their common behavior, or the common reaction of others toward them p.29 ." In an earlier work, Biddle (1961) defined position "... as a set of persons who exhibit similar characteristics, who are treated similarly by others, or for whom a cluster of unique cognitions are maintained either by themselves or others p.5 ." Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958) use the term position to refer to the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of relationships.

While definitions of role vary, Gross, et. al., (1958) have identified three major role formulations or categories: normative definitions, individual orientation definitions, and behavior or performance definitions.

The first category equates role with normative culture patterns. Linton's definition (1936) of role is representative of this category:

A status, as distinct from an individual who may occupy it, is simply a collection of rights and duties.... A role represents the dynamic aspect of a status. The individual is socially assigned to a status and occupies it with relation to other statuses. When he puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing role pp. 113-114 .

Linton's definition relates role to the behavioral standards of society for persons occupying a given status and not to the actual behavior of the status incumbent.

Newcomb (1950) takes a similar position. He states that "The ways of behaving which are expected of any

individual who occupies a certain position constitute the role p.280 ."

Getzels (1958) also uses a normative definition of role:

A role has certain normative obligations and responsibilities, which may be termed "role expectations," and when the role incumbent puts these obligations and responsibilities into effect, he is said to be performing his role. The expectations define for the actor, whoever he may be, what he should or should not do as long as he is the incumbent of the particular role p.153 .

Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey (1962) follow the same normative definition. Their definition states that what a typical occupant of a given position is expected to do constitutes the role associated with that position.

The second category, as proposed by Gross, et. al. treats role in terms of an individual's definition of his situation with reference to his and others social position. These writers cite Sargent's definition (1951) of role as illustrative of this category:

A person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demand and expectations of those in his group pp.359-360 .

Parsons and Shils (1951) also define role as an individual's orientation:

The role is that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines

his participation in an interaction process. It involves a set of complementary expectations concerning his own actions and those of others with whom he interacts. Both the actor and those with whom he interacts possess these expectations p.23 .

It should be noted that the definitions of role in this category do not exclude the expectations of the society, but broaden the scope of the definition to include the position incumbent's interpretation of appropriate behavior.

The third category of role definitions deals with role as the behavior of actors occupying social positions. Definitions in this category do not treat role in terms of his situational orientation, but rather in terms of what he actually does. An example of this type of definition is that of Davis (1949):

How an individual actually performs in a given position as distinct from how he is supposed to perform, we call his role. The role then is the manner in which a person actually carries out the requirements of his position p.90 .

Sarbin's definition (1954) also refers to the incumbent's actual behavior:

A role is a patterned sequence of learned actions or deeds performed by a person in an interaction situation p.225 .

While these three categories of role formulations are indicative of different interpretations of role,

there are elements that are common to most definitions. Gross, et. al. (1958) suggest that there are three such common elements: social locations, behavior, and expectations.

Getzels and Guba (1957) offer the following generalizations about the nature of roles: 1) roles represent offices, or statuses within the institution, 2) roles are defined in terms of role expectations, 3) roles are institutional givens, 4) the behaviors associated with a role may be thought of as lying along a continuum from required to prohibited, and 5) roles are complementary.

Related Studies

This study is concerned with an analysis of the role of the assistant superintendent in charge of the instructional program. As such, the study attempts to focus on a position that combines segments of two populations. One population consists of those persons occupying positions within the school hierarchy and designated as assistant, associate, and deputy superintendents. This population is characterized by a variety of assigned functions which may or may not include responsibilities for the instructional program. The second population includes those persons who occupy positions

to which have been assigned broad leadership responsibilities for directing, supervising, and coordinating the instructional program. Persons serving such positions are identified by many titles. They may be called curriculum directors, directors of instruction, directors of elementary education, and directors of secondary education. They may also be designated as assistant, associate, or deputy superintendents in charge of curriculum or instruction. Subsequently, relevant related studies may be divided into two groups: those concerned with the assistant superintendency in general, and those dealing with those positions, regardless of title, to which have been assigned district level responsibilities for the instructional program.

Four unpublished doctoral dissertations on the general topic of the assistant superintendent have been identified.

Hutcheson (1957) surveyed 201 school districts in the United States to determine prevailing practices concerning the employment of assistant superintendents. He also sought the recommendations of superintendents regarding the employment and assignment of duties to central-office administrative officers. Hutcheson's conclusions included the following: 1) there seems to be confusion as to what an assistant superintendent is, 2)

there seems to be confusion as to the staff's relationship to the superintendent, 3) duties and responsibilities for assistant superintendents are for the most part not clearly defined.

Weir (1959) surveyed all assistant superintendents in New Jersey to determine their duties and functions. The data collected indicated that assistant superintendents in New Jersey appear to function most frequently in these areas: curriculum evaluation and development, teacher recruitment and orientation, in-service training, public relations, pupil services, audio-visual aids, personnel, business management, and general administration and supervision. Weir also found that with the exception of assistant superintendents in charge of business, assistant superintendents rarely worked in situations where the job was clearly defined.

Abbott's study (1965) was designed to determine the emerging patterns related to the nature and scope of the position of the assistant superintendency in North Carolina and the United States. The study indicated a great amount of variety and overlapping of functions assigned to assistant superintendents. There appeared to be lacking in most school districts written policies concerning the duties and responsibilities of assistant superintendents.

Paschal (1963) studied the training, duties and areas of service of assistant superintendents serving school districts in cities with populations ranging from 50,000 to 300,000 within the 19 state region served by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The study revealed the following findings:

1. Assistant superintendents in charge of instruction and curriculum outnumbered those with responsibilities in other areas.
2. Very little similarity of duties was found among assistant superintendents having similar titles.
3. Eighty-nine per cent of the assistant superintendents indicated that they were directly responsible to the superintendent. Eleven per cent reported shared responsibility to the superintendent and to the board of education.
4. Ninety-seven per cent of the assistant superintendents had earned degrees. Twenty-five per cent had earned doctorates.

Within recent years, a number of role studies focusing on the position of assistant superintendent in charge of instruction, or on positions designated by such titles as director of instruction and curriculum director have been completed.

MacNair (1966) investigated the role expectations held for assistant superintendents in charge of instruction in unified school districts of California. A major aim of the study was that of determining the extent of agreement or disagreement among four role-defining groups: superintendents, assistant superintendents, high school principals and high school counselors. Analysis of the data revealed considerable interposition consensus among superintendents, assistant superintendents and principals; however, there was less consensus between counselors and the other three role-defining groups. Intraposition consensus was high among all groups.

Moran's study (1962) was designed to discover and analyze the concepts and perceptions of superintendents, directors of instruction, principals and teachers regarding the role of the director of instruction in developing programs of instructional improvement. He found that the four groups of respondents held different concepts of the director of instruction's role, but the differences were of degree rather than kind. Administrators differed with teachers in three areas: job definition, line of responsibility and organizing efforts. Directors of instruction expressed a desire for more status and authority within the organizational hierarchy.

Duffy's study (1965) focused on the observed and perceived roles of the director of instruction. Four position incumbents were observed to obtain information related to 1) the observable specific tasks which characterize the role of the director of instruction as well as the interactions and processes involved in their tasks, 2) the tasks, interactions and processes of the role that are common or specific among school systems, 3) the relationships between the observed tasks of the director of instruction and the way in which the professional staff and the director perceive the director's decision-making role, and 4) the extent to which the observed tasks of the director of instruction are similar to those tasks suggested by the 25 decision items included in the Decision Point Analysis Instrument.

Duffy found that the director of instruction devotes approximately 70 per cent of his observed time and frequency of behaviors to the tasks of curriculum and instruction and of staff personnel. Approximately 80 per cent of his time is spent in interactions with people, and the building principal is the position incumbent with whom the director interacts most often. In general, the observed tasks, interactions and processes were found to be common among the four observed directors of instruction, and 15 of the 25 Decision Point Analysis Instrument items were

found to be suggestive of the tasks of the director of instruction.

Breniman's study (1963) was conducted among 61 school districts in Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Montana. The study concentrated on the duties, responsibilities, preparation, and status of directors of instruction. Breniman noted that the position has become more administrative in nature, and that there is a tendency for the position to assume more line authority within the administrative hierarchy of the school district.

Batsakis' study of the role of the director of instruction (1964) was limited to an analysis of his own work as the director of instruction in School District Number Seven in the city of Dearborn Heights. Among the major conclusions of the study were the following:

1. The effectiveness of the services and assistance provided by the director of instruction depends greatly upon the degree to which he resolves the problem of his working relations with staff members.
2. In this particular situation, the role of the director of instruction needs to be clarified. His specific duties need to be spelled out clearly and carefully.

3. The director of instruction must be given the authority necessary to carry out the responsibilities assigned to him. This position needs to be given a place in the line of administrative authority. To make the director of instruction a staff person with no administrative authority is to lessen his effectiveness.

Stearn (1966) sought to determine the divergence and congruence of role expectations held for the position of curriculum director. Four role-defining groups were included as respondents. These groups were superintendents, curriculum directors, principals, and teachers.

Stearns concluded that superintendents, curriculum directors, and principals held generally congruent expectations for the role of the curriculum director; however, principals and teachers were less supportive of the curriculum director's role than were curriculum directors and superintendents. Teachers and curriculum directors held widely divergent expectations regarding the curriculum director's role as a supervisor of instruction and in the area of personnel responsibilities.

Summary

Role theory includes the study of interactions between people whose actions have been organized into roles.

These persons occupy positions organized within the society. Roles performed by persons occupying positions are related to the position. For most analytical purposes, the most significant unit of the social structure is not the person but the role.

One of the problems in role theory is that of conceptual differences. As a result, the literature reveals a multitude of terms having similar definitions, and a number of common terms defined differently.

Some efforts have been made to categorize terms and definitions. Definitions of role have been classified into three categories: 1) normative definitions emphasizing behavior that is expected of a person occupying a given position, 2) individual orientation definitions including the individual's definition of his situation, and 3) behavior definitions treating role in terms of what the individual actually does.

Two kinds of studies appear to be relevant to this study: those dealing with the assistant superintendency, and those investigating role expectations associated with positions of assistant superintendents in charge of instruction and directors of instruction and curriculum. The studies of the assistant superintendency are concerned primarily with the scope and nature of the position as determined by assigned duties and responsibilities.

Role studies related to the position of assistant superintendent in charge of instruction, or similar positions, seem to approach the role of the position incumbent almost entirely in terms of expectations related to tasks. Of those studies investigating consensus among role defining groups, the findings appear to indicate a high degree of interposition and intraposition consensus among superintendents, assistant superintendents and principals regarding their role expectations for the position of assistant superintendent in charge of instruction.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Selection of Respondents

Superintendents, assistant superintendents in charge of instruction, and principals were selected as the role-defining populations for the study. The selection of respondents from each of the above populations was based on two criteria: 1) all respondents must be employed by first-class school districts or county units in the states of Oregon and Washington, and 2) all respondents must be employed by districts that employ assistant superintendents whose primary responsibility is that of coordinating and supervising the instructional program.

An initial selection of districts was accomplished by identifying those first-class school districts employing assistant superintendents. This identification was based on the listings of school districts in the 1967-68 Oregon School Directory and the Washington Education Directory 1967-68 Edition. Since the directories do not in all cases specify the responsibilities of assistant superintendents listed, the superintendents of all

districts indicated as employing assistant superintendents were contacted by letter (Appendix A) in order to identify those districts employing an assistant superintendent in charge of instruction. In addition, superintendents were asked to report a current list of names and addresses of administrative personnel not employed during the 1967-68 school year.

Fifty-five districts (29 districts in Washington, and 26 districts in Oregon) meeting the selection criteria were identified. Based on the belief that the variable of size will have had a much greater influence on administrative relationships in large districts than in those districts included in the study, the Portland, Oregon, and Seattle, Washington, districts were excluded leaving a total of 53 districts to be included in the study.

These districts employ 50 superintendents, 55 assistant superintendents in charge of instruction, 218 secondary school principals and 564 elementary school principals. All superintendents, all assistant superintendents in charge of instruction and a stratified random sample of principals were included as respondents in the study.

A stratified random sampling procedure was used in order to secure a representative sample of principals.

since 50 per cent of the population of secondary principals are employed by 13 of the 53 districts and 50.5 per cent of the population of elementary school principals are employed by 12 of the 53 districts, the probability of selecting a principal representing one of the larger districts would have been greater than that of selecting a principal from one of the smaller districts had a simple random sample been made. A second factor, the number of elementary school principals, also indicated the desirability of a stratified random sample. Of the total population of principals, 72.1 per cent are elementary school principals.

TABLE I
SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

<u>Districts</u>	<u>Number of Principals in Population</u>	<u>Number of Principals in Sample</u>
Employing 6 or more secondary school principals	109	55
Employing fewer than 6 secondary school principals	109	55
All districts	218	110

Each population of principals, secondary and elementary, was divided into two cells each containing approximately 50 per cent of the population. Membership in a given cell was determined by district size as indicated by the number of principals employed. A number was assigned to each principal. With the aid of a table

TABLE II
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Districts	Number of Principals in Population	Number of Principals in Sample
Employing 15 or more elementary school principals	285	143
Employing fewer than 15 elementary school principals	279	140
All districts	564	283

of random numbers (Arkin and Colton, 1950), a random sample of 50 per cent was selected from each cell. Tables I and II indicate the numbers of principals thus selected as respondents: 110 secondary school principals, and 283 elementary school principals.

The Instrument

In spite of the numerous role studies that have been conducted, a search of the literature revealed that no satisfactory instrument was available for this study. Subsequently, it was necessary to construct a role norm inventory specifying expected behaviors of assistant superintendents in charge of instruction.

As has been previously stated, the focus of the study is on an attempt to identify the role of the assistant superintendent in terms of those normative standards applicable to the conduct or behavior of the assistant superintendent within the framework of his organizational relationships with the superintendent and principals.

Rather than attempt to specify and analyze all dimensions of these relationships, it seemed appropriate to concentrate on one dimension, independence of action. In so doing, it becomes possible to determine those normative standards which specify the limits of autonomy associated with the position of assistant superintendent. These limits of autonomy are those which define the extent to which the assistant superintendent can, in the performance of those tasks assigned to his position, act independently of the superintendent and principals, or

inversely, the extent to which his actions are dependent on prescribed controls and limitations imposed by the superintendent and principals.

The selection of this dimension was based on Eye and Netzer's (1965) dichotomy of the functions of supervision:

The supportive function of supervision is the performance of all tasks in a manner and to a purpose that will uphold and strengthen other personnel in achieving the results properly expected of each incumbent of an organizational position.

The contributory function of supervision is the performance of those tasks under independent or prescribed controls which constitute assistance toward the achievement of results appropriate to the purpose ascribed to the organization and assigned to specific line positions [p. 12].

Eye and Netzer (1965) define independent control as that which grants full authority and responsibility in the performance of the assigned tasks, and prescribed control as that which delineates the limits within which autonomy may be exercised.

The literature provides some justification for the selection of independence of action as an appropriate dimension for studying organizational relationships. Corwin (1966) states that some of the most vital relationships are those that define the system of control over work and one member over another. Argyris (1960) refers to what has been called the dilemma of the one and the many when he speaks of the incongruence of the demands

of the organization and the needs of the individual. According to Argyris, the organization demands submissive, subordinate, and dependent behavior, while the personality needs of the healthy individual demand dominant status and relative independence.

In devising the role norm inventory, the task, in this instance, became one of developing a series of statements which could be interpreted as expectations for behavior associated with the performance of tasks assigned to the position of assistant superintendent in charge of instruction, and which were relevant to organizational relationships between the focal position and counter positions.

The development of a series of statements suitable for the purposes of a study was preceded by an attempt to define an appropriate universe of items which an instrument might sample. Guba and Bidwell (1957), faced with a similar problem, developed an item matrix designed to facilitate the generation of appropriate items. Thus, the problem of defining the universe of items which the instrument might sample was approached by developing a three-dimensional item matrix.

The first dimension, organizational relationships, appeared to be defined by the role sectors to be analyzed,

i.e., all statements must be applicable to the relationship of the position of assistant superintendent to the positions of superintendent and principal.

The second dimension, independence of action, was necessary in order to limit statements of expectations to those which could be interpreted as independent or dependent kinds of behavior on the part of the assistant superintendent.

Since the study is concerned with behavior associated with the performance of tasks assigned to the focal position, the third dimension appeared to be the content areas within which administrative tasks are performed. For this purpose, it was necessary to utilize the administrative performance systems described in the literature. Hencley (1963) states that three dimensions of function are common to such systems: the policy-purpose determination function, the technical-operational function, and the energizing-process function. The energizing-process function was not included in the third dimension of the matrix for two reasons. One, the second dimension of the matrix restricts the analysis to independent and dependent kinds of behavior. Two, items related to the energizing-process function appeared to fit equally well in other cells.

The resulting item matrix appears on the following page.

ITEM MATRIX

	Counter Positions			
	Superintendent		Principal	
	Behavior of Assistant Superintendent		Behavior of Assistant Superintendent	
	Independent	Dependent	Independent	Dependent
Policy-Purpose				
Technical-Operational				
Instruction				
Staff Personnel				
Pupil Personnel				
Finance and Business Management				
School Plant and Facilities				
School-Community Relations				

After compiling a list of items based on the literature and which appeared to fit the requirements of the matrix, an initial selection of items to be included in the instrument was made. That selection was based on the following criteria:

1. General and ambiguous statements were avoided.
2. Items from each of the content areas: policy-purpose and technical-operational, were selected.
3. Approximately equal numbers of items were selected for each role sector.
4. Approximately equal numbers of items specifying independent and dependent behavior were selected.

In an effort to eliminate ambiguous and irrelevant items, the instrument was administered to two groups of graduate students at the University of Oregon. One group consisted of those students enrolled in the advanced curriculum and supervision seminar. The others were enrolled in the advanced administrative problems seminar. Twenty-four students completed and returned the instrument.

Following the pre-test, the instrument was revised and submitted to a panel of judges selected from among practicing school administrators. The members of the panel included one superintendent, one deputy superintendent, two directors of instruction, and three principals.

The primary task of the panel was that of determining the face validity of the items included in the instrument; however, panel members were asked to suggest additional items for consideration.

A final revision of the instrument incorporating the suggestions of panel members was drafted and submitted to the respondents selected for the study.

This revision was made up of thirty-five normative statements applicable to the relationship of the position of the assistant superintendent to the position of the superintendent, and thirty-six normative statements applicable to the relationship of the position of the assistant superintendent to that of the principal. These statements are shown below by role sector. Statements marked by an asterisk were categorized as being indicative of independent behavior. Those not so marked were considered as statements indicating dependent behavior.

Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents

- * 1. Formulate and recommend directly to the school board policies governing the instructional program.
2. Present to the superintendent recommendations related to the instructional program and requiring school board approval.
- * 3. Direct the development and operation of an instructional materials center for teacher use.
4. Submit a written report to the superintendent on all meetings with the professional staff.

5. Discuss proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems with the superintendent before presenting them to principals.
- * 6. Initiate and conduct meetings with principals for the purpose of discussing instructional problems.
7. Submit his decisions related to curricular and instructional problems to the superintendent for approval.
- * 8. Make decisions regarding the selection of curricular or instructional problems for study at the district level.
- * 9. Make decisions related to the initiation, design, and direction of pilot projects requiring experimentation with new teaching content, tools, and techniques.
10. Seek direction and advice from the superintendent when planning curriculum projects.
- *11. Make decisions related to the participation of lay citizens on curriculum committees.
12. Submit recommendations regarding the structure and membership of curriculum committees to the superintendent for approval.
13. Submit written communications directed to staff to the superintendent for approval before transmittal.
- *14. Make decisions on procedures for evaluating the instructional program.
- *15. Develop and direct the process by which instructional materials, supplies, and equipment are selected.
16. Present proposed changes in the instructional supervision program to the superintendent for approval.
17. Discuss the nature and content of all reports made to the school board with the superintendent prior to making such reports.

- *18. Make decisions related to the implementation of recommendations of curriculum committees.
- 19. Submit curriculum guides, course syllabi, and resource units developed by curriculum committees to the superintendent for approval.
- *20. Make decisions regarding approval of applications by staff members for permission to attend professional conferences.
- *21. Make decisions regarding the selection and employment of instructors or staff for in-service programs.
- 22. Present plans for staff in-service to the superintendent for approval.
- 23. Secure the superintendent's permission to attend professional conferences.
- *24. Direct and coordinate the activities of directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.
- *25. Clarify and determine roles for and with directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.
- 26. Present frequent reports to the superintendent regarding the activities of directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.
- 27. Submit recommendations regarding the assignment of professional personnel to the superintendent for approval.
- 28. Recommend pilot programs related to psychological, health, and guidance services to the superintendent for approval.
- *29. Make decisions regarding the scope and nature of psychological, health, and guidance services.
- *30. Prepare that portion of the school budget dealing with district-wide instructional services, materials, and equipment.

31. Serve as a consultant to groups preparing educational specifications for new school construction.
- *32. Make decisions related to the educational specifications for new or remodeled buildings.
33. Submit reports and bulletins dealing with the instructional program to the superintendent for approval before releasing them to the public.
- *34. Initiate and conduct conferences on matters pertaining to the instructional program with parents and other lay citizens.
35. Secure the superintendent's approval of all materials to be released to the communication media of the community.

Role 2: Acting Toward Principals

- *36. Make final decisions on recommendations to be submitted to the superintendent regarding curriculum and instructional matters.
37. Serve as a consultant to principals regarding the development of recommended policies related to the instructional program.
- *38. Initiate periodic evaluations of policies governing instructional procedures.
- *39. Initiate and conduct district-wide meetings with teachers for the purpose of discussing instructional problems.
40. Secure principals' approval of proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems before presenting such proposals to teachers.
41. Make regular and frequent reports to principals regarding the activities of curriculum committees.
- *42. Plan procedures and techniques designed to measure the effectiveness of the instructional program.

43. Submit recommendations of curriculum committees to principals for their approval prior to further action.
- *44. Visit schools for the purpose of observing the instructional program in action.
- *45. Select teachers for participation in experimental instructional programs.
46. Initiate a pilot project in a school only upon the request or permission of the principal.
47. Request permission of principals prior to assigning teachers to curriculum projects.
- *48. Make final decisions regarding the selection of instructional materials, supplies, and equipment.
49. Submit frequent reports to principals regarding the activities of instructional supervisors.
50. Assign supervisors on the basis of principals' recommendations.
- *51. Serve as a consultant on instructional problems at the request of a teacher or teachers when that request has been made without the knowledge of the principal.
- *52. Determine guidelines controlling classroom visitation by instructional supervisors.
- *53. Visit a school without an invitation from the principal.
- *54. Visit a teacher's classroom without having been asked by the principal to do so.
- *55. Direct the implementation of procedures and techniques designed to measure program effectiveness.
56. Make frequent reports to principals regarding the activities and progress of curriculum committees.

- *57. Evaluate principals for the record.
- *58. Evaluate teachers for the record.
- 59. Evaluate teachers only upon the request of principals.
- *60. Supervise the assignment and scheduling of teachers.
- 61. Restrict recommendations for the continued employment or dismissal of probationary teachers to those instances where such recommendations have been requested or approved by principals.
- *62. Recommend the continued employment or dismissal of principals.
- *63. Direct the assignment of principals.
- 64. Secure the approval of principals before assigning or transferring teachers.
- 65. Secure the permission of principals to discuss in-service needs with teachers.
- 66. Submit plans for teacher in-service programs to principals for approval.
- *67. Make decisions related to the development of criteria for assigning pupils to classroom groups within a given grade level or organizational plan.
- 68. Consult frequently with principals about the activities and performance of psychological, health, and guidance personnel.
- *69. Make decisions regarding the appropriate utilization of facilities for instructional purposes.
- *70. Decide which community drives and activities merit school participation.
- 71. Submit reports and bulletins dealing with the instructional program to principals for approval before distributing such reports to community.

Since superintendents and principals were asked to express only their role expectations for the position of assistant superintendent, and assistant superintendents were asked to indicate both their own role expectations for the position and their perceptions of the role expectations of superintendents and principals for the position, it was necessary to submit the role norm inventory to respondents in two forms (Appendix B). Superintendents and principals received the form entitled Expectations of Superintendents and Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction, and assistant superintendents received the form entitled Expectations and Perceptions of Assistant Superintendents for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction. Both forms contained identical items and response categories; however, assistant superintendents were provided with space to respond to each item three times.

The available response categories for each item are 1) absolutely must, 2) preferably should, 3) may or may not, 4) preferably should not, and 5) absolutely must not.

Superintendents and principals were asked to respond to each item in terms of the following question:

"As a superintendent (principal), do you feel that the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction should or should not do the following things?"

Assistant superintendents were asked to respond to each item three times. First, they were asked to respond in terms of the question, "As an assistant superintendent, do you feel that the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction should or should not do the following things?" For the second and third response, they were asked to respond to each item in terms of the statement, "As an assistant superintendent, I think that most superintendents (principals) would say that the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction should or should not do the following things."

In addition to the role norm inventory, the instrument included a face sheet requesting information related to the respondents' professional preparation and experience.

Collection of Data

The instrument was mailed to all respondents for completion. Approximately one month later, a follow-up letter (Appendix A) and a second copy of the instrument were mailed to those respondents who had not responded to the previous request for participation.

Included in the sample, were 50 superintendents, 55 assistant superintendents in charge of instruction, 110 secondary school principals and 283 elementary school principals.

The instrument was completed and returned by 41 superintendents, 50 assistant superintendents, 86 secondary school principals and 224 elementary school principals. Expressed in percentages, 82 per cent of the superintendents, 90.9 per cent of the assistant superintendents, 78.2 per cent of the secondary school principals and 79.2 per cent of the elementary school principals included in the sample completed and returned the instrument. In terms of district size, the completed instrument was

TABLE IV

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS INCLUDED IN STUDY

Role Defining Group	Number in Sample	Respondents (Number)	Respondents (Per Cent)
Superintendents	50	41	82.0
Assistant Superintendents	55	50	90.9
Secondary School Principals	110	86	78.2
Elementary School Principals	283	224	79.2
All Principals	393	310	78.9
All Groups	498	401	80.5

received from 40 secondary school principals employed by districts employing 6 or more secondary school principals, 46 secondary school principals employed by districts employing fewer than 6 secondary school principals, 116 elementary school principals employed by districts employing 15 or more elementary school principals, and 108 elementary school principals employed by districts employing fewer than 15 elementary school principals.

Analysis of the Data

The analysis of the data involved three problems: 1) the determination of intraposition consensus, 2) the determination of the "average" response from absolutely must to absolutely must not, and 3) the determination of significant differences among the responses of the three role-defining groups.

A measure of ordinal consensus developed by Professor Robert Leik of the University of Washington was used to measure intraposition consensus. This measure provides an agreement score with a theoretical range from -1.0 where 50 per cent of the responses are in each of the extreme categories, through 0.0 where 20 per cent of the responses are in each category, to +1.0 where all responses are in one category (Leik, 1966).

Mean response scores were determined by assigning the values of 1 to 5 to the response categories beginning with absolutely must, and then computing the mean for all responses to a given item.

The chi square test was used to determine significant differences among the responses of the three role-defining groups. This test may be used to determine the significance of differences between independent groups, and the measurement may be as weak as nominal scaling (Siegel, 1956).

The .05 level of significance was pre-determined as being indicative of significant differences between observed and expected frequencies.

The responses to the items of the instrument were transferred to IBM cards for statistical computation. The services of the University of Oregon Computer Center were used for the computer analysis of the data.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings concerning the role of the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction are presented in this chapter. As indicated in Chapter I, the purpose of the study was three-fold: 1) to determine the degree of intraposition position consensus, or agreement, within the three role-defining groups regarding their expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent; 2) to determine whether or not there are significant differences among the three role-defining groups regarding their expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent; and 3) to determine whether or not there are significant differences between assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals and the actual expectations expressed by superintendents and principals. Therefore, the presentation of the findings has been organized in the following sequence. First, the findings relative to the expectations of assistant superintendents and their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals are presented. Second, the expectations of superintendents and principals for the behavior of the assistant superintendent are

examined. Third, the expectations of assistant superintendents are compared with the expectations of superintendents and principals. Fourth, the assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals are compared with the actual expectations expressed by superintendents and principals. And fifth, significant differences are related to the three dimensions at the item matrix.

Expectations and Perceptions of Assistant Superintendents

When all normative statements included within the role norm inventory are examined, the agreement scores indicate a wide range of agreement among assistant superintendents. As is shown in Table V, the agreement scores for assistant superintendents' expectations range from a low score of .183, which indicates almost complete lack of agreement, to a high score of .817, which indicates a relatively high level of agreement. The agreement scores for assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of others reflect a similar range.

Insofar as the assistant superintendents' expectations are concerned, there are two role norms, numbers 62 and 63, where the agreement score is .183. For role norm 62 ("Recommend the continued employment or dismissal of

principals."), 28 per cent of the assistant superintendents responded absolutely must, 26 per cent preferably should, 6 per cent absolutely must not, 12 preferably should not, and the remaining 28 per cent responded may or may not. For role norm 63 ("Direct the assignment of principals."), 26 per cent responded absolutely must, 22 per cent preferably should, 6 per cent absolutely must not, 12 per cent preferably should not, and 34, may or may not.

TABLE V

LOWEST AND HIGHEST AGREEMENT SCORE AND MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES FOR ALL NORMS BY ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS' EXPECTATIONS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF THE EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS

	Lowest Agreement Score		Highest Agreement Score		Mean Agreement Score
	Norm	Score	Norm	Score	All Norms
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	62	.183	63	.817	.467
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:					
Superintendents	63	.133	16	.826	.464
Principals	58	.133	40	.740	.464

The assistant superintendents, in regard to their own expectations, are in highest agreement on role norm 16, ("Present proposed changes in the instructional supervision program to the superintendent for approval."). With

an agreement score of .817, 80 per cent responded absolutely must, 18 per cent preferably should, and 2 per cent may or may not.

While not identical, a similar point of view prevails among assistant superintendents on role norm 24 ("Direct and coordinate the activities of directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction."), the agreement score is .779. Seventy-eight per cent responded absolutely must, 18 per cent preferably should, and 4 per cent may or may not.

In terms of how they view the expectations of superintendents, assistant superintendents, with an agreement score of .133, are in lowest agreement on role norm 63 ("Direct the assignment of principals."). The lack of agreement is indicated by the distribution of responses. Twenty-six point five per cent responded absolutely must, 24.5 per cent preferably should, 6.1 per cent absolutely must not, 16.3 preferably should not, and 26.5 may or may not.

Assistant superintendents are, when viewing the expectations of superintendents, in highest agreement on role norm 16 ("Present proposed changes in the instructional program to the superintendent for approval."). Seventy-nine point two per cent responded absolutely must and 20.8 per cent preferably should.

As assistant superintendents view the expectations of principals, they are in lowest agreement on role norm 58 ("Evaluate teachers for the record."). With an agreement score of .133, assistant superintendents responded as follows: 10.2 per cent absolutely must, 12.2 per cent preferably should, 22.4 per cent absolutely must not, 28.6 per cent preferably should not, and 26.5 per cent may or may not.

Assistant superintendents are in highest agreement on how they view the expectations of principals for role norm 40 ("Secure principals' approval of proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems before presenting such proposals to teachers."). With an agreement score of .740, 77.1 per cent of the assistant superintendents responded absolutely must, 14.6 per cent preferably should, and 8.3 per cent may or may not.

The study deals with two role sectors: 1) the relationship of the position of the assistant superintendent to that of the superintendent, and 2) the relationship of the position of assistant superintendent to that of the school principal. In subsequent discussion and the accompanying tables, these role sectors are referred to as Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) and Role 2 (acting toward principals).

When these roles are viewed independently and mean agreement scores are computed for each, some differences between the roles are found. These differences are indicated in Table VI.

The assistant superintendents are in higher agreement regarding their own expectations for Role 1 (acting toward the superintendent) than they are for Role 2. Their mean agreement score is .514 as contrasted with a mean agreement score of .420 for Role 2 (acting toward principals). They are also in higher agreement among themselves when reporting their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals for Role 1 than they are for Role 2.

The mean agreement score for their perceptions of the superintendents' expectations for Role 1 is .523 as opposed to .406 for their perception of superintendents' expectations for Role 2. The assistant superintendents' views of the expectations of principals for Role 1 are reflected by a mean agreement score of .473, and for Role 2 the mean agreement score is .455.

When the mean agreement scores are viewed vertically for each role, assistant superintendents are in lowest agreement relative to Role 1 when reporting their perceptions of the expectations of principals for the appropriate behavior of the assistant superintendent in acting toward

TABLE VI

MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES FOR ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS'
 EXPECTATIONS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF THE
 EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND
 PRINCIPALS BY ROLES AND
 TOTAL POSITION

	Assistant Superintendents' Roles		
	Acting Toward Superintendents	Acting Toward Principals	Total Position
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	.514	.420	.467
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:			
Superintendents	.523	.406	.464
Principals	.473	.455	.464

the superintendent. Conversely, assistant superintendents are in highest agreement regarding Role 2 when reporting their perceptions of the expectations of principals.

As was noted in Chapter III, each role of the assistant superintendent was represented on the role norm inventory by approximately equal numbers of role norms indicating independent and dependent behavior on the part of the assistant superintendent. When the responses of assistant superintendents are analyzed in terms of the independent and dependent role norms for each role, there are differences not only between the mean agreement scores for independent and dependent role norms, but also between the mean agreement scores of the two roles. These data are shown in Tables VII and VIII.

So far as Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) is concerned, assistant superintendents when expressing their own expectations are slightly higher in agreement on independent behavior role norms than they are on dependent behavior role norms. The mean agreement scores are .521 and .508. However, assistant superintendents, when reporting their views of the expectations of superintendents, have a mean agreement score of .535 indicating they are in higher agreement on dependent behavior role norms than on independent behavior norms. With respect to their perceptions of the expectations of principals, the mean agreement

TABLE VII

MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES FOR ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS'
 EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE EXPECTATIONS
 OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS REGARDING
 INDEPENDENCE OF ACTION IN ACTING
 TOWARD SUPERINTENDENTS

	<u>Acting Toward Superintendents</u>		All Norms
	<u>Independent</u> Behavior Norms	<u>Dependent</u> Behavior Norms	
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	.521	.508	.514
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:			
Superintendents	.510	.535	.523
Principals	.478	.468	.473

TABLE VIII

MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES FOR ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS'
 EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE EXPECTATIONS
 OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS REGARDING
 INDEPENDENCE OF ACTION IN ACTING
 TOWARD PRINCIPALS

	<u>Acting Toward Principals</u>		All Norms
	Independent Behavior Norms	Dependent Behavior Norms	
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	.389	.455	.420
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:			
Superintendents	.373	.443	.406
Principals	.393	.524	.455

scores of .478 and .468 indicate that assistant superintendents are slightly higher in agreement on independent behavior role norms.

The data in Table VIII reveal that with regard to Role 2 (acting toward principals) assistant superintendents are in higher agreement on dependent behavior role norms than they are on independent behavior role norms insofar as both their own expectations and perceptions of the expectations of superintendents are concerned.

When the mean agreement scores reported in Table VII are contrasted with those of Table VIII, the scores for both independent and dependent behavior role norms are higher for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) than those for Role 2 (acting toward principals).

The behaviors associated with a role may be thought of as lying along a continuum from required to prohibited. The response categories of absolutely must, preferably should, may or may not, preferably should not, and absolutely must not may be thought of as approximating this continuum. Similarly, responses in the categories of absolutely must and preferably should may be viewed as an indication of approval; responses in the may or may not category, as an indication of permissiveness; and responses in the categories of preferably should not and absolutely must not, as an indication of disapproval.

An examination of the distribution of the responses of assistant superintendents for each of the two roles reveals some similarities as well as differences. These data are shown in Table IX.

TABLE IX

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS' EXPECTATIONS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS BY RESPONSE CATEGORIES, ROLE, AND TOTAL POSITION

	Response Categories				
	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN
<u>Acting Toward Superintendents</u>					
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	40.4	33.7	19.5	4.6	1.7
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:					
Superintendents	38.2	34.8	21.2	3.6	2.1
Principals	28.5	34.3	30.5	4.8	1.9
<u>Acting Toward Principals</u>					
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	31.2	31.2	25.1	9.0	3.5
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:					
Superintendents	28.4	32.7	27.3	8.4	3.2
Principals	29.8	29.4	27.1	8.7	5.0
<u>Total Position</u>					
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	35.7	32.4	22.4	6.8	2.6
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:					
Superintendents	33.3	33.7	24.3	6.1	2.6
Principals	29.1	31.8	28.8	6.8	3.5

When reporting their own expectations and their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals for both Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) and Role 2 (acting toward principals), assistant superintendents most frequently respond in those categories indicating required behavior. For example, for Role 1, 74.1 per cent of the responses indicating the assistant superintendents' expectations are found in the absolutely must and preferably should categories. For Role 2, 62.4 per cent of the responses indicating their expectations are in these two categories. A similar pattern prevails as far as the assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals are concerned. In all instances, the response categories preferably should not and absolutely must not are used infrequently. It should be noted that the distribution of responses may be a function of the particular role norms included in the inventory.

Differences in the frequencies of responses in those categories indicating required behavior are found when the distributions for Role 1 are compared with those for Role 2. Assistant superintendents respond less frequently in the absolutely must and preferably should categories when expressing their expectations for Role 2 than when

reporting their expectations for Role 1. For Role 2, 62.4 per cent of their responses were in these two categories as contrasted with 74.1 per cent for Role 1. Again, a similar pattern is found when their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents are examined. Seventy-three per cent of their responses for Role 1 are found in the required behavior categories and 61.1 per cent for Role 2. The difference is not nearly as marked insofar as their perceptions of the expectations of principals are concerned. For Role 1, 62.8 per cent of the responses are in the required behavior categories, and for Role 2 the percentage is 59.2.

The data in Table X show the distribution of responses by percentage of responses in each category for independent and dependent behavior role norms for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents).

The majority of responses for both sets of role norms and for both the assistant superintendents' expectations and perceptions are found again in the required behavior response categories of absolutely must and preferably should. When independent behavior role norms are considered separately, these two response categories combined account for 73.5 per cent of the responses indicating assistant superintendents' expectations, 69.4 per cent of the responses indicating their perceptions of the

TABLE X

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS' EXPECTATIONS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS BY RESPONSE CATEGORIES, ROLE, AND INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT BEHAVIOR NORMS

	Response Categories				
	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN
<u>Acting Toward Superintendents</u>					
<u>Independent Behavior Norms</u>					
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	37.0	36.5	19.7	4.1	2.8
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:					
Superintendents	33.0	36.4	23.3	3.5	3.8
Principal	25.2	36.8	30.5	4.4	3.1
<u>Dependent Behavior Norms</u>					
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	43.7	31.0	19.3	5.1	0.8
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:					
Superintendents	43.2	33.3	19.3	3.7	0.5
Principals	31.7	31.9	30.4	5.2	0.8

expectations of superintendents, and 62.0 per cent of the responses indicating their perceptions of principals expectations. When dependent behavior role norms are examined, the combined categories for required behavior account for 74.7 per cent of the responses expressing assistant superintendents' expectations, 76.5 per cent of the responses expressing their perceptions of superintendents' expectations, and 63.6 per cent of the responses

expressing their perceptions of the expectations of principals. There is a slight tendency for assistant superintendents when reporting both their expectations and perceptions to respond in the absolutely must category more frequently when responding to dependent behavior role norms than when responding to independent behavior role norms.

Table XI shows the percentage distribution of responses for independent and dependent behavior role norms for Role 2 (acting toward principals).

With the exception of the assistant superintendents' perceptions of principals expectations for independent behavior role norms, in all instances the majority of responses again are found in categories absolutely must and preferably should. When the two sets of norms for this role are examined separately, there is a much stronger tendency for assistant superintendents to express their expectations and perceptions in terms of required behavior for dependent behavior role norms than there is for independent behavior role norms. For dependent behavior role norms, 70.2 per cent of the responses indicating the assistant superintendents' expectations are found in the absolutely must and preferably should categories.

TABLE XI

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS' EXPECTATIONS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS BY RESPONSE CATEGORIES, ROLE, AND INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT BEHAVIOR NORMS

	Response Categories				
	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN
<u>Acting Toward Principals</u>					
<u>Independent Behavior Norms</u>					
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	26.5	28.8	26.5	12.9	5.2
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:					
Superintendents	26.0	29.9	27.4	12.2	4.5
Principals	18.1	26.6	32.5	14.2	8.5
<u>Dependent Behavior Norms</u>					
Assistant Superintendents' Expectations	36.4	33.8	23.6	4.5	1.7
Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of Expectations of:					
Superintendents	31.1	35.8	27.2	4.2	1.7
Principals	42.8	32.4	21.0	2.6	1.1

By contrast, only 55.3 per cent of their expectation responses for independent behavior role norms are in these two categories. With regard to their perceptions of superintendents' expectations, 66.9 per cent of their responses for dependent behavior role norms are found in these two categories as opposed to 55.9 per cent for independent behavior norms. In terms of their perceptions

of principals' expectations, assistant superintendents perceived principals as strongly endorsing dependent behavior with 75.2 per cent of their responses in the absolutely must and preferably should categories. Conversely, only 44.7 per cent of the assistant superintendents recorded their perceptions of the expectations of principals for independent behavior role norms in these two categories.

In order to determine whether or not assistant superintendents' own expectations for their behavior differ significantly from their perceptions of superintendents' and principals' expectations, the chi-square test was used to compare the distributions of their responses for each of the 71 role norms.

When the assistant superintendents' expectations are compared with their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents, none of the chi-square values are significant at the .05 level. When the assistant superintendents' expectations are compared with their perceptions of the expectations of principals, only one chi-square value is significant. The chi-square value of 14.57 for role norm 50 ("Assign supervisors on the basis of principals' recommendations.") is significant at the .01 level. The assistant superintendents' expectation

responses indicate a prevailing or mean response score of 2.68 with an agreement score of .467, while the mean response score for their perceptions is 2.08, and the agreement score is .653. The assistant superintendents' own expectations indicate a permissive attitude toward this norm, but they perceive principals as preferring the assignment of supervisors on the basis of principals' recommendations.

Expectations of Superintendents and Principals

The range of agreement scores for superintendents and principals is shown in Table XII. While there is some variation, the range of agreement scores for superintendents and principals is quite similar to that of the assistant superintendents' expectations. In each case, the lowest agreement score for any one role norm approaches zero. The highest agreement scores vary from .752 for all principals to .854 for superintendents, and the lowest agreement scores vary from .098 for elementary school principals to .187 for superintendents. Mean agreement scores tend to be grouped near the mid-point (.476) between the highest and lowest agreement scores. Superintendents have the highest mean agreement score of .534, and the lowest mean agreement score, .467, is that of assistant superintendents (See Table V.).

TABLE XII

LOWEST AND HIGHEST AGREEMENT SCORES AND MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES FOR ALL NORMS BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS

	Lowest Agreement		Highest Agreement		Mean Agreement Score All Norms
	Score	Norm	Score	Norm	
Superintendents	.187	60	.854	2	.534
All Principals	.120	1	.752	17	.468
Elementary School Principals	.098	1	.761	17	.471
Secondary School Principals	.176	1	.755	2	.470

Superintendents are in highest agreement on role norm 2 ("Present to the superintendent recommendations related to the instructional program and requiring school board approval."). Their mean response score is 1.17 with 82.5 per cent of the responses in the absolutely must category. The remaining responses are all in the preferably should category. Superintendents are in lowest agreement on role norm 60 ("Supervise the assignment and scheduling of teachers."). The mean response score of 3.05 and the low agreement score indicating a relatively even distribution of responses is reflected in the actual distribution: 14.6 per cent absolutely must, 17.1 per cent preferably should, 29.3 per cent may or may not, 26.8 per cent preferably should not, and 12.2 per cent absolutely should not.

All principals (elementary and secondary school principals as a combined sample) are in highest agreement on role norm 17 ("Discuss the nature and content of all reports made to the school board with the superintendent prior to making such reports."). The mean response for this norm is 1.30. Seventy-three point eight per cent of the responses are in the absolutely must category, 22.7 per cent are in the preferably should category, and the remaining responses are in the may or may not category. The combined sample of principals is in lowest agreement on role norm 1 ("Formulate and recommend directly to the school board policies governing the instructional program."). With a mean response score of 3.77, 7.6 per cent of the principals responded absolutely must, 12.8 per cent preferably should, 16.1 per cent may or may not, 22.4 per cent preferably should not, and 41.1 per cent absolutely must not. Despite a low agreement score, the majority of the responses, 63.5 per cent, indicate disapproval of this behavior.

Elementary school principals are also in highest agreement on role norm 17 ("Discuss the nature and content of all reports made to the school board with the superintendent prior to making such reports."). The mean response score of 1.29 indicates strong approval. Seventy-four

point four per cent responded absolutely must, 22.4 preferably should, and 3.1 per cent may or may not. Elementary school principals are in lowest agreement on role norm 1 ("Formulate and recommend directly to the school board policies governing the instructional program."). With a mean response score of 3.73, 7.3 per cent responded absolutely must, 14.2 per cent preferably should, 17.0 per cent may or may not, 20.6 per cent preferably should not, and 40.8 per cent absolutely must not. Again the responses of a majority of principals indicate most elementary school principals disapprove.

Secondary school principals are in highest agreement on role norm 2 ("Present to the superintendent recommendations related to the instructional program and requiring school board approval."). As indicated by the mean response score of 1.29, the majority of secondary school principals responded absolutely must (75.3 per cent) and preferably should (20.0). The remaining responses are in the may or may not category. As is the case with elementary school principals and the combined sample of principals, secondary school principals are in lowest agreement on role norm 1. Their responses follow a pattern similar to that of the other samples of principals. Eight point one per cent responded absolutely must, 9.3 per cent preferably

should, 14.0 per cent may or may not, 26.7 per cent preferably should not, and 41.9 per cent absolutely must not.

When the mean agreement scores are computed for each of the two roles some differences appear not only within each sample but also among the samples. The results are shown in Table XIII. The lowest mean agreement score for all four samples is for Role 2 (acting toward principals). For Role 2, the lowest mean agreement score (.446) is for the responses of the combined sample of all principals. The highest mean agreement score for Role 2 is that of the superintendents (.497).

TABLE XIII

MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES FOR EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS BY ROLES AND TOTAL POSITION

	Assistant Superintendents' Roles		Total Position
	Acting Toward Superintendent	Acting Toward Principals	
Superintendents	.573	.497	.534
All Principals	.490	.446	.468
Elementary School Principals	.489	.453	.471
Secondary School Principals	.491	.450	.470

While there is only a very slight variation in the mean agreement scores of the three samples of principals for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents), the highest mean agreement score for Role 1 is that of the superintendents (.573). In all cases, the mean agreement scores are higher for Role 1 than for Role 2.

Whenever the mean agreement scores for each role are broken down and mean agreement scores are computed for each set of independent and dependent behavior role norms, additional differences are noted. The data for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) are shown in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES FOR EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS REGARDING INDEPENDENCE OF ACTION IN ACTING TOWARD SUPERINTENDENTS

	<u>Acting Toward Superintendents</u>		All Norms Role 1
	<u>Independent Behavior Norms</u>	<u>Dependent Behavior Norms</u>	
Superintendents	.553	.592	.573
All Principals	.487	.493	.490
Elementary School Principals	.484	.495	.489
Secondary School Principals	.494	.488	.491

In all but one instance, the mean agreement scores are higher for dependent behavior role norms than for independent behavior role norms. In the case of secondary school principals, their mean agreement score of .494 is higher for independent behavior norms than is their mean agreement score of .488 for dependent behavior norms. (It may be recalled from Table VII that for Role 1, the mean agreement score (.521) of the assistant superintendents for independent behavior role norms is higher than their mean agreement score (.508) for dependent behavior role norms.) The mean agreement scores for superintendents' expectations for each set of behavior norms is higher than the corresponding mean agreement scores of each of the samples of principals.

Table XV shows similar results for Role 2 (acting toward principals). All samples have higher agreement scores for dependent behavior role norms than for independent behavior role norms. The difference is less pronounced for superintendents' expectations than are the differences within each of the sample populations of principals. Superintendents have a mean agreement score of .490 for independent behavior role norms, and .504 for dependent behavior role norms. By way of contrast, secondary school principals have a mean agreement score of .409

for independent behavior role norms and .495 for dependent behavior role norms.

TABLE XV

MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES FOR EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS REGARDING INDEPENDENCE OF ACTION IN ACTING TOWARD PRINCIPALS

	Acting Toward Principals		All Norms Role 2
	Independent Behavior Norms	Dependent Behavior Norms	
Superintendents	.490	.504	.497
All Principals	.415	.481	.446
Elementary School Principals	.426	.484	.453
Secondary School Principals	.409	.495	.450

The mean agreement scores for all role norms for Role 2 indicate that there is a lower level of agreement within each sample for Role 2 than for Role 1. In all instances, the mean agreement scores are lower for Role 2.

When the responses indicating the expectations of superintendents and principals are totaled by response categories for each role, the findings show a similar response pattern for all samples. These data are shown in Table XVI. For both Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) and Role 2 (acting toward principals), both

TABLE XVI

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS
AND PRINCIPALS BY RESPONSE CATEGORIES, ROLE,
AND TOTAL POSITION

	Response Categories				
	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN
<u>Acting Toward Superintendents</u>					
Superintendents	33.4	42.1	18.9	3.6	2.1
All Principals	35.3	37.6	20.8	4.1	2.2
Elementary School Principals	34.5	38.3	20.9	4.1	2.2
Secondary School Principals	37.4	35.6	20.6	4.2	2.2
<u>Acting Toward Principals</u>					
Superintendents	23.9	40.5	24.7	7.4	3.5
All Principals	22.9	35.6	27.8	9.1	4.6
Elementary School Principals	21.9	36.7	28.3	8.9	4.2
Secondary School Principals	25.2	32.9	26.7	9.4	5.6
<u>Total Position</u>					
Superintendents	28.6	41.3	21.8	5.5	2.8
All Principals	29.0	36.6	24.4	6.6	3.4
Elementary School Principals	28.1	37.5	24.6	6.5	3.2
Secondary School Principals	31.2	34.3	23.7	6.9	4.0

superintendents and principals respond most frequently in the absolutely must and preferably should categories. Of these two response categories in all but one instance, a higher percentage of responses is found in the preferably should category. Secondary school principals have slightly more responses in the absolutely must category than in the preferably should category.

A second aspect of the response pattern is that all respondents, superintendents and principals, use the absolutely must category less frequently when expressing their expectations for Role 2 than they do for Role 1. For example, 23.9 per cent of the superintendents' responses for Role 2 are found in the absolutely must category in contrast to 33.4 per cent for Role 1. The combined sample of all principals has 22.9 per cent of its responses in the absolutely must category for Role 2 and 35.3 per cent in this category for Role 1.

In all cases, the response categories of preferably should not and absolutely must not are used infrequently by all respondents regardless of the role. This pattern is similar to that of the responses of assistant superintendents. Again, the form of the response distributions may be a function of the particular role norms included in the inventory.

The data in Table XVII show the distribution of responses by percentage of responses in each category for independent and dependent behavior role norms for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents).

TABLE XVII

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS BY RESPONSE CATEGORIES, ROLE, AND INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT BEHAVIOR NORMS

	Response Categories				
	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN
<u>Acting Toward Superintendents</u>					
<u>Independent Behavior Norms</u>					
Superintendents	27.7	45.5	17.7	5.1	4.0
All Principals	27.6	41.9	21.7	5.3	3.5
Elementary School Principals	27.3	42.0	22.1	5.1	3.4
Secondary School Principals	28.5	41.4	20.8	5.6	3.8
<u>Dependent Behavior Norms</u>					
Superintendents	38.7	38.9	19.9	2.2	0.3
All Principals	42.5	33.5	20.0	3.0	0.9
Elementary School Principals	41.3	34.8	19.8	3.1	1.1
Secondary School Principals	45.8	30.2	20.4	2.9	0.8

Again, the majority of responses for both superintendents and principals are found in the two categories absolutely must and preferably should. When independent behavior role norms are examined separately, these two categories combined account for 73.2 per cent of the superintendents' responses, 69.5 per cent of all principals' responses, 69.3 per cent of the elementary school principals' responses, and 69.9 per cent of the responses of secondary school principals. For dependent behavior role norms, the percentages in these two categories are slightly higher: 77.6 per cent for superintendents, 76.0 per cent for all principals, 76.1 per cent for elementary school principals, and 76.0 per cent for secondary school principals. This difference is accounted for in part by the fact that in all instances the percentage of responses in the absolutely must category for dependent behavior role norms is higher than the percentage of responses in the same category for independent behavior role norms.

Table XVIII shows the percentage distribution of responses for independent and dependent behavior role norms for Role 2 (acting toward principals).

When the distributions of responses for independent behavior role norms are examined, less than 50 per cent of the responses of principals (48.1 per cent for all principals, 48.9 per cent for elementary school principals, and

TABLE XVIII

PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS
AND PRINCIPALS BY RESPONSE CATEGORIES, ROLE, AND
INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT BEHAVIOR NORMS

	Response Categories				
	AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN
<u>Acting Toward Principals</u>					
<u>Independent Behavior Norms</u>					
Superintendents	23.8	36.2	26.0	9.9	4.1
All Principals	17.6	30.5	30.8	13.5	7.6
Elementary School Principals	17.1	31.8	31.1	13.1	6.9
Secondary School Principals	18.8	27.1	30.2	14.4	9.5
<u>Dependent Behavior Norms</u>					
Superintendents	24.0	45.4	23.2	4.6	2.8
All Principals	28.8	41.4	24.5	4.1	1.3
Elementary School Principals	27.3	42.1	25.1	4.2	1.3
Secondary School Principals	32.5	39.5	22.8	3.9	1.3

45.9 per cent for secondary school principals) are found in the absolutely must and preferably should categories. Sixty per cent of the superintendents responded absolutely must or preferably should.

The percentage of responses in these categories for dependent behavior role norms indicates stronger approval

by all samples for dependent behavior on the part of the assistant superintendents. Sixty-nine point four per cent of the superintendents' responses are found in the two categories, 70.2 per cent of all principals' responses, 69.4 per cent of elementary school principals' responses, and 72.0 per cent of secondary school principals.

In an effort to determine whether the differences between the expectations of superintendents and principals for the behavior of the assistant superintendent are significant, chi-square values were computed for each of the 71 role norms. Distribution comparisons were made between the responses of superintendents and all principals, between the responses of superintendents and elementary school principals, between the responses of superintendents and secondary school principals, and between the responses of elementary school principals and secondary school principals. The data for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) are shown in Table XIX. This table presents the level of significance for each of those role norms for which the differences between role-defining sample populations are significant at or beyond the .05 level with four degrees of freedom. Chi-square values for role norms 1, 3, 13, and 22 are significant for the comparisons indicated in the table.

TABLE XIX

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXPECTATIONS OF
 SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS FOR ROLE 1:
 ACTING TOWARD SUPERINTENDENTS

Role Norm	Superintendents All Principals	Superintendents E. Principals	Superintendents S. Principals	E. Principals S. Principals
1	.050	.050	----	----
3	.025	.050	.010	----
13	.050	.010	----	----
22	----	----	----	.005

For role norm 1 ("Formulate and recommend directly to the school board policies governing the instructional program."), the distribution of the responses of superintendents differ significantly from those of both the combined sample of principals and of elementary school principals. While the majority of respondents in each of the three samples indicate strong disapproval of this role norm, the agreement scores of all principals (.120) and of elementary school principals (.098) indicate a low level of agreement. Secondary school principals also tend to report disapproval of the role norm, and their agreement score (.176) is somewhat higher than that of all principals and elementary school principals.

For role norm 3 ("Direct the development and operation of an instructional materials center for teacher use."), all role-defining groups generally express approval. However, differences between the responses of superintendents and the three samples of principals arise as the result of a high level of agreement among superintendents and a correspondingly low level of agreement among principals.

The majority of respondents, both superintendents and principals, hold a permissive attitude toward role norm 13 ("Submit written communications directed to the staff to

the superintendent for approval before transmittal."). That is, the majority of responses are found in the may or may not category. However, the agreement scores of all principals and elementary school principals reflect low agreement and a subsequent wide dispersion of responses.

A significant difference exists between elementary school principals and secondary school principals on role norm 22 ("Present plans for staff in-service to the superintendent for approval. "). While both groups report approval for the role norm, 50.0 per cent of the secondary school principals responded absolutely must, 45.3 per cent preferably should, 3.5 per cent may or may not, and the remainder preferably should not. Thirty-five per cent of all elementary school principals responded absolutely must, 42.6 per cent preferably should, 20.6 per cent may or may not, 1.3 per cent preferably should not, and 0.4 per cent absolutely must not.

Table XX shows the level of significance for each of those role norms for Role 2 (acting toward principals) on which the response distribution differences between role-defining sample populations are significant at or beyond the .05 level with four degrees of freedom.

There are significant differences between the responses of superintendents and all principals, and between the responses of superintendents and elementary school

TABLE XX

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXPECTATIONS OF
SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS FOR ROLE 2:
ACTING TOWARD PRINCIPALS

Role Norm	Superintendents All Principals	Superintendents E. Principals	Superintendents S. Principals	E. Principals S. Principals
39	.050	.025	----	----
40	----	----	.050	----
43	----	----	----	.005
45	.001	.001	.001	----
48	.005	.010	.001	----
60	----	----	.010	.001
64	.001	.005	.001	----
67	.005	.005	.025	----
69	----	----	.050	.050
70	----	----	.050	----

principals for role norm 39 ("Initiate and conduct district-wide meetings with teachers for the purpose of discussing instructional problems."). Most respondents in each of the three role-defining groups indicate approval for this role norm. The differences result from a lower level of agreement among the sample populations of principals than among superintendents. The mean agreement score of superintendents is .695. For all principals, the agreement score is .501, and for elementary school principals, the agreement score is .517.

The difference between superintendents and secondary school principals for role norm 40 ("Secure principals' approval of proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems before presenting such proposals to teachers.") are significant. While both groups indicate approval for this role norm, there is a stronger tendency among secondary school principals to view the behavior represented as required or mandatory than there is among superintendents.

For role norm 43 ("Submit recommendations of curriculum committees to principals for their approval prior to further action."), the responses of elementary school principals are significantly different from those of secondary school principals. Again, both groups indicate

approval for this role norm, but secondary school principals give stronger support for making the behavior required.

Significant differences exist between superintendents and each of the three samples of principals regarding role norm 45 ("Select teachers for participation in experimental instructional programs."). With 82.5 per cent of their responses in the categories absolutely must and preferably should, superintendents express strong approval for this role norm. Principals in each group tend to support a permissive attitude, however, their responses are characterized by agreement scores lower than that of superintendents.

Significant differences also are present between superintendents and each of the samples of principals for role norm 48 ("Make final decisions regarding the selection of instructional materials, supplies, and equipment.") A majority of superintendents responded preferably should. The mean response scores of each of the samples of principals indicate a permissive attitude, but the agreement scores are relatively low and responses are widely distributed.

For role norm 60 ("Supervise the assignment and scheduling of teachers.") significant differences are found between superintendents and secondary school

principals, and between secondary school and elementary school principals. Superintendents with an agreement score of .187 are represented by a low level of agreement, and their responses are rather evenly distributed among the five response categories. Secondary school principals, while far from complete agreement, tend to view this behavior as prohibited. Elementary school principals tend to be more permissive.

Superintendents disagree significantly with each of the samples of principals on role norm 64 ("Secure the approval of principals before assigning or transferring teachers.") Superintendents have a high agreement score (.701) and a mean response score of 2.00 indicating that the majority of them responded in the preferably should category. The larger number of principals in each sample also approve of the behavior indicated, but lower agreement scores reflect a wider distribution of scores than that of superintendents.

There are also significant differences between the responses of superintendents and each of the sample populations of principals for role norm 67 ("Make decisions related to the development of criteria for assigning pupils to classroom groups within a given grade level or organizational plan."). There is only slight variation in the agreement scores of the four role-defining groups.

These scores range from a low of .370 for secondary school principals to a high of .403 for elementary school principals. The majority of superintendents' responses are found in the preferably should and may or may not categories and the majority of principals' responses in each case are found in the may or may not and preferably should not categories.

Insofar as role norm 69 ("Make decisions regarding the appropriate utilization of facilities for instructional purposes.") is concerned, there are significant differences between superintendents and secondary school principals, and between secondary school principals and elementary school principals. With an agreement score of .551, superintendents generally approve of the behavior indicated, but most do not view the role norm as mandatory. Secondary school principals evidence less agreement, and tend to adopt a more permissive attitude. Elementary school principals take a position closer to that of superintendents.

Significant differences are present between superintendents and principals on role norm 70 ("Decide which community drives and activities merit school participation."). Superintendents agree more highly than do secondary school principals, and adopt a permissive attitude. Secondary school principals are less permissive and tend

to adopt the position that the assistant superintendent preferably should not engage in this behavior.

In retrospect, it should be noted that statistically significant differences between the expectations of superintendents and principals occur more frequently on role norms describing the behavior of assistant superintendents toward principals, than is the case for role norms describing the behavior of assistant superintendents toward superintendents.

Comparison of Assistant Superintendents' Expectations
with the Expectations of Superintendents
and Principals

The next step in the analysis of the data is that of comparing the expectations of assistant superintendents with the expectations of superintendents and principals. In order to identify differences that are significant, chi-square values were computed for each of the 71 role norms. The data for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) are presented in Table XXI. This table shows the level of significance for each of those role norms for which the differences between the expectations of assistant superintendents and the expectations of the other role-defining groups are significant at or beyond the .05 level with four degrees of freedom. Chi-square values

TABLE XXI

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXPECTATIONS OF
 ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS AND OTHERS FOR ROLE 1:
 ACTING TOWARD SUPERINTENDENTS

Role Norm	A. Sup'ts. Superintendents	A. Sup'ts. All Principals	A. Sup'ts. E. Principals	A. Sup'ts. S. Principals
6	-----	-----	-----	.025
12	-----	-----	-----	.050
13	-----	-----	-----	.050
30	-----	.010	.010	-----
31	.025	.010	.005	-----
32	.050	.005	.010	.025
33	-----	.010	.025	-----

were found to be significant for role norms 6, 12, 13, 30, 31, 32, and 33 for the comparisons indicated in the table.

The responses of assistant superintendents and those of secondary school principals for role norm 6 ("Initiate and conduct meetings with principals for the purpose of discussing instructional problems.") differ significantly. Assistant superintendents with a high agreement score (.750) and a mean response score of 1.30 strongly approve this role norm. A majority of secondary school principals also strongly approve, but their responses are more widely distributed among the response categories.

Assistant superintendents also differ significantly with secondary school principals on role norm 12 ("Submit recommendations regarding the structure and membership of curriculum committees to the superintendent for approval."). As is indicated by a comparatively low agreement score (.371), the responses of assistant superintendents are widely distributed with the larger percentage of responses reported in the categories preferably should and may or may not. Secondary school principals are in higher agreement (.471) than are assistant superintendents, and express stronger approval for the role norm.

For role norm 13 ("Submit written communications directed to staff to the superintendent for approval

before transmittal."), significant differences exist between assistant superintendents and secondary school principals. Few assistant superintendents view this behavior as being required or prohibited. Most express a permissive point of view. While most secondary school principals also report a permissive attitude, more of them express strong approval for the role norm than do assistant superintendents.

Assistant superintendents differ significantly with the combined sample of all principals and with elementary school principals on role norm 30 ("Prepare that portion of the school budget dealing with district-wide instructional services, materials and equipment."). Assistant superintendents strongly approve of this role norm (80.0 per cent). Both samples of principals support the role norm, but most view the behavior as preferred rather than required.

For role norm 31 ("Serve as a consultant to groups preparing educational specifications for new school construction."), assistant superintendents differ significantly with superintendents, all principals, and elementary school principals. While all four groups express approval for this role norm, assistant superintendents voice stronger approval than do superintendents and

principals. Superintendents are in highest agreement (.736), and 68.3 per cent of their responses are found in the preferably should category.

Assistant superintendents differ significantly with all four comparison groups on role norm 32 ("Make decisions related to educational specifications for new or remodeled buildings."). While the agreement scores are not high, most respondents in each of the five groups express approval of the role norm. The differences arise as the result of superintendents and principals viewing this behavior as that in which the assistant superintendent preferably should engage. Assistant superintendents tend to support stronger approval.

The chi-square values for role norm 33 ("Submit reports and bulletins dealing with the instructional program to the superintendent for approval before releasing them to the public.") show that significant differences exist between assistant superintendents and the combined sample of principals, and between assistant superintendents and elementary school principals. The agreement scores range from .400 for assistant superintendents to .471 for elementary school principals. The responses of assistant superintendents tend to express less approval for this role norm than do principals. Over 50.0 per cent of the

principals in each group view the behavior as being mandatory.

Table XXII presents data for Role 2 (acting toward principals). The table shows the level of significance for each of the role norms for which the differences between the expectations of assistant superintendents and other sample populations are significant at or beyond the .05 level with four degrees of freedom. Chi-square values were found to be significant for role norms 37, 39, 40, 41, 45, 47, 48, 53, 54, 57, 60, 63, and 69.

The expectations of assistant superintendents differ significantly from those of elementary school principals for role norm 37 ("Serve as a consultant to principals regarding the development of recommended policies related to the instructional program."). Both groups of respondents indicate approval for this role norm. The agreement scores are comparatively high, and the difference in their responses is reflected by the mean response scores. Assistant superintendents have a mean response score of 1.40, and elementary school principals have a mean response score of 1.63. These scores indicate stronger approval on the part of assistant superintendents.

For role norm 39 ("Initiate and conduct district-wide meetings with teachers for the purpose of discussing instructional problems."), the responses of assistant

TABLE XXII

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXPECTATIONS OF
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS AND OTHERS FOR ROLE 2:
ACTING TOWARD PRINCIPALS

Role Norm	A. Sup'ts. Superintendents	A. Sup'ts. All Principals	A. Sup'ts. E. Principals	A. Sup'ts. S. Principals
37	----	----	.050	----
39	.025	.050	.010	----
40	.050	----	----	----
41	----	.050	.050	----
45	.050	----	----	----
47	.050	----	----	----
48	.050	----	----	----
53	.010	.001	.001	.001
54	.005	.001	.001	.005
57	----	----	----	.050
60	----	----	----	.025
63	----	.005	.025	.005
69	----	----	----	.025

superintendents differ significantly from those of superintendents, all principals, and elementary school principals. The agreement scores range from .400 for assistant superintendents to .695 for superintendents. All groups of respondents express approval for the role norm. However, with 50 per cent of their responses in the absolutely must category, assistant superintendents tend to strongly approve of the behavior indicated.

On role norm 40 ("Secure principals' approval of proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems before presenting such proposals to teachers."), the assistant superintendents' responses differ significantly from those of superintendents. Assistant superintendents are in higher agreement (.617) than are superintendents (.521). While superintendents approve of the role norm, assistant superintendents voice stronger approval with 66 per cent of their responses in the absolutely must category.

On role norm 41 ("Make regular and frequent reports to principals regarding the activities of curriculum committees."), assistant superintendents' responses differ significantly from those of all principals and of elementary school principals. Again, each group reports approval of the role norm, but most assistant superintendents indicate strong approval.

For role norm 45 ("Select teachers for participation in experimental instructional programs."), the responses of assistant superintendents differ significantly from those of superintendents. The agreement score for assistant superintendents (.388) is much lower than that of superintendents (.625) resulting in a wider distribution of scores. Superintendents express approval of the role norm with a mean response score of 1.90.

Assistant superintendents' and superintendents' expectations for role norm 47 ("Request permission of principals prior to assigning teachers to a curriculum project.") differ significantly, but again the difference is one of degree of approval. Most superintendents view the role norm as preferred behavior, but most assistant superintendents responded absolutely must.

Assistant superintendents also differ significantly with superintendents on role norm 48 ("Make final decisions regarding the selection of instructional materials, supplies, and equipment."). The agreement score for assistant superintendents is low (.300) reflecting a lack of consensus. Superintendents show a higher degree of agreement (.533), and most (53.7 per cent) indicate approval for the role norm.

For role norm 53 ("Visit a school without an invitation from the principal."), the responses of assistant

superintendents differ significantly from those superintendents, all principals, elementary school principals and secondary school principals. Again, there is a lack of agreement among assistant superintendents resulting in a wide dispersion of responses. The agreement scores of the other role-defining groups are relatively high, ranging from .562 for superintendents to .602 for secondary school principals. Superintendents and principals all report a permissive attitude toward the role norm.

As is the case for role norm 53, the responses of assistant superintendents differ significantly from those of each of the other role-defining groups for role norm 54 ("Visit a teacher's classroom without having been asked by the principal to do so."). Assistant Superintendents again have a low agreement score (.317) and their responses are widely dispersed. Superintendents and all groups of principals are represented by agreement scores ranging from .529 to .667, and report a permissive attitude toward the role norm.

For role norm 57 ("Evaluate principals for the record."), the responses of assistant superintendents differ significantly from those of secondary school principals. While the agreement score of assistant superintendents (.200) is lower than that of secondary school principals (.402), both are low. As a result, it is

extremely difficult to ascertain an accurate prevailing response. Their respective mean response scores are 2.44 and 2.32.

A similar situation prevails regarding role norm 60 ("Supervise the assignment and scheduling of teachers."). While the responses of assistant superintendents differ significantly from those of secondary school principals, the agreement scores of .350 for assistant superintendents and .302 for secondary school principals are low, and the mean response scores of 3.26 and 3.88 reflect this lack of agreement.

For role norm 63 ("Direct the assignment of principals."), the responses of assistant superintendents differ significantly from those of all principals, elementary school principals, and secondary school principals. All agreement scores are low ranging from .183 for assistant superintendents to .329 for elementary school principals. No meaningful attitude, other than to say that each group is characterized by a lack of agreement, can be identified for any group.

On role norm 69 ("Make decisions regarding the appropriate utilization of facilities for instructional purposes."), assistant superintendents' responses differ significantly from those of secondary school principals. Responses for both groups are distributed widely, but

assistant superintendents respond most frequently in the preferably should and may or may not categories.

While secondary school principals follow a similar pattern, more responses are found in the may or may not category than in preferably should.

As is true when superintendents' expectations are compared with the expectations of principals, statistically significant differences between the expectations of assistant superintendents and those of superintendents and principals occur more frequently on role norms describing assistant superintendents' behavior toward principals, than is the case for role norms describing assistant superintendents' behavior toward superintendents.

Comparison of Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions with the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals

The final analysis of the data focuses on the ability of assistant superintendents to perceive the expectations held by superintendents and principals. Assistant superintendents' perceptions were compared with the expectations of each of the other role-defining groups. Chi-square values were computed for each of the 71 role norms. Significant chi-square values indicate errors in perception on the part of assistant superintendents. The data for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) are shown in Table XXIII. The table shows the level of significance

TABLE XXIII

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS AND THE EXPECTATIONS OF
SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS FOR ROLE 1:
ACTING TOWARD SUPERINTENDENTS

Role Norm	A.S.: Sup'ts. Sup'ts: Actual	A.S.: Principal Principals: Actual	A.S.: Principal E.P.: Actual	A.S.: Principal S.P.: Actual
2	----	.050	----	----
5	----	.005	.001	----
7	----	.005	.005	.050
9	----	.005	.001	----
10	----	.010	.010	----
11	----	.025	.025	----
12	----	.025	.050	.025
13	----	.050	.050	.050
18	----	.050	----	----
19	----	.025	.050	.025
22	----	----	----	.010
32	----	----	----	.050
33	----	.050	.050	----

for each of the role norms for which the differences between the perceptions of the assistant superintendents and the expectations of superintendents and principals are significant at or beyond the .05 level with four degrees of freedom.

As is shown in Table XXIII, when assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents for Role 1 are compared with the actual expectations of superintendents, none of the resulting chi-square values are significant at or beyond the .05 level. For this role, then, assistant superintendents correctly perceive or predict the expectations of superintendents.

Such is not the case, when assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals are compared with the actual expectations of principals. When their perceptions are compared with those of each of the samples of principals, errors in perception are noted for role norms 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 22, 32, and 33.

For role norm 2 ("Present to the superintendent recommendations related to the instructional program and requiring school board approval."), there is a significant difference between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of all principals. Agreement scores for both groups are high, and both groups report strong approval for the role norm. Most of the

difference between the responses of the two groups is accounted for by the fact that while 63.8 per cent of the assistant superintendents predicted that principals would respond absolutely must, 72.6 per cent of the principals responded in this category.

On role norm 5 ("Discuss proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems with the superintendent before presenting them to principals."), there are significant differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of all principals and the expectations of elementary school principals. The respective mean response scores are 2.54, 2.17, and 2.13. These scores indicate that assistant superintendents tend to predict a permissive attitude on the part of principals where this role norm is concerned. Actually, principals tend to approve the behavior indicated by the role norm.

On role norm 7 ("Submit his decisions related to curricular and instructional problems to the superintendent for approval."), there are significant differences between the perceptions of the assistant superintendents and the expectations of each of the samples of principals. In view of the high agreement scores for each group, the mean response scores are rather accurate indicators of the prevailing response for each group. With a mean

response score of 1.96, assistant superintendents perceive principals as giving weak approval of this role norm. The combined sample of all principals has a mean response score of 1.55; elementary school principals, 1.57, and secondary school principals, 1.52. These scores indicate that principals approve of the role norm.

In the case of role norm 9 ("Make decisions related to the initiation, design, and direction of pilot projects requiring experimentation with new teaching content tools, and techniques."), there are significant differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of all principals and elementary school principals. Assistant superintendents perceive principals as being less supportive of this role norm than they actually are. The mean response score for assistant superintendents is 2.25. The combined sample of principals has a mean response score of 1.92, and for elementary school principals the mean response score is 1.90.

For role norm 10 ("Seek direction and advice from the superintendent when planning curriculum projects."), there are significant differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of all principals and of elementary school principals. Assistant superintendents perceive principals as approving this role norm. However, principals in both samples

approve more strongly of the behavior indicated than predicted by assistant superintendents. In each case, nearly approximately 80.0 per cent of the principals responded in the absolutely must and preferably should categories.

When the perceptions of assistant superintendents are compared with the expectations of principals on role norm 11 ("Make decisions related to the participation of lay citizens on curriculum committees."), significant differences exist between assistant superintendents' perceptions and the expectations of all principals and of elementary school principals. With an agreement score of .601, assistant superintendents perceive principals assuming a permissive attitude as indicated by may or may not responses. Principals' responses are widely distributed, but most tend to express approval by responding in the preferably should category.

On role norm 12 ("Submit recommendations regarding the structure and membership of curriculum committees to the superintendent for approval."), there are significant differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of all samples of principals. Agreement scores are comparatively low ranging from .397 for elementary school principals to .471 for secondary school principals. Consequently, the mean response scores are somewhat misleading. However, most assistant

superintendents (48.9 per cent) predict that principals would respond may or may not when, in fact, principals tend to approve of the behavior stated.

When the perceptions of assistant superintendents are compared with expectations of principals for role norm 13 ("Submit written communications directed to staff to the superintendent for approval before transmittal."), significant differences become apparent between assistant superintendents' perceptions and the expectations of all samples of principals. With an agreement score of .575 and a mean response score of 3.10, most assistant superintendents predict a permissive attitude on the part of principals. In fact, the attitude of principals is generally permissive, but not to the degree predicted by assistant superintendents as is indicated by mean response scores of 2.68, 2.67 and 2.71.

For role norm 18 ("Make decisions related to the implementation of recommendations of curriculum committees."), significant differences exist between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the combined sample of principals. Assistant superintendents (69.4 per cent) perceive principals as approving this role norm. Actually, 84.4 per cent of the principals indicate approval.

On role norm 19 ("Submit curriculum guides, course syllabi, and resource units developed by curriculum

committees to the superintendent for approval."), there are significant differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of all samples of principals. The mean response scores of the three samples of principles are similar (1.71, 1.78, and 1.76), however, as in the case of superintendents, their responses tend to be widely distributed. The difference appears to result from the fact that while 66.7 per cent of the assistant superintendents predict that principals will approve of this role norm, 79.9 per cent of all principals, 79.7 per cent of the elementary principals, and 80.3 per cent of the secondary school principals actually did respond in those categories indicating approval.

On role norm 22 ("Present plans for staff in-service to the superintendent for approval."), the perceptions of assistant superintendents differ significantly from the expectations of secondary school principals. Assistant superintendents (72.9 per cent) perceive principals as approving the role norm. Insofar as secondary school principals are concerned, 95.3 per cent responded absolutely must and preferably should.

For role norm 32 ("Make decisions related to the educational specifications for new or remodeled buildings."), the perceptions of assistant superintendents also differ significantly from the expectations of

secondary school principals. Most assistant superintendents predict that principals will approve of this role norm, but secondary school principals express weaker approval than that predicted.

The perceptions of assistant superintendents differ significantly from the expectations of all principals and of elementary school principals for role norm 33 ("Submit reports and bulletins dealing with the instructional program to the superintendent for approval before releasing them to the public."). While only 66.7 per cent of the assistant superintendents predict principal approval of the role norm, 83.1 per cent of all principals and 84.2 per cent of the elementary principals expressed approval.

The data for Role 2 (acting toward principals) are presented in Table XXIV. The table reports the level of significance for each of the role norms for which the difference between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of superintendents and principals are significant at or beyond the .05 level with four degrees of freedom.

Insofar as the accuracy of assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents is concerned, the data in Table XXIV show that there are only four errors of perception on the part of assistant

TABLE XXIV

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS AND THE EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS FOR ROLE 2: ACTING TOWARD PRINCIPALS

Role Norm	A.S.: Sup'ts. Sup'ts: Actual	A.S.: Principal Principals: Actual	A.S.: Principal E.P.: Actual	A.S.: Principal S.P.: Actual
39	.025	----	----	----
40	----	.010	.005	----
43	----	.050	.005	----
46	----	.005	.005	.005
47	----	.001	.001	.005
49	.050	----	----	----
50	----	.010	.010	.010
53	.010	----	----	----
54	.001	----	----	----
57	----	----	----	.050
59	----	.005	.005	.025
63	----	.050	.050	----

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, EUGENE

superintendents. Chi-square values for role norms 39, 49, 53, and 54 are significant.

On role norm 39 ("Initiate and conduct district-wide meetings with teachers for the purpose of discussing instructional problems."), 75.1 per cent of the assistant superintendents predict that superintendents view this role norm as required behavior. Twenty-five per cent perceive superintendents as having a permissive attitude. The actual expectations of superintendents indicate that 95.1 per cent of the superintendents express approval, or view the role norm in terms of required behavior. Only 4.9 per cent report a permissive attitude.

For role norm 49 ("Submit frequent reports to principals regarding the activities of instructional supervisors."), assistant superintendents with an agreement score of .444 are uncertain about the expectations of superintendents. However, 43.8 per cent predict that superintendents will express approval of this role norm; 47.9 per cent predict a permissive response; and 8.3 per cent predict responses indicating disapproval. Seventy-five per cent of the superintendents report approval for the role norm. Of the remainder, 17.5 per cent express a permissive attitude.

On role norm 53 ("Visit a school without an invitation from the principal."), the responses of assistant

assistant superintendents are widely distributed as is indicated by an agreement score of .337. Nevertheless, 63.3 per cent predict that superintendents view this behavior as required. However, only 27.5 per cent of the superintendents view the behavior as required, and 62.5 per cent report a permissive attitude.

With regard to role norm 54 ("Visit a teacher's classroom without having been asked by the principal to do so."), the agreement score of assistant superintendents is low (.269). Forty-seven per cent predict that superintendents approve of this behavior; 26.5 per cent predict that superintendents will respond may or may not; and 10.2 per cent predict that superintendents will disapprove. Of the superintendents, 17.5 per cent express approval; 67.5 per cent respond may or may not; and 15.0 per cent disapprove.

When the assistant superintendents' perceptions of principals' expectations are compared with the actual expectations of principals, eight errors in perception on the part of assistant superintendents are noted. The chi-square values indicate significant differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents, and the expectations of at least one sample of principals on role norms 40, 43, 46, 47, 50, 57, 59, and 63.

Significant differences appear when assistant superintendents' perceptions are compared with the expectations of all principals and of elementary school principals for role norm 40 ("Secure principals approval of proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems before presenting such proposals to teachers."). With an agreement score of .740, most assistant superintendents (77.1 per cent) perceive principals as responding absolutely must. The combined sample of all principals and that of elementary school principals exhibit less agreement than do assistant superintendents. While expressing approval for the role norm, only 48.4 per cent of all principals and 45.7 per cent of elementary school principals respond absolutely must.

There are significant differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of the combined sample of all principals and of elementary school principals for role norm 43 ("Submit recommendations of curriculum committees to principals for their approval prior to further action."). Assistant superintendents see principals as viewing this role norm in terms of being required behavior. Most assistant superintendents (64.6 per cent) predict that principals will respond absolutely must. Actually, most principals express approval for the role norm, but insofar as these two

samples are concerned, the responses of principals expressing approval are nearly equally divided between the categories of absolutely must and preferably should.

On role norm 46 ("Initiate a pilot project in a school only upon the request or permission of the principal."), the perceptions of assistant superintendents differ significantly from the expectations of principals in each of the samples. Seventy-six point six per cent of the assistant superintendents predict that principals will respond absolutely must. Principals in each of the three samples express approval for the role norm, but less than 50.0 per cent respond absolutely must.

The perceptions of assistant superintendents differ significantly from the expectations of each sample of principals with regard to role norm 47 ("Request permission of principals prior to assigning teachers to curriculum projects."). With an agreement score of .677, most assistant superintendents (75.5 per cent) predict that principals will respond absolutely must. While principals approve of the behavior indicated by the role norm, more of their responses are found in the preferably should category rather than in the absolutely must category.

For role norm 50 ("Assign supervisors on the basis of principals' recommendations."), assistant

superintendents perceptions of the expectations of principals differ significantly from the expectations of all principals, elementary school principals, and secondary school principals. A majority (75.0 per cent) of assistant superintendents predict that principals will indicate approval of the role norm. The mean response scores of the samples of principals are in each instance 2.56. While the agreement scores are not high, the mean response score appears to accurately reflect the views of most principals, since 79.6 per cent of all principals' responses are found in the preferably should and may or may not categories. For elementary school principals, 80.5 per cent of their responses are in these categories, and for secondary principals, the percentage is 77.6.

On role norm 57 ("Evaluate principals for the record."), there are significant differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of secondary school principals. Secondary school principals (58.8 per cent) express approval for this norm, and 34.1 per cent report a permissive attitude. Assistant superintendents have a very low agreement score (.167). Sixteen point seven per cent respond absolutely must, 27.1 per cent preferably should, 29.2 per cent may or may not, 14.6 per cent preferably should not, and 12.5 per cent absolutely must not.

On role norm 59 ("Evaluate teachers only upon the request of principals."), assistant superintendents' perceptions differ significantly from the expectations of all principals, elementary school principals, and secondary school principals. Assistant superintendents, again, are in low agreement (.220), and as a result, their responses vary considerably. However, 51.1 per cent predicted approval on the part of principals. Principals in each sample respond most frequently in the preferably should and may or may not categories.

For role norm 63 ("Direct the assignment of principals."), the differences between the perceptions of assistant superintendents and the expectations of all principals and of elementary school principals are significant. Assistant superintendents are very low in agreement (.184) with 18.8 per cent of them responding absolutely must, 12.5 per cent preferably should, 37.5 per cent may or may not, 14.6 per cent preferably should not and 16.7 per cent absolutely must not. Principals in both groups have slightly higher agreement scores (.322 and .329), and tend to report a permissive attitude most often.

The following section presents data concerning the relationship of the significant differences reported above to the three dimensions of the item matrix.

Significant Differences and their Relationship
to the Item Matrix

The selection of items to be included in the instrument was based on a three-dimensional matrix. The first dimension specified two roles or role sectors: acting toward superintendents and acting toward principals. The second dimension categorized items as being indicative of independent or dependent behavior. The third dimension identified content areas within which administrative tasks are performed.

Based on the assumption that the responsibilities of the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction are largely confined to the area of instruction, the majority of items included in the instrument were assigned to that content area. Approximately equal numbers of items were assigned each of the roles, and approximately equal numbers of items specifying independent and dependent behavior were selected.

Tables XXV, XXVI, and XXVII show the number of items representing each of the content areas for each role. In addition, these tables also indicate the per cent distribution of significant differences resulting from inter-sample comparisons by role, content areas, and independent or dependent behavior.

TABLE XXV

Per Cent Distribution of Significant Differences between Expectations
of Superintendents and Principals by Roles, Content Areas, and
Independent or Dependent Behavior

Content Areas by Roles	Number of Items	Significant Differences by Per Cents			
		Supts:Exp. Prins:Exp.	Supts:Exp. E.Prins:Exp.	Supts:Exp. S.Prins:Exp.	E.Prins:Exp. S.Prins:Exp.
		Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.
Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents					
Policy-Purpose	2	12.5	12.5		
Technical- Operational					
Instruction	21	12.5	12.5	12.5	11.1
Staff Personnel	4				25.0
Pupil Personnel	2				
Finance	1				
School Plant	2				
School- Community	3				

TABLE XXV-continued

Content Areas by Roles	Number of Items	Significant Differences by Per Cents							
		Supts:Exp.		Supts:Exp.		Supts:Exp.		E.Prins:Exp.	
		Prins:Exp.	E.Prins:Exp.	E.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	
		Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.		
Role 2: Acting Toward Principals									
Policy-Purpose	3								
Technical- Operational									
Instruction	19	50.0		50.0		33.3	11.1		25.0
Staff Personnel	10		12.5	12.5		22.2			25.0
Pupil Personnel	1								
Finance	0								
School Plant	1					11.1			25.0
School- Community	2					11.1			
Totals	71	75.0	25.0	87.5	12.5	88.8	11.1		50.0 50.0

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

TABLE XXVI

Per Cent Distribution of Significant Differences between Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Expectations of Superintendents and Principals by Roles, Content Areas, and Independent or Dependent Behavior

Content Areas by Roles	Number of Items	Significant Differences by Per Cents							
		A.Supts:Exp.		A.Supts:Exp.		A.Supts:Exp.		A.Supts:Exp.	
		Supts:Exp.		Prins:Exp.		E.Prins:Exp.		S.Prins:Exp.	
		Indep.	Dep.	Indep.	Dep.	Indep.	Dep.	Indep.	Dep.
Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents									
Policy-Purpose	2								
Technical- Operational									
Instruction	21							10.0	20.0
Staff Personnel	4								
Pupil Personnel	2								
Finance	1								
School Plant	2	11.1	11.1	22.2	11.1	22.2	11.1		10.0
School- Community	3				11.1		11.1		

LIBRARY OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

TABLE XXVI-continued

Content Areas by Roles	Number of Items	Significant Differences by Per Cents							
		A.Supts:Exp.		A.Supts:Exp.		A.Supts:Exp.		A.Supts:Exp.	
		Supts:Exp.	Prins:Exp.	Prins:Exp.	E.Prins:Exp.	E.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	
		Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	
Role 2: Acting Toward Principals									
Policy-Purpose	3								
Technical- Operational									
Instruction	19	55.5	22.2	33.3	11.1	33.1	11.1	20.0	
Staff Personnel	10			11.1		11.1		30.0	
Pupil Personnel	1								
Finance	0								
School Plant	1							10.0	
School- Community	2								
Totals	71	66.6	33.3	66.3	33.3	66.3	33.3	80.0	20.0

TABLE XXVII

Per Cent Distribution of Significant Differences between Perceptions
of Assistant Superintendents and Expectations of Superintendents
and Principals by Roles, Content Areas,
and Independent or Dependent Behavior

Content Areas by Roles	Number of Items	Significant Differences by Per Cents							
		A.Supts:Per.		A.Supts:Per.		A.Supts:Per.		A.Supts:Per.	
		Supts:Exp.	Prins:Exp.	E.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.
Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents									
Policy-Purpose	2								
Technical- Operational									
Instruction	21		23.5 29.4		18.8 31.2		9.1 36.3		
Staff Personnel	4								
Pupil Personnel	2								
Finance	1								
School Plant	2								
School- Community	3		5.9		6.3		9.1		

TABLE XXVII-continued

Content Areas by Roles	Number of Items	Significant Differences by Per Cents							
		A.Supts:Per.		A.Supts:Per.		A.Supts:Per.		A.Supts:Per.	
		Supts:Exp.	Prins:Exp.	Prins:Exp.	E.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	S.Prins:Exp.	Indep.Dep.	Indep.Dep.
Role 2: Acting Toward Principals									
Policy-Purpose	3								
Technical- Operational									
Instruction	19	75.0	25.0	29.4	31.2			27.3	
Staff Personnel	10			11.8	12.5	9.1	9.1		
Pupil Personnel	1								
Finance	0								
School Plant	1								
School- Community	2								
Totals	71	75.0	25.0	23.5	76.5	18.8	81.2	27.3	72.7

The data shown in these tables reflect findings of the study reported in preceding sections of Chapter IV. When inter-sample comparisons are made of the expectations of the role-defining groups, significant differences on individual role norms result more frequently for Role 2 (acting toward principals) than for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents). The data also show that significantly different expectations appear more frequently on independent behavior role norms than on dependent behavior norms.

The data in Table XXV show that 75 per cent of the significant differences between the expectations of superintendents and all principals are on role norms indicating independent behavior. For the comparisons of the expectations of superintendents and elementary school principals, the percentage is 87.5. When the expectations of superintendents and secondary school principals are compared, 88.8 per cent of the significant differences are on independent behavior role norms.

The data in Table XXVI indicate a similar situation when the expectations of assistant superintendents are compared with those of superintendents, all principals, elementary school principals, and secondary school superintendents. In the order indicated above, the percentages are 66.6, 66.3, and 80.0.

When assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals are compared with the actual expectations of these role-defining groups, the data in Table XXVII reveal that 75.0 per cent of assistant superintendents' errors in perceiving the expectations of superintendents are on independent behavior role norms. However, assistant superintendents in perceiving the expectations of principals err more frequently on dependent behavior role norms than on independent behavior role norms.

In terms of content areas, the majority of significant differences appear in the area of instruction. This may, however, be a consequence of the loading of role norm statements in this area.

A summary of the major findings reported in this chapter is presented in Chapter V. Within that context, the major findings are related to the questions and hypothesis stated in Chapter I.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

This study was concerned with the role expectations held for the position of assistant superintendent in charge of instruction by the incumbents of the focal position, superintendents, and principals; and the assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals.

The purpose of the study was three-fold: 1) to determine the degree of intraposition consensus, or agreement, within the three role-defining groups regarding their expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent; 2) to determine whether or not there were significant differences among the three role-defining groups regarding their expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent; and 3) to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals and the expectations expressed by assistant superintendents, superintendents, and principals.

Populations Studied

The selection of respondents from each of the role-defining populations was based on two criteria: 1) all respondents must be employed by first-class school districts or county units in the states of Oregon and Washington, and 2) all respondents must be employed by districts that employ assistant superintendents whose primary responsibility is that of coordinating and supervising the instructional program.

Of those respondents who met the selection criteria, 100 per cent of the superintendents and assistant superintendents were included in the study. A stratified random sample totaling 50 per cent of the elementary and secondary school principals was selected. Altogether, 498 respondents were chosen for the study: 50 superintendents, 55 assistant superintendents, 110 secondary school principals, and 283 elementary school principals.

Of these, 401, or 80.5 per cent responded to the instrument used for the study. In terms of role-defining groups, 41 superintendents, 50 assistant superintendents, 86 secondary school principals, and 224 elementary school principals responded.

Procedures

A role norm inventory containing 71 role norm statements was used to identify respondent expectations held for the behavior of the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction. Since assistant superintendents were asked not only to report their own expectations for the behavior of the position incumbents, but also their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals, two forms of the instrument were used.

A letter explaining the study and a stamped, self-addressed role norm inventory were mailed to each of the 498 respondents. Four weeks later, a follow-up letter and a second copy of the instrument were sent to those respondents who had not responded to the initial request for participation.

The data were coded and transferred to IBM cards. Once the accuracy of the coding and key punching had been verified, the data were analyzed by computer at the University of Oregon Computer Center.

Major Findings

This study sought answers to two questions dealing with intraposition consensus, and tested fourteen hypotheses related to interposition consensus. After careful

analysis of the data, the following conclusions are presented:

Question One

To what extent is there agreement among the members of each role-defining group regarding their expectations for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents?

It was found that the level of agreement for each of the role-defining groups, when viewed as an average level of agreement computed over all role norms, is characterized by neither high nor low consensus. Mean, or average, agreement scores for the total position of assistant superintendents range from a low of .468 for all principals to a high of .534 for superintendents. Mean agreement scores which approximate 50 per cent, as is the case for each of the role-defining groups included in this study, result from the fact that the agreement scores for individual role norms approach a somewhat uniform distribution along a continuum from a point near zero, indicating the almost complete absence of agreement, to a point near plus one, indicating nearly complete agreement.

When the mean agreement scores of each role-defining group for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) are compared with the corresponding mean agreement scores for Role 2 (acting toward principals), in all instances the scores are higher for Role 1 than for Role 2. For Role 1,

the mean agreement scores range from .489 for elementary school principals to .573 for superintendents. For Role 2, the mean agreement scores range from .420 for assistant superintendents to .497 for superintendents. It would appear, then, that, for those role norms included in the inventory, the members of each role-defining group agree more highly about how assistant superintendents should act toward superintendents than they do about how assistant superintendents should act toward principals.

When Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) is considered, and the mean agreement scores of the role-defining groups for independent behavior role norms are compared with their mean agreement scores for dependent behavior role norms, assistant superintendents and secondary school principals agree more highly on independent behavior role norms than on dependent behavior role norms. Superintendents, the combined sample of all principals, and elementary school principals agree more highly on dependent behavior role norms than on independent behavior role norms. For Role 2 (acting toward principals), the mean agreement scores of all samples are higher for dependent behavior norms than for independent behavior norms. Thus, insofar as the populations represented by the samples in this study are concerned, there appears to be more uncertainty regarding independent behavior on

the part of assistant superintendents, particularly, with reference to Role 2, than there is regarding dependent behavior on the part of assistant superintendents. At least, this appears to be the case insofar as the role norms included in this inventory are concerned.

Of perhaps secondary importance insofar as intra-position consensus is concerned, is the finding that comparatively few respondents, regardless of the sample population represented, tend to view the behaviors described in the inventory as prohibited, i.e. they respond preferably should not and absolutely must not infrequently. As indicated in Chapter IV, this phenomenon may be a function of the particular set of role norms included in the inventory.

It is noted that the mean agreement scores indicate that the highest level of agreement regarding the expectations for assistant superintendents' behavior is found among superintendents. In all instances, the mean agreement scores for superintendents are higher than those of the other role-defining groups.

Question Two

To what extent is there agreement among assistant superintendents regarding their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents?

When all role norms are considered, the mean agreement scores for individual role norms indicate a wide range of agreement among assistant superintendents when reporting their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals. On some role norms, their responses indicate an almost complete absence of agreement, while on others, their responses reflect a high level of agreement. The actual range of agreement scores for assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents is from a low score of .133 to a high score of .826. For their perceptions of the expectations of principals, the range extends from .133 to .740. In both instances, the mean agreement score for all role norms is .464 indicating, insofar as the role norms included in the inventory are concerned, that the agreement level among assistant superintendents in the sample cannot be represented as one of high or low consensus. Obviously, such is not the case regarding individual role norms. On individual role norms, the level of agreement varies from low to high.

When mean agreement scores for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) and Role 2 (acting toward principals) are considered, the level of agreement among assistant superintendents is higher regarding their perceptions of the expectations of superintendents for Role 1 than it is

for their perceptions of principals' expectations. For Role 2, assistant superintendents exhibit a higher level of agreement when predicting the expectations of principals than when predicting the expectations of superintendents. Assistant superintendents also agree more highly insofar as their perceptions of how superintendents and principals view their behavior toward superintendents, than they do on how these groups view their behavior toward principals. Therefore, with respect to their actions toward principals, it appears to be the case that assistant superintendents experience some difficulty in ascertaining what superintendents and principals consider to be appropriate behavior.

When mean agreement scores for each role are broken down in terms of independent and dependent behavior role norms, assistant superintendents agree more highly when predicting how superintendents view dependent behavior role norms than when predicting superintendents' expectations for independent behavior role norms. When predicting the expectations of principals, they agree more highly on independent role norms for Role 1 than on dependent behavior role norms. For Role 2, they agree more highly when predicting principals' expectations for dependent behavior role norms. Thus, insofar as independent behavior role norms are concerned, it seems to be the case

that assistant superintendents tend to view the expectations of superintendents and principals with considerable ambiguity.

Hypothesis One

The assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents are similar to their own expectations for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents.

This study reveals no statistically significant differences between assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and the expectations of assistant superintendents. There is, therefore, sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Two

The assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals are similar to their own expectations for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents.

When assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals for the behavior indicated by the 71 role norms are compared with their own expectations, only one difference is statistically significant. The difference is significant for role norm 50. Therefore, there is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Three

The expectations of superintendents for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of all principals.

Statistically significant differences exist between the expectations of superintendents and the combined sample of all principals on eight role norms: 1, 3, 13, 39, 45, 48, 64, and 67. However, for 89 per cent of all role norms, the differences between the expectations of superintendents and those of the combined samples of principals are not statistically significant. Therefore, there is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Four

The expectations of superintendents for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of elementary school principals.

Differences between the expectations of superintendents and the expectations of elementary school principals are statistically significant for role norms 1, 3, 13, 39, 45, 48, 64, and 67. Of these, all but 1, 3, and 13 represent Role 2 (acting toward principals). Since differences are significant for only 8 of 71 role norms, there is sufficient justification for accepting the hypothesis.

Hypothesis Five

The expectations of superintendents for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of secondary school principals.

Differences between the expectations of superintendents and the expectations of secondary school principals are statistically significant for role norms 3, 40, 45, 48, 60, 64, 67, 69, and 70. Of these, all but 3 represent Role 2 (acting toward principals). Those role norms for which the differences are significant represent 9 out of a total of 71 role norm statements, therefore, there is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Six

The expectations of secondary school principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of elementary school principals.

Statistically significant differences between the expectations of secondary school principals and the expectations of elementary school principals exist for role norms 22, 43, 60, and 69. There is, therefore, sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Seven

The expectations of assistant superintendents for their own appropriate behavior are similar to the expectations of superintendents.

Statistically significant differences exist between the expectations of assistant superintendents and the expectations of superintendents for role norms 31, 32, 39, 40, 45, 47, 48, 53, and 54. Of those role norms for which the differences are significant, all but 31 and 32 represent Role 2 (acting toward principals). Despite the differences, there is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Eight

The expectations of assistant superintendents for their own appropriate behavior are similar to the expectations of all principals.

The expectations of assistant superintendents when compared with the expectations of all principals are statistically significant for role norms 30, 31, 32, 33, 39, 41, 53, 54, and 63. Of these, 30, 31, 32, and 33 represent Role 1 (acting toward superintendents) and the remainder represent Role 2 (acting toward principals). Since the differences between the expectations of assistant superintendents and those of principals are not significant for 87 per cent of the 71 role norms, there is sufficient justification for accepting the hypothesis.

Hypothesis Nine

The expectations of assistant superintendents for their own appropriate behavior are similar to the expectations of elementary school principals.

Statistically significant differences exist between the expectations of assistant superintendents and those of elementary school principals for role norms 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 39, 41, 53, 54, and 63. Of these, 30, 31, 32, and 33 represent Role 1 (acting toward superintendents). The rest represent Role 2 (acting toward principals). Although the differences are significant for ten role norms, there is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Ten

The expectations of assistant superintendents for their own appropriate behavior are similar to the expectations of secondary school principals.

For role norms 6, 12, 13, 32, 53, 54, 57, 60, 63, and 69, the differences between the expectations of assistant superintendents and the expectations of secondary school principals are statistically significant. Four of the ten role norms describe assistant superintendents' behavior for Role 1 (acting toward superintendents), and six describe his behavior for Role 2 (acting toward principals). Since the differences for 86 per cent of the 71 role norms are not significant, there is sufficient evidence for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Eleven

Assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of superintendents.

Of all role norms, the differences between assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and the superintendents' expectations are statistically significant for role norms 39, 49, 53, and 54. All represent errors of perception on the part of assistant superintendents as they view superintendents' expectations for their behavior toward principals. There is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Twelve

Assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of all principals.

Statistically significant differences exist between assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals and the expectations of principals for role norms 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 33, 40, 43, 46, 47, 50, 59, and 63. These errors in perception represent 18 out of a total of 71 role norms. Eleven represent errors in perception regarding Role 1 (acting

toward superintendents), and seven, errors in perception regarding Role 2 (acting toward principals). Since assistant superintendents accurately predicted the expectations of principals for 75 per cent of all role norms included in the inventory, there is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Thirteen

Assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of elementary school principals.

Differences between assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals and the expectations of elementary school principals are statistically significant for role norms 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 33, 40, 43, 46, 47, 50, and 60. Of these, role norms 5 through 33 represent Role 1 (acting toward superintendents), and role norms 40 through 60 represent Role 2 (acting toward principals). Insofar as elementary school principals are concerned, assistant superintendents accurately predicted the expectations of principals for 77 per cent of all role norms included in the inventory. Therefore, there is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Fourteen

Assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents are similar to the expectations of secondary school principals.

There are statistically significant differences between assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of principals and the expectations of secondary school principals for role norms 7, 12, 13, 19, 22, 32, 46, 47, 50, 57, and 59. Of these role norms, 7 through 32 represent Role 1 (acting toward superintendents). The remainder represents Role 2 (acting toward principals). Totally, assistant superintendents were in error on 16 per cent of the role norms included in the inventory. Thus, there is sufficient justification for accepting this hypothesis.

Conclusions

Although the analysis of the data indicates that there is a high level of interposition consensus among assistant superintendents, superintendents, and principals with regard to their expectations for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents, the data does provide some evidence that appears to lend support to the contention that within those school districts

represented in this study, the members of these role-defining groups are less certain about what constitutes an appropriate relationship between the assistant superintendent and principals than they are about the relationship between the assistant superintendent and the superintendent.

Evidence supporting this contention is provided by the following findings of the study:

- 1) Mean agreement scores indicate higher intraposition consensus within each of the role-defining groups when respondents express expectations for the behavior of assistant superintendents toward superintendents, than when these same respondents express expectations for the behavior of assistant superintendents toward principals.
- 2) Perception errors occur more frequently on the part of assistant superintendents when they predict the expectations of superintendents and principals for the behavior of the assistant superintendents toward principals, than is the case when predicting the expectations of superintendents and principals for the behavior of assistant superintendents toward superintendents.
- 3) In those instances where statistically significant differences occur between the expectations of one role-defining group and those of another group, these differences occur most often on role norms dealing with the assistant superintendents' behavior toward principals.

However, these findings may not be indicative of the fact that school officials have failed to define the relationship of the assistant superintendent to principals as carefully and as clearly as the relationship

between the assistant superintendent and the superintendent. Instead, these findings may be indicative of a situation wherein the problem of defining the assistant superintendent's relationship with principals is far more complex and difficult than that of defining the assistant superintendent's relationship with the superintendent. In both instances, the crucial independent variable would appear to be that of effective communication. In the case of the relationship between the assistant superintendent and the superintendent, the incumbents of these two positions normally occupy office space in the same building. The proximity of their offices would tend to facilitate communication of both an informal and formal nature. Conversely, face to face communication between the assistant superintendent and principals may be limited as the result of principals being situated in school buildings scattered throughout the district. Secondly, the problem of communication is further confounded by the number of principals with whom the assistant superintendent must work. For example, of those districts included in this study, the total number of principals employed by a single district ranged from 4 to 61. While the assistant superintendent's relationship with principals may be in most instances on

a one to one basis, the fact that he must communicate with all principals limits the amount of personal contact that he has with each.

In addition to the problem of communication, it would appear that the matter of the superordinate-subordinate relationship would also affect the determination of stable and mutually acceptable role expectations for the position of assistant superintendent. The assistant superintendent occupies a position which is subordinate to that of the superintendent and one to which certain responsibilities and authority has been delegated. However, responsibility for his performance rests in the position of the superintendent and creates a situation of mutual dependency. The superintendent's success is dependent upon the success of the assistant superintendent, and the assistant superintendent is dependent upon the superintendent for approval. Subsequently, this situation of mutual dependency would tend to insure that the assistant superintendent and superintendent come to grips with the problem of role expectations early in their relationship. On the other hand, the issue of the superordinate-subordinate relationship between the assistant superintendent and principals may not in most instances be as well-defined. A contributing

factor may be that there is a lack of agreement among recognized authorities regarding whether the position of assistant superintendent should be properly considered line or staff.

Recommendation for Further Research

Inasmuch as the independent variables of district size and the classification of the position as line or staff were not controlled in this study, future research should provide for this control.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Monographs

- Argyris, C. Understanding organizational behavior. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1962.
- Arkin, H. & Colton, R.R. Tables for statisticians. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1950.
- Biddle, B.J., Jr. The present state of role theory. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1961.
- Blau, P.M. The dynamics of bureaucracy: a study of interpersonal relations in two government agencies. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Campbell, R.F., Cunningham, L.L., & McPhee, R.F. The organization and control of American schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.
- Castetter, W.B., & Burchell, H.R. Educational administration and the improvement of instruction. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1967.
- Charters, W.W., Jr. Teacher perceptions of administrative behavior: cooperative research report no. 929. St. Louis: Washington University, 1964.
- Corwin, R.G. Staff conflicts in the public schools: U.S. Office of Education cooperative research report no. 2637. Columbus, Ohio: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio State University, 1966.
- Dalton, M. Men who manage. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Etzioni, A. Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Eye, G.G., & Netzer, L.A. Supervision of instruction: a phase of administration. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

- Fensch, E.A., & Wilson, R.E. The superintendency team: organization and administration. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964.
- Foskett, J.M. The normative world of the elementary school principal. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967.
- Griffiths, D.E., Clark, D.L., Wynn, D.R., & Iannaccone, L. Organizing schools for effective education. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 1962.
- Gross, N., Mason, W.S., & McEachern, A.W. Explorations in role analysis: studies of the school superintendency role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Gross, N., & Herriott, R.E. Staff leadership in public schools: a sociological inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Guba, E.G., & Bidwell, C.E. Administrative relationships: teacher effectiveness, teacher satisfaction, and administrative behavior. Chicago: The Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.
- Halpin, A.H. The leadership behavior of school superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: University Press, Ohio State University, 1956.
- Lane, W.R., Corwin, R.G., & Monahan, W.G. Foundations of educational administration: a behavioral analysis. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.
- Linton, R. The study of man. New York: Appleton-Century, 1936.
- Newcomb, T.M. Social psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1950.
- Parsons, T., & Shils, E.A. (Eds.) Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1951.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1956.

Simon, H.A. Administrative behavior: a study of decision-making processes in administrative organization. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.

Thompson, V.A. Modern organization: a general theory. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Publications of the Government, Learned Societies
and Other Organizations

American Association of School Administrators. The American school superintendency: thirtieth yearbook. Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1952.

American Association of School Administrators, & The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Organizing for improved instruction: a joint statement issued by the American association of school administrators and the association for supervision and curriculum development. Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1963.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Role of supervisor and curriculum director in a climate of change. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1965.

Department of Public Instruction. School statistics. Olympia, Washington: DPI, 1966.

Department of Public Instruction. School statistics. Olympia, Washington: DPI, 1967.

State Department of Education. The Oregon school directory. Salem, Oregon: SDE, 1956.

State Department of Education. The Oregon school directory. Salem, Oregon: SDE, 1964.

State Department of Education. The Oregon school directory. Salem, Oregon: SDE, 1966.

State Department of Education. The Oregon school directory. Salem, Oregon: SDE, 1967.

Washington Education Association. Washington education directory: 1967-68 edition. Seattle, Washington: WEA, 1967.

Periodicals

- Doll, R.C., Shafer, H.T., Christie, S., & Salsbury, J.C. What are the duties of the curriculum director? Educational Leadership, 1958, 15, 428-430.
- Etzioni, A. Authority structure and organizational effectiveness, Administrative Science Quarterly, 1959, 4, 43-67.
- Frazier, A. The superintendent: his own curriculum director, Educational Leadership, 1962, 20, 38-43.
- Getzels, J.W., & Guba, E.G. Social behavior and the administrative process, The School Review, 1957, 65 (Winter), 423-442.
- Hass, G.C. Role of the director of instruction, Educational Leadership, 1960, 18, 101-108.
- Hills, R.J. A new concept of staff relations, Administrators' Notebook, 1960, 8, 1-4.
- Leik, R.K. A measure of ordinal consensus. Pacific Sociological Review, 1966, 9, 85-90.
- Sharp, G.M. Curriculum coordinators study their job. Educational Leadership, 1955, 7, 464-466.

Essays and Articles in Collections

- Charters, W.W., Jr. The social background of teaching. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
- Clark, B.R. The sociology of educational administration. In Joanne H. Kitchel (Ed.), Perspectives on Educational administration and the behavioral sciences. Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.
- Davis, K. Status and related concepts. In Bruce J. Biddle, Jr., & Edwin J. Thomas (Eds.), Role theory: concepts and research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

- Getzels, J.W. Administration as a social process. In Andrew H. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.
- Getzels, J.W. Conflict and role behavior in the educational setting. In W.W. Charters, Jr. & N.L. Gage (Eds.), Readings in the social psychology of education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1963.
- Guba, E.G. Research in internal administration - what do we know? In Roald F. Campbell, & James M. Lipham (Eds.), Administrative theory as a guide to action. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1960.
- Halpin, A.W. A paradigm for research on administrative behavior. In R.F. Campbell, & R.T. Gregg (Eds.), Administrative behavior in education. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- Hencley, S. Functional interrelationships within administrative performance systems. In Donald J. Leu, & Herbert C. Rudman (Eds.), Preparation programs for school administrators: common and specialized learnings. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1963.
- MacKenzie, G.N. Assistant superintendent-instruction. In Donald J. Leu, & Herbert C. Rudman (Eds.), Preparation programs for school administrators: common and specialized learnings. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1963.
- Sarbin, T.R. Role theory. In Gardner Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954.
- Sargent, S. Concepts of role and ego. In John H. Rohrer, & Moshe Sherif (Eds.), Social psychology at the crossroads. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Thomas, E.J., & Biddle, B.J., Jr. The nature and history of role theory. In Bruce J. Biddle, Jr., & Edwin J. Thomas (Eds.), Role theory: concepts and research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Unpublished Materials

- Abbot, R.M. Emerging patterns in the nature and scope of the assistant superintendency in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1965.
- Batsakis, A.G. An analysis of the role of the director of instruction in a selected school district. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1964.
- Breniman, W.E. The role of the director of instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963.
- Dalton, M. A study of formal organization among managers of an industrial plant. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949.
- Duffy, E.J. The role of the director of instruction - tasks, interactions, and processes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.
- Hutcheson, H.I. The employment and designation of duties to assistant superintendents in school systems employing from 150 to 200 teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1957.
- MacNair, C.R. Role expectations for the position of assistant superintendent of instruction as seen by key secondary personnel. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.
- Moran, F.L. The identification of problems in developing programs of instructional improvement as evidenced by varying role expectations of the director of instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Paschal, H.L.R. Training, duties and areas of service of assistant superintendents in selected school districts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963.

Stearns, F.K., Jr. Role expectations of the curriculum director as perceived by superintendents, principals and teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1966.

Weir, N.S. The assistant superintendent in local school districts of New Jersey. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1959.

APPENDIX A

LETTERS

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON



160

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

EUGENE, OREGON 97403

telephone (code 503) 342-1411

The College of Education at the University of Oregon is interested in conducting a study of the role of the assistant superintendent. The design of the study requires that data be collected from a large sample of key administrators in those school districts employing an assistant superintendent in charge of instruction.

Since the current state school directories are based on the 1967-68 school year, your assistance in compiling an up-to-date list of names and addresses of administrative personnel employed as superintendents, assistant superintendents in charge of instruction, and principals is needed.

If your school district employs an assistant superintendent whose primary responsibility is that of the instructional program, please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. For your convenience, the questionnaire is self-addressed and stamped.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Russel E. Klein'.

Russel E. Klein
NDEA Fellow

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'John E. Suttle'.

John E. Suttle, Adviser
Professor of Education

- 1. Please indicate below the name of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction, and the address of the school district office.

(Superintendent)
(Assistant Superintendent)
(School District)
(Street Address)
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

(Fold Here)

- 2. Please indicate below the name and address of each principal who was not employed as a principal in your district during the 1967-68 school year, or who has been transferred to a different school.

(Principal) (Principal)
(School) (School)
(Street Address) (Street Address)
(City) (State) (Zip Code) (City) (State) (Zip Code)

(Fold Here)

(Principal) (Principal)
(School) (School)
(Street Address) (Street Address)
(City) (State) (Zip Code) (City) (State) (Zip Code)

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON



Department of ¹⁶²
Curriculum and Instruction
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

EUGENE, OREGON 97403
telephone (code 503) 342-1411

November 22, 1968

Dear Colleague:

As an administrator in a school district that employs an assistant superintendent whose primary responsibility is that of the instructional program, you are undoubtedly concerned about the organizational relationship of this position to other administrative positions within the district.

The College of Education at the University of Oregon is interested in conducting a study that deals specifically with those organizational relationships affecting the role of the assistant superintendent.

The design of the study requires that data be collected from a large sample of key administrators in those districts employing an assistant superintendent in charge of instruction. Therefore, your participation is vital to the success of the study.

The instrument is designed to take as little of your time as possible. Please consider your answers carefully and fill out the questionnaire completely. All information will be handled with the greatest of professional confidence.

When you have finished, please fold the questionnaire as indicated and staple or tape it together before mailing.

Your cooperation and participation is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

Russel E. Klein

Russel E. Klein
NDEA Fellow

John E. Suttle

John E. Suttle
Professor of Education

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON



SCHOOL OF EDUCATION 163

EUGENE, OREGON 97403

telephone (code 503) 342-1411

December 26, 1968

Dear Colleague:

Recently, you were invited to express your expectations for the role of the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction. Your reply has not been received.

In order that the study might accurately reflect the expectations of school administrators, it is important that we receive as many responses as possible. Should it be the case that you have not yet completed the instrument, please do so.

For your convenience, a second copy of the instrument has been enclosed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Russel E. Klein".

Russel E. Klein
NDEA Fellow

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John E. Suttle".

John E. Suttle
Professor of Education

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT

7
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10

EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS
FOR THE ROLE OF THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT IN CHARGE OF INSTRUCTION

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

The information requested below will be helpful in interpreting the results of the study.
All information will be held in strictest confidence and will never be identified by name.

1. Name _____
2. School district _____
No. _____ State _____ ADM _____
3. Position now held:

_____ Superintendent	_____ Secondary School Principal
_____ Assistant Superintendent	_____ Elementary School Principal
4. Title of preceding position:

_____ Teacher	_____ Assistant Superintendent
_____ Vice-Principal	_____ Superintendent
_____ Elementary School Principal	_____ Other (specify)
_____ Secondary School Principal	_____
5. Years of service in present position _____.
6. Years of service in present district _____.
7. Years of teaching experience:

_____ Elementary	_____ Secondary
------------------	-----------------
8. Years of administrative experience prior to present appointment:

_____ Vice-Principal	_____ Superintendent
_____ Principal	_____ Other (specify)
_____ Assistant Superintendent	_____
9. Academic preparation:

Highest degree held: Bachelor's	_____ Master's	_____ Doctoral
Undergraduate major	_____	
Master's degree major	_____	
Doctoral degree major	_____	

PART II. ROLE INVENTORY

Directions:

- 1) It will be necessary for you to make three responses to each item.
 - a) First, please respond to each item in terms of the following question: "As an assistant superintendent, do you feel that the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction should or should not do the following things?"
 - b) Secondly, respond to each item in terms of the following statement: "I think that most superintendents would say that the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction should or should not do the following things."
 - c) Finally, respond to each item in terms of this statement: "I think that most principals would say that the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction should or should not do the following things."
- 2) The categories of responses for each item are as follows:
 - 1) Absolutely must
 - 2) Preferably should
 - 3) May or may not
 - 4) Preferably should not
 - 5) Absolutely must not

To indicate the answer you have selected for each item, DRAW A CIRCLE around the numeral in the appropriate column and row.

Sample Item:

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>	
Make recommendations to the school board without prior approval of the superintendent.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>	
1. Formulate and recommend directly to the school board policies governing the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
2. Present to the superintendent recommendations related to the instructional program and requiring school board approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
3. Direct the development and operation of an instructional materials center for teacher use.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON LIBRARY EUGENE

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>	
4. Submit a written report to the superintendent on all meetings with the professional staff.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
5. Discuss proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems with the superintendent before presenting them to principals.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
6. Initiate and conduct meetings with principals for the purpose of discussing instructional problems.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
7. Submit his decisions related to curricular and instructional problems to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
8. Make decisions regarding the selection of curricular or instructional problems for study at the district level.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
9. Make decisions related to the initiation, design, and direction of pilot projects requiring experimentation with new teaching content, tools, and techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
10. Seek direction and advice from the superintendent when planning curriculum projects.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
11. Make decisions related to the participation of lay citizens on curriculum committees.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
12. Submit recommendations regarding the structure and membership of curriculum committees to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
13. Submit written communications directed to staff to the superintendent for approval before transmittal.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
14. Make decisions on procedures for evaluating the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>	
15. Develop and direct the process by which instructional materials, supplies, and equipment are selected.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
16. Present proposed changes in the instructional supervision program to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
17. Discuss the nature and content of all reports made to the school board with the superintendent prior to making such reports.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
18. Make decisions related to the implementation of recommendations of curriculum committees.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
19. Submit curriculum guides, course syllabi, and resource units developed by curriculum committees to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
20. Make decisions regarding approval of applications by staff members for permission to attend professional conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
21. Make decisions regarding the selection and employment of instructors or staff for in-service programs.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
22. Present plans for staff in-service to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
23. Secure the superintendent's permission to attend professional conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
24. Direct and coordinate the activities of directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
25. Clarify and determine roles for and with directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON LIBRARY, EUGENE

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>	
26. Present frequent reports to the superintendent regarding the activities of directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
27. Submit recommendations regarding the assignment of professional personnel to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
28. Recommend pilot programs related to psychological, health, and guidance services to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
29. Make decisions regarding the scope and nature of psychological, health and guidance services.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
30. Prepare that portion of the school budget dealing with district-wide instructional services, materials, and equipment.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
31. Serve as a consultant to groups preparing educational specifications for new school construction.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
32. Make decisions related to the educational specifications for new or remodeled buildings.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
33. Submit reports and bulletins dealing with the instructional program to the superintendent for approval before releasing them to the public.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
34. Initiate and conduct conferences on matters pertaining to the instructional program with parents and other lay citizens.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
35. Secure the superintendent's approval of all materials to be released to the communication media of the community.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
36. Make final decisions on recommendations to be submitted to the superintendent regarding curriculum and instructional matters.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>	
37. Serve as a consultant to principals regarding the development of recommended policies related to the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
38. Initiate periodic evaluations of policies governing instructional procedures.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
39. Initiate and conduct district-wide meetings with teachers for the purpose of discussing instructional problems.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
40. Secure principals' approval of proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems before presenting such proposals to teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
41. Make regular and frequent reports to principals regarding the activities of curriculum committees.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
42. Plan procedures and techniques designed to measure the effectiveness of the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
43. Submit recommendations of curriculum committees to principals for their approval prior to further action.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
44. Visit schools for the purpose of observing the instructional program in action.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
45. Select teachers for participation in experimental instructional programs.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
46. Initiate a pilot project in a school only upon the request or permission of the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
47. Request permission of principals prior to assigning teachers to curriculum projects.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
48. Make final decisions regarding the selection of instructional materials, supplies, and equipment.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>	
49. Submit frequent reports to principals regarding the activities of instructional supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
50. Assign supervisors on the basis of principals' recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
51. Serve as a consultant on instructional problems at the request of a teacher or teachers when that request has been made without the knowledge of the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
52. Determine guidelines controlling classroom visitation by instructional supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
53. Visit a school without an invitation from the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
54. Visit a teacher's classroom without having been asked by the principal to do so.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
55. Direct the implementation of procedures and techniques designed to measure program effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
56. Make frequent reports to principals regarding the activities and progress of curriculum committees.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
57. Evaluate principals for the record.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
58. Evaluate teachers for the record.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
59. Evaluate teachers only upon the request of principals.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
60. Supervise the assignment and scheduling of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>	
61. Restrict recommendations for the continued employment or dismissal of probationary teachers to those instances where such recommendations have been requested or approved by principals.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
62. Recommend the continued employment or dismissal of principals.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
63. Direct the assignment of principals.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
64. Secure the approval of principals before assigning or transferring teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
65. Secure the permission of principals to discuss in-service needs with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
66. Submit plans for teacher in-service programs to principals for approval.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
67. Make decisions related to the development of criteria for assigning pupils to classroom groups within a given grade level or organizational plan.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
68. Consult frequently with principals about the activities and performance of psychological, health, and guidance personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
69. Make decisions regarding the appropriate utilization of facilities for instructional purposes.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
70. Decide which community drives and activities merit school participation.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal
71. Submit reports and bulletins dealing with the instructional program to principals for approval before distributing such reports to the community.	1	2	3	4	5	Asst. Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Supt.
	1	2	3	4	5	Principal

RUSSEL E. KLEIN
4975 WHITEAKER ST.
EUGENE, OREGON 97405

STAPLE

STA

EXPECTATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS FOR THE ROLE
OF THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT IN CHARGE OF INSTRUCTION

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

The information requested below will be helpful in interpreting the results of the study.
All information will be held in strictest confidence and will never be identified by name.

1. Name _____
2. School district _____
No. _____ State _____ ADM _____
3. Position now held:

_____ Superintendent	_____ Secondary School Principal
_____ Assistant Superintendent	_____ Elementary School Principal
4. Title of preceding position :

_____ Teacher	_____ Assistant Superintendent
_____ Vice-Principal	_____ Superintendent
_____ Elementary School Principal	_____ Other (specify)
_____ Secondary School Principal	_____
5. Years of service in present position _____.
6. Years of service in present district _____.
7. Years of teaching experience:
_____ Elementary _____ Secondary
8. Years of administrative experience prior to present appointment:

_____ Vice-Principal	_____ Superintendent
_____ Principal	_____ Other (specify)
_____ Assistant Superintendent	_____
9. Academic preparation :
Highest degree held: Bachelor's _____ Master's _____ Doctoral _____
Undergraduate major _____
Master's degree major _____
Doctoral degree major _____

PART II. ROLE INVENTORY

Directions:

- 1) Please respond to each item in terms of that question listed below which is appropriate for your position.
 - a) Superintendent's Question: "As a superintendent, do you feel that the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction should or should not do the following things?"
 - b) Principal's Question: "As a principal, do you feel that the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction should or should not do the following things?"
- 2) The categories of responses for each item are as follows:
 - 1) Absolutely must
 - 2) Preferably should
 - 3) May or may not
 - 4) Preferably should not
 - 5) Absolutely must not

To indicate the answer you have selected for each item, DRAW A CIRCLE around the numeral in the appropriate column.

Sample Item:

Make recommendations to the school board
without prior approval of the superintendent.

AM PS MMN PSN AMN

1 2 3 4 5

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>
1. Formulate and recommend directly to the school board policies governing the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Present to the superintendent recommendations related to the instructional program and requiring school board approval.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Direct the development and operation of an instructional materials center for teacher use.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Submit a written report to the superintendent on all meetings with the professional staff.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Discuss proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems with the superintendent before presenting them to principals.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Initiate and conduct meetings with principals for the purpose of discussing instructional problems.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Submit his decisions related to curricular and instructional problems to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Make decisions regarding the selection of curricular or instructional problems for study at the district level.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Make decisions related to the initiation, design, and direction of pilot projects requiring experimentation with new teaching content, tools, and techniques.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Seek direction and advice from the superintendent when planning curriculum projects.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Make decisions related to the participation of lay citizens on curriculum committees.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Submit recommendations regarding the structure and membership of curriculum committees to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Submit written communications directed to staff to the superintendent for approval before transmittal.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Make decisions on procedures for evaluating the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Develop and direct the process by which instructional materials, supplies, and equipment are selected.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Present proposed changes in the instructional supervision program to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>
17. Discuss the nature and content of all reports made to the school board with the superintendent prior to making such reports.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Make decisions related to the implementation of recommendations of curriculum committees.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Submit curriculum guides, course syllabi, and resource units developed by curriculum committees to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Make decisions regarding approval of applications by staff members for permission to attend professional conferences.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Make decisions regarding the selection and employment of instructors or staff for in-service programs.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Present plans for staff in-service to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Secure the superintendent's permission to attend professional conferences.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Direct and coordinate the activities of directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Clarify and determine roles for and with directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Present frequent reports to the superintendent regarding the activities of directors, coordinators, and supervisors employed by the division of curriculum and instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Submit recommendations regarding the assignment of professional personnel to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Recommend pilot programs related to psychological, health, and guidance services to the superintendent for approval.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Make decisions regarding the scope and nature of psychological, health and guidance services.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Prepare that portion of the school budget dealing with district-wide instructional services, materials, and equipment.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>
31. Serve as a consultant to groups preparing educational specifications for new school construction.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Make decisions related to the educational specifications for new or remodeled buildings.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Submit reports and bulletins dealing with the instructional program to the superintendent for approval before releasing them to the public.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Initiate and conduct conferences on matters pertaining to the instructional program with parents and other lay citizens.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Secure the superintendent's approval of all materials to be released to the communication media of the community.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Make final decisions on recommendations to be submitted to the superintendent regarding curriculum and instructional matters.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Serve as a consultant to principals regarding the development of recommended policies related to the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Initiate periodic evaluations of policies governing instructional procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Initiate and conduct district-wide meetings with teachers for the purpose of discussing instructional problems.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Secure principals' approval of proposed curricular changes and solutions to instructional problems before presenting such proposals to teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Make regular and frequent reports to principals regarding the activities of curriculum committees.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Plan procedures and techniques designed to measure the effectiveness of the instructional program.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Submit recommendations of curriculum committees to principals for their approval prior to further action.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Visit schools for the purpose of observing the instructional program in action.	1	2	3	4	5
45. Select teachers for participation in experimental instructional programs.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>
46. Initiate a pilot project in a school only upon the request or permission of the principal.	1	2	3	4	5
47. Request permission of principals prior to assigning teachers to curriculum projects.	1	2	3	4	5
48. Make final decisions regarding the selection of instructional materials, supplies, and equipment.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Submit frequent reports to principals regarding the activities of instructional supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Assign supervisors on the basis of principals' recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5
51. Serve as a consultant on instructional problems at the request of a teacher or teachers when that request has been made without the knowledge of the principal.	1	2	3	4	5
52. Determine guidelines controlling classroom visitation by instructional supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5
53. Visit a school without an invitation from the principal.	1	2	3	4	5
54. Visit a teacher's classroom without having been asked by the principal to do so.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Direct the implementation of procedures and techniques designed to measure program effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5
56. Make frequent reports to principals regarding the activities and progress of curriculum committees.	1	2	3	4	5
57. Evaluate principals for the record.	1	2	3	4	5
58. Evaluate teachers for the record.	1	2	3	4	5
59. Evaluate teachers only upon the request of principals.	1	2	3	4	5
60. Supervise the assignment and scheduling of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
61. Restrict recommendations for the continued employment or dismissal or probationary teachers to those instances where such recommendations have been requested or approved by principals.	1	2	3	4	5
62. Recommend the continued employment or dismissal of principals.	1	2	3	4	5
63. Direct the assignment of principals.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>AM</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>MMN</u>	<u>PSN</u>	<u>AMN</u>
64. Secure the approval of principals before assigning or transferring teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
65. Secure the permission of principals to discuss in-service needs with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
66. Submit plans for teacher in-service programs to principals for approval.	1	2	3	4	5
67. Make decisions related to the development of criteria for assigning pupils to classroom groups within a given grade level or organizational plan.	1	2	3	4	5
68. Consult frequently with principals about the activities and performance of psychological, health, and guidance personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
69. Make decisions regarding the appropriate utilization of facilities for instructional purposes.	1	2	3	4	5
70. Decide which community drives and activities merit school participation.	1	2	3	4	5
71. Submit reports and bulletins dealing with the instructional program to principals for approval before distributing such reports to the community.	1	2	3	4	5

RUSSEL E. KLEIN
4975 WHITEAKER ST.
EUGENE, OREGON 97405

APPENDIX C

TABLES

TABLE XXVIII

Agreement Scores (AS) and Mean Response Scores (RS) for 71 Assistant Superintendent Role Norms by Assistant Superintendents' Self Expectations, by Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Superintendents and Principals, and by the Actual Expectations of Others

	Role Norms							
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup't.: Self	.354	4.08	.767	1.28	.483	1.94	.467	2.76
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.444	4.33	.711	1.35	.497	2.15	.514	2.62
Sup'ts.: Actual	.390	4.27	.854	1.17	.715	2.00	.675	2.71
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.257	4.07	.574	1.51	.450	2.15	.653	2.92
All Principals: Actual	.120	3.77	.745	1.31	.425	2.25	.457	2.58
Elem. Principals: Actual	.098	3.73	.741	1.31	.438	2.29	.465	2.60
Sec. Principals: Actual	.176	3.85	.755	1.29	.392	2.14	.438	2.51
	Role Norms							
	(5)		(6)		(7)		(8)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.467	2.16	.750	1.30	.417	1.70	.462	2.02
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.566	2.06	.618	1.46	.514	1.58	.475	2.15
Sup'ts.: Actual	.512	2.10	.553	1.61	.512	1.59	.634	1.95
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.479	2.54	.549	1.54	.410	1.96	.521	2.32
All Principals: Actual	.449	2.17	.579	1.50	.539	1.55	.475	2.12
Elem. Principals: Actual	.478	2.13	.580	1.50	.529	1.57	.475	2.11
Sec. Principals: Actual	.373	2.28	.578	1.51	.564	1.52	.477	2.16

TABLE XXVIII-continued

	Role Norms							
	(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.517	1.86	.626	1.96	.439	2.35	.371	2.43
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.566	1.94	.521	1.94	.371	2.39	.486	2.32
Sup'ts.: Actual	.492	2.07	.553	1.90	.479	2.67	.614	2.02
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.479	2.25	.504	2.26	.601	2.60	.450	2.55
All Principals: Actual	.586	1.92	.530	1.85	.435	2.42	.417	2.16
Elem. Principals: Actual	.580	1.90	.563	1.86	.449	2.42	.397	2.20
Sec. Principals: Actual	.603	1.97	.448	1.83	.399	2.42	.471	2.05
	Role Norms							
	(13)		(14)		(15)		(16)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.456	3.00	.600	1.84	.371	1.86	.817	1.22
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.566	2.94	.514	1.79	.427	1.81	.826	1.21
Sup'ts.: Actual	.715	2.95	.634	2.00	.512	1.80	.756	1.29
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.575	3.10	.490	2.12	.405	2.14	.507	1.59
All Principals: Actual	.402	2.68	.552	1.93	.489	2.09	.624	1.45
Elem. Principals: Actual	.384	2.67	.557	1.89	.482	2.12	.602	1.48
Sec. Principals: Actual	.448	2.71	.539	2.01	.506	2.03	.680	1.38

TABLE XXVIII-continued

	Role Norms							
	(17)		(18)		(19)		(20)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.733	1.32	.533	1.80	.333	1.96	.433	2.24
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.722	1.33	.566	1.81	.479	1.87	.444	2.46
Sup'ts.: Actual	.634	1.44	.634	2.05	.492	1.93	.472	2.05
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.541	1.55	.490	2.00	.462	2.19	.337	2.61
All Principals: Actual	.752	1.30	.564	1.84	.416	1.76	.420	2.40
Elem. Principals: Actual	.761	1.29	.576	1.84	.426	1.78	.421	2.40
Sec. Principals: Actual	.729	1.33	.535	1.84	.409	1.71	.419	2.40
	Role Norms							
	(21)		(22)		(23)		(24)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.600	1.92	.483	1.66	.550	1.54	.779	1.27
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.549	2.12	.497	1.65	.514	1.58	.740	1.31
Sup'ts.: Actual	.533	2.02	.634	1.80	.492	1.61	.736	1.32
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.592	2.16	.444	1.92	.388	1.80	.592	1.49
All Principals: Actual	.560	2.16	.512	1.80	.408	1.71	.632	1.44
Elem. Principals: Actual	.559	2.15	.503	1.90	.403	1.72	.598	1.48
Sec. Principals: Actual	.564	2.17	.535	1.56	.422	1.69	.719	1.34

TABLE XXVIII-continued

	Role Norms							
	(25)		(26)		(27)		(28)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.617	1.46	.433	1.88	.533	1.56	.433	1.76
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.609	1.47	.504	1.87	.486	1.62	.415	1.85
Sup'ts.: Actual	.593	1.49	.614	1.78	.553	1.54	.370	1.78
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.507	1.59	.439	2.14	.439	1.78	.388	2.16
All Principals: Actual	.590	1.49	.456	1.87	.386	1.87	.383	1.97
Elem. Principals: Actual	.570	1.52	.452	1.90	.403	1.86	.399	2.05
Sec. Principals: Actual	.641	1.43	.467	1.80	.341	1.88	.341	1.79
	Role Norms							
	(29)		(30)		(31)		(32)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.439	2.22	.433	1.72	.617	1.46	.433	1.88
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.388	2.29	.405	1.86	.558	1.53	.439	2.06
Sup'ts.: Actual	.289	2.41	.553	2.10	.736	1.88	.542	2.30
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.479	2.42	.439	2.06	.507	1.73	.405	2.18
All Principals: Actual	.316	2.62	.516	2.11	.560	1.86	.485	2.30
Elem. Principals: Actual	.299	2.60	.516	2.14	.578	1.91	.500	2.27
Sec. Principals: Actual	.360	2.65	.516	2.05	.516	1.74	.448	2.36

TABLE XXVIII--continued

	Role Norms							
	(33)		(34)		(35)		(36)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.400	2.04	.617	2.10	.233	2.20	.400	1.72
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.433	1.83	.626	2.08	.323	2.15	.362	1.77
Sup'ts.: Actual	.512	1.85	.634	1.95	.431	2.20	.472	1.66
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.375	2.04	.541	2.27	.286	2.33	.405	2.02
All Principals: Actual	.462	1.65	.530	2.22	.368	2.00	.460	1.77
Elem. Principals: Actual	.471	1.64	.532	2.24	.348	1.95	.476	1.77
Sec. Principals: Actual	.438	1.67	.525	2.20	.419	2.12	.419	1.77
	Role Norms							
	(37)		(38)		(39)		(40)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.667	1.40	.633	1.44	.400	1.72	.617	1.46
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.514	1.58	.531	1.56	.427	1.81	.566	1.52
Sup'ts.: Actual	.625	1.55	.593	1.51	.695	1.73	.521	1.92
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.524	1.71	.609	1.78	.392	2.06	.740	1.31
All Principals: Actual	.563	1.61	.586	1.69	.501	2.05	.464	1.68
Elem. Principals: Actual	.597	1.63	.617	1.71	.517	2.11	.453	1.74
Sec. Principals: Actual	.535	1.56	.506	1.64	.457	1.91	.578	1.51

TABLE XXVIII-continued

	Role Norms							
	(41)		(42)		(43)		(44)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.600	1.48	.567	1.52	.450	1.74	.650	1.42
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.427	1.69	.524	1.67	.497	1.98	.541	1.55
Sup'ts.: Actual	.496	1.61	.551	1.62	.496	1.87	.583	1.50
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.653	1.42	.524	1.80	.653	1.42	.507	1.59
All Principals: Actual	.523	1.64	.516	1.70	.496	1.80	.507	1.59
Elem. Principals: Actual	.524	1.67	.549	1.72	.515	1.92	.508	1.59
Sec. Principals: Actual	.529	1.56	.480	1.62	.583	1.50	.504	1.60
	Role Norms							
	(45)		(46)		(47)		(48)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.388	2.33	.507	1.59	.507	1.59	.300	2.56
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.479	2.29	.427	1.69	.479	1.71	.288	2.52
Sup'ts.: Actual	.625	1.90	.333	2.05	.646	1.77	.533	2.37
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.490	2.63	.716	1.34	.677	1.39	.354	2.92
All Principals: Actual	.436	2.69	.353	1.85	.545	1.79	.386	2.87
Elem. Principals: Actual	.436	2.67	.372	1.80	.559	1.79	.384	2.80
Sec. Principals: Actual	.438	2.73	.304	1.99	.510	1.81	.390	3.03

TABLE XXVIII-continued

	Role Norms							
	(49)		(50)		(51)		(52)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.367	2.40	.467	2.68	.417	3.82	.354	2.53
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.444	2.50	.531	2.81	.444	3.75	.337	2.47
Sup'ts.: Actual	.562	2.12	.492	2.73	.479	3.77	.542	2.20
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.410	2.29	.653	2.08	.444	4.21	.462	2.69
All Principals: Actual	.431	2.30	.423	2.56	.332	3.84	.372	2.61
Elem. Principals: Actual	.446	2.35	.424	2.56	.317	3.81	.385	2.57
Sec. Principals: Actual	.392	2.19	.422	2.56	.373	3.91	.405	2.71
	Role Norms							
	(53)		(54)		(55)		(56)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.317	2.22	.317	2.70	.617	1.90	.600	1.80
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.337	2.18	.269	2.65	.541	1.94	.618	1.92
Sup'ts.: Actual	.562	2.77	.667	3.00	.562	1.77	.562	1.77
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.410	2.62	.444	3.17	.626	2.08	.566	1.73
All Principals: Actual	.592	2.69	.570	3.05	.602	2.01	.631	1.86
Elem. Principals: Actual	.602	2.69	.585	3.05	.612	2.03	.647	1.89
Sec. Principals: Actual	.563	2.69	.529	3.05	.578	1.96	.588	1.76

TABLE XXVIII-continued

	Role Norms							
	(57)		(58)		(59)		(60)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.200	2.44	.200	3.40	.286	2.55	.350	3.26
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.252	2.29	.253	3.31	.291	2.53	.340	3.25
Sup'ts.: Actual	.231	2.26	.380	3.08	.359	2.79	.187	3.05
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.167	2.79	.133	3.41	.220	2.34	.236	3.42
All Principals: Actual	.316	2.45	.289	3.54	.379	2.63	.235	3.45
Elem. Principals: Actual	.283	2.50	.302	3.57	.366	2.63	.306	3.28
Sec. Principals: Actual	.402	2.32	.273	3.48	.412	2.65	.302	3.88
	Role Norms							
	(61)		(62)		(63)		(64)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.303	2.31	.183	2.42	.183	2.50	.490	1.84
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.358	2.27	.218	2.20	.133	2.51	.462	1.90
Sup'ts.: Actual	.268	2.68	.333	2.40	.354	2.72	.701	2.00
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.379	2.02	.219	2.81	.184	2.98	.565	1.52
All Principals: Actual	.386	2.28	.256	2.64	.322	2.93	.495	1.61
Elem. Principals: Actual	.363	2.29	.257	2.61	.329	2.83	.474	1.65
Sec. Principals: Actual	.444	2.24	.275	2.72	.306	3.21	.598	1.48

TABLE XXVIII-continued

	Role Norms							
	(65)		(66)		(67)		(68)	
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.417	2.42	.417	2.22	.392	2.98	.439	2.06
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.410	2.46	.439	2.22	.415	2.94	.468	2.17
Sup'ts.: Actual	.496	2.39	.561	2.16	.386	2.68	.583	2.13
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.415	2.28	.486	1.98	.410	3.17	.402	2.15
All Principals: Actual	.497	2.26	.589	2.08	.393	3.32	.444	2.37
Elem. Principals: Actual	.508	2.24	.578	2.12	.403	3.32	.433	2.36
Sec. Principals: Actual	.471	2.31	.618	1.96	.370	3.31	.471	2.38
	Role Norms							
	(69)		(70)		(71)			
	AS	RS	AS	RS	AS	RS		
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Self	.473	2.22	.375	3.00	.286	2.45		
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Sup'ts.	.462	2.23	.271	2.75	.271	2.50		
Sup'ts.: Actual	.551	2.23	.594	3.08	.298	2.53		
Ass't. Sup'ts.: Principals	.433	2.53	.433	2.96	.438	2.15		
All Principals: Actual	.396	2.62	.412	3.15	.374	2.32		
Elem. Principals: Actual	.395	2.55	.432	3.05	.364	2.36		
Sec. Principals: Actual	.399	2.81	.360	3.40	.402	2.20		

TABLE XXIX

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Superintendents and Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
1	S.	7.3	4.9	2.4	24.4	61.0	9.93	4	.050
	P.	7.6	12.8	16.1	22.4	41.1			
3	S.	17.1	65.9	17.1	0.0	0.0	11.94	4	.025
	P.	22.2	39.2	31.4	6.2	1.0			
13	S.	2.4	14.6	68.3	14.6	0.0	10.82	4	.050
	P.	13.6	24.7	45.8	12.0	3.9			
39	S.	31.7	63.4	4.9	0.0	0.0	10.68	4	.050
	P.	27.4	44.6	24.8	2.0	1.3			
45	S.	27.5	55.0	17.5	0.0	0.0	28.73	4	.001
	P.	10.6	28.4	46.9	10.2	4.0			
48	S.	9.8	53.7	29.3	4.9	2.4	18.30	4	.005
	P.	10.1	23.4	43.5	15.9	7.1			
64	S.	17.9	71.8	5.1	2.6	2.6	19.59	4	.001
	P.	51.7	38.7	7.9	0.7	1.0			
67	S.	10.5	31.6	36.8	21.1	0.0	17.03	4	.005
	P.	3.9	12.5	42.0	30.8	10.8			

TABLE XXX

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Superintendents and Elementary School Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cent					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
1	S.	7.3	4.9	2.4	24.4	61.0	10.74	4	.050
	E.P.	7.3	14.2	17.0	20.6	40.8			
3	S.	17.1	65.9	17.1	0.0	0.0	10.66	4	.050
	E.P.	19.5	40.7	33.0	5.4	1.4			
13	S.	2.4	14.6	68.3	14.6	0.0	12.10	4	.010
	E.P.	13.1	27.5	43.2	12.2	4.1			
39	S.	31.7	63.4	4.9	0.0	0.0	11.58	4	.025
	E.P.	23.5	46.2	27.6	1.4	1.4			
45	S.	27.5	55.0	17.5	0.0	0.0	26.48	4	.001
	E.P.	10.9	28.6	46.4	10.9	3.2			
48	S.	9.8	53.7	29.3	4.9	2.4	13.41	4	.010
	E.P.	10.4	26.1	43.7	12.6	7.2			
64	S.	17.9	71.8	5.1	2.6	2.6	17.11	4	.005
	E.P.	48.8	39.6	9.7	0.9	0.9			
67	S.	10.5	31.6	36.8	21.1	0.0	17.07	4	.005
	E.P.	4.1	11.4	41.6	33.8	9.1			

TABLE XXXI

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Superintendents and Secondary School Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
3	S.	17.1	65.9	17.1	0.0	0.0	11.90	4	.010
	S.P.	29.4	35.3	27.1	8.2	0.0			
40	S.	32.5	45.0	20.0	2.5	0.0	10.54	4	.050
	S.P.	55.3	38.8	5.9	0.0	0.0			
45	S.	27.5	55.0	17.5	0.0	0.0	23.51	4	.001
	S.P.	9.6	27.7	48.2	8.4	6.0			
48	S.	9.8	53.7	29.3	4.9	2.4	21.94	4	.001
	S.P.	9.3	16.3	43.0	24.4	7.0			
60	S.	14.6	17.1	29.3	26.8	12.2	14.35	4	.010
	S.P.	3.5	5.8	25.6	29.1	36.0			
64	S.	17.9	71.8	5.1	2.6	2.6	19.40	4	.001
	S.P.	58.8	36.6	3.5	0.0	1.2			
67	S.	10.5	31.6	36.8	21.1	0.0	11.90	4	.025
	S.P.	3.5	15.1	43.0	23.3	15.1			
69	S.	15.4	51.3	28.2	5.1	0.0	10.73	4	.050
	S.P.	7.0	31.4	38.4	19.8	3.5			
70	S.	2.6	15.4	64.1	7.7	10.3	9.64	4	.050
	S.P.	2.3	14.0	39.5	30.2	14.0			

TABLE XXXII

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Elementary and Secondary School Principals for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cent					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
22	E.P.	35.0	42.6	20.6	1.3	0.4	15.58	4	.005
	S.P.	50.0	45.3	3.5	1.2	0.0			
43	E.P.	33.2	44.1	20.5	2.3	0.0	18.42	4	.005
	S.P.	58.3	33.3	8.3	0.0	0.0			
60	E.P.	5.9	15.8	38.0	24.9	15.4	21.12	4	.001
	S.P.	3.5	5.8	25.6	29.1	36.0			
69	E.P.	9.6	39.7	40.2	7.3	3.2	10.55	4	.050
	S.P.	7.0	31.4	38.4	19.8	3.5			

TABLE XXXIII

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Superintendents for Role 1:
Acting Toward Superintendents

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cent					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
31	A.S.	58.0	38.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	12.15	4	.025
	S.	22.0	68.3	9.8	0.0	0.0			
32	A.S.	40.0	34.0	24.0	2.0	0.0	10.17	4	.050
	S.	12.5	55.0	25.0	5.0	2.5			

TABLE XXXIV

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Superintendents for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
39	A.S.	50.0	30.0	18.0	2.0	0.0	11.42	4	.025
	S.	31.7	63.4	4.9	0.0	0.0			
40	A.S.	66.0	22.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	10.69	4	.050
	S.	32.5	45.0	20.0	2.5	0.0			
45	A.S.	20.4	30.6	44.9	4.1	0.0	10.33	4	.050
	S.	27.5	55.0	17.5	0.0	0.0			
47	A.S.	55.1	30.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	9.95	4	.050
	S.	32.5	60.0	5.0	2.5	0.0			
48	A.S.	20.0	24.0	38.0	16.0	2.0	9.90	4	.050
	S.	9.8	53.7	29.3	4.9	2.4			
53	A.S.	30.0	32.0	26.0	10.0	2.0	14.37	4	.010
	S.	10.0	17.5	62.5	5.0	5.0			
54	A.S.	14.0	28.0	32.0	26.0	0.0	16.37	4	.005
	S.	2.5	15.0	67.5	10.0	5.0			

TABLE XXXV

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Principals for Role 1:
Acting Toward Superintendents

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
30	A.S.	48.0	32.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	14.05	4	.010
	P.	23.4	45.5	28.2	2.3	0.6			
31	A.S.	58.0	38.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	13.88	4	.010
	P.	33.2	47.6	18.9	0.3	0.0			
32	A.S.	40.0	34.0	24.0	2.0	0.0	16.99	4	.005
	P.	16.0	47.1	28.8	7.5	0.0			
33	A.S.	34.0	34.0	28.0	2.0	2.0	13.95	4	.010
	P.	53.9	29.2	15.3	1.6	0.0			

TABLE XXXVI

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Principals for Role 2:
Acting Toward Principals

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
39	A.S.	50.0	30.0	18.0	2.0	0.0	10.85	4	.050
	P.	27.4	44.6	24.8	2.0	1.3			
41	A.S.	62.0	30.0	6.0	2.0	0.0	10.76	4	.050
	P.	46.7	43.4	9.5	0.0	0.3			
53	A.S.	30.0	32.0	26.0	10.0	2.0	32.85	4	.001
	P.	6.9	26.1	59.2	6.5	1.3			
54	A.S.	14.0	28.0	32.0	26.0	0.0	21.27	4	.001
	P.	3.6	16.2	56.8	18.5	4.9			
63	A.S.	26.0	22.0	34.0	12.0	6.0	15.682	4	.005
	P.	7.9	28.2	37.7	15.1	11.1			

TABLE XXXVII

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Elementary School Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
30	A.S.	48.0	32.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	14.68	4	.010
	E.P.	22.1	45.5	29.7	1.8	0.9			
31	A.S.	58.0	38.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	16.70	4	.005
	E.P.	29.9	49.8	19.9	0.5	0.0			
32	A.S.	40.0	34.0	24.0	2.0	0.0	14.58	4	.010
	E.P.	16.4	46.8	30.0	6.8	0.0			
33	A.S.	34.0	34.0	28.0	2.0	2.0	12.30	4	.025
	E.P.	53.6	30.6	14.4	1.4	0.0			

TABLE XXXVIII

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Elementary School Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
37	A.S.	66.0	28.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	9.59	4	.050
	E.P.	42.5	51.6	5.9	0.0	0.0			
39	A.S.	50.0	30.0	18.0	2.0	0.0	14.77	4	.010
	E.P.	23.5	46.2	27.6	1.4	1.4			
41	A.S.	62.0	30.0	6.0	2.0	0.0	9.73	4	.050
	E.P.	45.2	43.8	10.5	0.0	0.5			
53	A.S.	30.0	32.0	26.0	10.0	2.0	29.36	4	.001
	E.P.	7.2	24.8	60.4	6.8	0.9			
54	A.S.	14.0	28.0	32.0	26.0	0.0	19.64	4	.001
	E.P.	4.5	13.5	58.7	19.3	4.0			
63	A.S.	26.0	22.0	34.0	12.0	6.0	11.32	4	.025
	E.P.	9.0	30.8	37.1	14.5	8.6			

TABLE XXXIX

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Secondary School Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
6	A.S.	76.0	18.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	11.51	4	.025
	S.P.	54.1	43.5	1.2	0.0	1.2			
12	A.S.	16.3	36.7	34.7	12.2	0.0	9.54	4	.050
	S.P.	29.4	37.6	31.8	1.2	0.0			
13	A.S.	2.0	28.6	42.9	20.4	6.1	9.63	4	.050
	S.P.	15.1	17.4	52.3	11.6	3.5			
32	A.S.	40.0	34.0	24.0	2.0	0.0	13.20	4	.025
	S.P.	15.1	47.7	25.6	9.3	2.3			

TABLE XXXX

Significant Differences between The Expectations of Assistant Superintendents and Secondary School Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
53	A.S.	30.0	32.0	26.0	10.0	2.0	19.18	4	.001
	S.P.	6.0	29.8	56.0	6.0	2.4			
54	A.S.	14.0	28.0	32.0	26.0	0.0	16.71	4	.005
	S.P.	1.2	23.5	51.8	16.5	7.1			
57	A.S.	26.0	32.0	20.0	16.0	6.0	9.53	4	.050
	S.P.	20.0	38.8	34.1	3.5	3.5			
60	A.S.	6.0	14.0	42.0	24.0	14.0	11.35	4	.025
	S.P.	3.5	5.8	25.6	29.1	36.0			
63	A.S.	26.0	22.0	34.0	12.0	6.0	15.12	4	.005
	S.P.	4.8	21.4	39.3	16.7	17.9			
69	A.S.	20.4	40.8	34.7	4.1	0.0	12.83	4	.025
	S.P.	7.0	31.4	38.4	19.8	3.5			

TABLE XXXXI

Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Superintendents and the Expectations of Superintendents for the Role of the Assistant Superintendent

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
39	A.S.:Sup'ts.	43.8	31.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	11.50	4	.025
	S.:Actual	31.7	63.4	4.9	0.0	0.0			
49	A.S.:Sup'ts.	14.6	29.2	47.9	8.3	0.0	9.88	4	.050
	S.:Actual	20.0	55.0	17.5	7.5	0.0			
53	A.S.:Sup'ts.	30.6	32.7	26.5	8.2	2.0	13.91	4	.010
	S.:Actual	10.0	17.5	62.5	5.0	5.0			
54	A.S.:Sup'ts.	14.3	32.7	26.5	0.0	0.0	20.00	4	.001
	S.:Actual	2.5	15.0	67.5	10.0	5.0			

TABLE XXXXII

Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
2	A.S.:Prin.	63.8	25.5	8.5	0.0	2.1	9.85	4	.050
	P.:Actual	72.6	24.1	3.3	0.0	0.0			
5	A.S.:Prin.	12.5	29.2	50.0	8.3	0.0	18.41	4	.005
	P.:Actual	24.4	44.6	22.1	6.8	2.0			
7	A.S.:Prin.	37.5	29.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	17.53	4	.005
	P.:Actual	58.0	29.6	11.4	1.0	0.0			
9	A.S.:Prin.	18.8	39.6	39.6	2.1	0.0	18.19	4	.005
	P.:Actual	29.1	53.6	14.4	2.6	0.3			
10	A.S.:Prin.	17.0	40.4	42.6	0.0	0.0	13.76	4	.010
	P.:Actual	35.8	44.0	19.9	0.3	0.0			
11	A.S.:Prin.	4.2	35.4	56.3	4.2	0.0	11.62	4	.025
	P.:Actual	13.0	44.6	32.9	6.5	2.9			
12	A.S.:Prin.	14.9	25.5	48.9	10.6	0.0	12.14	4	.025
	P.:Actual	27.1	36.6	31.0	3.9	1.3			
13	A.S.:Prin.	0.0	20.4	53.1	22.4	4.1	10.91	4	.050
	P.:Actual	13.6	24.7	45.8	12.0	3.9			
18	A.S.:Prin.	30.6	38.8	30.6	0.0	0.0	10.49	4	.050
	P.:Actual	34.1	50.3	13.3	1.9	0.3			
19	A.S.:Prin.	22.9	43.8	27.1	4.2	2.1	11.88	4	.025
	P.:Actual	47.1	32.8	17.5	2.3	0.3			
33	A.S.:Prin.	35.4	31.3	27.1	6.2	0.0	10.22	4	.050
	P.:Actual	53.9	29.2	15.3	1.6	0.0			

TABLE XXXXIII

Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
40	A.S.:Prin.	77.1	14.6	8.3	0.0	0.0	14.34	4	.010
	P.:Actual	48.4	37.9	12.1	1.0	2.7			
43	A.S.:Prin.	64.6	29.2	6.2	0.0	0.0	11.12	4	.050
	P.:Actual	40.1	41.1	17.1	1.6	0.0			
46	A.S.:Prin.	76.6	17.0	4.3	0.0	2.1	17.25	4	.005
	P.:Actual	46.1	28.9	19.8	3.9	1.3			
47	A.S.:Prin.	75.5	14.3	8.2	0.0	2.1	27.29	4	.001
	P.:Actual	37.6	47.4	13.7	0.7	0.7			
50	A.S.:Prin.	16.7	58.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	14.74	4	.010
	P.:Actual	9.2	38.0	41.6	9.5	1.6			
59	A.S.:Prin.	29.8	21.3	40.4	2.1	6.4	16.42	4	.005
	P.:Actual	10.6	34.4	40.7	9.6	4.6			
63	A.S.:Prin.	18.8	12.5	37.5	14.6	16.7	10.24	4	.050
	P.:Actual	7.9	28.2	37.7	15.1	11.1			

TABLE XXXIV

Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Elementary School Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
5	A.S.:Prin.	12.5	29.2	50.2	8.3	0.0	22.09	4	.001
	E.P.:Actual	24.8	47.7	19.4	5.9	2.3			
7	A.S.:Prin.	37.5	29.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	17.39	4	.005
	E.P.:Actual	55.7	33.0	10.4	0.9	0.0			
9	A.S.:Prin.	18.8	39.6	39.6	2.1	0.0	18.96	4	.001
	E.P.:Actual	30.5	53.2	13.2	2.7	0.5			
10	A.S.:Prin.	17.0	40.4	42.6	0.0	0.0	14.47	4	.010
	E.P.:Actual	33.5	48.0	18.1	0.5	0.0			
11	A.S.:Prin.	4.2	35.4	56.3	4.2	0.0	13.15	4	.025
	E.P.:Actual	12.2	47.1	30.3	7.7	2.7			
12	A.S.:Prin.	14.9	25.5	48.9	10.6	0.0	10.04	4	.050
	E.P.:Actual	26.2	36.2	30.8	5.0	1.8			
13	A.S.:Prin.	0.0	20.4	53.1	22.4	4.1	11.06	4	.050
	E.P.:Actual	13.1	27.5	43.2	12.2	4.1			
19	A.S.:Prin.	22.9	43.8	27.1	4.2	2.1	9.68	4	.050
	E.P.:Actual	45.5	34.2	17.6	2.3	0.5			
33	A.S.:Prin.	35.4	31.3	27.1	6.2	0.0	10.66	4	.050
	E.P.:Actual	53.6	30.6	14.4	1.4	0.0			

TABLE XXXXV

Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Elementary School Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
40	A.S.:Prin.	77.1	14.6	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.00	4	.005
	E.P.:Actual	45.7	37.6	14.5	1.4	0.9			
43	A.S.:Prin.	64.6	29.2	6.2	0.0	0.0	17.66	4	.005
	E.P.:Actual	33.2	44.1	20.5	2.3	0.0			
46	A.S.:Prin.	76.6	17.0	4.3	0.0	2.1	15.50	4	.005
	E.P.:Actual	47.5	29.1	19.7	2.7	0.9			
47	A.S.:Prin.	75.5	14.3	8.2	0.0	2.1	27.01	4	.001
	E.P.:Actual	37.1	48.4	13.6	0.5	0.5			
50	A.S.:Prin.	16.7	58.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	13.94	4	.010
	E.P.:Actual	8.2	40.0	40.5	10.0	1.4			
59	A.S.:Prin.	29.8	21.3	40.4	2.1	6.4	15.66	4	.005
	E.P.:Actual	10.1	36.4	39.6	8.3	5.5			
63	A.S.:Prin.	18.8	12.5	37.5	14.6	16.7	10.97	4	.050
	E.P.:Actual	9.0	30.8	37.1	14.5	8.6			

TABLE XXXXVI

Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Secondary School Principals for Role 1: Acting Toward Superintendents

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
7	A.S.:Prin.	37.5	29.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	10.93	4	.050
	S.P.:Actual	64.0	20.9	14.0	1.2	0.0			
12	A.S.:Prin.	14.9	25.5	48.9	10.6	0.0	12.28	4	.025
	S.P.:Actual	29.4	37.6	31.8	1.2	0.0			
13	A.S.:Prin.	0.0	20.4	53.1	22.4	4.1	9.94	4	.050
	S.P.:Actual	15.1	17.4	52.3	11.6	3.5			
19	A.S.:Prin.	22.9	43.8	27.1	4.2	2.1	11.43	4	.025
	S.P.:Actual	51.2	29.1	17.4	2.3	0.0			
22	A.S.:Prin.	37.5	35.4	25.0	2.1	0.0	14.69	4	.010
	S.P.:Actual	50.0	45.3	3.5	1.2	0.0			
32	A.S.:Prin.	26.5	30.6	40.8	2.0	0.0	10.24	4	.050
	S.P.:Actual	15.1	47.7	25.6	9.3	2.3			

TABLE XXXXVII

Significant Differences between Assistant Superintendents' Perceptions of the Expectations of Principals and the Expectations of Secondary School Principals for Role 2: Acting Toward Principals

Role Norm	Sample	Responses by Per Cents					χ^2	df	Sign. Level
		AM	PS	MMN	PSN	AMN			
46	A.S.:Prin.	76.6	17.0	4.3	0.0	2.1	16.61	4	.005
	S.P.:Actual	42.4	28.2	20.0	7.1	2.4			
47	A.S.:Prin.	75.5	14.3	8.2	0.0	2.0	18.21	4	.005
	S.P.:Actual	38.8	44.7	14.1	1.2	1.2			
50	A.S.:Prin.	16.7	58.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	13.49	4	.010
	S.P.:Actual	11.8	32.9	44.7	8.2	2.4			
57	A.S.:Prin.	16.7	27.1	29.2	14.6	12.5	10.27	4	.050
	S.P.:Actual	20.0	38.8	34.1	3.5	3.5			
59	A.S.:Prin.	29.8	21.3	40.4	2.1	6.4	11.42	4	.025
	S.P.:Actual	11.8	29.4	43.5	12.9	2.4			

APPENDIX D

ABSTRACT

An Abstract of the Dissertation of
Russel E. Klein for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the College of Education to be taken June 1969
Title: An Analysis of the Role of the Assistant
Superintendent in Charge of Instruction

Approved: _____
(Thesis Adviser, John E. Suttle)

This study was concerned with the role expectations held for the position of assistant superintendent in charge of instruction by the incumbents of the focal position, superintendents, and principals; and the assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals.

The purpose of the study was three-fold: 1) to determine the degree of intraposition consensus, or agreement, within the three role-defining groups regarding their expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent; 2) to determine whether or not there were significant differences among the three role-defining groups regarding their expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent; and 3) to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the assistant superintendents' perceptions of the expectations of superintendents and principals and the expectations

expressed by assistant superintendents, superintendents, and principals.

The study was based upon data collected from 41 superintendents, 50 assistant superintendents, 86 secondary school principals, and 224 elementary school principals.

A comprehensive role norm inventory consisting of 71 role norm statements was used to identify respondents' expectations and perceptions regarding the relationship of the position of assistant superintendent to that of superintendent and principal.

In addition to posing two questions dealing with intraposition consensus, the study projected fourteen hypotheses. These hypotheses were related to the problem of interposition consensus regarding the expectations of the role-defining groups, and to the relationship of the assistant superintendents' perceptions to their own expectations and to the expectations of superintendents and principals.

The level of intraposition consensus for each of the role-defining groups was found to range from an almost complete lack of consensus to almost complete consensus depending upon the particular role norm in question. All role-defining groups exhibited a higher level of intraposition consensus regarding how assistant superintendents should act toward superintendents than they did regarding

how assistant superintendents should act toward principals. Intraposition consensus was also higher on dependent behavior role norms than on independent behavior role norms.

Perception errors on the part of assistant superintendents occurred more frequently when predicting the expectations of superintendents and principals for the appropriate behavior of assistant superintendents toward principals, than was the case when predicting the expectations of superintendents and principals for appropriate behavior toward superintendents.

Assistant superintendents were found to perceive superintendents and principals as having expectations similar to their own expectations for the behavior of the assistant superintendent.

In those instances where statistically significant differences occurred between the expectations of one role-defining group and those of another, these differences occurred most often on role norms dealing with assistant superintendents' behavior toward principals.

While statistically significant differences occurred on individual role norms, the expectations of superintendents for the behavior of assistant superintendents did not differ significantly with the expectations of principals on 83 per cent of the role norms included in the inventory.

Statistically, significant differences were found on only four role norms when the expectations of secondary school principals were compared with those of elementary school principals.

When the expectations of assistant superintendents were compared with the expectations of superintendents, statistically significant differences were found on only nine role norms. Thus, the expectations of these two groups were similar for 87.3 per cent of all role norms.

The expectations of assistant superintendents were found to differ significantly from those of all principals on nine role norms. Again, the expectations of these two groups were similar for 87.3 per cent of all role norms.

Thus, the findings of the study supported the hypothesized relationship that assistant superintendents, superintendents, and principals hold similar expectations for the role of the assistant superintendent.

10

TYPED BY: Gale Hopkinson