

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

72-22,239

JENNINGS, James Maxwell, 1935-
THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN
MICHIGAN.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1972
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN MICHIGAN

By

James Maxwell Jennings

A THESIS

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

**Some pages may have
indistinct print.**

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ABSTRACT

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN MICHIGAN

By

James Maxwell Jennings

This study was designed to determine the status, thought, and practices of elementary school principals in Michigan with respect to personal characteristics; school and resources; experiences, training, and aspirations; welfare and conditions of employment; and administrative/supervisory activities and viewpoints.

Study data were obtained from a questionnaire completed by 86 percent of the 1,179 full-time supervising principals who were members of the sponsoring Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals.

FINDINGS

The typical elementary school principal in Michigan in 1971 was a married, white male between 35-49 years of age who had spent less than twenty years in education and fewer than ten years as a full-time principal. In his present position he spends more

than forty-eight hours per week during his 42-43 week term of employment supervising a suburban K-6 school of 15-24 full-time classroom teachers which has a per-teacher ratio of 26-30 students.

The Michigan principal reported having earned at least the master's degree and had enrolled within a two-year period in college-credit courses specifically oriented toward the elementary school and principalship.

He also revealed a positive degree of satisfaction toward his overall job performance and his selection of occupational position. One-third of his colleagues indicated some level of dissatisfaction with salary and working conditions, while four in every ten reported that they would return to classroom teaching if offered the same salary received as principals. He considered salary increases for principals as lagging behind salary increases for teachers and expressed a desire to determine his salary through individual or group negotiation.

Forty-one percent reported operating in school districts which were confronted with austerity budget conditions. One in every three principals stated that his office facilities were unsatisfactory. Twenty percent reported no involvement in the teacher-negotiations process; 20 percent indicated that they were not evaluated as to their performance as principals; and 15 percent

received no opportunity for administrator inservice. And 30 percent were assigned district-wide responsibilities in addition to their principalships.

Fourteen percent of the respondents reported that no formal parent-organization group existed in their schools, while 49 percent responded that their parent group was not an active and dynamic operation whose meetings were reasonably well attended.

Significant cost-quality relationships involving programs, facilities, and personnel were found to exist in direct proportion to the wealth of the school district as indicated by the operating expenditure level per child.

IMPLICATIONS

The Michigan principalship needs an increased number of minority group members and females within its ranks.

The prevailing system of paying for public schools in Michigan produces inequitable educational situations which tend to deny equal opportunity to children.

Michigan principals have recognized the value of adequate professional preparation for the principalship, and they desire to have a larger voice in decision-making and to use their own ideas concerning the operation of the schools which they administer.

Principals are not in agreement with the manner in which their salaries are determined, and they report their economic status has suffered due to the demands by other negotiating groups.

As a group and as individuals, principals need to work toward the elimination of conditions which deter some elementary administrators from doing the job they may want to do and should do. Principals need and deserve improvements and recompense for professionalism, time, and service.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

- (1) That persons in positions of influence and decision-making move to eliminate the inequity among K-12 Michigan school districts in the financing of public education;
- (2) That every effort be made by school boards and superintendents to place each elementary school in the state under the direction of a qualified, full-time supervising elementary principal;
- (3) That periodic studies and adjunctive research pertinent to the Michigan elementary school principalship be undertaken.

DEDICATED TO

My Wife and Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation for the encouragement and cooperation received from the many individuals who helped make this study possible:

To my parents who instilled in me the value of an education, the writer offers his humble gratitude.

To Mr. Lauren Pickett, Dr. David C. Smith, and the late Mr. Charles G. Coggins, acknowledgment is given for their inspiration and encouragement which helped lead the writer to pursue university studies.

To the MAESP executive board and executive secretary, Mr. Edward P. Keller, the writer expresses his thanks for the sponsorship and cooperation given in conducting the study.

To the many MAESP principals who took time from their busy schedules to respond to the study questionnaire, appreciation is extended.

To Mr. Sid Sytsma, the writer recognizes the assistance received with computer services and statistical analyses.

To Dr. Louis Romano, Dr. James McKee, and Dr. Dale Alam, special thanks are extended for serving on the doctoral committee.

To Dr. Richard F. Featherstone, advisor for the dissertation, the author acknowledges his patient counsel and guidance.

Finally the writer's appreciation and love are expressed to his wife, Shirley, for her understanding and sacrifices, and to his sons, Mark, Brad, and Todd, for giving up time with their father so that this doctoral venture might be accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE	4
FORMULATION OF STUDY HYPOTHESIS	5
SELECTION OF RESEARCH METHOD	5
INFORMATION SOURCES	6
CONSTRUCTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	6
SPONSORSHIP OF THE STUDY	9
DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.	9
PUBLICIZING THE STUDY	11
ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.	12
TABULATION OF THE DATA	13
RELATED STUDIES	14
DEFINITION OF TERMS	19
FORMAT FOR SUCCEEDING CHAPTERS	22
2. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MICHIGAN ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL.	24
SEX	24
1951-1952 Michigan Study.	24
National Studies	25
Statewide Studies	26
Presentation of Data and Findings.	27

Chapter

Page

AGE	28
1951-1952 Michigan Study	28
National Studies	28
Statewide Studies.	31
Presentation of Data and Findings	32
RACIAL-ETHNIC COMPOSITION.	33
Statewide Studies.	33
Presentation of Data and Findings	35
RESIDENTIAL PATTERN.	36
Statewide Studies.	36
Presentation of Data and Findings	37
BIRTHPLACE.	38
Statewide Studies.	38
Presentation of Data and Findings	39
MARITAL STATUS	40
1951-1952 Michigan Study	40
National Studies	40
Statewide Studies.	40
Presentation of Data and Findings	42
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF SPOUSE	43
Statewide Studies.	43
Presentation of Data and Findings	43
POLITICAL PREFERENCE	44
Statewide Studies.	44
Presentation of Data and Findings	44
3. PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL AND RESOURCES	47
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN DISTRICT	47
Statewide Studies.	47
Presentation of Data and Findings	48
School District Enrollment.	49
Presentation of Data and Findings	49

CHARACTER OF SCHOOL DISTRICT	51
1951-1952 Michigan Study	51
National Studies	51
Statewide Studies	51
Presentation of Data and Findings.	52
SCHOOL DISTRICT OPERATING EXPENDITURE LEVEL	54
Presentation of Data and Findings.	54
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS SUPERVISED	55
National Studies	55
Statewide Studies	56
Presentation of Data and Findings.	57
GRADE LEVELS ADMINISTERED	61
National Studies	61
Statewide Studies	61
Presentation of Data and Findings.	62
PUPIL ENROLLMENT UNDER DIRECTION OF PRINCIPAL.	63
National Studies	63
Statewide Studies	64
Presentation of Data and Findings.	66
ECONOMIC CHARACTER OF SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD.	67
National Studies	67
Statewide Studies	67
Presentation of Data and Findings.	69
PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO	70
Statewide Studies	70
Presentation of Data and Findings.	70
CLASSROOM TEACHER POSITIONS	73
National Studies	73
Statewide Studies	73
Presentation of Data and Findings.	75

Chapter	Page
PERCENTAGE OF MALE TEACHING STAFF	76
Presentation of Data and Findings	76
AVAILABILITY OF SECRETARIAL ASSISTANCE	78
1951-1952 Michigan Study	78
National Studies	78
Statewide Studies.	78
Presentation of Data and Findings	80
ADEQUACY OF SUPPLY AND SELECTION OF LIBRARY BOOKS IN PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL. . . .	81
Statewide Studies	81
Presentation of Data and Findings	81
ADEQUACY OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIEL IN PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL	82
Statewide Studies	82
Presentation of Data and Findings	84
ADEQUACY OF PRINCIPAL'S OFFICE	84
National Studies	84
Statewide Studies.	85
Presentation of Data and Findings	86
ADEQUACY OF SPECIALIZED PERSONNEL	87
1951-1952 Michigan Study	87
National Studies	89
Statewide Studies.	90
Presentation of Data and Findings	91
CONDITION OF 1971-1972 SCHOOL BUDGET	94
Presentation of Data and Findings	94
TYPE OF PARENT ORGANIZATION	95
Presentation of Data and Findings	95
EVALUATION OF PARENT GROUP ORGANIZATION	95
Presentation of Data and Findings	95

Chapter	Page
4. EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND ASPIRATIONS . . .	98
TOTAL NUMBER YEARS IN EDUCATION . . .	99
1951-1952 Michigan Study	99
National Studies.	99
Statewide Studies	100
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	101
YEARS SERVED AS FULL-TIME PRINCIPAL . . .	102
1951-1952 Michigan Study	102
National Studies.	102
Statewide Studies	104
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	106
POSITION HELD PRIOR TO FIRST PRINCIPAL- SHIP.	107
1951-1952 Michigan Study	107
National Studies.	110
Statewide Studies	110
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	111
GRADUATE SCHOOL INSTITUTION.	115
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	115
MAJOR FIELD OF GRADUATE STUDY	116
1951-1952 Michigan Study	116
National Studies.	116
Statewide Studies	117
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	118
HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE EARNED	118
National Studies.	118
Statewide Studies	120
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	121
LENGTH OF TIME SINCE LAST ENROLLED FOR COLLEGE CREDIT COURSES.	124
1951-1952 Michigan Study	124
Statewide Studies	124
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	125

Chapter	Page
FINAL OCCUPATIONAL GOAL OF PRINCIPAL . . .	126
National Studies	126
Statewide Studies.	126
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	128
POSITION DESIRED BY PRINCIPALS WHO ASPIRE	129
National Studies	129
Statewide Studies.	129
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	130
INTEREST IN BECOMING PRINCIPAL IF START- ING AGAIN	131
National Studies	131
Statewide Studies.	131
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	132
5. PRINCIPAL'S WELFARE AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT	134
LENGTH OF ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT	135
National Studies	135
Statewide Studies.	135
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	136
PLANS TO CONTINUE IN PRINCIPALSHIP IF OFFERED SAME SALARY TO RETURN TO TEACHING.	139
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	139
SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE OF FIELD. . . .	140
National Studies	140
Statewide Studies.	142
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	143
HOURS SPENT ON SCHOOL DUTIES.	143
National Studies	143
Statewide Studies.	144
Presentation of Data and Findings . . .	145

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL IMPROVE- MENT	146
1951-1952 Michigan Study	146
National Studies	148
Statewide Studies.	148
Presentation of Data and Findings	149
HOW PRINCIPAL'S EXPENSES FOR CONFERENCE AND CONVENTION PARTICIPATION ARE HANDLED	150
1951-1952 Michigan Study	150
Statewide Studies.	150
Presentation of Data and Findings	151
DISTRICT-WIDE RESPONSIBILITIES	152
Presentation of Data and Findings	152
METHOD OF FILLING PRINCIPALSHIP OPENINGS.	153
1951-1952 Michigan Study	153
Statewide Studies.	153
Presentation of Data and Findings	155
DETERMINATION OF SALARY	156
1951-1952 Michigan Study	156
Statewide Studies.	156
Presentation of Data and Findings	157
PRINCIPAL'S FEELINGS ABOUT WHETHER SALARY INCREASES FOR PRINCIPALS ARE LAGGING BEHIND SALARY INCREASES FOR TEACHERS	159
National Studies	159
Presentation of Data and Findings	159
SATISFACTION WITH SALARY AND WORKING CON- DITIONS	161
Presentation of Data and Findings	161
VALUE AND FUTURE DIRECTION OF MAESP SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES.	166
Statewide Studies.	166
Presentation of Data and Findings	166

Chapter	Page
6. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AND VIEWPOINTS	169
ROLE WHEN TEACHERS NEGOTIATE	169
Presentation of Data and Findings	169
EXISTENCE OF PERSONAL PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES AND/OR ANNUAL GOALS.	171
Presentation of Data and Findings	171
EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS	173
Presentation of Data and Findings	173
ATTITUDE TOWARD MAJOR FUNCTIONS	175
National Studies	175
Statewide Studies	176
Presentation of Data and Findings	176
PERCEIVED CENTRAL OFFICE VIEW OF PRINCIPALSHIP.	178
National Studies.	178
Statewide Studies	178
Presentation of Data and Findings	179
EXTENT PRINCIPALS FEEL TEACHERS HAVE INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	183
Presentation of Data and Findings	183
MOST IMPORTANT IMPROVEMENT IN PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL WITHIN PAST FIVE YEARS	184
Presentation of Data and Findings	184
EXTENT PRINCIPAL HAS USED CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.	186
Presentation of Data and Findings	186
METHODS OF REPORTING PUPIL PROGRESS TO PARENTS.	188
Presentation of Data and Findings	188

EXTENT OF PRINCIPAL'S PERSONAL SATISFACTION WITH OVERALL PERFORMANCE	192
Presentation of Data and Findings	192
7. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	195
ORGANIZATION OF CONCLUDING CHAPTER	195
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	196
Sex	196
Racial-Ethnic Composition.	197
Residential Pattern.	198
Birthplace.	198
Marital Status	198
Employment of Spouse	199
Political Preference	199
PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL AND RESOURCES	200
Number of Schools in District	200
School District Enrollment	200
Character of School District.	200
Number of Schools Supervised.	201
School District Operating Expenditure Levels	202
Grades Administered.	203
Pupil Enrollment.	204
Economic Character of School Neighbor- hood	204
Pupil-Teacher Ratio.	204
Classroom Teacher Positions	205
Percentage of Male Teaching Staff	205
Secretarial Assistance.	206
Adequacy of Specialized Personnel	206
Condition of 1971-1972 School Budget	207
Adequacy of Library Books and Instruc- tional Materiel	207
Adequacy of Office Facilities	208
Parent Organization Group.	208
EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND ASPIRATIONS	209
Experience in Education	209
Years as Full-Time Principal.	209
Position Held Just Prior to First Principalship	210

Graduate School Institution	210
Major Field of Graduate Work.	211
Highest College Degree Earned	211
Last Enrollment for College	212
Final Occupational Goal	212
Interest in Becoming a Principal Again	213
WELFARE AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT.	214
Length of Annual Employment	214
Plan to Continue in Principalship if Offered Same Salary to Return to Teaching	214
Summer Employment of Principals.	215
Hours Spent on School Duties.	215
Opportunities for Professional Improvement	215
District-Wide Responsibilities	216
Method of Filling Principalship Openings.	216
Determination of Salary	216
Principals' Salary Increases Lagging Behind Teacher Increases	217
Satisfaction with Salary and Working Conditions	217
Value and Future Direction of MAESP Services and Activities.	218
ADMINISTRATIVE/SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AND VIEWPOINTS	218
Principals' Role When Teachers Negotiate. Existence of Personal Performance Objectives and/or Annual Goals	218
Principals' Evaluation.	219
Attitude Toward Major Functions.	219
Central Office View of Principalship	220
Extent Staff Has Individualized Instructional Program of School	221
Most Important Improvement	221
Extent Corporal Punishment Used.	221
Use of Grades in Reporting Pupil Progress	222
Satisfaction with Overall Performance.	222

Chapter	Page
STUDY IMPLICATIONS	223
CONCLUDING STATEMENT	239
REFERENCES CITED.	240
APPENDICES.	242

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. National Percentage of Men and Women Supervising Principals, 1928-1968	25
2. Distribution of Principals by Sex	27
3. Comparison of Various Levels of Age by Sex	29
4. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels by Sex	30
5. National Median Age of Supervising Principals, 1928-1968	31
6. Distribution of Principals by Age	33
7. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels by Age	34
8. Distribution of Principals by Racial-Ethnic Group.	36
9. Residential Pattern of Principals	38
10. Birthplace of Principals	39
11. Marital Status of Principals.	42
12. Employment Status of Spouse	43
13. Political Preferences of Principals	45
14. Number of Schools in Principal's District	48
15. School District Enrollment	50
16. Character of School District.	52
17. Comparison of Levels of Operating Expenditures by Type of School District.	53

Table	Page
18. 1970-71 Operating Expenditure Level of School District	55
19. Number of Separately Named Schools Supervised	57
20. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Number of Schools Supervised.	59
21. Comparison of Number of Schools Supervised by Number of Hours Spent Per Week on School Duties.	60
22. Grade Levels Administered	63
23. National Median Elementary School Enrollments, 1928-1968	64
24. Pupil Enrollment Under Direction of Principal	66
25. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Pupil Enrollment Under Direction of Principal.	68
26. Economic Character of School Neighborhood	69
27. Pupil-Teacher Ratio of Principal's School	71
28. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Pupil-Teacher Ratio	72
29. Number of Classroom Teacher Positions Under Principal's Direction	75
30. Percentage of Male Teaching Staff.	76
31. Comparison of Percentage of Male Teachers on Staff by Sex	77
32. Availability of Secretarial Assistance	80
33. Evaluation of Supply and Selection of Library Books and Adequacy of Instructional Materiel in Principal's School	82
34. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Evaluation of Library Book and Instructional Materiel Adequacy	83

Table	Page
35. Evaluation of Office Facilities in Principal's School	87
36. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Office Facility Adequacy	88
37. Comparative Evaluation of Amount of Service Received From Specialized Personnel in Areas of Curriculum and Learning Problems	92
38. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Adequacy of Specialized Personnel Service	93
39. Condition of 1971-72 School Budget	94
40. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Condition of 1971-72 School Budget	96
41. Type of Parent Organization Group.	97
42. Evaluation of Whether Parent-Teacher Group Is an Active and Dynamic Operation Whose Meetings Have Been Reasonably Well-Attended	97
43. Principal's Total Number Years Experience in Education	101
44. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Principal's Years of Experience in Education	103
45. Years Served as Full-Time Principal	106
46. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Years Served as Principal.	108
47. Comparison of Years Served as Principal by Sex	109
48. Position Held Just Prior to First Elementary Principalship.	112
49. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Position Held Just Prior to First Elementary Principalship	114

Table	Page
50. Rank Order of Institutions Where Principals Received Major Part of Graduate School Education	116
51. Percentage Distributions of Present and Related Studies Regarding Major Field of Graduate Work.	119
52. Highest College Degree Earned	121
53. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels by Highest Earned Degree.	123
54. Length of Time Since Principal Was Last Enrolled for College Credit Courses	125
55. Number of Principals Who Consider the Elementary Principalship as Their Final Occupational Goal	129
56. Position Desired by Principals Who Aspire Beyond Elementary Principalship.	130
57. Interest in Becoming an Elementary Principal if Starting Again	133
58. Length of Annual Employment.	137
59. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Length of Annual Employment	138
60. Plans to Continue in Elementary Principalship if Offered Same Salary to Return to Teaching	140
61. Comparison of Plans to Continue in Elementary Principalship if Offered the Same Salary by School District Expenditure Levels.	141
62. Summer Employment of Principals in a Field Other than Education	143
63. Hours Spent Each Week on School Duties	146
64. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Hours Spent Each Week on School Duties.	147
65. Opportunities for Professional Improvement.	149

Table	Page
66. How the Principal's Expenses for Conference and Convention Participation Are Handled . . .	151
67. Number of Principals With District-Wide Responsibilities	152
68. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Number of Principals With District-Wide Responsibilities	154
69. Method of Filling Principalship Openings in Principal's School District	155
70. Method of Salary Determination and Principal's Viewpoint About How It Should Be Determined	158
71. Opinion About Whether Salary Increases for Principals are Lagging Behind Salary Increases for Teachers	160
72. Comparison of Sex With Opinion About Whether Salary Increases for Principals Are Lagging Behind Salary Increases for Teachers	162
73. Principal's Level of Satisfaction With Salary and Working Conditions	163
74. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels by Principal's Level of Satisfaction With Salary and Working Conditions	164
75. Comparison of Years Served as Principal by Level of Satisfaction With Salary and Working Conditions	165
76. Principal's Opinion About the Future Direction of MAESP Services and Activities.	167
77. Principal's Opinion Regarding the Benefits of MAESP Membership to the Principalship	168
78. Principal's Level of Involvement When Teachers Negotiate With the Board of Education	170
79. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels by Principal's Involvement When Teachers Negotiate With Board of Education	172

Table	Page
80. Existence of Required Personal Performance Objectives and/or Annual Goals	173
81. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Existence of Required Personal Performance Objectives and/or Annual Goals	174
82. Evaluation of Principals.	175
83. Principal's Attitudes Toward His Major Functions	177
84. Principal's Perception of the Central Office View of His Elementary Principalship	181
85. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Principal's Perception of Central Office View of His Principalship.	182
86. Extent to Which Principal Feels His Staff Has Individualized the Instructional Program to the Needs of Children	183
87. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Extent to Which Principal Feels His Staff Has Individualized Instructional Program.	185
88. Most Important Improvement in Principal's School Within Past Five Years	186
89. Extent to Which Principals Have Used Corporal Punishment as a Disciplinary Measure Within the Past Twelve Months.	187
90. Comparison of Extent to Which Principals Have Used Corporal Punishment by Sex.	189
91. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Extent to Which Principals Have Used Corporal Punishment	190
92. Methods of Reporting Pupil Progress to Parents.	191

Table	Page
93. Extent of Principal's Personal Satisfaction With Overall Performance	192
94. Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels by Extent of Principal's Personal Satisfaction With Overall Performance.	194

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In an attempt to contend with the press for social change, the American public school institution is undergoing rapid alteration. Problems of economic disparity, racial strife, international conflict, and the counter culture of youth are being reflected in our educational thinking, and the diversity of thought about what is good education for children is conspicuous.

The uncertainties of present-day society have invaded the world of the elementary school principal and have combined to introduce new challenges and opportunities unparalleled in our nation's history. Dynamic changes are taking place with increasing rapidity and pervasiveness in curriculum, methodology, and educational technology. New knowledge and skills are being required to deal with new content, new organizational patterns, and new hardware.

The human dimensions of the enterprise are calling for better human relations skill on the part of persons serving in the position of elementary school principal. Potent forces are at work in the massive insistence on

the part of teacher groups and a demanding citizenry for participation in major educational decision making. Moreover, efforts of federal and state courts to attain the constitutional guarantees of societal parity have been and are being felt in the educational arena. As the tempo of change intensifies in the nation's schools, it appears certain that the elementary principalship will assume heightened importance and become increasingly difficult.

In order to understand and implement the best of modern practice the elementary principal must be a student of his profession. He must find time for the analytic study and appraisal of his duties and responsibilities, and become aware of the nature and rationale of changes taking place in the principalship. Appraisals of elementary school principals must be made to ascertain whether their characteristics and qualifications are sufficient to enable them to meet the challenges of today and to aggressively lead the way in educational changes that will surely come.

Challenges facing administrative leadership are nowhere more compelling than in the state of Michigan. Similarly, the opportunities to shape educational policy and practices, for raising the competencies, standards, and professional status of principals are nowhere more exciting.

It is in respect to the overwhelming need and responsibility of elementary school principals of Michigan to make an appraisal of their leadership endeavors that this status study of the principalship has been devoted.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The major problem approached in this study was the gathering of statistical data on the status of elementary school principals in Michigan that could serve as information for various groups having interests in the following questions:

1. What is the present status, thought, and practice of the elementary school principalship?
2. What significant interrelationships exist when comparisons are made among selected aspects of the elementary school principalship?
3. How do certain characteristics of the prevailing status compare with data from recent national and statewide studies of the status of elementary school principals?
4. How does the current status compare with identical aspects of an earlier study of the Michigan principalship?

The data gathered regarding the status of the elementary principal now in service in Michigan were intended to serve several purposes.

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE

The purposes of gathering statistical data regarding the status of the elementary school principal in the state of Michigan were fourfold. They were:

1. To obtain information on certain aspects of the status of the Michigan principalship that will enable principals to make self-appraisals of their practices, thought, personal, and professional characteristics.
2. To develop information which might convince persons who influence and control public school expenditures that the present method of financing Michigan lower education is related to certain inequitable conditions affecting elementary school principals and principalships and, in addition, that changes are in order.
3. To obtain information which may serve as evidence for local superintendents and boards of education that elementary principals require and deserve improvements in welfare and conditions of employment.

4. To present information that may encourage the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals to commission and support further studies of adjunctive research and periodic investigation of the Michigan principalship.

FORMULATION OF STUDY HYPOTHESIS

In order to investigate the status, thought, and practices of Michigan elementary principals, the subsequent hypothesis developed from the statement of the problem was examined and tested for its validity. The hypothesis of interest is stated as follows: That Michigan elementary school principals exhibit analogous personal and professional characteristics and possess similar occupational situations, sources of job satisfaction, and aspirations.

SELECTION OF RESEARCH METHOD

The nature of the type of study problem implied the use of the normative-survey method of research. The most practical and feasible means of gathering data for this study was considered by the researcher to be by use of a questionnaire--a method widely employed in survey research involving large sample studies. With the realization that restrictions are existent in research projects utilizing questionnaires, it was

decided to proceed under the assumption Michigan elementary principals would be inclined to respond in an accurate and forthright manner to an unsigned check-type survey form.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The primary sources of information for ascertaining the prevailing status of the Michigan elementary school principalship were the full-time elementary school principals who were members of MAESP during the 1971-1972 school year.

Secondary data sources included recent doctoral dissertations and published state and national studies of the status of the elementary school principalship.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire instrument consisting of sixty-six items and questions was drafted to gather the desired information that would answer the questions posed under the statement of the problem.

Individual questions were developed after reviewing survey forms of recent statewide studies dealing with the elementary school principalship and, also, questionnaires used in the 1968 national study of the elementary principalship and the 1969 national study of the assistant principalship. Wherever possible,

questions similar to the 1968 national study were included enabling relationships to be considered between this study and the national study. Questions were developed also from the researcher's personal interests as well as from suggestions and opinions offered by the executive secretary of MAESP, members of the MAESP Professional Standards Commission, and fellow administrators.

The instrument included four types of questions: questions of (1) fact, (2) information, (3) self-perception, and (4) opinion. Emphasis was placed on structured questions that presented the respondents with fixed-response items worded to induce single-choice objective answers in terms of fixed alternatives. Forced-choice questions facilitated their administration and ease of handling in the data analysis stage. Emphasis was also placed on key words and instructions specific to the individual questions in order to facilitate respondent understanding.

There was every reason to assume that Michigan elementary school principals saw a need for the study and responded with a high degree of accuracy and honesty. Because of investigator concern that some of the intensity and color of respondent feeling might have been sacrificed because of use of structured questions, some opportunity was provided for respondents to expound at length on two specific survey questions of their choosing by the inclusion of a section at the end of the instrument

entitled: Optional Additional Comments on Specific Questions (About question _____ in section _____ I want to say:). Furthermore, questions involving items containing multiple alternatives too numerous to include necessitated introducing an open category: Other (write in _____). In this way the respondent was provided with an opportunity to specify exceptions to the categories presented in each question. Written answers to the open-type questions were sorted and classified according to similarity of response.

Concerns about the clarity and validity of the questionnaire were assessed and dealt with throughout the formulation stage of development. Counsel and a review of the total instrumentation procedures and initial draft of the questionnaire were sought from the Department of Research Consultation of Michigan State University and from leader members of MAESP. In addition, a nationally recognized authority in the field of educational research, Professor Mary Ellen McSweeney of MSU, evaluated the clarity, organization, and content of the procedural plan and survey form.

A copy of the survey questionnaire will be found in the Appendix.

SPONSORSHIP OF THE STUDY

Realizing that ratification of such a comprehensive research study by a recognized and prestigious state professional organization might enable the investigator to produce a study of greater value and significance, the investigator sought the sponsorship and support of MAESP. The project was proposed to the Professional Standards Commission of MAESP who in turn recommended that the executive board of MAESP sponsor the survey of their membership. A copy of the project proposal will be found in the Appendix. The study was endorsed and underwritten by the executive board as a means of strengthening the status and administrative practices of principals within the state.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was confined to the total population of the membership of the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals serving during the fall of the 1971-1972 school year. It was further delimited to only full-time elementary principals. Each eligible MAESP member received the survey instrument. Those instruments returned by members other than full-time principals were not included in the study.

MAESP is a voluntary group that does have the majority of the estimated 2,000 Michigan elementary

principalships in its membership ranks. Detroit public school principals, however, are known to hold few memberships in the MAESP organization. Because of this fact, the reader should exercise caution when drawing study conclusions about all elementary school principals in the state. The inferences in the study should be made only with regards to the full-time MAESP principals who comprised the study sample, even though the investigator considers the MAESP principal to be generally representative of the typical Michigan elementary school principal.

The percentage of missing elements expected in the sampled population of MAESP members was not felt to be extensive enough in any categorization of variables to present a statistically significant problem. For example, responses from the remaining large urban school districts in Michigan such as Flint, Grand Rapids, and Lansing were considered by the researcher as providing a large enough sample for the gathering of information concerning principals in urban districts.

The study was undertaken to identify significant relationships, note similarities, and detect inequities popularly thought to exist regarding principals and principalships serving school districts of varying levels of financial support. In this study 1970-1971 school district operating expenditures per pupil were

rank ordered in three levels. These were: high, \$800 and above; middle, \$700-\$799; and low, \$699 and below. These three rank-order criteria were established by locating the 25th and 75th percentile ranges above and below the statistical interval which contained the median operating expenditure per pupil in Michigan's 527 K-12 school districts in 1969-70, and then projecting a \$100 increase across all districts for the school year of interest, 1970-1971. The estimated projection was devised to cover the increase in per-pupil state aid to all districts and the investigator's expectation that the MAESP sample group was more affluent than the state group as a whole. The quartile groups were then set at the nearest hundred-dollar amount to facilitate ease of respondent checking.

PUBLICIZING THE STUDY

As a means of alerting member principals who were to be involved in the MAESP-sponsored survey, an advance notification and description of the study appeared in the October, 1971 issue of the MAESP Newsletter. This publication received total circulation among MAESP membership. Then, a reminder notice printed in the December, 1971 issue of MAESP Newsletter assisted in soliciting cooperation in completing and returning the survey instrument.

Announcements stressing the importance of thorough consideration and quick return were made by the executive secretary of MAESP and the chairman of the Professional Standards Commission at the business session of the Annual MAESP State Conference held in Grand Rapids November 3-5, 1971. A letter stressing the benefits of the study to each individual principal and his profession was also distributed at this business meeting of the State Conference (see Appendix).

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

On November 12, 1971, the survey form was mailed to the 1,300 elementary school principals who comprised the known eligible membership of MAESP. Enclosed with the nine-page questionnaire was a copy of the letter of transmittal appealing to self-interest and altruism (see Appendix). A due date of December 1, 1971 was indicated, allowing each principal slightly less than three weeks in which to complete and return the questionnaire.

From the initial mailing, fifty-six surveys were positively identified as being ineligible, while sixty-five were returned too late for inclusion in the tabulated study data. Usable questionnaire returns were received from 1,011 respondents, or 86 percent of the remaining 1,179 principals.

Because sufficient responses were received, follow-up procedures designed to obtain replies from non-respondents who did not respond initially were not employed (see Appendix).

TABULATION OF THE DATA

The information recorded on the completed questionnaires from the MAESP membership was transferred by key-punch machine to 80-column computer cards. The resultant data cards were then processed through the Computer Laboratory facilities of MSU.

The CISSR-ACT-PFCOUNT computer program was selected to compile the data according to the frequency and percentages of responses for each item and question. In addition to obtaining composite results within the questions, chi square was selected as the statistical analysis method to study the nature of the relationships between selected variables. Moreover, the chi square test of independence was used to test the null hypothesis that the selected variables were essentially independent or unrelated. The levels of confidence for the rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant relationships was determined at the .05 level or greater.

The data were also compared with selected aspects of the principalship as revealed in recent national and statewide studies and the earlier Michigan study in

order to determine whether similarities or differences and trends existed.

The data relating to the several aspects of the problem were assembled in tables designed to include the following information:

1. The frequency and percentage of each type of response for each question and item, as well as cumulative frequencies and percentages on selected quantitative variables.
2. The value of chi square, degrees of freedom, and level of confidence at which the null hypothesis of no relationship could be rejected. Significant relationships that were determined by the product moment correlation as negative were noted as such.

The reader should note that questionnaire responses which could not clearly be attributed to a single particular sub-item were included as missing data. Missing data and double responses to single-response questions were considered as non-responses and were not included in the quantities used to compute the value of chi square between variables.

RELATED STUDIES

Three national studies and at least twenty-nine doctoral dissertations dealing with the status of elementary school principals have been completed since

World War II. The investigator acknowledges that although these related materials have a general, collective similarity to this investigation, there is a dissimilarity in their scope and direction of concern. Rather than attempt to explain in a general review of the literature how the related studies were similar and dissimilar to this investigation, the corresponding points of likeness having pertinent bearing upon each element of interest in this study were referred to in the textual chapters. Presenting the data of this study together with the findings of these related studies was done to facilitate reader understanding of the comparisons that were made and the conclusions that were drawn.

The examination of statewide studies was limited to those written since 1960 in order that only the most recent, up-to-date information would receive attention. National studies undertaken prior to 1968 were dealt with only when it was appropriate to demonstrate trends and changes which have taken place over the years.

The reader should note that references to tabular data in related status studies which form the basis of comparison in succeeding chapters were made whenever possible in terms of full-time supervising principals. The literature examined included the following studies:

Lepick (5), in 1961, studied the personal characteristics, training, experience, professional growth,

and community involvement of California principals from school districts of varying sizes.

Youngblood (13), in 1961, studied the elementary principalship in Texas schools in order to ascertain whether there were significant differences in the status of principals grouped according to such factors as race, sex, and degree of training and experience.

Shelton (10) compared the status of the Arkansas elementary school principal in 1963 with the Arkansas elementary school principal in 1953 to determine the qualifications and training needed.

From a 1964 survey of elementary schools in Illinois, Gill and Merigis (4) defined the principal's role and status in relationship to current practices and emerging trends in the organization and administration of public schools in that state.

Perkins (9), in a 1965 questionnaire and interview study, assessed the relationship among Oregon principals according to variables of age, sex, preparation, experience, and size of school administered.

Moss (8), a year later, undertook a survey study to determine the job status of elementary school principals in Wyoming as compared with the surrounding states of Nebraska, South Dakota, Montana, and Idaho.

Modeland (7), in 1968, studied the professional preparation and practices of Kansas elementary school

principals. The study gathered information on such factors as highest degree earned, earnings, membership in professional organizations, school size, and professional experience obtained before becoming a principal.

Warren (12) investigated the practices and procedures existing in Missouri public elementary schools in 1968. Information was sought to discover opinions of current educational innovations and the degree of the principal's sources of job satisfaction. Relationships were examined among principals according to variables of type of community, sex, age, preparation and experience, and the amount of salary received.

Arms (1) analyzed and compared the status of the membership of the Indiana AESP in 1968 to a model of the elementary principal as determined by a review of current literature and research. An examination was conducted in the areas of professional and community involvements, opinions, and viewpoints regarding important social and educational issues.

Andlauer (2) studied changes that had taken place in the New Jersey elementary school principalship between 1960 and 1968. He identified significant differences among persons serving in inner-city, suburban, and rural school districts in 1968 in relation to training, experience, assignment, role concepts, attitudes

toward teacher organizations, problems pertaining to their assignments, and evaluation of federal government programs.

Brothers (3), in 1969, surveyed personal and professional characteristics of persons serving as principals in Oklahoma elementary schools and, in addition, obtained information pertaining to the school plant, organization, and supportive personnel.

The most recently published study of the state-wide general status of the elementary principalship was undertaken in 1970 as a joint endeavor of the University of Georgia Department of Educational Administration and the Georgia Department of Elementary Principals. Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6) developed a profile which depicted the typical Georgia principal's professional preparation and certification, financial status and working conditions, and community relations.

The NAESP, more than any other source, has published considerable information about the status of the elementary school principalship. The organization has made periodic studies of its membership in 1928, 1948, 1958, and 1968 in order to enlighten and improve the performance and conditions under which principals function. The 1968 national study (15) focused attention on the personal and professional characteristics of 2,300 randomly selected elementary school

principals from across the nation. The report determined the prevailing status of the profession and obtained a statistical profile of the characteristics, duties, and opinions of the nation's elementary school principals.

An earlier survey (14) of the status of the Michigan elementary school principal was undertaken by a five-member study commission of the MAESP in 1951-1952. The study, identified in the publication's foreword as "a rough survey for working purposes," was based on a 35 percent return involving 379 replies. The investigators in the initial Michigan study sought information in areas of professional status and experiences, personal characteristics, salary, and availability of special services.

Clearly, then, the earlier Michigan study does not approach the present study in comprehensiveness, analysis, or evaluation of data. The investigator's doctoral study represents the first comprehensive attempt to assess the status of the Michigan principalship, and is an extensive, general investigation of the elementary principalship rather than an intensive study of a specific aspect.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The specific meanings of technical terms used in this study are as follows:

Current Operating Expenditures.--The basic expenses of a school district but not items of a capital outlay or debt retirement nature.

Elementary School.--All forms of grade organization which comprise any combination of grades including kindergarten through grade six.

Elementary School Principal.--A full-time person who is directly responsible for the administration of the elementary school plant and for the supervision of learning within that plant. In this study the term elementary school principal refers to full-time principals who are members of MAESP and is used synonymously with principal, supervising principal, and elementary administrator.

MAESP.--The Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals, formerly known as the Department of Elementary School Principals of the Michigan Education Association.

Michigan Study--1951-1952.--An earlier survey of the status of the Michigan elementary school principalship undertaken by a five-member study commission of MAESP and published in 1952.

NAESP.--The National Association of Elementary School Principals, formerly known as the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association; a voluntary organization of national principals and persons interested in the elementary principalship.

NAESP National Study--1968.--The major nationwide survey of the status of the elementary school principalship published in 1968 by NAESP in cooperation with the National Education Association Research Division. Similar studies were issued in 1928, 1948, and 1958 as NAESP yearbooks. The term national principalship is used in this study to refer to the elementary school principal as described in the 1968 national study.

Personal Characteristics.--Characteristics associated with certain demographic and selected factors of an elementary principal's background and current way of life which are deemed to have a bearing upon an individual's status. Included are such factors as sex, age, racial-ethnic grouping, residential patterns, political preference, marital, and employment status.

Professional Characteristics.--Characteristics associated with certain selected factors in the elementary principal's training, experience, and interest in professional advancement. Included are such factors as

number of years served in education and in the principalship, highest earned college degree, major field of graduate work, and final occupational goal.

Practice.--The established method of performing an administrative action or process.

Respondents.--The eligible full-time elementary school principals who completed and returned questionnaires for this study.

School District.--A system of schools which is governed by a single administrative staff, a single board of education, and which includes all grades from kindergarten through grade twelve.

Status.--The term as used in this study refers to the mode of existence within a set of conditions affecting an elementary principal.

Teaching Principal.--A part-time principal who has regularly scheduled classroom teaching duties while carrying out the additional responsibilities of administering and supervising the elementary school.

FORMAT FOR SUCCEEDING CHAPTERS

The investigator has utilized seven chapters to present this study. The use of auxiliary chapters

was based on the scope and nature of the problem presented and was designed to facilitate readability.

Following the introductory chapter, the investigator developed Chapters II through VI to present and analyze the material pertaining to the status, viewpoints, and practices of Michigan elementary school principals. The collected study data were compared with selected variables within the study and to an earlier Michigan study. Comparisons were made also with recent state and national studies in order to determine relationships and discover differences between Michigan principals and their counterparts across the nation.

The review of literature and data gathered in each of the five textual chapters was reported in the following sequence: (1) 1951-1952 Michigan Study; (2) national studies; (3) statewide studies; and (4) presentation of data and findings. The reader should note that free-standing sideheads were eliminated wherever a review of related studies determined that references to elements of interest in this study were not considered.

In Chapter VII the investigator summarized the entire study, drew conclusions, and formulated recommendations based on findings and conclusions. Suggestions for adjunctive research and periodic investigation regarding the Michigan principalship were included.

Chapter 2

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MICHIGAN ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

Data related to the personal characteristics of the Michigan elementary school principal are presented, analyzed, and compared in this chapter.

The MAESP principal was examined in relation to the study hypothesis that analogous personal characteristics are exhibited with respect to specific factors of sex, age, racial-ethnic grouping, residential patterns, political preference, marital, and employment status. Information obtained from recent national and statewide studies and an earlier Michigan study served as comparative data for this investigation.

SEX

1951-1952 Michigan Study

Of the 377 principals reporting on this question in the earlier study of the Michigan elementary principalship, 151 respondents, or 40 percent, were men.

National Studies

The NAESP completed its fourth follow-up study on the elementary school principalship in 1968. Of the 1,891 supervising principals reporting in the 1968 study (15:11), 77.6 percent were male.

In earlier surveys the proportion of men principals was lower. In 1928 44.5 percent were men. In 1958 (16:110) the relationship stood at 62 percent men principals, 3 percent higher than the 1948 national study. These findings indicated an increasing trend in favor of employing men as elementary principals.

Data from the four national studies portray the increasing percentage of male elementary school principals which has occurred during the last four decades. Information from the four studies are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

National Percentage of Men and Women
Supervising Principals, 1928-1968

Year of Study	Men	Women
1928	45	55
1948	59	41
1958	62	38
1968	77.6	22.4

Statewide Studies

Lepick (5:118), in a California study completed in 1961, found the ratio to be three to one in favor of men. The ratio mentioned in the California study was slightly lower than an Indiana study by Arms (1:14) which contained percentages of male and female respondents of 8.25 percent and 17.5 percent, respectively.

The percentage of men holding supervising principalships in Oregon in 1965 was determined by Perkins (9:52) to be 85 percent.

Eighty-three percent of the Oklahoma elementary school principals reporting in a 1969 study by Brothers (3:68) were also ahead of the present national trend toward placing men in the elementary principalship.

Youngblood (13:20) reported in a 1961 Texas study the existence of a similar imbalance between the number of male and female principals, but cautioned that the fact does not necessarily indicate that women suffer discrimination in selection because of their sex.

Andlauer (2:40) found in his 1968 comparative study that the number of female elementary school principals over a nine-year period dropped from more than one-third to slightly more than one-sixth of all elementary principals.

Georgia status study investigators (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:6) reported in 1970 that 79 percent of the principals in that state were men.

Warren (12:33) reported that three-fourths of the responding principals in his Missouri study were male.

The study located which contained the lowest ratio of male to female principals was the 1964 study of white Arkansas principals conducted by Shelton (10:45). The study investigator reported 55 percent male and 45 percent female.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The percentage of men holding full-time principalships in Michigan in 1971 was determined by this researcher to be considerably greater than that of women. Of the respondents to this item on the questionnaire, 779, or 77.13 percent, were men, while 231, or 22.87 percent, were women. A tabulation of these data is presented in Table 2. Thus, the results of this study show that, by actual count, slightly more than three in every four Michigan elementary principals were men.

Table 2

Distribution of Principals by Sex

Sex	Number	Percentage
Male	779	77.13
Female	231	22.87

The data obtained compare favorably to recent national and a majority of statewide studies. A significant increase, 37 percent, in the proportion of men to women principals was noted to have occurred over the past two decades in Michigan.

When the relationship between the variables of sex and age was examined, only nine of the 186 principals less than 35 years of age were found to be female. Table 3 reports the significant relationship indicating that male principals tend to be proportionately younger than female principals at a .001 level of significance.

The sexes of responding principals are presented by expenditure level of employing school district in Table 4. No relationship was found to exist at the .05 level of significance.

AGE

1951-1952 Michigan Study

In the earlier Michigan study (14:8) only 21 percent of the 336 respondents to this question reported being less than 40 years of age; 52 percent between the ages of 40 and 50; and 27 percent over 50 years of age.

National Studies

The median age of supervising principals included in the 1968 national study (15:10) was 45 years. This was the same median age reported in 1928, and represents

Table 3
Comparison of Various Levels
of Age by Sex

	Age				Total
	Less than 35	35-49 Years	50-64 Years	65 or Older	
<u>Male</u>					
Freq.	177.00	471.00	130.00	0.00	778.00
Percent across	22.75	60.54	16.71	0.00	100.00
Percent down	95.16	87.87	45.94	0.00	77.11
Percent of total	17.54	46.68	12.88	0.00	77.11
Theoret. freq.	143.42	413.29	218.21	3.08	
Cell χ^2	7.86	8.06	35.66	3.08	
<u>Female</u>					
Freq.	9.00	65.00	153.00	4.00	231.00
Percent across	3.90	28.14	66.23	1.73	100.00
Percent down	4.84	12.13	54.06	100.00	22.89
Percent of total	.89	6.44	15.16	.40	22.89
Theoret. freq.	42.58	122.71	64.79	.92	
Cell χ^2	26.48	27.14	120.10	10.39	
<u>Total</u>					
Freq.	186.00	536.00	283.00	4.00	1009.00
Percent across	18.43	53.12	28.06	.40	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	18.43	53.12	28.05	.40	100.00

$\chi^2 = 238.776$; $df = 3$; Significant at .001 level;
unused = 2.

Table 4

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels by Sex

Expenditure Level	Male	Female	Total
<u>High</u>			
Freq.	341.00	109.00	450.00
Percent across	75.78	24.22	100.00
Percent down	44.58	47.60	45.27
Percent of total	34.31	10.97	45.27
Theoret. freq.	346.33	103.67	
Cell χ^2	.08	.27	
<u>Middle</u>			
Freq.	226.00	62.00	288.00
Percent across	78.47	21.53	100.00
Percent down	29.54	27.07	28.97
Percent of total	22.74	6.24	28.97
Theoret. freq.	221.65	66.35	
Cell χ^2	.09	.29	
<u>Low</u>			
Freq.	198.00	58.00	256.00
Percent across	77.34	22.66	100.00
Percent down	25.88	25.33	25.75
Percent of total	19.92	5.84	25.75
Theoret. freq.	197.02	58.98	
Cell χ^2	.00	.02	
<u>Total</u>			
Freq.	765.00	229.00	994.00
Percent across	76.96	23.04	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	76.96	23.04	100.00

$\chi^2 = .747$; $df = 2$; Not Significant; unused = 17.

only a slight decrease compared with the medians reported in 1958 (16:112) of 47.6 percent and in 1948 of 46.5 percent. Table 5 demonstrates that the median age of national supervising principals for the years 1928 through 1968 has remained fairly constant in the mid-forty range.

Table 5
National Median Age of Supervising
Principals, 1928-1968

National Study	Median Age
1928	45
1948	46.5
1958	47.6
1968	45

Statewide Studies

Texas principals were assessed by Youngblood (12:23) in 1961 as possessing a median age of 45 years. Also noted was the tendency for the median age of principals to increase as the size of the school system enrollment increased.

Shelton's 1964 study (10:45) of Arkansas principals determined that the typical elementary school principal was 49 years of age.

Moss (8:49) found the typical principal in Wyoming in 1966 was 44.5 years of age and in four surrounding states, 47 years.

The median age of the Georgia elementary principal was reported by Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:5) in 1969 to be forty-four years.

A somewhat lower median age was reported in Oregon by Perkins (9:52) who revealed that the typical principal was 43.4 years of age.

Andlauer's comparative study (2:41) between the 1960 New Jersey principal and the 1968 New Jersey principal found that the median age for both was between the ages of 41 and 45 years. Larger proportions of principals were noted in 1968 in the 36 to 45 years age category.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The data in Table 6 show that 53.07 percent of the 1,010 Michigan principals reporting were within the range of 35-49 years of age. More than 18 percent (18.42%) were less than age 35, while 28.52 percent were over 50 years of age. Only four Michigan elementary school principals reported ages of 65 and over.

A review of recent state and national studies revealed no significant trend in either direction relative to the median ages of elementary school principals. The median age of supervising principals has, in fact, remained fairly constant.

The aspect of age was found to be a recognized factor in most all status studies of the personal

characteristics of elementary principals, although no data were located suggesting one best age or suggesting a quintessential range or limit for the elementary principalship.

Table 6
Distribution of Principals by Age

Age	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Less than 35	186	18.42	186	18.42
35-49 years	536	53.07	722	71.49
50-64 years	284	28.12	1,006	99.60
65 or older	4	.40	1,010	100.00

The ages of responding principals are presented by level of expenditure of employing school district in Table 7. There was a tendency for the age of supervising principals to be greater in high expenditure districts and for principals to be younger in the lower expenditure districts.

RACIAL-ETHNIC COMPOSITION

Statewide Studies

Few investigators in statewide studies have examined the racial-ethnic characteristics of elementary principals. The Arkansas study by Shelton (10:4) was, in fact, limited by design to white elementary principals.

Table 7

Comparison of School District
Expenditure Levels by Age

Expenditure Level	Age				Total
	Less than 35	35-49 Years	50-64 Years	65 or Older	
<u>High</u>					
Freq.	59.00	250.00	141.00	1.00	451.00
Percent across	13.08	55.43	31.26	.22	100.00
Percent down	32.07	47.44	50.54	25.00	45.37
Percent of total	5.94	25.15	14.19	.10	45.37
Theoret. freq.	83.48	239.11	126.59	1.81	
Cell χ^2	7.18	.50	1.64	.37	
<u>Middle</u>					
Freq.	66.00	135.00	85.00	1.00	287.00
Percent across	23.00	47.04	29.62	.35	100.00
Percent down	35.87	25.62	30.47	25.00	28.87
Percent of total	6.64	13.58	8.55	.10	28.87
Theoret. freq.	53.13	152.16	80.56	1.15	
Cell χ^2	3.12	1.94	.25	.02	
<u>Low</u>					
Freq.	59.00	142.00	53.00	2.00	256.00
Percent across	23.05	55.47	20.70	.78	100.00
Percent down	32.07	26.94	19.00	50.00	25.75
Percent of total	5.94	14.29	5.33	.20	25.75
Theoret. freq.	47.39	135.73	71.86	1.03	
Cell χ^2	2.85	.29	4.95	.91	
<u>Total</u>					
Freq.	184.00	527.00	279.00	4.00	994.00
Percent across	18.51	53.02	28.07	.40	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	18.51	53.02	28.07	.40	100.00

$\chi^2 = 24.000$; $df = 6$; Significant negative relationship at .001 level; unused = 17; p.m.c. = -.117985.

Brothers (3:66) reported that more than 90 percent of the 641 Oklahoma elementary school principals responding to his survey were Caucasian. The black race was represented by 4.5 percent, the Indian race by less than 1 percent (.69%), with no other race reported.

Youngblood (13:21) reported that white principals in Texas composed 89 percent of the respondent group. Black principals composed 11 percent of the Texas respondents.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The data in Table 8 indicate that 972, or 96.33 percent, of the 1,009 Michigan respondents were Caucasian. Eighteen principals, or 1.78 percent, indicated that they were black. Three indicated being Spanish-surnamed; two principals reported Oriental heritage; and one principal revealed that he was an American Indian. The data indicate, then, that the vast majority of Michigan principalships are held by members of the white race. Only thirty-seven, or 3.67 percent, of 1,009 principals responding to this question indicated minority group membership. This was a smaller percentage than was reported in either the Oklahoma or Texas studies.

It was interesting to note that few statewide studies and none of the four NAESP studies of the

elementary principalship made attempts to determine the racial composition of persons serving in the principalship.

Table 8
Distribution of Principals by
Racial-Ethnic Group

Racial-Ethnic Group	Number	Percentage
Afro-American	18	1.78
American Indian	1	.10
Oriental American	2	.20
Spanish-surnamed American	3	.30
Caucasian	972	96.33
All others	13	1.29

It would appear that elementary school principalships in most Michigan schools and in other parts of the nation have not been open to minority groups, or that minority-group individuals have not aspired to the principalship.

RESIDENTIAL PATTERN

Statewide Studies

Nearly identical data were reported in studies which examined the percentage of principals living within the boundaries of the school system which employs them. Data from a California study by Lepick (5:266) revealed that 73.5 percent of all elementary principals resided

within their school district boundaries, while 26.5 percent lived in areas outside school district limits.

A similar percentage was found by Shelton (10:72) who determined that 75.8 percent of Arkansas elementary principals owned their homes in the community in which they work.

Arms (1:76) reported that 71.7 percent of all reporting Indiana principals lived within the boundaries of the school district which employed them.

Responses to questions requesting information regarding place of residence noted slight differences in the corresponding percentages for Oregon (Perkins, 9:135), 79.5 percent, and for California (Lepick, 5:266), 73.5 percent.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Data pertaining to the location of residence was sought in order to determine the percentage of principals who live outside the school district employing them. More than 57 percent (57.58%) of the 1,002 Michigan principals responding to this question indicated that they lived within the boundaries of the school district which employed them. On the other hand, a total of 425 principals, or 42.42 percent, revealed that they lived outside school district boundaries (Table 9).

Significant differences were noted in the ratio of principals in other states when compared with Michigan

regarding the practice of maintaining residences within their employing district. California, Arkansas, and Indiana reported higher percentage differentials amounting to 15.9 percent, 18.2 percent, and 14.1 percent, respectively.

Table 9
Residential Pattern of Principals

Reside Within District Boundaries	Number	Percentage
Yes	577	57.58
No	425	42.42

BIRTHPLACE

Statewide Studies

The New Jersey study (Andlauer, 2:41) was the only statewide status study of the principalship which examined the place of birth in relation to the principal's place of employment. It was found that the place of birth of the typical New Jersey principal in both 1960 and 1968 was within 50 miles of the school district in which he was employed. Moreover, a lesser proportion of principals surveyed in 1968 were born in the districts in which they held their principalships, and a lesser percentage were born outside the state than those surveyed in 1960.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Table 10 deals with the birthplace of Michigan principals in this study as it relates to the place of employment. Only 9.02 percent of the responding principals indicated that they were born in the district where employed; slightly more than one-third (35.68%) were born in Michigan within 50 miles of their present district; 26.66 percent were born elsewhere in Michigan; and 28.64 percent reported their birthplace as being outside Michigan.

Table 10
Birthplace of Principals

Place of Birth	Number	Percentage
Within present district	91	9.02
Within 50 miles	360	35.68
Elsewhere in Michigan	269	26.66
Outside Michigan	289	28.64

Inquiries concerning the place of birth in relation to place of employment were not made in the four national studies. In only one statewide study was residential information investigated.

A comparison of this study to the New Jersey study yielded the following observations: Nearly twice as large a percentage of New Jersey principals as Michigan principals administered in the districts in which they

were born and were presently employed. Closely comparative figures were reported regarding principals administering within 50 miles of where they were born, while a differential of 11 percent fewer Michigan principals than New Jersey principals were born outside the state of their employment.

MARITAL STATUS

1951-1952 Michigan Study

The investigators in the earlier Michigan study (14:8) reported that of the 372 respondents, 60 percent of the elementary principals were married and 40 percent were not.

National Studies

Of the total sample group of supervising principals replying to the 1968 national study (15:12), 83.1 percent were reported as married; about 12 percent had never been married; and 5 percent were widowed, divorced, or separated. The national study investigators reported that only 32.7 percent of the female respondents were married, whereas 92.4 percent of the male respondents were married.

Statewide Studies

In 1961 Youngblood (13:27) reported that of all Texas principals in his study, 95.7 percent of the male

principals were married, 62.6 percent of the female principals were married, and 88.9 percent of all principals were married.

Returns from a study by Warren (12:33) on married principals in Missouri revealed that 75.2 percent were men and 24.3 percent were women.

Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:6) indicated that 83.8 percent of all reporting Georgia principals were married, 11.4 percent were single, and 4.8 percent responded that they were separated, divorced, or widowed.

An examination of the marital status of Indiana principals by Arms (1:56) determined that 87.3 percent of all principals were married. Only 2.5 percent were reported as widowed, separated, or divorced. The study also noted that while only 9.8 percent of all principals were never married, of this number, 54.5 percent of these single principals were female.

Of those responding to the 1966 Wyoming study by Moss (8:50), close to 90 percent were married. Results of this Wyoming study also indicated that there were more married men than women and that only 27 percent of the women principals were married.

Shelton's study (10:46) of the Arkansas elementary principalship showed that 78 percent of these principals were married, 12.2 percent were single, and 10 percent

were widowed. The above figure was slightly lower than the 86 percent-married figure reported in the Oklahoma study by Brothers (3:69), who reported also that 9.1 percent were single.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Data obtained in this study revealed that 85.25 percent of Michigan principals were married. The singleness due to non-marriage was reported at 8.25 percent; 3.27 percent were reported as divorced or separated; and close to 3 percent (2.97%) were widowed. Table 11 presents these data.

Table 11
Marital Status of Principals

Marital Status	Number	Percentage
Single	86	8.52
Married	860	85.23
Divorced	27	2.68
Separated	6	.59
Widowed	30	2.97

The study data indicate a large percentage (85.23%) of married elementary school principals in Michigan. A comparison of these data with other recent national and statewide studies revealed close similarities of findings in the 83-90 percent range.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF SPOUSE

Statewide Studies

Inquiries concerning information regarding the employment status of elementary school principals in state studies were meager. California principals were asked to state whether they were the sole wage earner in a 1961 study by Lepick (5:136). Lepick revealed that a two-income family unit existed in approximately one-third of the cases reported.

Presentation of Data and Findings

To determine the degree to which spouses were employed, Michigan principals were requested to state whether they were the sole wage earner in their families. According to the figures in Table 12, 61.69 percent of Michigan principals replied that they were the sole wage earner in their family. These data would indicate that nearly four in every ten Michigan principals have an employed spouse.

Table 12

Employment Status of Spouse

Sole Wage Earner	Number	Percentage
Yes	620	61.69
No	385	38.31

It was noted that a higher percentage of Michigan principals (38.31%) reported two incomes in their families than was found in the California study (32.4%).

POLITICAL PREFERENCE

Statewide Studies

In the 1961 California study by Lepick (5:143) it was found that 52.6 percent of the 627 principals responding indicated a preference for the Republican party; 46.1 percent preferred the Democratic party; and 1.3 percent indicated some other political affiliation.

The results of the 1965 Oregon study (Perkins; 9:57) disclosed a slight margin of preference for the Republican over the Democratic party, 48.4 percent and 42 percent, respectively. Independent affiliations constituted 6.2 percent of the remaining responses.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Of the responding Michigan principals, 20.52 percent favored the Democratic party, 38.43 percent selected the Republican party, and 40.74 percent expressed that they were "independent." The data in Table 13 reflect the preference of political affiliation by Michigan principals.

It was interesting to note that four in ten Michigan elementary school principals failed to indicate a preference for a major political party. In addition, nearly twice as many principals indicated a preference for the Republican party than those preferring the Democratic party. These findings were quite dissimilar to the data found in the Oregon and California studies.

Table 13
Political Preferences of Principals

Preference	Number	Percentage
Democrat	204	20.52
Republican	382	38.43
Independent	405	40.74
Other	3	.30

Information pertaining to the political preferences of the elementary school principals was not included in previous national studies or the earlier Michigan study. Few statewide studies have been concerned with political affiliations. Perhaps the scarcity of information was due to the fact that such information was considered as too personal or of such limited consequence to be assessed. Although such information may not be applicable to the successful operation of an elementary school, it may be important in suggesting the political leanings of principals.

The data do take on added meaning when it is recalled that the educational profession has become politically active and that more than 90 percent of the nation's educators voted in the last Congressional and Presidential elections.

Chapter 3

PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL AND RESOURCES

Data pertaining to the adequacy and availability of school resources and the occupational situations of Michigan elementary school principals are presented, analyzed, and compared in this chapter.

The principalship was examined in relation to the study hypothesis that school resources and occupational situations of Michigan elementary principals are analogous with respect to specific factors of school and district enrollments and character, organizational aspects, materiel, staff and specialized services, financial situation, and parent group affiliation.

Information obtained from recent national and statewide studies and an earlier Michigan study served as comparative data for this examination.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN DISTRICT

Statewide Studies

Andlauer's (2:51) comparative study of the New Jersey principalship found that the median number of

schools in that state in 1960 and 1968 was five. He also reported that the percentage of districts with fewer than three schools decreased from over 30 percent in 1960 to 20 percent in 1968.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The results of the investigation of the number of elementary schools in the principal's district are reported in Table 14. Over 36 percent (36.51%) indicated that five or less schools existed in their districts; 27 percent (27.18%) reported six to ten; and 11 percent (10.71%) were in districts having 31 or more elementary schools. About one in five principals, then, were in districts of 11 to 30 elementary schools.

Table 14

Number of Schools in Principal's District

Number of Schools	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
1 - 5	368	36.51	368	36.51
6 - 10	274	27.18	642	63.69
11 - 15	84	8.33	726	72.02
16 - 20	64	6.35	790	78.37
21 - 25	64	6.35	854	84.72
26 - 30	46	4.56	900	89.29
31 or more	108	10.71	1008	100.00

Related research regarding this aspect of the study was almost non-existent. Comparing the findings of the Michigan and New Jersey studies revealed

percentages of 63.69 percent and 53.8 percent, respectively, in school districts of five or less elementary schools. At the other extreme, Michigan had more than twice as large a percentage of principals serving in districts which had more than sixteen elementary schools; New Jersey reported 12.3 percent and Michigan reported 27.97 percent.

School District Enrollment

Investigators in the 1968 national study (15:91) indicated that approximately 25 percent of respondents served in the largest systems (25,000 or more pupils); 47 percent in middle range systems (3,000 to 24,999); and 28 percent from the smaller school districts (100 to 2,999).

Presentation of Data and Findings

The inclusion of the size of school district in the study constituted an aspect worthy of consideration in order to determine the extent to which respondents represented small, medium, and large school system enrollments. In consideration of the size of the school district enrollment, the three classification ranges identified in the national study were utilized. Table 15 indicates the distribution of elementary principals by population size of the employing school district.

A total of 287 principals, or 28.5 percent, reported serving in the largest systems; 611, or 60.68 percent, reported employment in middle-sized districts; and 10.82 percent indicated being from smaller school systems under 3,000 pupils.

Table 15
School District Enrollment

District Enrollment	Number	Percentage
100 to 2,999	287	28.50
3,000 to 24,999	611	60.68
25,000 or more	109	10.82

Comparative data in related studies were limited, with only the 1968 national study giving consideration to this aspect. General similarities were found to exist between the data of the national study and these findings with respect to the proportions of principals serving in the larger systems with 25,000 or more pupils. The national study investigators did report a larger proportion of principals serving in smaller schools (10.8 percent compared to 28 percent) and a smaller percentage of principals reporting from middle-range systems with enrollments of 3,000 to 24,999 (47 percent compared to 60.68 percent).

CHARACTER OF SCHOOL DISTRICT

1951-1952 Michigan Study

Seventy of 379 respondents in the earlier Michigan study (14:18) reported that the population of their city or type of school was "rural or consolidated", terms which were not defined.

National Studies

Three-fourths of the supervising principals reporting in the 1968 national study (15:91) classified their communities as either urban or suburban--38.2 percent and 36.4 percent, respectively. The study researchers cautioned that "it should be kept in mind that rural usually includes small towns and villages as well as relatively open farming areas."

Statewide Studies

New Jersey principals were identified by Andlauer (2:80) by the type of community to which they were assigned as follows: 24 percent in urban communities; 62.7 percent in suburban communities; and 13.3 percent in rural areas.

The types of communities and percentages by Georgia researchers (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:8) were as follows: urban, 23.4 percent; suburban, 36.6 percent; and rural, 40 percent.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Of the principals queried, nearly 54 percent characterized their communities as suburban; 21 percent indicated their communities as urban; with 251 of the 996 respondents to this question (25%) reported their locations as rural. The types of communities employing responding elementary principals can be viewed in Table 16.

Table 16
Character of School District

District Character	Number	Percentage
Suburban	534	53.61
Urban	211	21.18
Rural	251	25.20

The investigator also determined that suburban principals were more likely to be employed in high expenditure districts than were urban or rural principals. The types of school districts employing responding principals are presented by level of operating expenditure per pupil in Table 17.

Table 17
Comparison of Levels of Operating Expenditure
by Type of School District

Expenditure Level	Type of School District			
	Suburban	Urban	Rural	Total
<u>High</u>				
Freq.	285.00	138.00	24.00	447.00
Percent across	63.76	30.87	5.37	100.00
Percent down	53.98	66.03	9.72	45.43
Percent of total	28.96	14.02	2.44	45.43
Theoret. freq.	239.85	94.94	112.20	
Cell χ^2	8.50	19.53	69.34	
<u>Middle</u>				
Freq.	141.00	41.00	102.00	284.00
Percent across	49.65	14.44	35.92	100.00
Percent down	26.70	19.62	41.30	28.86
Percent of total	14.33	4.17	10.37	28.86
Theoret. freq.	152.39	60.32	71.29	
Cell χ^2	.85	6.19	13.23	
<u>Low</u>				
Freq.	102.00	30.00	121.00	253.00
Percent across	40.32	11.86	47.83	100.00
Percent down	19.32	14.35	48.99	25.71
Percent of total	10.37	3.05	12.30	25.71
Theoret. freq.	135.76	53.74	63.51	
Cell χ^2	8.39	10.49	52.05	
<u>Total</u>				
Freq.	528.00	209.00	247.00	984.00
Percent across	53.66	21.24	25.10	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	53.66	21.24	25.10	100.00

$\chi^2 = 188.560$; $df = 4$; Significant at .001 level;
unused = 27.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OPERATING
EXPENDITURE LEVEL

Presentation of Data and
Findings

One of the purposes of identifying a statistical portrait of the status of the elementary principal was to determine whether the present method of financing Michigan lower education was related to inequitable conditions affecting elementary school principals and principalships serving school districts of varying levels of financial support. However, a meticulous examination of all recent state and national status studies failed to locate findings and information pertaining to the cost-quality relationships of schools in which elementary school principals administered.

The 1970-1971 operating expenditures per pupil of principals' school districts in this study were grouped in three classifications. The reported numbers and percentages were: (1) \$800 and above per pupil, 451, or 45.33 percent; (2) \$700-\$799 per pupil, 288, or 28.94 percent; and (3) \$699 per pupil, 256, or 25.73 percent. These data are illustrated in Table 18.

Of course, the per-pupil expenditure does not tell the whole story of quality and equality in Michigan schools, but it is taken as a significant index of the

financial differentials among school districts to hold educational implication for this study.

Table 18
1970-71 Operating Expenditure Level
of School District

Expenditure Level	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Cell N	Cumulative Percent
\$800 and above per pupil	451	45.33	451	45.33
\$700 - \$799 per pupil	288	28.94	749	74.27
\$699 and below per pupil	256	25.73	995	100.00

Throughout this study a determination was made to discover whether the difference in dollars expended among school districts could be a dependent variable with respect to the qualitative and quantitative factors that relate to and affect the Michigan elementary school principal.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS SUPERVISED

National Studies

Among those elementary principals sampled in the national study (15:63), 10.3 percent were reported to supervise two schools; 2.4 percent administered three schools; and 1.9 percent were in charge of four or more schools.

Statewide Studies

The number of separately named elementary schools under the direction of elementary principals was examined by Youngblood (13:36) in the 1961 Texas study. The percentage of Texas principals assigned to single schools was reported as 92.5 percent; 5.4 percent served in dual principalships; and 2.1 percent had multischool principalships serving three or more schools.

Ninety-five percent of the responding principals in a recent Georgia study (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:8) indicated supervision of only one separately named elementary school, while 3.8 percent had responsibility for two schools.

A similarity of percentages was reported in the Indiana (Arms, 1:22) and Oklahoma (Brothers, 3:54) principalship studies, 87.7 percent and 87.1 percent, respectively.

Merigis and Gill (4:Table 2) found that of all reporting Illinois principals 85 percent administered one school, 12 percent administered two schools, and 3 percent were in charge of three or more schools.

Shelton (10:28) reported in a 1964 study that only 74.2 percent of Arkansas principals supervised only one school and 17.2 percent supervised two schools.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Close to eight hundred responders, or 78.99 percent, reported administering one school; 15.46 percent were in charge of two separately named schools; thirty-six principals reported supervising three schools (3.57%); and 1.98 percent of all responding Michigan principals had four or more schools under their direction. These data are presented in Table 19.

Table 19
Number of Separately Named
Schools Supervised

Number of Schools	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
One	797	78.99	797	78.99
Two	156	15.46	953	94.45
Three	36	3.57	989	98.02
Four or more	20	1.08	1009	100.00

One of every five Michigan principals, then, was reported to be in charge of more than one school. And the practice of assigning principals to multiple-school assignments was found to be more prevalent in Michigan than in all other reporting states, except Arkansas.

One responding principal appended a comment to his survey form that his multi-school principalship was like running around attempting to hold his fingers over

leaks in a dam. Another stated that supervising more than one school required too much office duty and not enough time for curriculum development and work with children.

The number of separately named elementary schools under the direction of responding principals is presented by level of school district operating expenditure per pupil in Table 20. The number of schools supervised by responding principals was related to expenditure level at the .001 level of significance. The null hypothesis of independence was accepted for the factor of expenditure level.

Principals from high expenditure districts were less likely to have multischool principalships than were principals from low expenditure school districts.

An interesting relationship was discovered when comparing the number of schools administered to the number of hours per week spent on regular and school-related duties. A significant relationship was found to exist between the number of schools administered and the hours per week being devoted to the job. Multischool principals were discovered to spend fewer hours per week on school work than principals with only a single school assignment. These relationships are presented in Table 21.

Table 20

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels
With Number of Schools Supervised

Expenditure Level	Number of Schools Supervised				
	One	Two	Three	Four or More	Total
<u>High</u>					
Freq.	397.00	46.00	5.00	3.00	451.00
Percent across	88.03	10.20	1.11	.67	100.00
Percent down	50.38	30.07	13.89	18.75	45.42
Percent of total	39.98	4.63	.50	.30	45.42
Theoret. freq.	357.89	69.49	16.35	7.27	
Cell χ^2	4.27	7.94	7.88	2.51	
<u>Middle</u>					
Freq.	219.00	49.00	12.00	8.00	288.00
Percent across	76.04	17.01	4.17	2.78	100.00
Percent down	27.79	32.03	33.33	50.00	29.00
Percent of total	22.05	4.93	1.21	.81	29.00
Theoret. freq.	228.54	44.37	10.44	4.64	
Cell χ^2	.40	.48	.23	2.43	
<u>Low</u>					
Freq.	172.00	58.00	19.00	5.00	254.00
Percent across	67.72	22.83	7.48	1.97	100.00
Percent down	21.83	37.91	52.78	31.25	25.58
Percent of total	17.32	5.84	1.91	.50	25.58
Theoret. freq.	201.56	39.14	9.21	4.09	
Cell χ^2	4.34	9.09	10.41	.20	
<u>Total</u>					
Freq.	788.00	153.00	36.00	16.00	993.00
Percent across	79.36	15.41	3.63	1.61	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	79.36	15.41	3.63	1.61	100.00

$\chi^2 = 50.185$; $df = 6$; Significant at .001 level;
unused = 18.

Table 21

Comparison of Number of Schools Supervised by Number
of Hours Spent Per Week on School Duties

Number of Schools	Number of Hours Spent on School Work								Total
	36 Hours or Less	36-41	42-47	48-53	54-59	60-65	66-71	72 or More	
<u>One</u>									
Freq.	8.00	51.00	275.00	285.00	125.00	47.00	2.00	2.00	795.00
Percent across	1.01	6.42	34.59	35.85	15.72	5.91	.25	.25	100.00
Percent down	88.89	80.95	76.82	79.39	86.21	77.05	50.00	40.00	79.18
Percent of total	.80	5.08	27.39	28.39	12.45	4.68	.20	.20	79.18
Theoret. freq.	7.13	49.89	283.48	284.27	114.82	48.30	3.17	3.96	
Cell χ^2	.11	.02	.25	.00	.90	.04	.43	.97	
<u>Two</u>									
Freq.	0.00	8.00	61.00	53.00	17.00	11.00	2.00	2.00	154.00
Percent across	0.00	5.19	39.61	34.42	11.04	7.14	1.30	1.30	100.00
Percent down	0.00	12.70	17.04	14.76	11.72	18.03	50.00	40.00	15.34
Percent of total	0.00	.80	6.08	5.28	1.69	1.10	.20	.20	15.34
Theoret. freq.	1.38	9.66	54.91	55.07	22.24	9.36	.61	.77	
Cell χ^2	1.38	.29	.67	.08	1.24	.29	3.13	1.98	
<u>Three</u>									
Freq.	0.00	1.00	17.00	12.00	3.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	35.00
Percent across	0.00	2.86	48.57	34.29	8.57	5.71	0.00	0.00	100.00
Percent down	0.00	1.59	4.75	3.34	2.07	3.28	0.00	0.00	3.49
Percent of total	0.00	.10	1.69	1.20	.30	.20	0.00	0.00	3.49
Theoret. freq.	.31	2.20	12.48	12.51	5.05	2.13	.14	.17	
Cell χ^2	.31	.65	1.64	.02	.84	.01	.14	.17	
<u>Four or More</u>									
Freq.	1.00	3.00	5.00	9.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	20.00
Percent across	5.00	15.00	25.00	45.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	100.00
Percent down	11.11	4.76	1.40	2.51	0.00	1.64	0.00	20.00	1.99
Percent of total	.10	.30	.50	.90	0.00	.10	0.00	.10	1.99
Theoret. freq.	.18	1.25	7.13	7.15	2.89	1.22	.08	.10	
Cell χ^2	3.76	2.43	.64	.48	2.89	.04	.08	8.14	
<u>Total</u>									
Freq.	9.00	63.00	358.00	359.00	145.00	61.00	4.00	5.00	1,004.00
Percent across	.90	6.27	35.66	35.76	14.44	6.08	.40	.50	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	.90	6.27	35.66	35.76	14.44	6.08	.40	.50	100.00

$\chi^2 = 34.008$; $df = 21$; Significant negative relationship at .05 level; unused = 7; p.m.c. = -.018211

GRADE LEVELS ADMINISTERED

National Studies

The reporters of the 1968 national study (15:62) showed that 39.2 percent of the schools administered by supervising principals in the total sample were grades K-6; 20.4 percent were grades 1-6; 7.3 percent were grades K-8; 9.6 percent were grades 1-8; 2.6 percent were pre-K-6. Twenty percent were organized in other ways. It was also noted that a fewer number of schools included grades 7 and 8 in their organization than was present in earlier national studies (17:44).

Statewide Studies

Of the Indiana principals reporting school organization (Arms, 1:98), 54.1 percent indicated grade organization type K-6; 15.9 percent indicated type 1-6; and 5.5 percent indicated type 1-8.

Merigis and Gill (4:Table 3) found a lower percentage regarding the K-6 type of organization than did the national study investigators. The Illinois study evidenced that 36.9 percent were in schools indicating type K-6; 8.4 percent in type 1-6; 23.5 percent in type K-8; 16.5 percent in type 1-8. And 14.7 percent were organized in some other manner.

Moss (8:161) revealed in his comparative study of the status of Wyoming principals that the most

popular plan for that state's principals was the K-6 pattern of organization (57.4%).

Most Texas principals (Youngblood, 13:39) were found to administer grade combinations including 1-6, 46.7 percent, while 24.8 percent had grades 1-8 in their schools.

Brothers' (3:54) investigation of the Oklahoma principalship showed that 72.5 percent of their schools were organized on a K-6 or 1-6 plan.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The most common pattern of school organization in operation in Michigan schools included grades kindergarten through six (61.94%). The next most used pattern of organization was kindergarten through five (15.26%). The remaining combinations, in order of their frequencies, were as follows: K-4, 6.14 percent; Pre-K-6, 5.15 percent; K-3, 2.18 percent; and all other combinations inclusive of the remaining 8.12 percent. The data in Table 22 indicate the various frequencies regarding grade levels administered by Michigan principals in this study.

This study revealed, then, that K-6 and K-5 grade organization patterns were found to be the most common type of elementary school plan used in Michigan. More than 77 percent of the respondents reported these patterns

in operation in their schools. On the other hand the organizational patterns reported in related studies were found to vary across the nation. Lack of public school kindergartens was thought to be responsible for reflecting somewhat different patterns than were present in Michigan figures.

Table 22

Grade Levels Administered

Grade Levels	Number	Percentage
Grades K-6	625	61.94
Pre-K-6	52	5.15
K-5	154	15.26
K-8	12	1.19
4-6	6	.59
K-3	22	2.18
K-4	62	6.14
Other	76	7.53

PUPIL ENROLLMENT UNDER
DIRECTION OF PRINCIPAL

National Studies

As reported by the investigators in the 1968 national study (15:66-67), the median elementary school enrollments of schools administered by supervising principals was 540.

A comparison of enrollment figures obtained in 1928, 1948, 1958, and 1968 indicated that the present trend is toward larger elementary schools. The 1968

data show an increase over the medians of 1958 and 1948, but not as high as the 1928 median (16:60). Enrollment medians from the four national studies are shown in Table 23 in an attempt to establish a basis of comparison for enrollment findings of this study.

Table 23

National Median Elementary School
Enrollments, 1928-1968

Median Elementary School Enrollments	
National Study	Median Enrollment
1928	632
1948	520
1958	536
1968	540

Statewide Studies

The mean of the total student enrollment in Missouri public schools was reported by Warren (12:42) to be 519.4 pupils and the mode to be at the level of 300-499 pupils.

Schools supervised by California elementary principals had a median enrollment of 582 pupils (Lepick, 5:207).

The typical principal in Georgia (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:9) reported approximately 600 pupils enrolled in his school. Thirty-four percent of the respondents reported that they had 399 or less students, with

2.65 percent of the schools they supervised having enrollments of over 1,000 students.

Merigis and Gill (4:Table 3) revealed that principals from Illinois schools reported a median of 540 students.

By district-size groups, the median enrollment for 1961 California (Lepick, 5:208) schools was 582 students.

A much smaller median number of students, 399.5, was found to be supervised by the typical elementary school principal in Arkansas (Shelton, 10:31).

Indiana principals were reported by Arms (1:95) as supervising schools with a mean enrollment of 536 students. In addition, almost 44 percent of reporting Indiana principals had schools with enrollments of 400-900 pupils, while 4.7 percent served schools with enrollments of 1,000 or more.

The median enrollment of the schools administered by Oregon (Perkins, 9:68) principals was 417.4.

Supervising principals in Texas (Youngblood, 13:45) had a median enrollment of 499 pupils.

The largest percentage of respondents in Brothers' (3:56) 1968 study of Oklahoma principals reported school enrollments within the range of 200 and 399.

Presentation of Data and Findings

An examination of the elementary school enrollment distributions presented in Table 24 showed that more than 60 percent (60.54%) of the principals in this study were administering schools with between 400-699 pupils. Of the remaining respondents, 24.85 percent administered schools with from 100-399 students; and 12.13 percent directed student bodies of 700-999.

Table 24

Pupil Enrollment Under Direction
of Principal

Enrollment	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Below 100	4	.40	4	.40
100 - 399	250	24.85	254	25.25
400 - 699	609	60.54	863	85.79
700 - 999	122	12.13	985	97.91
1,000 or more	21	2.09	1,006	100.00

At the extremes, four respondents reported that their schools had enrollments of fewer than 100 pupils, while 21 respondents (2.09%) indicated responsibility for schools of more than 1,000 pupils.

The most common enrollment interval of schools administered by principals in this study was 400-699. It should be noted that the pattern in student enrollment was generally similar to most other recent state studies and the national study.

The total pupil enrollments of the schools under the responding principals' direction are presented by school district expenditure level in Table 25. The number of pupils supervised by responding principals was related to district expenditure at the .05 significance level. The null hypothesis of independence was accepted for the factor of pupil enrollment. Those principals in high expenditure districts were found to be more likely to have schools with small enrollments than those in lower expenditure districts.

ECONOMIC CHARACTER OF SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD

National Studies

The investigators reporting the 1968 national study (15:92) found that 16.7 percent of the student bodies in principals' schools were mostly disadvantaged, while 23.8 percent were reported as having few disadvantaged pupils. A wide diversity in economic character was indicated by 27.5 percent of reporting principals.

Statewide Studies

Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:9) reported in the Georgia status study that 19 percent of the study respondents indicated that their pupils were predominantly disadvantaged; while 18 percent of the participants

Table 25

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Pupil
Enrollment Under Direction of Principal

Expenditure Level	Pupil Enrollment					Total
	Below 100	100-399	400-699	700-999	1,000 or More	
<u>High</u>						
Freq.	2.00	124.00	277.00	41.00	6.00	450.00
Percent across	.44	27.56	61.56	9.11	1.33	100.00
Percent down	50.00	50.00	46.40	33.61	31.58	45.45
Percent of total	.20	12.53	27.98	4.14	.61	45.45
Theoret. freq.	1.82	112.73	271.36	55.45	8.64	
Cell χ^2	.02	1.13	.12	3.77	.80	
<u>Middle</u>						
Freq.	1.00	70.00	171.00	41.00	3.00	286.00
Percent across	.35	24.48	59.79	14.34	1.05	100.00
Percent down	25.00	28.23	28.64	33.61	15.79	28.89
Percent of total	.10	7.07	17.27	4.14	.30	28.89
Theoret. freq.	1.16	71.64	172.47	35.24	5.49	
Cell χ^2	.02	.04	.01	.94	1.13	
<u>Low</u>						
Freq.	1.00	54.00	149.00	40.00	10.00	254.00
Percent across	.39	21.26	58.66	15.75	3.94	100.00
Percent down	25.00	21.77	24.96	32.79	52.63	25.66
Percent of total	.10	5.45	15.05	4.04	1.01	25.66
Theoret. freq.	1.03	63.63	153.17	31.30	4.87	
Cell χ^2	.00	1.46	.11	2.42	5.39	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	4.00	248.00	597.00	122.00	19.00	990.00
Percent across	.40	25.05	60.30	12.32	1.92	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	.40	25.05	60.30	12.32	1.92	100.00

$\chi^2 = 17.352$; $df = 8$; Significant at .05 level; unused = 21.

indicated few disadvantaged; and 26.8 percent reported a wide diversity in backgrounds. The study also found that economic level was associated with the size of school systems. As the size of the school district increased, the greater were the percentages reported as being below average economically.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The most "typical" principal in this study indicated the primary economic character of his school neighborhood as average. The data presented in Table 26 reports the following observations: above average, 18.11 percent; average, 48.56 percent; below average, 24.68 percent; and distinct diversity, 8.66 percent.

Table 26
Economic Character of School
Neighborhood

Neighborhood Character	Number	Percentage
Above average	182	18.11
Average	488	48.56
Below average	248	24.68
Distinct diversity	87	8.66

Only one recent state principalship study was located which dealt with the economic level associated with the school neighborhood supervised by the principal. The comparison found approximately twice as many

below-average neighborhoods existed in Georgia by percentage of total than were indicated to exist in Michigan.

When compared with the national study, Michigan principals were shown to have 8 percent fewer advantaged neighborhoods, 8 percent greater disadvantaged neighborhoods, and proportionately fewer diverse situations.

PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO

Statewide Studies

Moss (8:160) found that the average pupil-teacher ratio of classes in schools administered by Wyoming supervising principals was 26.2 to one.

Modeland (7:79) revealed in his study of Kansas principals a statewide pupil-teacher ratio of 27.5 to one.

A percentage distribution of 79.2 percent of Missouri classrooms was reported by Warren (12:42) in 1968 to be an enrollment of between 25-34 students. It was also reported that classroom enrollments of less than twenty-five comprised 13.2 percent of the total distribution; whereas approximately 5 percent of the classroom pupil-teacher ratios were 34 or above.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The largest group of principals in this study reported that 69.15 percent of their schools had a pupil-teacher ratio range of 26-30 students. Slightly

more than one in five principals, or 20.3 percent, administered schools in which the average number of students per classroom teacher was between 21 and 25, while about one in ten supervised schools with 31 to 35 students per classroom. The data concerning pupil-teacher ratios are located in Table 27.

Table 27

Pupil-Teacher Ratio of
Principal's School

Pupil-Teacher Ratio	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
15 or fewer	1	.10	1	.10
16 - 20	7	.70	8	.80
21 - 25	204	20.30	212	21.09
26 - 30	695	69.15	907	90.25
31 - 35	97	9.65	1,004	99.90
36 or above	1	.10	1,005	100.00

Most classes in Michigan schools administered by principals in this study fall within the interval including 26-30 students per classroom teacher. Similar ranges were found in related studies.

The comparison of school district expenditure level with pupil-teacher ratio is shown in Table 28. Interestingly, no relationship was found to exist at the .05 level of significance although a relationship was found to exist at the .10 level. It did not appear

Table 28

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels with Pupil-Teacher Ratio

District	Pupil-Teacher Ratio						Total
	15 or Less	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36 and above	
<u>High</u>							
Freq.	1.00	6.00	101.00	303.00	38.00	0.00	449.00
Percent across	.22	1.34	22.49	67.48	8.46	0.00	100.00
Percent down	00.00	85.71	49.75	44.56	39.18	0.00	45.40
Percent of total	.10	.61	10.21	30.64	3.84	0.00	45.40
Theoret. freq.	.45	3.18	92.16	308.72	44.04	.45	
Cell χ^2	.66	2.51	.85	.11	.83	.45	
<u>Middle</u>							
Freq.	0.00	1.00	62.00	197.00	26.00	0.00	286.00
Percent across	0.00	.35	21.68	68.88	9.09	0.00	100.00
Percent down	0.00	14.29	30.54	28.97	26.80	0.00	28.92
Percent of total	0.00	.10	6.27	19.92	2.63	0.00	28.92
Theoret. freq.	.29	2.02	58.70	196.64	28.05	.29	
Cell χ^2	.29	.52	.19	.00	.15	.29	
<u>Low</u>							
Freq.	0.00	0.00	40.00	180.00	33.00	1.00	254.00
Percent across	0.00	0.00	15.75	70.87	12.99	.39	100.00
Percent down	0.00	0.00	19.70	26.47	34.02	100.00	25.68
Percent of total	0.00	0.00	4.04	18.20	3.34	.10	25.68
Theoret. freq.	.26	1.80	52.14	174.64	24.91	.26	
Cell χ^2	.26	1.80	2.82	.16	2.63	2.15	
<u>Total</u>							
Freq.	1.00	7.00	203.00	680.00	97.00	1.00	989.00
Percent across	.10	.71	20.53	68.76	9.81	.10	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	.10	.71	20.53	68.76	9.81	.10	100.00

$\chi^2 = 16.650$; $df = 10$; Not Significant at .05 level; unused 22.

that high expenditure districts had proportionately lower teacher-pupil ratios than the low expenditure districts.

CLASSROOM TEACHER POSITIONS

National Studies

In 1968 the median number of teaching positions reported by researchers in the national principalship study (15:68) was 20, as compared with a figure of 18 in the 1958 survey (16:105).

Statewide Studies

The study by Arms (1:100) of Indiana principals reported 11 percent had nine or less classroom teachers. Schools with from 10-14 teachers were supervised by 27 percent of the supervising principals; 24.9 percent supervised 15-19 teachers; and 16.9 percent supervised 20-24 teachers.

In the 1969 New Jersey study Andlauer (2:53) found that the median ratio was located between twenty-one and twenty-five teachers. Close to half the responding principals in the study had an average of between 16 and 25 classroom teachers in their schools.

Supervising Texas principals were reported by Youngblood (11:45) as having medians of 18 teachers, with teacher medians decreasing as the size of the school system decreased.

The median number of full-time classroom teachers employed in Kansas schools was approximately twelve (Modeland, 7:79).

A tabulation of replies revealed that the median number of teachers in California schools was 18.4 percent (Lepick, 5:206).

The median number of full-time classroom teachers under the supervision of Oklahoma principals was reported by Brothers (3:57) as 12.4 percent, with almost 6 percent of the reporting principals indicating four or less teachers in their schools, and over 10 percent, 25 or more teachers on their staffs.

Georgia (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:10) principals reported that 35 percent of their schools had from 15 to 24 elementary teachers.

The median supervised by Wyoming principals was 13.9 teachers, and in surrounding states, 14.9 teachers (Moss, 8:77).

The median number of teachers supervised by Arkansas principals, according to Shelton (10:29), was 14.1, with 74.9 percent located within the range of ten through nineteen.

Perkins (9:70) reported that the Oregon principalship revealed a mode of 12-18 teachers and a median of 16.6 teachers.

Presentation of Data and Findings

In order to ascertain the approximate number of teachers in schools supervised by Michigan principals, respondents were requested to check the interval responding to the number of full-time classroom teachers assigned to their buildings. Table 29 contains the data concerning the number of teachers supervised by principals in this study.

Table 29
Number of Classroom Teacher Positions
Under Principal's Direction

Number of Teachers	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Below 5	1	.10	1	.10
5 - 14	250	24.78	251	24.88
15 - 24	567	56.19	818	81.07
25 - 34	160	15.86	978	96.93
35 - 44	20	1.98	998	98.91
45 - 54	7	.69	1,005	99.60
55 and above	4	.40	1,009	100.00

More than half, or 56.19 percent, of the principals reported a mode of 15-24 full-time classroom teachers in their schools; one in four supervised a number within the range of 5-14; and 15.86 percent had 25-34 full-time classroom teacher positions under their direction.

PERCENTAGE OF MALE TEACHING STAFF

Presentation of Data and Findings

One-hundred forty principals, or 13.86 percent, reported "zero" male classroom teachers under their direction; 34.65 percent of the responders indicated a percentage range of 1-5 percent male teachers; 17.33 percent had 6-10 percent males; 22.57 percent reported 11-20 percent males; 9.11 percent reported a range of 21-30 percent male; and only twenty-five elementary principals reported staffs with 21 or more percent male members. These data are found in Table 30.

Table 30

Percentage of Male Teaching Staff

Percent of Male	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Zero	140	13.86	140	13.86
1 - 5	350	34.65	490	48.51
6 - 10	175	17.33	665	65.84
11 - 20	228	22.57	893	88.42
21 - 30	92	9.11	985	97.52
31 - 40	16	1.58	1,001	99.11
41 and above	9	.89	1,010	100.00

A cross tabulation of classifications regarding percentage of male teachers on a respondent's staff with sex of principal showed a significant relationship existing at a .999 confidence level. Table 31 reports that

Table 31

Comparison of Percentage of Male Teachers on Staff by Sex

Sex	Percent of Male Teachers							Total
	Zero	1-5	6-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41 and above	
<u>Male</u>								
Freq.	92.00	249.00	144.00	192.00	7.00	15.00	9.00	778.00
Percent across	11.83	32.01	18.51	24.68	9.90	1.93	1.16	100.00
Percent down	65.71	71.14	82.29	84.58	83.70	93.75	100.00	77.11
Percent of total	9.12	24.68	14.27	19.03	7.63	1.49	.89	77.11
Theoret. freq.	107.95	269.87	134.94	175.03	70.94	12.34	6.94	
Cell χ^2	2.36	1.61	.61	1.65	.52	.57	.61	
<u>Female</u>								
Freq.	48.00	101.00	31.00	35.00	15.00	1.00	0.00	231.00
Percent across	20.78	43.72	13.42	15.15	6.49	.43	0.00	100.00
Percent down	34.29	28.86	17.71	15.42	16.30	6.25	0.00	22.89
Percent of total	4.76	10.01	3.07	3.47	1.49	.10	0.00	22.89
Theoret. freq.	32.05	80.13	40.06	51.97	21.06	3.66	2.06	
Cell χ^2	7.94	5.44	2.05	5.54	1.74	1.94	2.06	
<u>Total</u>								
Freq.	140.00	350.00	175.00	227.00	92.00	16.00	9.00	1,009.00
Percent across	13.88	34.69	17.34	22.50	9.12	1.59	.89	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	13.88	34.69	17.34	22.50	9.12	1.59	.89	100.00

$\chi^2 = 34.634$; $df = 6$; Significant negative relationship at .001 level;
 unused = 2; p.m.c. = -.064441.

male principals are more likely to have a greater percentage of male classroom teachers on their staffs than female principals.

No information was located in recent state and national status studies of the elementary principalship dealing with the percentage of the classroom teaching staff that is male.

AVAILABILITY OF SECRETARIAL ASSISTANCE

1951-1952 Michigan Study

The earlier Michigan study investigators (14:17) reported that of the 366 respondents to the question of whether clerical help existed, 32 percent reported none. Sixty-eight percent did report that they received clerical help. As stated in the report, "This does not indicate the extent which is mostly very limited."

National Studies

Seventy-nine percent of the supervising principals reporting in the 1968 national study (15:70) stated that they had one or more full-time secretaries. The comparable figure reported in the 1958 study (16:73) was 58 percent.

Statewide Studies

Gill and Merigis (4:31) discovered in their Illinois study that while nearly half the reporting

elementary principals had one secretary, almost 18 percent had no secretary, and 19 percent had only a half-time secretary. Eight and one-half percent reported two or more secretaries.

Responses to the Missouri study by Warren (12:44) indicated that almost 70 percent of principals in that state had at least one full-time secretary or clerk assigned to their school.

Brothers (3:94) noted that 53.5 percent of Oklahoma respondents felt that they were provided with adequate clerical help. Almost 30 percent reported conditions as inadequate.

In Wyoming (Moss, 8:76) only 22.6 percent of supervising principals had full-time secretaries. No secretarial help was reported by 27.4 percent of Wyoming principals, while almost 40 percent reported only part-time assistance.

Survey data in the Georgia principalship study reported by Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:28) indicated that 74 percent of the principals had a full-time secretary. In the study only 3 percent of the principals had no secretarial service, while 15 percent reported half-time assistance.

The lack of clerical assistance was mentioned by New Jersey principals (Andlauer, 2:56) in 1958 as the

fifth most critical problem facing elementary principals in that state, but they failed to include it as a problem area when surveyed in 1968.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The study data in Table 32 revealed that of all reporting Michigan principals, only ten indicated that they had no secretary; 3.27 percent had at least half-time help; 67.33 percent had one full-time secretary; 13.86 percent had a full-time and a half-time secretary; and 14.55 percent had two or more secretaries.

Relatively speaking, more Michigan principals appear to have secretarial assistance than their counterparts across the nation. Less than one percent of the principals in this study were without secretarial help, as compared with 8.7 percent in the national study.

Table 32

Availability of Secretarial Assistance

Secretarial Availability	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
None	10	.99	10	.99
One-half position	33	3.27	43	4.26
One position	680	67.33	723	71.58
One and one-half positions	140	13.86	863	85.45
Two positions	138	13.66	1,001	99.11
More than two positions	9	.89	1,010	100.00

ADEQUACY OF SUPPLY AND SELECTION OF LIBRARY
BOOKS IN PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL

Statewide Studies

Brothers (3:61) reported that 70.5 percent of Oklahoma principals felt that the supply of library books in their schools was adequate.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The elementary school library is a resource center for the total educational program and should furnish library books in such quality and quantities as to meet the reading and instructional needs of children.

The findings presented in Table 33 demonstrate that 72.89 percent of the responders to this study felt that their schools had an adequate supply and selection of library books for students. On the other hand, 270 respondents reported that the supply and selection of library books in their schools were inadequate. The data apparently indicate that, while a large proportion of elementary school libraries are felt to be at a level of adequacy, many Michigan principals consider that their libraries need improving. And based on study findings, Oklahoma and Michigan principals apparently share similar perceptions regarding the adequacy of library books.

The opinion of responding principals regarding the adequacy of library books for students is presented by expenditure level of school district in Table 34. A significant positive relationship was found to exist at the .99 level of confidence. Principals from high expenditure districts were discovered to be more likely to report their library as adequate than were low expenditure district principals.

Table 33

Evaluation of Supply and Selection of
Library Books and Adequacy of
Instructional Materiel in
Principal's School

Evaluation of Adequacy	Library Books		Instructional Materiel	
	Num- ber	Per- centage	Number	Percentage
Adequate	726	72.89	788	79.36
Inadequate	270	27.11	205	20.64

ADEQUACY OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIEL

IN PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL

Statewide Studies

Seventy percent of Oklahoma principals responding to a similar question in Brothers' (3:61) study indicated an adequacy of instructional materiel.

Table 34

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels with Evaluation of Library Book
and Instructional Materiel Adequacy

Expenditure Level	Library Book			Instructional Materiel		
	Ade-quate	Inade-quate	Total	Ade-quate	Inade-quate	Total
<u>High</u>						
Freq.	369.00	77.00	446.00	381.00	62.00	443.00
Percent across	82.74	17.26	100.00	86.00	14.00	100.00
Percent down	51.46	29.28	45.51	49.10	30.69	45.30
Percent of total	37.65	7.86	45.51	38.96	6.34	45.30
Theoret. freq.	326.31	119.69		351.50	91.50	
Cell χ^2	5.59	15.23		2.48	9.51	
<u>Middle</u>						
Freq.	185.00	94.00	279.00	207.00	75.00	282.00
Percent across	66.31	33.69	100.00	73.40	26.60	100.00
Percent down	25.80	35.74	28.47	26.68	37.13	28.83
Percent of total	18.88	9.59	28.47	21.17	7.67	28.83
Theoret. freq.	204.13	74.87		223.75	58.25	
Cell χ^2	1.79	4.89		1.25	4.82	
<u>Low</u>						
Freq.	163.00	92.00	255.00	188.00	65.00	253.00
Percent across	63.92	36.08	100.00	74.31	25.69	100.00
Percent down	22.73	34.98	26.02	24.23	32.18	25.87
Percent of total	16.63	9.39	26.02	19.22	6.65	25.87
Theoret. freq.	186.57	68.43		200.74	52.26	
Cell χ^2	2.98	8.12		.81	3.11	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	717.00	263.00	980.00	776.00	202.00	978.00
Percent across	73.16	26.84	100.00	79.35	20.65	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	73.16	26.84	100.00	79.35	20.65	100.00

$\chi^2 = 38.582$; $df = 2$;
Significant at .001
level; unused = 31.

$\chi^2 = 21.977$; $df = 2$;
Significant at .001
level; unused = 33.

Presentation of Data and Findings

As shown in Table 33, 79.36 percent of the responding principals indicated that the elementary schools under their direction were adequately supplied with teaching materials and instructional aids, while 205 responders reported that the materials and aids were not adequate.

The data indicate that one in five Michigan principals reported that they were administering schools in which their teachers were without adequate supplies to teach.

The adequacy of instructional materiel perceived by elementary school principals in this study is presented by expenditure level of school district in Table 34. The adequacy of materiel was related to expenditure level of school district at the .001 significance level. Principals from high expenditure districts were more likely to perceive their instructional materiel as adequate than were principals from lower expenditure levels.

ADEQUACY OF PRINCIPAL'S OFFICE

National Studies

The 1968 national study investigators (15:70) found that slightly more than half (54.6 percent) of the supervising principals reported that their offices were

satisfactory or better. It was interesting to note that the situation reported nationally in 1968 had not improved over conditions reported as 62 percent in the 1958 study (16:69, Table 30). In fact, the total of the satisfactory and exceptional ratings indicated a loss of more than 7 percent between 1958 and 1968.

The authors of the more recent study suggested that principals in 1968 were more selective about what constituted an efficient office setup (15:141). The 1968 study researchers concluded their comments on office inadequacies stating, "Undoubtedly, there has been some improvement in the overall situations but the gains in up-to-date office facilities continue to come too slowly."

Statewide Studies

Youngblood (13:71) reported in the 1961 Texas study that 51.2 percent felt that their office status was satisfactory; almost 13 percent indicated "tip top" space and equipment; while 2.6 percent reported no real office.

Almost half the responders to Modeland's (7:135) study of the Kansas principalship reported that they usually obtain sufficient space and equipment to conduct a reasonably efficient office operation. Another 19.5 percent replied that they always obtain sufficient office space and equipment.

Oklahoma principals reported that 83.6 percent felt that office supplies and equipment were adequate; while 70.4 percent indicated that office space was adequate (Brothers, 3:63-64).

Presentation of Data and Findings

Forty-nine percent of the Michigan principals in this study described their office facilities as satisfactory in space and equipment. Seventeen percent reported exceptionally good facilities; 8 percent indicated that they had enough space but needed office equipment; 17.5 percent reported adequate equipment but need for more space. A total of sixty-one principals reported that their office consisted of just room for a desk but not much more, while twenty-six principals replied that no real office facility existed. Table 35 deals with the data of this question.

It is apparent, then, that fewer Michigan principals are laboring under serious office facility and equipment limitations than were reported affecting the national principalship. A proportional differential amounting to 11 percent exists between the Michigan and national figures.

The status of the principal's office is presented by school district expenditure level in Table 36. A significant relationship was found to exist at the .99 level

of confidence. In this study principals from high expenditure districts were found to have proportionately better office facilities than other principals.

Table 35
Evaluation of Office Facilities
in Principal's School

Evaluation of Office	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Exceptionally good	169	16.82	169	16.82
Satisfactory space and equipment	491	48.86	660	65.67
Enough space, need equipment	82	8.16	742	73.83
Enough equipment, need space	176	17.51	918	91.34
Just room for a desk	61	6.07	979	97.41
No real office at present	26	2.59	1,005	100.00

ADEQUACY OF SPECIALIZED PERSONNEL

1951-1952 Michigan Study

The earlier Michigan study (14:16-17) reported the availability of special services to an elementary school principal, however limited the contact, in the following percentages: special services, 68 percent; social worker, 64 percent, speech correction, 76 percent; and psychological clinic, 65 percent.

Table 36

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels
With Office Facility Adequacy

Expenditure Level	Adequacy of Office Facilities						Total
	Exceptional	Satisfactory	Need Equip- ment	Need Space	Just Room for Desk	No Real Office	
<u>High</u>							
Freq.	96.00	212.00	21.00	76.00	31.00	12.00	448.00
Percent across	21.43	47.32	4.69	16.96	6.92	2.68	100.00
Percent down	57.14	43.98	26.58	43.68	50.82	46.15	45.25
Percent of total	9.70	21.41	2.12	7.68	3.13	1.21	45.25
Theoret. freq.	76.02	218.12	35.75	78.74	27.60	11.77	
Cell χ^2	5.25	.17	6.09	.10	.42	.00	
<u>Middle</u>							
Freq.	45.00	137.00	30.00	56.00	13.00	6.00	287.00
Percent across	15.68	47.74	10.45	19.51	4.53	2.09	100.00
Percent down	26.79	28.42	37.97	32.18	21.31	23.08	28.99
Percent of total	4.55	13.84	3.03	5.66	1.31	.61	28.99
Theoret. freq.	48.70	139.73	22.90	50.44	17.68	7.54	
Cell χ^2	.28	.05	2.20	.61	1.24	.31	
<u>Low</u>							
Freq.	27.00	133.00	28.00	42.00	17.00	8.00	255.00
Percent across	10.59	52.16	10.98	16.47	6.67	3.14	100.00
Percent down	16.07	27.59	35.44	24.14	27.87	30.77	25.76
Percent of total	2.73	13.43	2.83	4.24	1.72	.81	25.76
Theoret. freq.	43.27	124.15	20.35	44.82	15.71	6.70	
Cell χ^2	6.12	.63	2.88	.18	.11	.25	
<u>Total</u>							
Freq.	168.00	482.00	79.00	174.00	61.00	26.00	990.00
Percent across	16.97	48.69	7.98	17.58	6.16	2.63	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	16.97	48.69	7.98	17.58	6.16	2.63	100.00

$\chi^2 = 26.888$; $df = 10$; Significant at .01 level; unused = 21.

National Studies

A comparison between selected aspects of the 1958 study (16:67, Table 29) and 1968 national survey (15:74-77), on the basis of the percent of principals reporting the unavailability of resource personnel, suggests that there have been both definite improvements and decreases in the availability of specialized personnel in areas of curriculum and learning problems.

A significant gain was noted in the increased availability of librarians, while slight improvements were obtained in situations involving psychologists, social workers, and reading specialists. Moreover, definite decreases were noted in the number of specialized personnel in the fields of physical education, art, and music. The situation involving speech teachers remained relatively similar, though more than one in every three school situations was reportedly without this important service.

The 1968 national survey speculated that the gains and losses in the availability of specialized resource personnel was reflective of the growing problems of the school systems and the acuteness of many community socio-economic problems. Furthermore, they raised the issue of whether or not the availability of specialists is keeping pace with the emerging problems that are confronting elementary education and the principalship.

Statewide Studies

It was stated in the Indiana study by Arms (1:105) that of the reporting elementary principals, 6.8 percent had no music teachers; 19.7 percent were without art teachers; 41.8 percent had no physical education teachers; and 54.7 percent were without remedial reading personnel. Indiana school principals also reported 18.8 percent had no nurses; 19.9 percent were without speech personnel; 75.9 percent had no contact with psychologists in their schools; and 89.2 percent were without curriculum consultants.

The lack of availability of resource personnel in Oklahoma schools was revealed by Brothers (3:97) as follows: 39.6 percent without general curriculum consultant services; 16.4 percent without music teachers; 34 percent without reading teachers; 39.1 percent without physical education teachers; 55.2 percent without art teachers; 17 percent without nurses; 49.9 percent without librarians; 32.3 percent without speech teachers; and 42.7 percent without the services of a psychologist.

Resource personnel were reported unavailable in many Arkansas schools by Shelton (10:100). Of the 153 respondents, 32.1 percent had no special teacher or supervisor of music, art, and/or physical education. In addition, 49 percent of Arkansas principals reported

that they were without the services of a nurse, while 95.4 percent were without special help from a psychologist.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The point established in this study was not whether resource personnel was available, but rather whether service received was perceived to be adequate. It was not possible to make a determination of adequacy between studies as services were not always reported in equivalent terms. For example, a full-time resource person in a school with an enrollment of 1,500 pupils could be quite inadequate, whereas part-time availability in a small-enrollment school might represent a satisfactory level of service.

Principals in this study reported that their school received as much or more service from specialized personnel in areas related to curriculum and learning problems as other Michigan schools. A total percentage of 44.07 percent responded that their school received about the same amount of service; 27.62 percent replied that they received more service than other schools; while 6 percent felt that their school received much more service. Twelve percent reported feeling that they received less specialized personnel service than other Michigan schools. Table 37 shows the percentage of situations concerning this question.

Literature in the field indicated that resource personnel are not available in sufficient numbers to meet adequately the needs of children in many of our nation's schools. However, the data in this study tend to indicate that, in general, most Michigan elementary school principals feel they have available as much or more specialized service as other Michigan schools. More than three-fourths, or 77.67 percent, of the principals reported their school receiving such services.

Table 37

Comparative Evaluation of Amount of Service
Received from Specialized Personnel
in Areas of Curriculum and
Learning Problems

Service Received	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Much more	60	5.98	60	5.98
More	277	27.62	337	33.60
About the same	442	44.07	779	77.67
Less	189	18.84	968	96.51
Much less	35	3.49	1,003	100.00

The perceived availability of specialized personnel in areas of curriculum and learning problems is presented by expenditure level of school district in Table 38. The adequacy of specialized service was found to be significantly related to expenditure level at the .999 level of confidence. It was observed that

Table 38

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels with Adequacy of Specialized
Personnel Service

Expenditure Level	Adequacy of Specialized Personnel Service					Total
	Much More	More	About Same	Less	Much Less	
<u>High</u>						
Freq.	45.00	172.00	170.00	49.00	8.00	444.00
Percent across	10.14	38.74	38.29	11.04	1.80	100.00
Percent down	75.00	63.00	39.08	26.49	23.53	44.98
Percent of total	4.56	17.43	17.22	4.96	.81	44.98
Theoret. freq.	26.99	122.81	195.68	83.22	15.29	
Cell χ^2	12.02	19.70	3.37	14.07	3.48	
<u>Middle</u>						
Freq.	11.00	65.00	141.00	62.00	8.00	287.00
Percent across	3.83	22.65	49.13	21.60	2.79	100.00
Percent down	18.33	23.81	32.41	33.51	23.53	29.08
Percent of total	1.11	6.59	14.29	6.28	.81	29.08
Theoret. freq.	17.45	79.38	126.49	53.79	9.89	
Cell χ^2	2.38	2.61	1.66	1.25	.36	
<u>Low</u>						
Freq.	4.00	36.00	124.00	74.00	18.00	256.00
Percent across	1.56	14.06	48.44	28.91	7.03	100.00
Percent down	6.67	13.19	29.51	40.00	52.94	25.94
Percent of total	.41	3.65	12.56	7.50	1.82	25.94
Theoret. freq.	15.56	70.81	112.83	47.98	8.82	
Cell χ^2	8.59	17.11	1.11	14.11	9.56	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	60.00	273.00	435.00	185.00	34.00	987.00
Percent across	6.08	27.66	44.07	18.74	3.44	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	6.08	27.66	44.07	18.74	3.44	100.00

$\chi^2 = 111.380$; $df = 8$; Significant at .001 level;
unused = 24.

principals from high expenditure districts believe they received more services, while principals from low expenditure districts felt they received less.

CONDITION OF 1971-1972 SCHOOL BUDGET

Presentation of Data and Findings

Principals in this study were queried to determine whether their school district operated during the 1971-1972 school year under an austerity budget necessitated by a lack of local community support for proposed millage. The figures in Table 39 show that 40.65 percent of the respondents revealed that they were operating in districts which were confronted with austerity conditions during the 1971-1972 school year.

Table 39

Condition of 1971-72 School Budget

Condition	Number	Percentage
Operated under austerity budget	402	40.65
No austerity budget	587	59.35

The operation during the school year under an austerity budget was related to expenditure level of school systems at the .02 level of significance. Interestingly, principals from high expenditure districts were more apt to have operated under austerity conditions

than low expenditure district administrators (Table 40). This fact would tend to indicate that the taxpayer in the higher expenditure districts was more likely to have rejected a larger proportion of millage issues than the taxpayer in low-expenditure districts.

TYPE OF PARENT ORGANIZATION

Presentation of Data and Findings

Principals in this study reported that 48.06 percent of their schools were associated with the Michigan and National Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations (P.T.A.); 38 percent had schools that were "p.t.o.'s," independent organizations not associated with the P.T.A.; and 143, or 14.23 percent, of the respondents reported that no formalized organizational body existed.

Comparative data were not available to draw conclusions about the distributions presented in Table 41.

EVALUATION OF PARENT GROUP ORGANIZATION

Presentation of Data and Findings

Principals were requested to indicate whether or not their parent-teacher group was an active and dynamic operation whose meetings had been reasonably well attended during the past twelve months. Opinions were almost

Table 40

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels with Condition of 1971-72
School Budget

Expenditure Level	Operated Under Austerity	No Austerity	Total
<u>High</u>			
Freq.	201.00	238.00	439.00
Percent across	45.79	54.21	100.00
Percent down	50.76	41.18	45.07
Percent of total	20.64	24.44	45.07
Theoret. freq.	178.48	260.52	
Cell χ^2	2.84	1.95	
<u>Middle</u>			
Freq.	102.00	181.00	283.00
Percent across	36.04	63.96	100.00
Percent down	25.76	31.31	29.06
Percent of total	10.47	18.58	29.06
Theoret. freq.	115.06	167.94	
Cell χ^2	1.48	1.02	
<u>Low</u>			
Freq.	93.00	159.00	252.00
Percent across	36.90	63.10	100.00
Percent down	23.48	27.51	25.87
Percent of total	9.55	16.32	25.87
Theoret. freq.	102.46	149.54	
Cell χ^2	.87	.60	
<u>Total</u>			
Freq.	396.00	578.00	974.00
Percent across	40.66	59.34	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	40.66	59.34	100.00

$\chi^2 = 8.755$; $df = 2$; Significant at .02 level;
unused = 37.

evenly divided, with 51 percent responding "yes" and 49 percent responding "no." These data are dealt with in Table 42.

Table 41
Type of Parent Organization Group

Type	Number	Percentage
P.T.A.	483	48.06
P.T.O.	379	37.71
No formal group	143	14.23

Table 42
Evaluation of Whether Parent-Teacher
Group is an Active and Dynamic
Operation Whose Meetings Have
Been Reasonably Well-Attended

Evaluation	Number	Percentage
Yes	480	51.01
No	461	48.99

Four-hundred sixty-one Michigan elementary school principals reported that their parent-teacher organization was something less than an active and dynamic operation whose meetings have been reasonably well attended.

Chapter 4

EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND ASPIRATIONS

Data pertaining to the experience, training, and professional aspirations of Michigan elementary school principals are presented, analyzed, and compared in this chapter.

The principalship was examined in relation to the study hypothesis that experience, training, and professional aspirations of Michigan elementary principals are analogous with respect to such factors as total number of years served in education and in the principalship; position held just prior to the initial principalship; major field of graduate work and the institution where it was taken; highest earned college degree; length of time since last enrolled for credit courses; final occupational goal of principals; selection of principalship if starting over another career; and continuation as principal or return to teaching if offered the same salary.

Information obtained from recent national and statewide studies and an earlier Michigan Study served as comparative data for this investigation.

TOTAL NUMBER YEARS IN EDUCATION

1951-1952 Michigan Study

It was reported in the earlier Michigan study that 12 percent had less than five years experience before becoming a principal; 47 percent between six and fifteen years; 20 percent between sixteen and twenty years; and 21 percent possessed more than twenty-one years experience before becoming a principal.

National Studies

Respondents in the 1928 national study (18:180) revealed that the median total years of experience was 23.8 years for the principal of an elementary school.

The 1948 national study researchers (17:23-24) disclosed the median number of years in education to be 24 years for the supervising principal. By 1958 (16:244), the median had barely changed: 23.4 years in education.

The total experience in education remained relatively constant for the national principal until the 1968 study (15:19) revealed that the median had decreased to just eighteen years. The differential was explained by the entrance during the decade of a substantial number of young male principals.

Statewide Studies

The median for total years in education reported by Oregon principals in the Perkins study (9:96) was 15.2. Only 1.2 percent reported less than six years of total experience.

The typical elementary principal of Indiana was reported by Arms (1:82) as having 22.7 years total experience in education.

Arkansas principals revealed a median of 20.1 years of total service in the profession (Shelton, 10:57). Only 16.5 percent presented nine years of experience or less at the lower extremity of the distribution, with only 3.2 percent with forty years of experience or more.

Texas supervising principals (Youngblood, 13:123) reported a median of 18.8 years of professional experience. And there was a tendency among Texas principals for total years of experience to increase as the size of the district increased.

Slightly less than 57 of 100 Georgia principals reported less than nineteen years total experience in education, revealed Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:11). Another 13.5 percent of responding Georgia principals revealed less than nine years total experience in education. About one in four (25.7%) were reported in the 20-29 years range, with 17.5 percent reputed to have spent thirty or more total years in school work.

Presentation of Data and Findings

In order to determine length of service, principals in this study were asked to state the total number of years of experience in the education profession. The current year was to be included when reporting total years of experience.

The years that responding principals had served in the education profession are presented in Table 43.

Table 43

Principal's Total Number Years Experience in Education

Number of Years	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Less than 10	123	12.21	123	12.21
10 - 19 years	492	48.86	615	61.07
20 - 29 years	245	24.33	860	85.40
30 - 39 years	122	12.12	982	97.52
40 or more	25	2.48	1,007	100.00

Tabulated responses indicated that 12.21 percent of all Michigan elementary school principals surveyed had nine or less years total experience; 24.33 percent had 20-29 years experience; 12.12 percent had 30-39 years in the profession; while 25, or 2.48 percent, had 40 or more years of experience. The largest proportion, 48.86 percent, reported 10-19 total years of service in education.

Sixty-one percent of Michigan principals revealed that they had 19 years or less experience in education. The investigators in the earlier Michigan study reported 79 percent of the principals had less than 20 years experience. These figures are indicative that more Michigan principalships are being held by individuals who are veteran professionals.

The years that Michigan elementary school principals had served in the education profession were found to be related to school district expenditure level at the .01 level of significance. Table 44 shows the tendency among veteran principals to occupy positions in high expenditure districts, and among younger, less-experienced educators to occupy positions in the lower expenditure districts.

YEARS SERVED AS FULL-TIME PRINCIPAL

1951-1952 Michigan Study

The earlier Michigan study (14:8) contained the following data regarding the number of years served as principal: under five years, 38 percent; between six and ten years, 27 percent; between eleven and twenty years, 19 percent; and over thirty years, 2 percent.

National Studies

Over the past four decades there has been little variation in the total years experience of supervising

Table 44

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels With Principal's Years of
Experience in Education

Expenditure Level	Principal's Years in Education					Total
	9 or Less	10-19	20-29	30-39	40 or More	
<u>High</u>						
Freq.	34.00	222.00	116.00	61.00	14.00	447.00
Percent across	7.61	49.66	25.95	13.65	3.13	100.00
Percent down	27.87	45.68	48.74	50.83	56.00	45.11
Percent of total	3.43	22.40	11.71	6.16	1.41	45.11
Theoret. freq.	55.03	219.21	107.35	54.13	11.28	
Cell χ^2	8.04	.04	.70	.87	.66	
<u>Middle</u>						
Freq.	47.00	128.00	70.00	34.00	9.00	288.00
Percent across	16.32	44.44	24.31	11.81	3.13	100.00
Percent down	38.52	26.34	29.41	28.33	36.00	29.06
Percent of total	4.74	12.92	7.06	3.43	.91	29.06
Theoret. freq.	35.46	141.24	69.17	34.87	7.27	
Cell χ^2	3.76	1.24	.01	.02	.41	
<u>Low</u>						
Freq.	41.00	136.00	52.00	25.00	2.00	256.00
Percent across	16.02	53.13	20.31	9.77	.78	100.00
Percent down	33.61	27.98	21.85	20.83	8.00	25.83
Percent of total	4.14	13.72	5.25	2.52	.20	25.83
Theoret. freq.	31.52	125.55	61.48	31.00	6.46	
Cell χ^2	2.85	.87	1.46	1.16	3.08	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	122.00	486.00	238.00	120.00	25.00	991.00
Percent across	12.31	49.04	24.02	12.11	2.52	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	12.31	49.04	24.02	12.11	2.52	100.00

$\chi^2 = 25.170$; $df = 8$; Significant negative relationship at .01 level; unused = 20; p.m.c. = $-.125466$.

principals. The 1928 and 1948 national studies (16:113) reported median years experience as principal of 10.1 years and 10.5 years, respectively. By 1958 (16:113), the median number years of experience had decreased to 9.1 years.

The median number of years of experience as principal was revealed in the 1968 study (15:21-22) as nine years. Slightly more than half (50.5%) of the supervising principals reported less than ten years of experience in the principalship, while almost five in 100 (4.6%) had thirty or more years experience as principals.

Statewide Studies

The Georgia principalship study investigators (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:12) reported 50.8 percent with less than ten years experience as a principal and 4.3 percent with thirty years or more experience.

The Texas study (Youngblood, 13:129) contained data which revealed 60.4 percent with less than ten years experience in elementary administration. The Texas median was reported as 7.5 years experience.

Warren (12:63) indicated that 46.3 percent of elementary principals in the state of Missouri possessed less than ten years of experience as principals. No median was reported.

Perkins (9:97) assessed the Oregon principalship and found that the typical elementary school principal had been a supervising principal for eight years.

Shelton's study (10:64) of the Arkansas principal revealed the median years of experience in the principalship to be 6.7 years.

Oklahoma (Brothers, 3:52) principals reported that 46.7 percent had less than ten years experience, while 4.6 percent revealed thirty or more years experience. The median for the Oklahoma respondents was 9.5 years.

The time that Indiana (Arms, 1:43) principals had served in the principalship was reported as significantly higher than other state studies, an average period of 15.9 years.

Perkins (9:102) also revealed that 62.6 percent had ten or less years of experience, and only .20 percent reported experience beyond thirty years.

Andlauer (2:74) reported that the average New Jersey elementary principal in 1960 possessed 2-5 years of experience as compared with 6-10 years for the typical 1968 New Jersey principal. Moreover, it was noted that the percentage of 1960 principals with over 20 years experience was more than two times as large as the percentage in the 1968 study.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The distribution of responses of Michigan principals regarding years of experience as elementary principals is presented in Table 45. The figures show that 67.13 percent possessed less than 10 years experience; 27.51 percent had 20-29 years experience; and 5.36 percent had 30 or more years as principal.

Table 45
Years Served as Full-Time Principal

Number of Years	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
1 - 3 years	207	20.56	207	20.56
4 - 9 years	469	46.57	676	67.13
10 - 19 years	277	27.51	953	94.64
20 - 29 years	51	5.06	1,004	99.70
30 - 39 years	2	.20	1,006	99.90
40 or more	1	.10	1,007	100.00

A perusal of the data in this study revealed a greater proportion of individuals with less than 10 years experience than was indicated in any recently reported state or national study of the principalship. Although the estimated median years of experience of the current Michigan principal was found to be somewhat less than that of the principal on the national scale, the median number of years being served by Michigan principals appears to be increasing.

The total years that respondents had been full-time elementary principals is compared to expenditure level of school district in Table 46. The number of years and expenditure level were found to be related at the .001 significance level, and the null hypothesis of independence was accepted for the factor of experience.

The total years in the elementary principalship were highest for the supervising principals in high expenditure districts and lowest in lower expenditure districts.

A significant relationship was found to exist when comparing sex to the number of years served as principal. Table 47 depicts a difference between variables at an .001 level. It is apparent that male principals have a greater likelihood to have served fewer years than do the female group of principals.

POSITION HELD PRIOR TO FIRST PRINCIPALSHIP

1951-1952 Michigan Study

The investigators in the earlier Michigan study (14:6) reported that thirty-five respondents, or 20 percent of the total sample, had no elementary teaching experience. If this sample figure held true in the general principalship at the time, it would indicate

Table 46
 Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels
 With Years Served as Principal

Expenditure Level	Years Served as Principal						Total
	1-3	4-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	None	
<u>High</u>							
Freq.	70.00	202.00	143.00	33.00	1.00	0.00	449.00
Percent across	15.59	44.99	31.85	7.35	.22	0.00	100.00
Percent down	34.83	43.53	52.38	66.00	50.00	0.00	45.31
Percent of total	7.06	20.38	14.43	3.33	.10	0.00	45.31
Theoret. freq.	91.07	210.23	123.69	22.65	.91	.45	
Cell χ^2	4.87	.32	3.01	4.73	.01	.45	
<u>Middle</u>							
Freq.	65.00	128.00	82.00	11.00	1.00	0.00	287.00
Percent across	22.65	44.60	28.57	3.83	.35	0.00	100.00
Percent down	32.34	27.59	30.04	22.00	50.00	0.00	28.96
Percent of total	6.56	12.92	8.27	1.11	.10	0.00	28.96
Theoret. freq.	58.21	134.38	79.06	14.48	.58	.29	
Cell χ^2	.79	.30	.11	.84	.31	.29	
<u>Low</u>							
Freq.	66.00	134.00	48.00	6.00	0.00	1.00	255.00
Percent across	25.88	52.55	18.82	2.35	0.00	.39	100.00
Percent down	32.84	28.88	17.58	12.00	0.00	100.00	25.73
Percent of total	6.66	13.52	4.84	.61	0.00	.10	25.73
Theoret. freq.	51.72	119.39	70.25	12.87	.51	.26	
Cell χ^2	3.94	1.79	7.05	3.66	.51	2.14	
<u>Total</u>							
Freq.	201.00	464.00	273.00	50.00	2.00	1.00	991.00
Percent across	20.28	46.82	27.55	5.05	.20	.10	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	20.28	46.82	27.55	5.05	.20	.10	100.00

$\chi^2 = 35.131$; $df = 10$; Significant negative relationship at .001 level;
 unused = 20; p.m.c. = -.158837.

Table 47
 Comparison of Years Served as
 Principal by Sex

Sex	Years Served as Principal					Total
	1-3	4-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	
<u>Male</u>						
Freq.	179.00	376.00	185.00	34.00	1.00	775.00
Percent across	23.10	48.52	23.87	4.39	.13	100.00
Percent down	86.47	80.34	66.79	66.67	50.00	77.11
Percent of total	17.81	37.41	18.41	3.38	.10	77.11
Theoret. freq.	159.63	360.90	213.61	39.33	1.54	
Cell χ^2	2.35	.63	3.83	.72	.19	
<u>Female</u>						
Freq.	28.00	92.00	92.00	17.00	1.00	230.00
Percent across	12.17	40.00	40.00	7.39	.43	100.00
Percent down	13.53	19.66	33.21	33.33	50.00	22.89
Percent of total	2.79	9.15	9.15	1.69	.10	22.89
Theoret. freq.	47.37	107.10	63.39	11.67	.46	
Cell χ^2	7.92	2.13	12.91	2.43	.64	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	207.00	468.00	277.00	51.00	2.00	1005.00
Percent across	20.60	46.57	27.56	5.07	.20	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	20.60	46.57	27.56	5.07	.20	100.00

$\chi^2 = 33.764$; $df = 4$; Significant at .001 level;
 unused = 6.

that approximately one in every five persons assigned to elementary principalships would have had no teaching experience at that level.

National Studies

In the 1968 survey (15:12-13) of the national principalship, 57 in 100 respondents entered the principalship from the elementary school classroom; 15 in 100 from secondary classrooms; and 12 in 100 from the elementary assistant principalship. Compared to the 1958 study (16:106), the 1968 study found that fewer individuals (8.4%) were secondary teachers before becoming supervising principals.

Statewide Studies

Data from the recent Arkansas study by Shelton (10:64) revealed that 61.3 percent had been elementary teachers and 32.4 had been secondary teachers.

The study by Brothers (3:45) found that 41.3 percent of the supervising principals were elementary school teachers immediately before accepting assignments to their first principalship. Moreover, almost 35 percent of the responders in the Oklahoma study reported that they held educational positions other than that of teacher.

Sixty-two of 100 Oregon (Perkins, 9:100) principals identified the position that they had held just

prior to accepting their initial full-time principalship as elementary school teacher.

In the California study Lepick (5:189) found that 53.4 percent of the principals came to the principalship from the ranks of the elementary assistant principals.

The large majority of Georgia principals were reported by Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:10) to have served as classroom teachers just prior to becoming elementary principals (46%).

According to Arms (1:85), Indiana principals held the position of elementary classroom teacher in 60 percent of the cases, and secondary teachers in 14.4 percent of the situations named.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Nearly 61 in 100 (60.77%) of the Michigan principals in this study reported entering their positions from the elementary school classroom; 11 in 100 (10.98%) had just previously been secondary classroom teachers.

Tabulations of the percentage data from two national studies and the Georgia study are presented with the current findings in Table 48.

The category of "Other" in this study included the following positions held by individuals just prior to their assignments as elementary principal: reading teacher, high school and elementary counselor, guidance

Table 48

Position Held Just Prior to First
Elementary Principalship

Position Held	Position Held Just Prior to First Elementary Principalship				
	1958 Nat'l	1968 Nat'l	Georgia Study	Present Study	
	%	%	%	%	N
Classroom teacher (elementary)	56	57.4	45.84	60.77	(598)
Classroom teacher (secondary)	24	15.6	35.87	10.98	(108)
Assistant principal (elementary)	7	12.4	5.23	8.84	(87)
Assistant principal (secondary)		2.8	3.32	2.34	(23)
Central office specialist	5	4.5	1.66	4.88	(48)
Member of college faculty	-	1.1	.24	.81	(8)
Other	8	6.1	7.84	11.38	(112)

director, teaching principal, community school director, speech therapist, superintendent, physical education teacher, minister, administrative intern, band director, attendance officer, team leader, and music teacher.

Those status studies surveyed presented a wide range of percentages representing principals who served as classroom teachers in their prior educational experience. Most researchers indicated that classroom teaching presented the best path leading to the elementary principalship, and that it was somewhat discouraging to assign persons to the elementary principalship from positions outside this capacity. No attempt was made in any reported study, however, to ascertain the numbers of persons who came to the principalship with elementary classroom teaching experience yet had taken another position enroute.

The types of positions that principals in this study held just prior to their first elementary school principalship are presented by expenditure level of employing school district in Table 49. Prior position was found to be related to expenditure level at the .001 level of significance. More principals from lower expenditure districts tended to come directly to the principalship from the classroom than did high expenditure principals. There was the tendency for the latter to have

Table 49

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels with Position Held
Just Prior to First Elementary Principalship

	Elementary Teacher	Secondary Teacher	Assistant Principal Elementary	Assistant Principal Secondary	Secondary Principal	Central Office	College Faculty	Other	
<u>Row 1</u>									
Freq.	263.00	30.00	54.00	12.00	5.00	34.00	6.00	32.00	436.00
Percent across	60.32	6.88	12.39	2.75	1.15	7.80	1.38	7.34	100.00
Percent down	44.80	28.57	62.79	54.55	33.33	70.83	75.00	32.99	45.04
Percent of total	27.17	3.10	5.58	1.24	.52	3.51	.62	3.31	45.04
Theoret. freq.	264.39	47.29	38.74	9.91	6.76	21.62	3.60	43.69	
Cell χ^2	.01	6.32	6.02	.44	.46	7.09	1.59	3.13	
<u>Row 2</u>									
Freq.	164.00	40.00	21.00	5.00	5.00	7.00	1.00	38.00	281.00
Percent across	58.36	14.23	7.47	1.78	1.78	2.49	.36	13.52	100.00
Percent down	27.94	38.10	24.42	22.73	33.33	14.58	12.50	39.18	29.03
Percent of total	16.94	4.13	2.17	.52	.52	.72	.10	3.93	29.03
Theoret. freq.	170.40	30.48	24.96	6.39	4.35	13.93	2.32	28.16	
Cell χ^2	.24	2.97	.63	.30	.10	3.45	.75	3.44	
<u>Row 3</u>									
Freq.	160.00	35.00	11.00	5.00	5.00	7.00	1.00	27.00	251.00
Percent across	63.75	13.94	4.38	1.99	1.99	2.79	.40	10.76	100.00
Percent down	27.26	33.33	12.79	22.73	33.33	14.58	12.50	27.84	25.93
Percent of total	16.53	3.62	1.14	.52	.52	.72	.10	2.79	25.93
Theoret. freq.	152.21	27.23	22.30	5.70	3.89	12.45	2.07	25.15	
Cell χ^2	.40	2.22	5.73	.09	.32	2.38	.56	.14	
<u>Total</u>									
Freq.	587.00	105.00	86.00	22.00	15.00	48.00	8.00	97.00	968.00
Percent across	60.64	10.85	8.88	2.27	1.55	4.96	.83	10.02	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	60.64	10.85	8.88	2.27	1.55	4.96	.83	10.02	100.00

$\chi^2 = 48.762$; $df = 14$; Significant negative relationship at .001 level; p.m.c. = -.021846

had other kinds of administrative and supervisory experiences preparatory to assuming their initial elementary principalship.

GRADUATE SCHOOL INSTITUTION

Presentation of Data and Findings

Table 50 shows the rank order of institutions at which principals in this study received the major part of their graduate school education. An investigation of these data revealed that only 73 of the 1,011 respondents took the major part of their graduate work at institutions outside the state of Michigan. Two hundred six, or 21 percent, of the principals in this study indicated that they had received their graduate school education at Michigan State University. It was interesting to note the exact number and percentage of respondents reported to have taken their graduate work at the University of Michigan.

Following in rank order behind MSU and UM, were Wayne State University, 15.67 percent; Eastern Michigan, 14.39 percent; Western Michigan, 13.01 percent; Central Michigan, 10.34 percent. The remaining twenty-five principals revealed that the major portion of their graduate school education was earned at Northern Michigan (1.6%) and University of Detroit (1.07%). Aquinas, Alma, and Andrews received one response each.

It can be readily determined, then, that in-state institutions contributed mostly to the preparation of principals. Almost 44 percent of all principals in this study reported taking the major portion of their graduate work at MSU and UM.

Table 50

Rank Order of Institutions Where
Principals Received Major Part
of Graduate School Education

Institution	Number	Percentage
MSU	206	21.96
UM	206	21.96
WSU	147	15.67
EMU	135	14.39
WMU	122	13.01
CMU	97	10.34
NMU	15	1.60
UD	10	1.07

MAJOR FIELD OF GRADUATE STUDY

1951-1952 Michigan Study

The earlier Michigan study (14:5) asked the question: "Was any of your preparation in Elementary Administration?" Nearly 300 principals, or 79 percent, responded affirmatively.

National Studies

The 1968 national study investigators (15:26) revealed that elementary school administration, as a major field of study, was reported by 51 percent of

supervising principals. General school administration was selected by 21.7 percent of the national principals, while 11.6 percent took major course work in elementary supervision and curriculum.

Statewide Studies

Data dealing with the major field of graduate work for Georgia principals (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:14) showed that 90.84 percent of the respondents concentrated their study in the field of administration, with 60.24 percent indicating elementary school administration as their special area of graduate study.

Elementary school administration was the major field of graduate study for more than 43 percent of Kansas (Modeland, 7:67) elementary school principals. A somewhat similar percentage, 45 percent, was reported in the Oklahoma study by Brothers (3:38).

Data presented in the Oregon study by Perkins (9:82) revealed that 72.6 percent of elementary principals in that state majored in elementary school administration. Slightly less than 14 percent concentrated their work in areas of instruction and curriculum.

Sixty-nine percent of Indiana principals, reported Arms (1:80), selected elementary administration as their major field of study.

Arkansas principals presented somewhat different figures in Shelton's (10:57) study. He found that only

36.3 percent listed their graduate major as educational administration, while 37.2 percent majored in elementary education on the graduate level.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Table 51 presents a resumé of the Michigan principals' graduate field of work, in addition to data gathered from three state studies and the two most recent national studies.

The ranks of the Michigan principalship have within them a considerable number of principals who have graduate preparation in areas pertaining to the elementary principalship. Nearly 77 percent of the respondents reported major field work taken which was specifically oriented toward the elementary school and the elementary principalship. Replies to general school administration occupied 15.85 percent of the responses.

The field of specialization listed most often was guidance and counseling. Combinations checked by the respondents involving two or more areas of interest were treated as non-responses.

HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE EARNED

National Studies

According to the 1958 national study investigators (16:149-150), "The amount of education in years or degrees

Table 51

Percentage Distributions of Present and Related Studies Regarding
Major Field of Graduate Work

Major Field	Present and Related Studies					
	Kansas	Oklahoma	Georgia	1958 Nat'l	1968 Nat'l	Present Study
	%	%	%	%	%	N
Elementary school administration	43.72	45.7	60.24	60	51.0	51.43 (503)
Elementary school instruction	2.62	19.7	2.65	5	4.8	12.37 (121)
Elementary supervision and curriculum	8.64	1.7	.70	19	11.6	12.88 (126)
Secondary school administration	2.75	6.4	2.2	4	3.7	2.86 (28)
General school administration	35.34	14.8	30.6	4	21.7	15.85 (155)
An academic subject	5.23	7.4	1.93	5	4.0	3.99 (39)
No graduate work or specialization	.39	3.6	.48	3	1.5	.61 (6)

is one of the important quantitative marks available to describe the status of the profession."

Statewide Studies

Data from the Oklahoma study by Brothers (3:35) showed that 84.6 percent of the elementary school principals in that state held the master's degree or higher.

Of Indiana principals reporting advanced degrees (Arms, 1:78), 1.2 percent possessed a bachelor's degree only; 61.2 percent had earned the master's degree; and 1.6 percent had received the doctoral degree.

Shelton (10:50) reported that almost 90 percent of principals in that state held a degree above the bachelor's.

The master's degree was reported as the most commonly held degree by Wyoming principals (Moss, 8:54).

Andlauer (2:42), in his comparative study of New Jersey principals, indicated that almost twice the percentage of doctorates was earned in 1968 than in 1960. In addition, principals at the sixth-year level experienced a considerable increase. The proportion of New Jersey principals with training beyond the master's degree improved from less than 40 percent in 1960 to over 50 percent in 1968.

In Oregon Perkins (9:79) found that only 9.1 percent of those surveyed had not earned a master's degree.

Only 7 percent of Kansas elementary principals were reported by Modeland (7:66) as not having attained the minimum preparation of a master's degree, whereas nearly 2 percent had earned doctorates.

Over 95 percent of the principals in the Texas study by Youngblood (13:88) had attained at least a master's degree, as compared with almost 80 percent in the national principalship study.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Regarding academic degree information, survey results revealed that 95.84 percent of the respondents had earned at least a master's degree and 12.19 percent had completed degree work beyond that level, including 1.68 percent who had achieved the doctorate. These data are presented in Table 52.

Table 52

Highest College Degree Earned

Highest Degree	1928 Nat'l	1948 Nat'l	1958 Nat'l	1968 Nat'l	Present Michigan Study	N
Less than bachelor's	54	4	2	.6	.69	(7)
Bachelor's	30	29	16	10	3.47	(35)
Master's	15	64	76	79.9	83.65	(844)
Specialist's	-	-	3	7.4	10.51	(106)
Doctorate	1	3	3	2.2	1.68	(17)

Michigan principals without a degree today are almost nonexistent, whereas they constituted a sizable number in 1950-1951.

The highest earned degree of principals in this study is presented in Table 53 as related to expenditure level of school district. The highest earned degree of responding principals was found to be significantly related to expenditure level at the .001 level of significance. Principals from high expenditure districts were more likely to have a higher educational level than principals from lower expenditure districts. Moreover, supervising principals in high expenditure districts were found to be more likely to possess specialist and doctoral degrees.

The percentage of principals on the state level holding at least the master's degree has increased significantly. Almost 95.84 percent of the principals in this study have attained at least a master's degree. This would seem to indicate that the educational level of the Michigan elementary school principalship appears to be higher than that indicated by the national or any other recently reported statewide study, except at the doctoral level where only seventeen, or 1.68 percent, of the responders reported the doctoral degree.

Table 53

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels by Highest Earned Degree

Expenditure Level	Highest Earned Degree					
	Less Than B.A.	B.A.	M.A.	6 Yr.	Ph.D.	Total
<u>High</u>						
Freq.	2.00	5.00	363.00	65.00	14.00	449.00
Percent across	.45	1.11	80.85	14.48	3.12	100.00
Percent down	40.00	15.15	43.53	62.50	82.35	45.22
Percent of total	.20	.50	36.56	6.55	1.41	45.22
Theoret. freq.	2.26	14.92	377.11	47.03	7.69	
Cell χ^2	.03	6.60	.53	6.87	5.19	
<u>Middle</u>						
Freq.	3.00	13.00	246.00	25.00	1.00	288.00
Percent across	1.04	4.51	85.42	8.68	.35	100.00
Percent down	60.00	39.39	29.50	24.04	5.88	29.00
Percent of total	.30	1.31	24.77	2.52	.10	29.00
Theoret. freq.	1.45	9.57	241.89	30.16	4.93	
Cell χ^2	1.66	1.23	.07	.88	3.13	
<u>Low</u>						
Freq.	0.00	15.00	225.00	14.00	2.00	256.00
Percent across	0.00	5.86	87.89	5.47	.78	100.00
Percent down	0.00	45.45	26.98	13.46	11.76	25.78
Percent of total	0.00	1.51	22.66	1.41	.20	25.78
Theoret. freq.	1.29	8.51	215.01	26.81	4.38	
Cell χ^2	1.29	4.95	.46	6.12	1.30	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	5.00	33.00	834.00	104.00	17.00	993.00
Percent across	.50	3.32	83.99	10.47	1.71	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	.50	3.32	83.99	10.47	1.71	100.00

$\chi^2 = 40.308$; $df = 8$; Significant negative relationship at .001 level; unused = 18; p.m.c. = -.164728.

LENGTH OF TIME SINCE LAST ENROLLED
FOR COLLEGE CREDIT COURSES

1951-1952 Michigan Study

To the item "date of last study with or without credit," 10 percent of 1951-1952 Michigan principals reported not being involved for ten or more years; 44 percent had participated within a nine-year period between 1942 and 1950; and 47 percent were studying during the year in which the survey was taken.

Statewide Studies

Almost 3 in every 4 (74.9%) Oklahoma principals surveyed by Brothers (3:41) reported enrollment at colleges or universities, while 16 in 100 (15.7%) had not been enrolled for the past ten or more years.

Of Kansas (Modeland, 7:86) elementary school principals reporting intentions to complete enrollment in college courses within a two-year period, only 17.5 percent responded that coursework was not in their plans.

Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:50) found a definite interest in graduate study on the part of elementary principals in that state. Seventy-one percent of Georgia principals were attending credit courses or had done so within a three-year period prior to being surveyed.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Respondents in this study were queried to determine how long it had been since they were last enrolled for credit courses at a college or university. The length of time since last enrolled and the percentage of responses follows: presently enrolled, 19.41 percent; less than one year, 18.02 percent; one year, 9.8 percent; two years, 16.63 percent; three years, 9.8 percent; four years, 7.23 percent; and five or more years, 19.11 percent. The tabulation of responses is presented in Table 54.

Table 54

Length of Time Since Principal Was
Last Enrolled for College
Credit Courses

Term	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Presently enrolled	196	19.41	196	19.41
Less than 1 year	182	18.02	378	37.43
1 year	99	9.80	477	47.23
2 years	168	16.63	645	63.86
3 years	99	9.80	744	73.66
4 years	73	7.23	817	80.89
5 or more years	193	19.11	1,010	100.00

That elementary principals periodically return to the college campus for study is vital to maintaining the skills and knowledge necessary to keep up to date.

Graduate study has been a continuing part of the professional growth program of elementary school principals in Michigan as shown by the data in this study. A cumulative total of 477 principals, or 47.23 percent, reported being enrolled within a period of one year or less. A combined total of 63.86 percent indicated enrollment within the past two years, while 73.66 percent had taken course work at some time during the past three years. Only one in five principals reported being away from college course work five or more years.

FINAL OCCUPATIONAL GOAL OF PRINCIPAL

National Studies

According to the 1968 national study investigators (15:16), 56.7 percent considered the elementary principalship as their final occupational goal. Respondents in the 1958 study (16:245), on the other hand, reported that 63 percent regarded the principalship as the final occupational position.

Statewide Studies

Almost three in every four Oregon principals reported that they planned to continue in the elementary school principalship as their final occupational goal

(Perkins, 9:121). Thirty-nine percent reported that they planned to seek other positions, while 15.5 percent were undecided.

Brothers (3:107) queried Oklahoma principals about making the principalship a terminal career. He found that 75.8 percent responded affirmatively, while 12 percent stated that they expected to change positions.

Only 7.4 percent of all Indiana principals surveyed by Arms (1:137) stated intentions of changing from elementary administration. Seventy-eight percent indicated a preference to continue in their present occupational type position.

Shelton (10:67) reported that respondents from the state of Arkansas planned to remain in the elementary principalship at a rate of 89 in every 100. Only 11.3 percent of individuals in that state reported an interest in seeking another final occupational goal.

Views of Texas principals reported by Youngblood (13:140) registered percentages of 45.6 percent desiring to remain in the principalship; 29.9 percent desiring to change; and 24.5 undecided.

Indiana (Arms, 1:137) principals preferring to remain in the principalship totaled 78.4 percent, while only 7.4 percent disclosed a desire to seek other positions.

Georgia principals were reported by Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:21) to be somewhat divided in their preferences. Close to 57 percent revealed their ultimate position to be the elementary school principalship, while 43 percent reported that the principalship was definitely not their occupational goal.

Presentation of Data and Findings

This question was designed to determine whether elementary principals view the principalship as their final occupational position or whether the principalship is regarded as a prelude to other types of positions. Less than half, or 47 in 100 (46.55%), apparently have no expectation beyond their present type of position, desiring instead to remain in the capacity of elementary school principal.

This amount is lower than the recent national study and all but one recent state study. About one in four, or 25.57 percent, stated that the elementary principalship was not their terminal aspiration; and 279 respondents, or 27.87 percent, replied that they were undecided. Table 55 depicts the extent to which principals in the state of Michigan see the principalship as a final occupational position.

POSITION DESIRED BY PRINCIPALS
WHO ASPIRE

National Studies

A review of the 1958 national study (16:114-115) showed that 24 percent desired to become superintendents; 17 percent wanted to do supervisory work; while 17 percent wished to do college teaching.

Table 55

Number of Principals Who Consider the
Elementary Principalship as Their
Final Occupational Goal

Elementary Principalship as Goal	Number	Percentage
Yes	466	46.55
No	256	25.57
Undecided	279	27.87

The 1968 national study investigators (15:16-17) reported similar findings, with 24.5 percent of the respondents desiring the superintendency; 18.5 percent wanting to be supervisors; and 16 percent reporting an interest in college teaching.

Statewide Studies

Of Georgia (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:21) principals who had specific career goals, 25 percent reported that they looked forward to a university position, and 27.5 percent expressed an interest in the superintendency.

Of that number, the largest percentage, 32.75 percent, indicated ambitions to become a director of elementary education. The second most preferred position was reported to be the superintendency, with 18.12 percent responding. Almost 15 percent, or 14.63 percent, replied that they wished to become central office supervisors. It was interesting to note that one in ten indicated a desire to become an elementary classroom teacher. The category of "other" most often included persons aspiring to college faculty positions.

This study did not specify why principals sought these other positions.

INTEREST IN BECOMING PRINCIPAL IF STARTING AGAIN

National Studies

The 1968 national study investigators (16:15) reported that 82 in 100 principals across the nation revealed that they "certainly would" or "probably would" become an elementary principal if starting a career again.

Statewide Studies

Indiana principals (Arms, 1:133) reacted by choosing education as a career again in 83 of 100 situations. Six percent indicated they would not choose education as a career again.

Of that number, the largest percentage, 32.75 percent, indicated ambitions to become a director of elementary education. The second most preferred position was reported to be the superintendency, with 18.12 percent responding. Almost 15 percent, or 14.63 percent, replied that they wished to become central office supervisors. It was interesting to note that one in ten indicated a desire to become an elementary classroom teacher. The category of "other" most often included persons aspiring to college faculty positions.

This study did not specify why principals sought these other positions.

INTEREST IN BECOMING PRINCIPAL IF STARTING AGAIN

National Studies

The 1968 national study investigators (16:15) reported that 82 in 100 principals across the nation revealed that they "certainly would" or "probably would" become an elementary principal if starting a career again.

Statewide Studies

Indiana principals (Arms, 1:133) reacted by choosing education as a career again in 83 of 100 situations. Six percent indicated they would not choose education as a career again.

Jarvis, Parker, and Moore found that 87 in 100 Georgia principals indicated that they "certainly would" or "probably would" choose the principalship again. Less than 7 percent responded with a negative response.

The affirmative responses as to whether education would be selected again were reported by Perkins (9:123) to be 80 percent in the Oregon study.

Presentation of Data and Findings

If they were starting all over again, 45.75 percent of Michigan principals in this study indicated that they "certainly would" become a principal again. One-third, or 33.97 percent, responded that they "probably would." A combination of these two categories indicated that nearly 80 percent responded with a positive degree of satisfaction toward their occupational position. In the negative categories only seventy-eight principals, or 7.79 percent, indicated a "certainly not" or "probably not" response. These data are located in Table 57.

The survey appears to indicate that the sampled morale within the ranks of the principals toward their profession was relatively high with eight in ten principals positively disposed toward selecting the position if starting a career again. The total proportion was similar to principals reporting in the 1968 national study when asked whether they would again be principals.

However, the study did not attempt to pinpoint the reasons why some principals would choose not to become an elementary principal again if given the opportunity.

Table 57

Interest in Becoming an Elementary
Principal if Starting Again

Interest	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Certainly would	458	45.75	458	45.75
Probably would	340	33.97	798	79.72
About even for and against	125	12.49	923	92.21
Probably not	72	7.19	995	99.40
Certainly not	6	.60	1,001	100.00

Chapter 5

PRINCIPAL'S WELFARE AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

Data pertaining to the principal's welfare situation and attitudes regarding certain conditions of employment are presented, analyzed, and compared in this chapter.

The principalship was examined in relation to the study hypothesis that the principal's welfare and conditions of employment are analogous with respect to such factors as length of current employment; summer employment hours spent on school work; opportunities for professional improvement activities; district-wide responsibilities; method of filling principalship openings; attitudinal responses regarding salaries; and opinions about present benefits and future directions of MAESP.

Information obtained from recent national and statewide studies and an earlier Michigan study served as comparative data for this investigation.

LENGTH OF ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT

National Studies

The 1968 national study investigators (15:38) sought to determine the length of the contract year for elementary principals. It was found that one-half, or 51 percent, of the supervising principals were contracted for ten but less than eleven months. Twelve percent worked a term less than ten months. The median term of employment for national principals was ten months.

In 1958 (16:121) the median period of service for supervising principals was also ten months. However, relatively few, only 17 percent, were employed for service beyond ten months.

Statewide Studies

Fifty-nine percent of Indiana principals were reported by Arms (1:126) as contracted to work ten months. Arms found an almost normal distribution curve from eight months to 11.5 months.

The term of employment of responding principals in the Texas study by Youngblood (13:69) was as follows: 28.4 percent contracted for nine months; 40.2 percent for ten months; 11.5 percent for eleven months; and 10.3 percent for twelve months.

The median reported by Shelton (10:67) regarding number of months Arkansas principals were employed was

ten. A surprisingly large number of principals in the study were employed for twelve months (43.1%).

Ten months was also the median length of employment of Wyoming principals, according to Moss (8:28).

Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:24) found that 61 in 100 Georgia principals reported eleven months of employment. Thirteen in 100 worked for nine, but less than ten months, and only 1 in 4 was employed for twelve months.

Information was sought by Warren (12:40) from Missouri principals as to the length of annual employment. Nearly two of every three respondents were under contract for 43 weeks or less each year.

Perkins (9:71) found that the annual term of employment for which Oregon principals were contracted was a median of eleven months. A bimodal distribution was disclosed with contractual arrangements of ten- and twelve-month principals, 34.4 percent and 28.4 percent, respectively.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Principals in this study were requested to indicate length of employment, including any summer school duties but excluding vacation weeks. The terms of contracted service in rank order were as follows: 42-43 weeks, 38.02 percent; 44-45 weeks, 21.16 weeks;

40-41 weeks, 19.46 percent; 48-49 weeks, 9.38 percent; and 46-47 weeks, 6.49 percent. At the extremes, thirty-six principals, or 3.59 percent, reported working 39 weeks or less, while nineteen, or 1.9 percent, reported working 50 or more weeks (Table 58).

Table 58
Length of Annual Employment

Number of Weeks	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
39 weeks or less	36	3.59	36	3.59
40 - 41	195	19.46	231	23.05
42 - 43	381	38.02	612	61.08
44 - 45	212	21.16	824	82.24
46 - 47	65	6.49	889	88.72
48 - 49	94	9.38	983	98.10
50 or more	19	1.90	1,002	100.00

It is apparent that most Michigan principals are employed for service beyond the traditional school term worked by teachers. The findings also indicate that Michigan principals appear to have proportionately similar contractual arrangements as the national principal.

The length of annual employment in weeks is presented by level of operating expenditure per child in Table 59. This study found that length of annual employment was related to level of expenditure at the .001 level of significance. Principals from low

Table 59

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels with Length
of Annual Employment

Expenditure Level	Length of Annual Employment							Total
	39 or Less	40-41 Weeks	42-43 Weeks	44-45 Weeks	46-47 Weeks	48-49 Weeks	50 or More	
<u>High</u>								
Freq.	12.00	70.00	196.00	108.00	28.00	28.00	4.00	446.00
Percent across	2.69	15.70	43.95	24.22	6.28	6.28	.90	100.00
Percent down	34.29	36.27	52.13	51.92	43.75	30.43	22.22	45.23
Percent of total	1.22	7.10	19.88	10.95	2.84	2.84	.41	45.23
Theoret. freq.	15.83	87.30	170.08	94.09	28.95	41.61	8.14	
Cell χ^2	.93	3.43	3.95	2.06	.03	4.45	2.11	
<u>Middle</u>								
Freq.	11.00	68.00	96.00	52.00	19.00	33.00	7.00	286.00
Percent across	3.85	23.78	33.57	18.18	6.64	11.54	2.45	100.00
Percent down	31.43	35.23	25.53	25.00	29.69	35.87	38.89	29.01
Percent of total	1.12	6.90	9.74	5.27	1.93	3.35	.71	29.01
Theoret. freq.	10.15	55.98	109.06	60.33	18.56	26.69	5.22	
Cell χ^2	.07	2.58	1.56	1.15	.01	1.49	.61	
<u>Low</u>								
Freq.	12.00	55.00	84.00	48.00	17.00	31.00	7.00	254.00
Percent across	4.72	21.65	33.07	18.90	6.69	12.20	2.76	100.00
Percent down	34.29	28.50	22.34	23.08	26.56	33.70	38.89	25.76
Percent of total	1.22	5.58	8.52	4.87	1.72	3.14	.71	25.76
Theoret. freq.	9.02	49.72	96.86	53.58	16.49	23.70	4.64	
Cell χ^2	.99	.56	1.71	.58	.02	2.25	1.20	
<u>Total</u>								
Freq.	35.00	193.00	376.00	208.00	64.00	92.00	18.00	986.00
Percent across	3.55	19.57	38.13	21.10	6.49	9.33	1.83	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	3.55	19.57	38.13	21.10	6.49	9.33	1.83	100.00

$\chi^2 = 31.740$; $df = 12$; Significant at .01 level; unused = 25.

expenditure districts were found to be employed for longer terms than principals from high expenditure districts.

PLANS TO CONTINUE IN PRINCIPALSHIP
IF OFFERED SAME SALARY TO RETURN
TO TEACHING

Presentation of Data and
Findings

Respondents in this study were queried as to whether they would continue in the elementary school principalship if offered the same salary to become full-time classroom teachers.

A review of the literature revealed no sources dealing with the question.

Elementary principals have been known to expound about the trials and tribulations of their principalships. This question was formulated to ascertain whether the removal of any factor of financial advantage would affect the respondent's desire to continue in the principalship. In other words, was the attraction of status achieved by financial rewards a determinant in the reasons Michigan principals sought the principalship?

Table 60 reports the data of this question as 60.1 percent desiring to continue in the principalship, with 39.9 percent revealing that they would return to teaching if given the opportunity to earn the same

salary. Nearly 40 in 100 principals, then, would return to the position as full-time classroom teacher if given the opportunity to earn the same salary.

Table 60

Plans to Continue in Elementary
Principalship if Offered Same
Salary to Return to Teaching

Plans if Offered Same Salary	Number	Percentage
Continue as principal	595	60.10
Return to teaching	395	39.90

Principals' views toward returning to the classroom if offered the same salary are compared with expenditure level of school district in Table 61. No relationship was found to exist at the .95 level of confidence between expenditure level of school district and views about returning to the classroom if offered the same salary.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE

OF FIELD

National Studies

The 1958 study (17:31) reported that 37 percent of all principals were working outside the field of education. A decade later the 1968 study (16:126) revealed that 61 in 100 males earned money from outside employment

Table 61

Comparison of Plans to Continue in Elementary
Principalship if Offered the Same Salary
by School District Expenditure Levels

Expenditure Level	Plans If Offered Same Salary		
	Continue as Principal	Return to Teaching	Total
<u>High</u>			
Freq.	266.00	175.00	441.00
Percent across	60.32	39.68	100.00
Percent down	45.55	44.76	45.23
Percent of total	27.28	17.95	45.23
Theoret. freq.	264.15	176.85	
Cell χ^2	.01	.02	
<u>Middle</u>			
Freq.	172.00	110.00	282.00
Percent across	60.99	39.01	100.00
Percent down	29.45	28.13	28.92
Percent of total	17.64	11.28	28.92
Theoret. freq.	168.91	113.09	
Cell χ^2	.06	.08	
<u>Low</u>			
Freq.	146.00	106.00	252.00
Percent across	57.94	42.06	100.00
Percent down	25.00	27.11	25.85
Percent of total	14.97	10.87	25.85
Theoret. freq.	150.94	101.06	
Cell χ^2	.16	.24	
<u>Total</u>			
Freq.	584.00	391.00	975.00
Percent across	59.90	40.10	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	59.90	40.10	100.00

$\chi^2 = .577$; $df = 2$; Not Significant; unused = 36.

while 10 percent of the female principals held outside employment, for a total of 42 percent employed. The 1968 report (15:131) also revealed that principals were "doing less moonlighting than they did in 1958." In 1968 male supervising principals reported that nonschool employment decreased to 42 percent, while females were involved in outside employment in only 5 percent of the cases.

Statewide Studies

Brothers (3:106) presents evidence that 49.8 percent of Oklahoma principals did not hold an income-producing job outside the principalship.

Moss (8:120) found that 17.7 percent of responding Wyoming principals earned extra income from employment carried on during the school year and during summer months.

Arms (1:28) reported that 29.6 percent of Indiana elementary principals were employed at summer jobs involving fields other than education.

Shelton's (10:71) tabulations show that 45 percent of Arkansas principals had employment outside their jobs as administrator, and that about two in every three of these "moonlighters" were employed during summer vacation.

Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:24) reported that 64.65 percent of Georgia principals enjoyed seven to ten weeks vacation each summer.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Principals in this study were asked whether they normally worked during the summer months in a field other than education. One-hundred thirty-three, or 13.45 percent, answered this question affirmatively. Table 62 presents the data concerning the incidence of summer employment of Michigan principals.

Table 62

Summer Employment of Principals
in a Field Other Than Education

Employment Status	Number	Percentage
Employed	133	13.45
Not employed	856	86.55

The most recent national study reported a decrease in the percentage of principals supplementing their regular salaries from outside employment. The data in this study indicate that fewer Michigan principals are accepting summer employment outside the field of education than is the practice across the nation.

HOURS SPENT ON SCHOOL DUTIES

National Studies

When queried about the amount of total time spent on regular and school-related activities, national principals (15:43) reported a median of 50 hours per

week. It was also found that those principals with the most experience spent less time in all school duties than those with the least experience.

Statewide Studies

Georgia (Jarvis, Parker, Moore, 6:24) respondents indicated that more than half, or 52.7 percent, spent between 40 and 45 hours at school each week. Thirty-two percent worked 46 to 50 hours, and 7.12 percent worked 51-59 hours. Almost 6 percent reported 60 plus hours per week.

Warren (12:46) reported that 32 percent of Missouri elementary principals spent 8 or more hours after school and on weekends with school duties.

Arkansas principals (Shelton, 10:42) spent a median time of 8.4 hours at school work each day and 4.8 hours at night and on the weekend. One in four principals spent only 2 hours or less after school or during weekends.

Arms (1:130) found that 74.2 percent spent 8.17 hours per day in carrying out their duties, with 48.9 percent working 9 or more hours per day.

Study results by Merigis and Gill (4:33) contained data which showed 90.5 percent of Illinois principals spending 8 hours or more; 63.7 percent spending 9 hours or more per day; and 19.7 percent spending 11 hours or more at school.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The investigator found that, on the average, Michigan principals reported a day close to the median in the national study. If the assumption is made that any report of 48 or more hours is an "extra load" beyond normal expectations, then 57 in 100 Michigan principals in the total sample were putting in overtime.

More specifically, 35.79 percent reported working 1-6 hours overtime; 14.41 percent reported working 7-12 hours overtime; and 6.16 percent reported working 13-18 hours overtime. Four principals reported working 19-24 hours overtime, while five individuals indicated putting in 25 or more hours per week beyond normal expectations. Sixty-three principals, or 6.26 percent, reported working only 36-41 hours per week on regular and school-related duties.

The tabulations of these data are located in Table 63.

It is clear that Michigan principals are spending considerable time beyond the regular school day. Fifty-seven percent reported working 48 or more hours on regular duties and school-related activities.

The shift toward a longer day found in related studies is contrary to the trend toward a shorter work period for the general working public, but is probably the cost of striving for professional status (16:104).

The total number of hours spent at school each week is presented by level of expenditure in Table 64. It was found that the number of hours spent on the job each week was related to level of expenditure at the .01 level of significance. A proportionately greater number of principals in high expenditure districts was less likely to spend less than 42 hours on the job and more likely to spend at least 54 hours per week.

Table 63

Hours Spent Each Week on
School Duties

Number of Hours	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Less than 36	9	.89	9	.89
36 - 41	63	6.26	72	7.16
42 - 47	358	35.59	430	42.74
48 - 53	360	35.79	790	78.53
54 - 59	145	14.41	935	92.94
60 - 65	62	6.16	997	99.11
66 - 71	4	.40	1,001	99.50
72 or more	5	.50	1,006	100.00

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL
IMPROVEMENT

1951-1952 Michigan Study

Only one in four Michigan principals in 1951-1952 (14:18) was allowed absence for study; about one in five was allowed absence for travel; and nearly four in five could take time off for professional reasons.

Table 64

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels with Hours Spent
Each Week on School Duties

Expenditure Level	Hours Spent Each Week on School Duties								Total
	Less Than 36	36-41	42-47	48-53	54-59	60-65	66-71	72 or More	
<u>High</u>									
Freq.	5.00	23.00	138.00	154.00	88.00	38.00	1.00	1.00	448.00
Percent across	1.12	5.13	30.80	34.38	19.64	8.48	.22	.22	100.00
Percent down	55.56	37.10	39.09	43.75	61.54	61.29	25.00	20.00	45.25
Percent of total	.51	2.32	13.94	15.56	8.89	3.84	.10	.10	45.25
Theoret. freq.	4.07	28.06	159.74	159.29	64.71	28.06	1.81	2.26	
Cell χ^2	.21	.91	2.96	.18	8.38	3.52	.36	.70	
<u>Middle</u>									
Freq.	3.00	18.00	115.00	109.00	28.00	10.00	1.00	2.00	286.00
Percent across	1.05	6.29	40.21	38.11	9.79	3.50	.35	.70	100.00
Percent down	33.33	29.03	32.58	30.97	19.58	16.13	25.00	40.00	28.89
Percent of total	.30	1.82	11.62	11.01	2.83	1.01	.10	.20	28.89
Theoret. freq.	2.60	17.91	101.98	101.69	41.31	17.91	1.16	1.44	
Cell χ^2	.06	.00	1.66	.53	4.29	3.49	.02	.21	
<u>Low</u>									
Freq.	1.00	21.00	100.00	89.00	27.00	14.00	2.00	2.00	256.00
Percent across	.39	8.20	39.06	34.77	10.55	5.47	.78	.78	100.00
Percent down	11.11	33.87	28.33	25.28	18.88	22.58	50.00	40.00	25.86
Percent of total	.10	2.12	10.10	8.99	2.73	1.41	.20	.20	25.86
Theoret. freq.	2.33	16.03	91.28	91.02	36.98	16.03	1.03	1.29	
Cell χ^2	.76	1.54	.83	.04	2.69	.26	.90	.39	
<u>Total</u>									
Freq.	9.00	62.00	353.00	352.00	143.00	62.00	4.00	5.00	990.00
Percent across	.91	6.26	35.66	35.56	14.44	6.26	.40	.51	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	.91	6.26	35.66	35.56	14.44	6.26	.40	.51	100.00

$\chi^2 = 34.910$; $df = 14$; Significant negative relationship at .01 level;
unused = 21; p.m.c. = -.10037.

National Studies

The opinions of supervising principals in the 1968 national study (15:30) were sought regarding the desirability of released time for certain professional improvement activities. Sixty-five percent of the respondents felt that school system inservice programs were very important. Forty-six percent thought that professional association programs were very important, while 64.1 percent indicated that exchange visits among principals were very important.

It was noteworthy, however, that 98 in 100 persons serving in the national principalship credited their success as principals to their on-the-job experiences as teachers and principals rather than to college preparation, intern exchange, local inservice, and training programs (15:28).

Statewide Studies

Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:17) examined the degree of importance attributed by Georgia principals to various professional improvement activities. Sixty-one percent thought that inservice programs within their school systems were "very important." Next highest item in popularity was plans for exchange visit. In addition, more than half, or 51.57 percent, viewed the programs of their professional associations as important enough to justify released time during school time.

About 34 in 100 Oklahoma principals were found by Brothers (3:76) to indicate that attendance at NAESP annual meetings was not permitted.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Principals were asked to indicate the extent to which they received opportunities and encouragement to participate in professional improvement activities. Responses are recorded in Table 65.

Table 65

Opportunities for Professional Improvement

	Much Opportunity		Some Opportunity		No Opportunity	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Inservice for administrators	168	17.25	660	67.76	146	14.99
Visitation to other schools	208	21.14	682	69.31	94	9.55
MAESP/NAESP association meetings and conventions	376	37.60	590	59.00	34	3.40
Attendance at non-AESP workshops and conferences	182	18.72	701	72.12	89	9.16
Combined totals	934	94.71	2,633	268.19	363	37.10

Fifteen percent indicated that they received no opportunity for administrator inservice. Ten percent reported no opportunity for visitation to other schools, while 9 percent reported no opportunity for attendance

at non-AESP workshops and conferences. Concerning conference expense, 58 percent replied that all conference and convention expenses were taken care of by their school systems. Six percent indicated that they were required to handle their own expenses, while 36 percent reported sharing the costs of participation.

Many state-wide studies report the number of state and national association meetings that respondents had attended within a five-year period. The number of meetings attended was considered by this researcher to be less relevant than whether respondents received the opportunities and encouragement to attend. Membership and lack of attendance at meetings are not always indicative of whether the principals are able to attend.

HOW PRINCIPAL'S EXPENSES FOR CONFERENCE
AND CONVENTION PARTICIPATION
ARE HANDLED

1951-1952 Michigan Study

Two decades ago only 31 in 100 principals in Michigan schools declared that their expenses for study were paid in part. Seventy-six in 100 were reimbursed in part for professional meetings, however (14:18).

Statewide Studies

Brothers (3:76) reported that the percentage of respondents who received some financial help from local

school districts for expenses to attend professional meetings in Oklahoma was 44.5 percent.

The method by which Oregon (Perkins, 9:113) principals' expenses were paid for attendance at conferences of the association was as follows: 100 percent self, 21.2 percent; 100 percent by district, 36 percent; combination of self and district, 32 percent.

Presentation of Data and Findings

More than one-half of the respondents, or 57.57 percent, replied that all their expenses were taken care of by their school system. Thirty-six percent reported that they shared the costs of conference and convention participation with their school district, while 59, or 6.03 percent, indicated that they handled their own expenses. The data for this question are located in Table 66.

Table 66

How the Principal's Expenses for
Conference and Convention
Participation are Handled

How Handled	Number	Percentage
100 percent self	59	6.03
100 percent district	563	57.57
Combination of 1 and 2	356	36.40

The majority of principals in this state, then, are receiving total reimbursement for expenses incurred seeking participation in professional improvement activities.

DISTRICT-WIDE RESPONSIBILITIES

Presentation of Data and Findings

Michigan elementary school principals were asked whether they had any district-wide administrative responsibilities in addition to their principalships. Thirty in 100 responded that they did have district-wide responsibilities. And the following district-wide responsibilities were specified: director of federal programs, attendance officer, in charge of substitutes, director of special education, in charge of bus transportation, director of elementary education.

About 70 in 100 indicated that they did not have duties which were system-wide in scope (Table 67).

Table 67

Number of Principals with District-Wide Responsibilities

Responsibilities	Number	Percentage
Yes	303	30.36
No	695	69.64

In the case of district-wide responsibilities held in addition to the principalship, a significant difference was noted when compared with the three levels of expenditures. In this instance, principals from high expenditure districts reported proportionately fewer district-wide responsibilities than did low-expenditure district principals. Table 68 depicts these data.

METHOD OF FILLING PRINCIPALSHIP OPENINGS

1951-1952 Michigan Study

The earlier Michigan study (14:9) revealed the manner of selection to the principalship as follows: recommendation by superintendent, 62 percent; recommendation by other administrators, 19 percent; competitive examination, 16 percent; and personal application, 2 percent.

Statewide Studies

Ten percent of Oklahoma principals were reported by Brothers (3:79) as being required to take an examination.

Lepick (5:191) reported that California principals were required to take written competitive examinations in about 30 in 100 cases in order to attain a promotion to the principalship.

Table 68

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels with Number of Principals with
District-Wide Responsibilities

Expenditure Level	District-Wide Responsibilities		
	Yes	No	Total
<u>High</u>			
Freq.	114.00	332.00	446.00
Percent across	25.56	74.44	100.00
Percent down	38.38	48.40	45.37
Percent of total	11.60	33.77	45.37
Theoret. freq.	134.75	311.25	
Cell χ^2	3.20	1.38	
<u>Middle</u>			
Freq.	97.00	185.00	282.00
Percent across	34.40	65.60	100.00
Percent down	32.66	26.97	28.69
Percent of total	9.87	18.82	28.69
Theoret. freq.	85.20	196.80	
Cell χ^2	1.63	.71	
<u>Low</u>			
Freq.	86.00	169.00	255.00
Percent across	33.73	66.27	100.00
Percent down	28.96	24.64	25.94
Percent of total	8.75	17.19	25.94
Theoret. freq.	77.04	177.96	
Cell χ^2	1.04	.45	
<u>Total</u>			
Freq.	297.00	686.00	983.00
Percent across	30.21	69.79	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	30.21	69.79	100.00

$\chi^2 = 7.824$; $df = 2$; Significant negative relationship at .02 level; unused = 28; p.m.c. = $-.079817$.

Presentation of Data and Findings

In an attempt to ascertain how Michigan school districts fill principalship openings, respondents were requested to indicate whether their district promoted from within ranks, hired outside applicants, or used a combination of these two practices.

A perusal of the data in Table 69 reveals that a majority of principals, or 62 percent, reported that their districts hired both from within and without the system. Nearly one-third of the respondents replied that their districts promoted from within ranks only.

It would appear, then, that more Michigan districts are recruiting principals from outside sources than was the case twenty years ago.

Table 69

Method of Filling Principalship
Openings in Principal's
School District

	Number	Percentage
Promotes from within ranks	314	31.40
Hires outside applicants	66	6.60
Combination of those above	620	62.00

DETERMINATION OF SALARY

1951-1952 Michigan Study

In 1951-1952 (14:18) 379 Michigan principals responded that their salaries were based as follows: on size and membership of building, 125 principals; on their training, 219 principals; and on their experience, 232 principals. Furthermore, 76 in 100 principals in this earlier study reported that their salaries were based on an established schedule.

Statewide Studies

Brothers (3:102) reported that one-third of Oklahoma principals favored a salary schedule based on a ratio tied to classroom teacher salaries; 7.8 percent favored individual negotiation; 12 percent favored single salary schedule considering experience; and 15.8 percent favored nature of school assignment.

The Indiana study by Arms (1:69) found that elementary principals in that state received a salary based upon the teachers' salary plus an index or sum within the school system. Only 12.7 percent of Indiana principals reported negotiating for their salaries.

The most common type of salary scheduling listed in the Wyoming principalship study by Moss (8:118) was the index system.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Principals were queried for their opinions as to how their principalship salary was determined and, also, how their salary should be determined. Forty in 100 replied that their salary was determined by their superintendent's offer or a schedule. When asked how they felt their salary should be determined, however, only 13 percent selected the superintendent's offer or schedule, whereas 74 percent reported that it should be an amount negotiated by administrator group.

Factors used in categorizing the determination of salaries of elementary school principals are reported in Table 70.

Compared with the relatively few numbers of principals negotiating salaries in the two reported state studies, the percentage of Michigan principals negotiating salaries through individual or group means is significant. Almost 54 percent of the principals in this study reported negotiating for their salaries. And a total of 82.9 percent reported they felt their salary should be determined through individual and group negotiation means.

Table 70

Method of Salary Determination and Principal's Viewpoint
About How it Should be Determined

Salary Determination	Individual Negotiation		Administrator Group Negotiation		Superintendent's Offer or Schedule		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
How salary is determined	66	6.65	210	47.23	400	40.28	58	5.84
How it should be determined	83	8.35	741	74.55	128	12.88	42	4.23
Combined totals	149	15.00	1,210	121.78	528	53.16	100	10.07

PRINCIPAL'S FEELINGS ABOUT WHETHER
SALARY INCREASES FOR PRINCIPALS
ARE LAGGING BEHIND SALARY
INCREASES FOR TEACHERS

National Studies

The 1958 national survey (16:119) concluded that NAESP surveys during the years of 1928 through 1958 showed that the relative financial status of elementary school principals had declined as compared with the status of classroom teachers. Between the 1958 survey and 1968 survey (15:132-133) the median salaries of elementary principals revealed an increase of \$3,463, a gain of 55.5 percent. During the same period, the study reported that the median salary of elementary school teachers exhibited an estimated increase of \$3,770, a gain of 62.3 percent.

Presentation of Data and Findings

According to the data in Table 71, 51 percent of the principals in this study reported that salary increases for principals were lagging behind salary increases for teachers in their districts. Forty-nine percent responded that they did not feel they were. Several principals made comments to the effect that they received what was left over after teachers got their raises.

According to national studies, principals have been steadily losing out in comparison with classroom teachers; that is, teachers' salaries have increased at a faster rate than have principals' salaries. When principals' salaries are based on a dollar differential or are scheduled independently of classroom teachers, the frequent result has been for principals to lose out in relation to teachers.

Table 71

Opinion About Whether Salary Increases
for Principals are Lagging Behind
Salary Increases for Teachers

Salary Opinion	Number	Percentage
Increases are lagging behind teachers	503	50.96
Increases are not lagging behind teachers	484	49.04

In this study slightly more than half, or 51 per cent, of the principals reported that salary increases for teachers have been going up at a faster rate than principals' salaries.

Attention is called to the figures in the previous table (Table 70) which report that nearly three-fourths of the principals felt that administrative group negotiation was most desired.

No significant relationship was determined when comparing the sexes of respondents to their views regarding whether salary increases for principals are lagging. Table 72 compares these factors.

SATISFACTION WITH SALARY AND WORKING CONDITIONS

Presentation of Data and Findings

Principals in this study were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction regarding their salary and working conditions. The distribution of responses was as follows: very satisfied, 27.29 percent; somewhat satisfied, 35.56 percent; both satisfied and dissatisfied, 26.56 percent; somewhat dissatisfied, 8.17 percent; and very dissatisfied, 2.29 percent. The data dealing with level of satisfaction regarding salary and working conditions are located in Table 73.

Sixty-three percent of study respondents reported levels of definite satisfaction with salary and working conditions. That more than one-third, or 37 percent, of the persons serving in Michigan principalships indicated existing dissatisfaction with salary and working conditions, however, is worthy of further study.

The attitude of responding principals, classified according to school district expenditure level,

Table 72

Comparison of Sex with Opinion About Whether
Salary Increases for Principals are Lagging
Behind Salary Increases for Teachers

Sex	Salary Opinion		Total
	Increases Are Lagging	Increases Not Lagging	
<u>Male</u>			
Freq.	403.00	363.00	766.00
Percent across	52.61	47.39	100.00
Percent down	80.12	75.16	77.69
Percent of total	40.87	36.82	77.69
Theoret. freq.	390.77	375.23	
Cell χ^2	.38	.40	
<u>Female</u>			
Freq.	100.00	120.00	220.00
Percent across	45.45	54.55	100.00
Percent down	19.88	24.84	22.31
Percent of total	10.14	12.17	22.31
Theoret. freq.	112.23	107.77	
Cell χ^2	1.33	1.39	
<u>Total</u>			
Freq.	503.00	483.00	986.00
Percent across	51.01	48.99	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	51.01	48.99	100.00

$\chi^2 = 3.503$; $df = 1$; Not Significant; unused = 25.

was not found to be significant. Table 74 reports these data which suggest no difference other than that due to chance.

Table 73

Principal's Level of Satisfaction
With Salary and Working
Conditions

Level of Satisfaction	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	274	27.29	274	27.29
Somewhat satisfied	357	35.56	631	62.85
Both satisfied and dissatisfied	268	26.69	899	89.54
Somewhat dissatisfied	82	8.17	981	97.71
Very dissatisfied	23	2.29	1,004	100.00

The number of years served as supervisory principal was also compared with the level of satisfaction with salary and working conditions. However, no relationship was determined to exist between the years served and the relative degree of satisfaction (Table 75).

How well are Michigan elementary school principals doing in regards to working conditions and salary? Any realistic answer to the question requires far more than a simple reporting of dollars and cents paid. The adequacy of compensation depends on comparisons with other members

Table 74

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels by Principal's Level
of Satisfaction with Salary and Working Conditions

Expenditure Level	Satisfaction with Salary and Working Conditions					Total
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Both	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	
<u>High</u>						
Freq.	137.00	158.00	113.00	32.00	8.00	448.00
Percent across	30.58	35.27	25.22	7.14	1.79	100.00
Percent down	50.55	44.89	43.30	39.02	34.78	45.30
Percent of total	13.85	15.98	11.43	3.24	.81	45.30
Theoret. freq.	122.76	159.45	118.23	37.14	10.42	
Cell χ^2	1.65	.01	.23	.71	.56	
<u>Middle</u>						
Freq.	74.00	106.00	77.00	23.00	6.00	286.00
Percent across	25.87	37.06	26.92	8.04	2.10	100.00
Percent down	27.31	30.11	29.50	28.05	26.09	28.92
Percent of total	7.48	10.72	7.79	2.33	.61	28.92
Theoret. freq.	78.37	101.79	75.48	23.71	6.65	
Cell χ^2	.24	.17	.03	.02	.06	
<u>Low</u>						
Freq.	60.00	88.00	71.00	27.00	9.00	255.00
Percent across	23.53	34.51	27.84	10.59	3.53	100.00
Percent down	22.14	25.00	27.20	32.93	39.13	25.78
Percent of total	6.07	8.90	7.18	2.73	.91	25.78
Theoret. freq.	69.87	90.76	67.30	21.14	5.93	
Cell χ^2	1.40	.08	.20	1.62	1.59	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	271.00	352.00	261.00	82.00	23.00	989.00
Percent across	27.40	35.59	26.39	8.29	2.33	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	27.40	35.59	26.39	8.29	2.33	100.00

$\chi^2 = 8.599$; $df = 8$; Not Significant; unused = 22.

Table 75

Comparison of Years Served as Principal by Level of Satisfaction
with Salary and Working Conditions

Years Served	Satisfaction with Salary and Working Conditions					Total
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Both	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	
<u>1-3</u>						
Freq.	58.00	68.00	57.00	18.00	4.00	205.00
Percent across	28.29	33.17	27.80	8.78	1.95	100.00
Percent down	21.32	19.05	21.43	21.95	17.39	20.50
Percent of total	5.80	6.80	5.70	1.80	.40	20.50
Theoret. freq.	55.76	73.18	54.53	16.81	4.71	
Cell χ^2	.09	.37	.11	.08	.11	
<u>4-9</u>						
Freq.	120.00	164.00	130.00	41.00	13.00	468.00
Percent across	25.64	35.04	27.78	8.76	2.78	100.00
Percent down	44.12	45.94	48.87	50.00	56.52	46.80
Percent of total	12.00	16.40	13.00	4.10	1.30	46.80
Theoret. freq.	127.30	167.08	124.49	38.38	10.76	
Cell χ^2	.42	.06	.24	.18	.46	
<u>10-19</u>						
Freq.	80.00	103.00	68.00	19.00	4.00	274.00
Percent across	29.20	37.59	24.82	6.93	1.46	100.00
Percent down	29.41	28.85	25.56	23.17	17.39	27.40
Percent of total	8.00	10.30	6.80	1.90	.40	27.40
Theoret. freq.	74.53	97.82	72.88	22.47	6.30	
Cell χ^2	.40	.27	.33	.54	.84	
<u>20-29</u>						
Freq.	13.00	21.00	11.00	4.00	2.00	51.00
Percent across	25.49	41.18	21.57	7.84	3.92	100.00
Percent down	4.78	5.88	4.14	4.88	8.70	5.10
Percent of total	1.30	2.10	1.10	.40	.20	5.10
Theoret. freq.	13.87	18.21	13.57	4.18	1.17	
Cell χ^2	.05	.43	.49	.01	.58	
<u>30 or More</u>						
Freq.	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Percent across	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Percent down	.37	.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	.20
Percent of total	.10	.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	.20
Theoret. freq.	.54	.71	.53	.16	.05	
Cell χ^2	.38	.11	.53	.16	.05	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	272.00	357.00	266.00	82.00	23.00	1,000.00
Percent across	27.20	35.70	26.60	8.20	2.30	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	27.20	35.70	26.60	8.20	2.30	100.00

$\chi^2 = 7.303$; $df = 16$; Not Significant; unused = 11.

of the profession, term of employment, fringe benefits, and other factors which surround and influence the work of the principal.

While there will probably always be variations among school districts in both salary policies and salaries paid, this study indicates that many Michigan principals believe that there is clearly room for substantially improving their salaries.

VALUE AND FUTURE DIRECTION OF MAESP SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

Statewide Studies

Of California principals responding to a question regarding the value of membership in the state principal association, 51 percent of males and 73 percent of females thought that the association was of "vital importance"; 38 percent males and 23 percent females felt that membership was "useful" (Lepick, 5:291).

The rating reported by Youngblood (13:136) of Texas principals found that 37.2 percent felt that their association was of much value; 52.9 percent, of some value; 9.9 percent, of little or no value.

Presentation of Data and Findings

Michigan elementary principals were requested to indicate the extent to which membership in MAESP benefits

the principalship. This inquiry was intended to determine the attitudes of Michigan principals toward the value of the Association rather than to determine the effectiveness of the state office. Respondents were requested to indicate whether membership in the state association was of much value, of some value, of little value, or of no value to the principalship.

Of the 996 members responding to this question, 261, or 26.2 percent, felt that MAESP membership was of much value; 602, or 60.44 percent, stated of some value; 133, or 13.35 percent, reported membership of little or no value.

Presented with these data in Table 76 are the opinions of respondents about the future direction of MAESP services and activities. Ninety-one percent reported a desire for balanced welfare and leadership activity.

Table 76

Principal's Opinion About the Future
Direction of MAESP Services
and Activities

Future Direction	Number	Percentage
Professional welfare services only	22	2.23
Leadership inservice activities only	62	6.29
Balanced welfare and leadership activity	902	91.48

The majority of Michigan elementary school principals apparently rate their professional membership in MAESP as less than of much value to the principalship. Although only ten principals, or 1 percent, of all responding principals rated their professional membership as of no value, less than 27 percent evaluated their membership as of much value. Data are shown in Table 77.

Table 77

Principal's Opinion Regarding the Benefits
of MAESP Membership to the Principalship

Membership Benefits	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Of much value	261	26.20	261	26.20
Of some value	602	60.44	863	86.65
Of little value	123	12.35	986	99.00
Of no value	10	1.00	996	100.00

It should be noted, however, that the fall membership of MAESP has grown in each of the last four years: 1968, 975 members; 1969, 1,125 members; 1970, 1,250 members; 1971, 1,366 members--although a 50 percent dues increase was levied.¹

¹Figures obtained from MAESP state office.

Chapter 6

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AND VIEWPOINTS

Data pertaining to the administrative/supervisory activities of the Michigan principal and, in addition, his viewpoints toward role perception and sources of job gratification are presented, analyzed, and compared in this chapter.

These factors were examined as they related to the study hypothesis of analogous situations and viewpoints related to and affecting Michigan elementary school principals.

Limited comparative data were available from recent national and statewide studies and the earlier Michigan study.

ROLE WHEN TEACHERS NEGOTIATE

Presentation of Data and Findings

The enactment of public employee legislation in the state of Michigan made appropriate the inclusion

in the survey inquiries regarding the role of the principal when teachers negotiate with boards of education.

The positions Michigan elementary school principals have taken when teachers negotiate were reported in the following percentage amounts: principal representative sits with board negotiating team, 48.4 percent; serves as advisor to board team, 31.7 percent; and is not involved in the teacher negotiation process, 19.5 percent. The responses concerning this aspect of the study are recorded in Table 78.

Table 78

Principal's Level of Involvement When
Teachers Negotiate With the
Board of Education

	Number	Percentage
Represented on board team	484	48.40
Serve only as advisors to board	317	31.70
Principals not involved	195	19.50
Other	4	.40

The information gained in this study about the role in teacher negotiations was that almost half the principals in this study were represented either directly or via a group representative on the board negotiating team. It was also noteworthy that slightly more than half the respondents reported that they were only advisors or not at all involved in the negotiation process.

Inter-relationships were sought to detect any significant difference among the degree of involvement in the teacher negotiations process as compared to level of expenditure. Table 79 graphically illustrates the results of the cross-tabulations which were found to be significantly related at the .001 level of significance. It is apparent that principals from higher-expenditure districts are more directly involved in the negotiations process than are principals from lower-expenditure districts.

EXISTENCE OF PERSONAL PERFORMANCE
OBJECTIVES AND/OR ANNUAL GOALS

Presentation of Data and
Findings

No statewide or national study was located which made reference to the existence of district requirements regarding personal performance objectives and/or annual goals of the principal.

Of the 994 principals reporting on this aspect of the study, only one-third stated that objectives or goals were a requirement in their school system. The remaining two-thirds reported that goals and objectives were not required for the year ahead (Table 80). However, many principals did indicate that annual performance objectives were in the process of being developed in their districts.

Table 79

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels
by Principal's Involvement When Teachers
Negotiate With Board of Education

Expenditure Level	Level of Involvement in Teacher Negotiations				Total
	On Board Team	Advise Only	Not Involved	Other	
<u>High</u>					
Freq.	268.00	116.00	62.00	2.00	448.00
Percent across	59.82	25.89	13.84	.45	100.00
Percent down	55.95	37.18	32.46	50.00	45.44
Percent of total	27.18	11.76	6.29	.20	45.44
Theoret. freq.	217.64	141.76	86.78	1.82	
Cell χ^2	11.65	4.68	7.08	.02	
<u>Middle</u>					
Freq.	134.00	96.00	53.00	1.00	284.00
Percent across	47.18	33.80	18.66	.35	100.00
Percent down	27.97	30.77	27.75	25.00	28.80
Percent of total	13.59	9.74	5.38	.10	28.80
Theoret. freq.	137.97	89.87	55.01	1.15	
Cell χ^2	.11	.42	.07	.02	
<u>Low</u>					
Freq.	77.00	100.00	76.00	1.00	254.00
Percent across	30.31	39.37	29.92	.39	100.00
Percent down	16.08	32.05	39.79	25.00	25.76
Percent of total	7.81	10.14	7.71	.10	25.76
Theoret. freq.	123.39	80.37	49.20	1.03	
Cell χ^2	17.44	4.79	14.59	.00	
<u>Total</u>					
Freq.	479.00	312.00	191.00	4.00	986.00
Percent across	48.58	31.64	19.37	.41	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	48.58	31.64	19.37	.41	100.00

$\chi^2 = 60.888$; $df = 6$; Significant at .001 level;
unused = 25.

An examination of the number of principals who submit annual performance objectives and goals to the central office administration according to expenditure levels indicated a relationship that was significant at the .999 confidence level. The study data located in Table 81 indicate that there is a greater tendency for high expenditure districts to require goals and objectives than low-expenditure districts.

Table 80

Existence of Required Personal
Performance Objectives and/or
Annual Goals

Performance Objective	Number	Percentage
Required	331	33.30
Not Required	663	66.70

EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS

Presentation of Data and Findings

One in five Michigan elementary principals, as revealed in Table 82, reported that he was not evaluated as to his performance. Twenty-five percent reported being evaluated according to formal policy developed with principal involvement, and 11 percent, according to formal policy developed without principal involvement.

Table 81

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels
With Existence of Required Personal
Performance Objectives and/or
Annual Goals

Expenditure Level	Existence of Personal Performance Objectives		
	Required	Not Required	Total
<u>High</u>			
Freq.	191.00	253.00	444.00
Percent across	43.02	56.98	100.00
Percent down	58.41	38.74	45.31
Percent of total	19.49	25.82	45.31
Theoret. freq.	148.15	295.85	
Cell χ^2	12.39	6.21	
<u>Middle</u>			
Freq.	79.00	204.00	283.00
Percent across	27.92	72.08	100.00
Percent down	24.16	31.24	28.88
Percent of total	8.06	20.82	28.88
Theoret. freq.	94.43	188.57	
Cell χ^2	2.52	1.26	
<u>Low</u>			
Freq.	57.00	196.00	253.00
Percent across	22.53	77.47	100.00
Percent down	17.43	30.02	25.82
Percent of total	5.82	20.00	25.82
Theoret. freq.	84.42	168.58	
Cell χ^2	8.91	4.46	
<u>Total</u>			
Freq.	327.00	653.00	980.00
Percent across	33.37	66.63	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	33.37	66.63	100.00

$\chi^2 = 35.748$; $df = 2$; Significant at .001 level;
unused = 31.

A high number of principals, 427, or 42.57 percent, replied that they were evaluated, but that no policy exists to guide or govern the process.

Table 82

Evaluation of Principals

Evaluation Procedure	Number	Percentage
According to formal policy developed WITHOUT principal involvement	109	10.87
According to formal policy developed WITH principal involvement	247	24.63
No policy exists, but we're evaluated	427	42.57
We are not evaluated	200	19.94
Other	20	1.99

Written comments to this aspect of the study included the following: "My board interviews with the third degree"; "Don't know"; "I wonder"; "Not sure"; and "This can be a Godawful lonely job. One exists in a complete vacuum as far as encouragement from any superior goes. You are left to your personal surmising as to whether you're a good principal or a dud."

ATTITUDE TOWARD MAJOR FUNCTIONS

National Studies

Supervising principals in the 1968 national study (15:51) reported that they would like to devote less time to clerical tasks and to administration and more time to curriculum development and supervision.

Statewide Studies

Youngblood (13:180) found the most rewarding duties of Texas principals in the areas of school organization and management (32.1%); pupil adjustment and guidance, 22.6 percent; and work with the teaching staff, 21.2 percent. Very few Texas principals reported their most rewarding duties in program development or parent and community relations. The largest proportion of Texas principals (13:61) responded that they wanted most to devote more time to working with their teaching staffs (30.6%); pupil adjustment (18.9%); and school organization and management (18.6%).

Presentation of Data and Findings

The purpose of this section was to summarize the opinions of Michigan principals about what they believed to be their most rewarding duty, the area in which they spend the greatest amount of time, and the area in which they would most like to spend more time. Limited information was found to be available in related status studies regarding these aspects.

Most principals, 59.33 percent, are spending a majority of time organizing and managing their schools. No one area was found to be overwhelmingly the most personally rewarding duty, although one in four reporting indicated his work with the teaching staff

as rewarding. Forty percent, or 392 principals, reported a desire to spend more time in program development and curriculum, while only 14 percent indicated that they were satisfied with their present time allotment.

The real significance of the illustration in Table 83 is not that time in itself is important, but that, given the choice, Michigan principals aspire to activities more directly connected with the improvement of instruction. Polled principals reported that they would prefer to give more time to program development and curriculum.

Table 83

Principal's Attitudes Toward His
Major Functions

Major Functions	Most Rewarding Area		Most Time Spent		Desire to Spend More Time	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Organization and management	195	20.70	569	59.33	28	2.87
Periodic classroom teaching	37	3.93	6	.63	44	4.50
Working with the teaching staff	247	26.22	124	12.93	242	24.77
Pupil adjustment and guidance	197	20.91	118	12.30	94	9.62
Program development and curriculum	169	17.94	59	6.15	392	40.12
Public relations	97	10.30	83	8.65	41	4.20
Present time allotment satisfactory					136	13.92

PERCEIVED CENTRAL OFFICE
VIEW OF PRINCIPALSHIP

National Studies

The 1958 and 1968 national studies explored the status of principals with respect to their understanding regarding the central office view of their role. The 1958 study results (16:143) showed that 59 in 100 national principals believed that they were placed in the "leadership" role. And the 1968 study investigators (15:143) indicated that school systems were moving in the direction of giving principals greater responsibility to make decisions.

The 1968 national surveyors (15:78) presented statements relative to the principal's supervisory responsibility and requested each respondent to choose the one which best described his status. Eighty-two percent indicated "primary" responsibility; 17 percent selected "partial" responsibility; and 1.1 percent felt that they had "little" responsibility.

Statewide Studies

Eighty-six percent of Oklahoma principals were reported by Brothers (3:84) to feel that they had sufficient authority to carry out good educational programs in their schools. Only 49.8 percent, however, reported that they had enough voice in budget preparation for their schools.

The Arkansas study by Shelton (10:107) revealed that 64 percent had "primary" responsibility; 32.7 percent had "partial" responsibility; and 3.2 percent had "little" responsibility.

Georgia participants were recorded by Jarvis, Parker, and Moore (6:38) as having the following percentages regarding answers to the same question as the Georgia and 1968 national study: 26, 18, and 4 percent.

Youngblood (13:163) found that less than half of the Texas respondents revealed themselves as leaders of their schools with considerable authority to plan, organize, and administer the educational program of their schools.

Lepick (5:307) asked California principals the question: "Does your superintendent implant the feeling that elementary school principals play as important a role in education and community leadership as do junior and senior high school principals?" One-fourth expressed a negative response.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The study questionnaire presented three descriptions of central office views of the elementary principalship and asked respondents to select the one that best described the responsibility given to the principals in their district. The intent of the three

descriptions was to determine the degree to which the Michigan principal felt he had the authority to plan, organize, and administer his own school.

Most Michigan principals, or 54.13 percent, viewed themselves as heads of their schools with considerable authority. Forty-two in 100 principals felt that they were assigned primarily to carry out central office policies and plans, with some encouragement to formulate their own plans. Only 4 percent reported that they were neither encouraged nor authorized to proceed independently. These data are reported in Table 84.

It would appear that when compared with their counterparts across the nation Michigan principals saw themselves as having less authority delegated from the central office.

The principals' perceptions of the central office view of the elementary principalship are presented by expenditure level of school district in Table 85. The two variables were found to be positively related at the .05 level of significance.

Table 84

Principal's Perception of the Central Office View
of His Elementary Principalship

Central Office View	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
The elementary principal is recognized publicly as the head of his school with considerable authority to plan, organize, and administer his school's educational program.	544	54.13	544	54.13
The principal is viewed as the administrative head of the school, assigned primarily to carry out the policies and plans of the central office. He is given some encouragement to plan for his own building.	423	42.09	967	96.22
The principal is neither encouraged nor authorized to proceed independently to alter his own school's program in any significant manner.	38	3.78	1,005	100.00

Table 85

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels with Principal's Perception of
Central Office View of His
Principalship

Expenditure Level	Central Office View of Principalship			
	Complete Leader	Partial Leader	Follower	Total
<u>High</u>				
Freq.	254.00	187.00	9.00	450.00
Percent across	56.44	41.56	2.00	100.00
Percent down	47.39	45.06	23.68	45.50
Percent of total	25.68	18.91	.91	45.50
Theoret. freq.	243.88	188.83	17.29	
Cell χ^2	.42	.02	3.97	
<u>Middle</u>				
Freq.	154.00	118.00	13.00	285.00
Percent across	54.04	41.40	4.56	100.00
Percent down	28.73	28.43	34.21	28.82
Percent of total	15.57	11.93	1.31	28.82
Theoret. freq.	154.46	119.59	10.95	
Cell χ^2	.00	.02	.38	
<u>Low</u>				
Freq.	128.00	110.00	16.00	254.00
Percent across	50.39	43.31	6.30	100.00
Percent down	23.88	26.51	42.11	25.68
Percent of total	12.94	11.12	1.62	25.68
Theoret. freq.	137.66	106.58	9.76	
Cell χ^2	.68	.11	3.99	
<u>Total</u>				
Freq.	536.00	415.00	38.00	989.00
Percent across	54.20	41.96	3.84	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	54.20	41.96	3.84	100.00

$\chi^2 = 9.596$; $df = 4$; Significant at .05 level;
unused = 22.

EXTENT PRINCIPALS FEEL TEACHERS HAVE
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL
PROGRAM

Presentation of Data and Findings

A question was formulated in an attempt to ascertain the extent to which Michigan principals feel that their teachers have individualized their schools' learning programs.

Thirty in 100, or 303 principals, reported that considerable individualization has taken place; 59 percent, or 590 principals, indicated that their teachers have individualized somewhat; while 112, or 11.15 percent, reported that little or no individualizing of the instructional program has taken place. These data are recorded in Table 86.

Table 86

Extent to Which Principal Feels
His Staff Has Individualized
the Instructional Program to
the Needs of Children

Extent Individualized	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Considerable	303	30.15	303	30.15
Somewhat	590	58.71	893	88.86
Little	109	10.85	1,002	99.70
None	3	.30	1,005	100.00

The extent to which the respondents' staffs have individualized and tailored the instructional program to the needs of children with respect to levels of expenditure of school district was compared. Table 87 presents the data showing that a positive significance level of .001 was reached as analyzed by the chi square test. It is apparent that principals from high-expenditure districts view their staffs as more likely to have individualized their programs than principals from lower-expenditure districts.

MOST IMPORTANT IMPROVEMENT IN
PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL WITHIN
PAST FIVE YEARS

Presentation of Data and
Findings

Table 88 reports the most significant improvement that had taken place in the schools of respondents during the past five years, 1967-1971.

Study participants were given six possible choices from which to select the most important improvement which had taken place within the past five years. These were, namely: materials and equipment, curriculum and program, organizational change, methodological approaches, professionalization of teaching staff, and para-professional involvement.

Table 87

Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels With Extent
to Which Principal Feels His Staff Has Individualized
Instructional Program

Expenditure Level	Extent Instructional Program Individualized				Total
	Considerable	Somewhat	Little	None	
<u>High</u>					
Freq.	166.00	247.00	37.00	0.00	450.00
Percent across	36.89	54.89	8.22	0.00	100.00
Percent down	55.52	42.66	34.26	0.00	45.50
Percent of total	16.78	24.97	3.74	0.00	45.50
Theoret. freq.	136.05	263.45	49.14	1.37	
Cell χ^2	6.59	1.03	3.00	1.37	
<u>Middle</u>					
Freq.	75.00	174.00	32.00	2.00	283.00
Percent across	26.50	61.48	11.31	.71	100.00
Percent down	25.08	30.05	29.63	66.67	28.61
Percent of total	7.58	17.59	3.24	.20	28.61
Theoret. freq.	85.56	165.68	30.90	.86	
Cell χ^2	1.30	.42	.04	1.52	
<u>Low</u>					
Freq.	58.00	158.00	39.00	1.00	256.00
Percent across	22.66	61.72	15.23	.39	100.00
Percent down	19.40	27.29	36.11	33.33	25.88
Percent of total	5.86	15.98	3.94	.10	25.88
Theoret. freq.	77.40	149.87	27.96	.78	
Cell χ^2	4.86	.44	4.36	.06	
<u>Total</u>					
Freq.	299.00	579.00	108.00	3.00	989.00
Percent across	30.23	58.54	10.92	.30	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	30.23	58.54	10.92	.30	100.00

$\chi^2 = 24.993$; $df = 6$; Significant at .001 level; unused = 22.

The areas most often selected by principals in this study were as follows: curriculum and program development, 26.92 percent; methodological approaches, 25.47 percent; new instructional materials and facilities, 18.4 percent. In addition, organizational change was selected by 14.35 percent as the most significant improvement.

Table 88

Most Important Improvement in Principal's
School Within Past Five Years

Area of Most Important Improvement	Number	Percentage
Curriculum and program development	259	26.92
Organizational change (e.g., team teaching)	138	14.35
New instructional materials and facilities	177	18.40
Methodological approaches (e.g., individualization)	245	25.47
Professionalization of teaching staff	62	6.44
Para-professional involvement	81	8.42

EXTENT PRINCIPAL HAS USED

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Presentation of Data and Findings

Discipline in the schools is widely discussed and often criticized. Nearly everyone believes in discipline and order, but there is considerable disagreement over meaning, policies, and methods.

A question was devised to reveal the extent to which Michigan principals have used corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure during the past twelve months.

Of all reporting elementary principals (see Table 89), 11, or 1.09 percent, indicated they used corporal punishment "often." On the other hand, it was reported by 173, or 17.16 percent, of the respondents that they used it "occasionally," while 210, or 20.83 percent, indicated that they "seldom" spanked. The greatest number and percentage for any response was "rarely," chosen by 355, or 35.22 percent. The second highest number and percentage, 259, or 25.69 percent, of all elementary principals revealed that they used corporal punishment "never."

Table 89

Extent to Which Principals Have Used
Corporal Punishment as a Disci-
plinary Measure Within the
Past Twelve Months

Level of Use	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Often	11	1.09	11	1.09
Occasionally	173	17.16	184	18.25
Seldom	210	20.83	394	39.09
Rarely	355	35.22	749	74.31
Never	259	25.69	1,008	100.00

It was interesting to note that men principals in this study indicated a greater incidence of

employing spanking than did women principals. Table 90 shows this significant difference at the .999 confidence level.

In Table 91 the data relating the three expenditure levels to the incidence of employing corporal punishment is reported. A significant negative relationship was found to have occurred. Principals from higher-expenditure districts tended to employ spanking less frequently than did principals from lower-expenditure districts.

METHODS OF REPORTING PUPIL

PROGRESS TO PARENTS

Presentation of Data and Findings

Recent years have seen widespread experimentation with different methods of reporting and grading pupil progress. Ideas have varied from precise numerical systems to the elimination of all grading.

A question was formulated for this study in an attempt to determine which methods of reporting are most commonly used in Michigan. Table 92 shows the types of method considered to be the most popularly used in Michigan schools.

Six possible alternatives were selected: grades, parent-teacher conferences, item checklists, written

Table 90

Comparison of Extent to Which Principals Have Used Corporal
Punishment by Sex

Sex	Principal's Use of Corporal Punishment					Total
	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Rarely	Never	
<u>Male</u>						
Freq.	9.00	147.00	166.00	290.00	166.00	778.00
Percent across	1.16	18.89	21.34	37.28	21.34	100.00
Percent down	81.82	84.97	79.43	81.69	64.09	77.26
Percent of total	.89	14.60	16.48	28.80	16.48	77.26
Theoret. freq.	8.50	133.66	161.47	274.27	200.10	
Cell χ^2	.03	1.33	.13	.90	5.81	
<u>Female</u>						
Freq.	2.00	26.00	43.00	65.00	93.00	229.00
Percent across	.87	11.35	18.78	28.38	40.61	100.00
Percent down	18.18	15.03	20.57	18.31	35.91	22.74
Percent of total	.20	2.58	4.27	6.45	9.24	22.74
Theoret. freq.	2.50	39.34	47.53	80.73	58.90	
Cell χ^2	.10	4.52	.43	3.06	19.74	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	11.00	173.00	209.00	355.00	259.00	1,007.00
Percent across	1.09	17.18	20.75	35.25	25.72	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	1.09	17.18	20.75	35.25	25.72	100.00

$\chi^2 = 36.067$; $df = 4$; Significant at .001 level; unused = 4.

Table 91

Comparison of School District Expenditure
Levels with Extent to Which Principals
Have Used Corporal Punishment

Expenditure Level	Principal's Use of Corporal Punishment					Total
	Often	Occa- sionally	Seldom	Rarely	Never	
<u>High</u>						
Freq.	3.00	68.00	83.00	146.00	151.00	451.00
Percent across	.67	15.08	18.40	32.37	33.48	100.00
Percent down	30.00	39.77	40.49	41.83	58.75	45.46
Percent of total	.30	6.85	8.37	14.72	15.22	45.46
Theoret. freq. Cell χ^2	4.55 .53	77.74 1.22	93.20 1.12	158.67 1.01	116.84 9.99	
<u>Middle</u>						
Freq.	4.00	50.00	59.00	104.00	68.00	285.00
Percent across	1.40	17.54	20.70	36.49	23.86	100.00
Percent down	40.00	29.24	28.78	29.80	26.46	28.73
Percent of total	.40	5.04	5.95	10.48	6.85	28.73
Theoret. freq. Cell χ^2	2.87 .44	49.13 .02	58.90 .00	100.27 .14	73.84 .46	
<u>Low</u>						
Freq.	3.00	53.00	63.00	99.00	38.00	256.00
Percent across	1.17	20.70	24.61	38.67	14.84	100.00
Percent down	30.00	30.99	30.73	28.37	14.79	25.81
Percent of total	.30	5.34	6.35	9.98	3.83	25.81
Theoret. freq. Cell χ^2	2.58 .07	44.13 1.78	52.90 1.93	90.06 .89	66.32 12.09	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	10.00	171.00	205.00	349.00	257.00	992.00
Percent across	1.01	17.24	20.67	35.18	25.91	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	1.01	17.24	20.67	35.18	25.91	100.00

$\chi^2 = 31.679$; $df = 8$; Significant negative relationship at .001 level; $p.m.c. = -.144664$.

commentary, combinations of the above including grades and combinations excluding grades.

Table 92
Methods of Reporting Pupil
Progress to Parents

Method	Number	Percentage
Grades (e.g., ABC's, S and U)	50	4.96
Parent-teacher conferences	79	7.83
Item checklists	16	1.59
Written commentary	13	1.29
Combination involving grades	606	60.06
Combination not involving grades	244	24.18
Other	1	.10

The largest number of elementary principals, 656, or 65.02 percent, reported that they utilized grades (e.g., ABC's, S and U) in the process of communicating pupil progress to parents. The remainder, 353, or 34.98 percent, indicated that the majority of teachers in their schools were not involved with the use of report card grades.

Results show that the majority of teachers use more than one method of reporting to parents, with the most widely used methods being parent-teacher conferences and grades. Methods including grades were used by nearly two-thirds of the respondents, while one-third employed methods which did not involve grades.

EXTENT OF PRINCIPAL'S PERSONAL
SATISFACTION WITH OVERALL
PERFORMANCE

Presentation of Data and Findings

Table 93 shows the extent of respondents' satisfaction with their overall performance as elementary principals, taking everything into consideration.

Table 93

Extent of Principal's Personal Satisfaction
With Overall Performance

Level of Satisfaction	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Number	Cumulative Percent
Very satisfied	200	20.00	200	20.00
Somewhat satisfied	388	38.80	588	58.80
Both satisfied and dissatisfied	376	37.60	964	96.40
Somewhat dissatisfied	28	2.80	992	99.20
Very dissatisfied	8	.80	1,000	100.00

Of the reporting elementary principals in this state, 200, or 20 percent, reported feeling very satisfied with their overall performance; 388, or 38.8 percent, felt somewhat satisfied with their performance.

Few principals, only 36 in number, reported being somewhat or very dissatisfied with their overall job performance.

Non-significant relationships were produced when the respondents' school district expenditure level was compared with satisfaction regarding overall performance. From data relating to this aspect of the study and found in Table 94, it is apparent that the measure of professional morale is not related to the amount of money expended by the school system in which the Michigan elementary school principal was employed.

Table 94
 Comparison of School District Expenditure Levels by
 Extent of Principal's Personal Satisfaction
 With Overall Performance

Expenditure Level	Satisfaction With Overall Performance					Total
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Both	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	
<u>High</u>						
Freq.	108.00	176.00	149.00	13.00	2.00	448.00
Percent across	24.11	39.29	33.26	2.90	.45	100.00
Percent down	54.55	46.22	40.27	46.43	25.00	45.53
Percent of total	10.98	17.89	15.14	1.32	.20	45.53
Theoret. freq.	90.15	173.01	168.46	12.75	3.64	
Cell χ^2	3.54	.05	2.25	.00	.74	
<u>Middle</u>						
Freq.	55.00	104.00	113.00	8.00	4.00	284.00
Percent across	19.37	36.62	39.79	2.82	1.41	100.00
Percent down	27.78	27.37	30.54	28.57	50.00	28.86
Percent of total	5.59	10.57	11.48	.81	.41	28.86
Theoret. freq.	57.15	109.67	106.79	8.08	2.31	
Cell χ^2	.08	.29	.36	.00	1.24	
<u>Low</u>						
Freq.	35.00	100.00	108.00	7.00	2.00	252.00
Percent across	13.89	39.68	42.86	2.78	.79	100.00
Percent down	17.68	26.32	29.19	25.00	25.00	25.61
Percent of total	3.56	10.16	10.98	.71	.20	25.61
Theoret. freq.	50.71	97.32	94.76	7.17	2.05	
Cell χ^2	4.87	.07	1.85	.00	.00	
<u>Total</u>						
Freq.	198.00	380.00	370.00	28.00	8.00	984.00
Percent across	20.12	38.62	37.60	2.85	.81	100.00
Percent down	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Percent of total	20.12	38.62	37.60	2.85	.81	100.00

$\chi^2 = 15.351$; $df = 8$; Not Significant; unused = 27.

Chapter 7

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major problem approached in this study was to gather statistical data relative to the prevailing status, thought, and practices of Michigan elementary school principals that could serve as information for various educational groups.

The survey research design and procedural plan utilized by the investigator facilitated the cross tabulation of variables and comparisons with data from recent state and national studies and an earlier Michigan study.

ORGANIZATION OF CONCLUDING CHAPTER

In this concluding chapter the researcher summarizes the major study findings relative to and characteristic of each element of the status of Michigan elementary principals and principalships. These findings are categorized and enumerated according to the five

main headings of the textual chapters. These are: Personal Characteristics; Principal's School and Resources; Experience, Training, and Aspirations; Principal's Welfare and Conditions of Employment; and Administrative/Supervisory Activities and Viewpoints.

The implications of the collected study findings which affected or strengthened the investigator's beliefs are presented. Recommendations and suggestions for further study are offered to benefit persons serving in the principalship and the educational profession as a whole.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

A summary of the major findings pertaining to the personal characteristics of Michigan elementary school principals and principalships follows:

Sex

1. The percentage of men holding full-time principalships was considerably greater than that of women; 77.13 were male, 22.87 were female.

2. A significant increase amounting to 37 percent in the proportion of men to women principals has occurred over the past two decades in Michigan.

3. The data obtained were similar to recent national and a majority of statewide studies.

4. When the relationship between sex and age was examined, only 9 of the 186 principals less than 35 years of age were found to be female.

5. Male principals tended to be proportionately younger than female principals.

Age

1. More than 53 percent of the respondents were within the range of 35-49 years of age; 18 percent were less than age 35; and 29 percent were over 50 years of age.

2. The median age of supervising principals in recent state and national studies has remained fairly constant, and is similar to the finding in this study.

3. It was more likely for the age of supervising principals to be less in lower expenditure districts and for age to increase in the higher expenditure districts (.001).

Racial-Ethnic Composition

1. The vast majority of Michigan principalships are held by members of the white race. Only thirty-seven, or 3.67 percent, indicated minority group membership.

2. The data indicate that 972, or 96 percent, of the 1,009 respondents were Caucasian.

3. Eighteen principals, or 1.78 percent, were black.

4. Three principals indicated Spanish-surnames; two, Oriental; and one, American Indian.

Residential Pattern

1. Fifty-eight percent live within the boundaries of the school district which employs them.

2. A total of 42 percent live outside school district boundaries.

3. When compared with other states, a higher percentage of Michigan principals are commuting from residences outside the communities in which they work.

Birthplace

1. Only 9 percent of Michigan principals were born in the district in which they were employed.

2. One in three were born within fifty miles of their present district.

3. Twenty-seven percent were born elsewhere in Michigan, and 29 percent reported their birthplace as being outside the state.

Marital Status

1. Eighty-five percent of Michigan principals were found to be married.

2. Singleness due to non-marriage was reported at 8 percent, while 3 percent were widowed. The remaining 4 percent were reported as divorced or separated.

3. Close similarities were found to exist between these data and related studies.

Employment of Spouse

1. Sixty-two percent of Michigan principals reported being the sole wage earner in their family. Nearly four in every ten were married to an employed spouse.

2. Compared to the results of a similar state-wide study, this investigator found a higher percentage of Michigan principals reporting two incomes.

Political Preference

1. Of the respondents, 21 percent favored the Democratic party, while 38 percent preferred the Republican party.

2. There are nearly twice as many Republicans as Democrats belonging to the MAESP, but the most common preference of political affiliation was expressed as "independent" (41%).

3. Study findings were quite dissimilar to data reported in other state studies, particularly in respect to the large number of responding independents.

PRINCIPAL'S SCHOOL AND RESOURCES

Number of Schools in District

1. Thirty-seven percent indicated five or less elementary schools in their district; 27 percent reported six to ten; and 11 percent indicated being in districts with thirty-one or more elementary schools.

2. About one in every five principals reported being in a district of 11 to 30 schools.

School District Enrollment

1. A total of 10.8 percent reported serving in large enrollment districts with 25,000 or more pupils.

2. Nearly 61 percent reported employment in middle enrollment districts of 3,000 to 24,999 students.

3. Twenty-nine percent indicated employment in small-enrollment districts of 2,999 or less.

4. The typical Michigan principal was more likely to be serving in districts with smaller enrollments than were principals across the nation.

Character of School District

1. Nearly 54 percent characterized their communities as suburban; 21 percent as urban; and 25 percent as rural.

2. The study findings closely paralleled the 1968 national study data.

3. Urban and rural principals were more likely to be employed in lower-expenditure districts than were suburban principals (.001).

Number of Schools Supervised

1. Seventy-nine percent reported being in charge of only one school.

2. Fifteen percent administered two schools; 4 percent reported supervising three schools; and nearly 2 percent directed four or more schools.

3. One in every five Michigan principals was in charge of more than one separately named school. Principals in charge of two or more schools were found to devote significantly fewer hours to regular and school-related activities than did principals with only a single school assignment.

4. The typical Michigan principal was more likely to be serving as principal of two or more schools than was the national principal.

5. Principals from low-expenditure districts were more likely to have multischool principalships than were principals from high-expenditure districts (.001).

School District Operating Expenditure Levels

1. In order to determine whether differences in dollars expended among Michigan school districts make a difference with respect to the qualitative and quantitative factors that relate to and affect the elementary school principal, the 1970-1971 operating expenditures of Michigan school districts were rank ordered in three classifications. The numbers and percentages reported by the respondents to this study were: (1) \$800 and above per pupil, 451, or 45.33 percent; (2) \$700-799 per pupil, 288, or 28.94 percent; and \$699 and below per pupil, 256, or 25.73 percent.

2. The findings of this study determined that certain relationships existed at the .05 level of significance among Michigan principals when cross tabulating school district operating expenditure levels with selected variables in the study. The major findings pertaining to an analysis of the elementary school principal and principalship by this factor were:

- a. The typical Michigan elementary principal in the lower-expenditure district was found to be more likely to be younger; more likely to be employed in a rural or urban district; and more likely to supervise two or more schools with larger enrollments.

- b. The typical principal from a lower-expenditure school district was found to be more likely to report inadequate library books and learning materials; have less satisfactory office facilities; and receive less service from specialized personnel. He was also found to be less involved in the negotiation of the teacher master contract and less likely to perceive the central office viewing him as a leader.
- c. His school tended to be less individualized than schools in higher-expenditure districts. He was also found to employ corporal punishment with greater frequency than do principals employed in high-expenditure districts.

Grades Administered

1. The most common pattern in operation in Michigan schools was kindergarten through six (62%). K-5 and K-4 patterns were the next most-used patterns, 15.26 percent and 6.14 percent, respectively.

2. Few principals were found to administer grades higher than level six. The earlier Michigan study reported a larger proportion of principals with responsibilities for seventh and eighth grades. The same held true of data in the national study of 1968.

Pupil Enrollment

1. The most common enrollment interval reported by Michigan principals was 400-699.
2. The pattern of student enrollment was found to be generally similar to recent national and statewide studies.
3. Principals in lower-expenditure districts were more likely to have schools with larger enrollments, while principals in high-expenditure districts were more likely to supervise schools with smaller enrollments (.05).

Economic Character of School Neighborhood

1. Eighteen percent indicated their school neighborhood as above average; 49 percent, as average; 25 percent, as below average; and 8 percent, as distinct diversity.
2. When compared to the most recent national study, Michigan principals reported 8 percent fewer advantaged neighborhoods.

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

1. Sixty-nine percent reported supervising schools with a pupil-teacher ratio of from 26-30 students.

2. One in every five principals reported supervising a school in which the ratio was between 21 and 25 pupils, while one in ten have 31 to 35 students per classroom teacher.

3. No relationship was found to exist between expenditure level of school district and pupil-teacher ratio (.05).

Classroom Teacher Positions

1. More than half the principals reported a mode of 15-24 full-time classroom teachers in their schools.

2. One in four Michigan principals supervise a range of teachers amounting to 5-14, while 16 percent have 25-34 full-time teaching positions under their direction.

Percentage of Male Teaching Staff

1. Thirteen percent reported having "zero" male teachers on their staffs.

2. Thirty-five percent had 1-5 percent male staff members; 17 percent reported a percentage of 6-10; while 9 percent had 21-30 percent males.

3. Two-thirds of the principals in this study reported 10 percent or less of their teaching staff as male.

4. A significant relationship was found when comparing sex of principal with percentage of male teachers on a staff. Male principals were found to be more likely to have a greater percentage of male classroom teachers on their staffs than were female principals.

Secretarial Assistance

1. One percent of reporting principals had no secretarial assistance; 3 percent had at least half-time help.

2. Sixty-seven percent had one full-time secretary, while 28 percent had more than one.

3. Proportionately more Michigan principals have secretarial assistance than their counterparts across the nation.

Adequacy of Specialized Personnel

1. A total of 44 percent reported that their school received about the same amount of service as other Michigan schools, while 28 percent replied that they received more service.

2. Three-fourths of the principals reported receiving as much or more service from specialized personnel as other schools in Michigan.

3. It was observed that principals from lower-expenditure districts believed that they received less service from specialized personnel in areas related to curriculum and learning problems. Principals from high-expenditure districts reported that they received more services compared to other Michigan schools (.001).

Condition of 1971-1972
School Budget

1. Forty-one percent reported operating in school districts which were confronted with austerity conditions during the 1971-1972 school year.

2. Fifty-nine percent reported no austerity conditions necessitated by a lack of local community support for proposed millage.

3. Principals from lower-expenditure districts were less likely to have operated under austerity conditions than were principals from higher-expenditure districts (.02).

Adequacy of Library Books and
Instructional Materiel

1. Seventy-three percent indicated that their school had an adequate supply and selection of library books for students.

2. Seventy-nine percent indicated that their schools were adequately supplied with teaching materials and instructional aids.

3. Principals from low-expenditure districts were more likely to report their supply and selection of library books as inadequate (.001).

4. Principals from low-expenditure districts were more likely to report their school's teaching materials and instructional aids as inadequate (.001).

Adequacy of Office Facilities

1. One in every three principals stated that his principal's office facilities were unsatisfactory.

2. Fewer Michigan principals were working in and with inadequate office facilities and equipment than were national principals.

3. Only one-half the respondents reported satisfactory facilities for the principal's office.

4. Principals from low-expenditure districts were found to have proportionately less satisfactory office facilities than did other principals (.01).

Parent Organization Group

1. Forty-eight percent of the principals reported that their school was associated with P.T.A.; 38 percent with p.t.o. Fourteen percent reported that no formal organizational body existed.

2. Forty-nine percent responded that their parent organization group was not an active and dynamic operation whose meetings were reasonably well attended.

EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND ASPIRATIONS

Experience in Education

1. Sixty-one percent revealed 19 years or less in education.

2. The earlier Michigan study reported 79 percent with less than 20 years experience, an indication that more principalships are being held currently by veteran educators.

3. Twenty-four percent indicated 20-29 years experience; 12 percent reported 9 or less years experience; and 12 percent revealed 30-39 years in the profession.

Years as Full-Time Principal

1. Sixty-eight percent reported less than 10 years experience; 27 percent, 20-29 years; and 5 percent, 30 or more years as full-time principal.

2. The estimated median years of experience of the current Michigan principal is somewhat lower than that of the principal on the national scale and in other state studies.

3. A significant relationship existed when comparing sex to the number of years served as principal. It is apparent that male principals have a greater likelihood to have served fewer years as principal than have female principals.

Position Held Just Prior to First Principalship

1. Sixty-one in 100 Michigan principals entered their positions directly from the elementary school classroom.

2. Eleven percent had just previously been secondary classroom teachers.

3. The typical Michigan principal was more likely to have entered the principalship from the elementary classroom and was less likely to have come to the elementary principalship from a secondary-oriented position.

Graduate School Institution

1. Almost 44 percent of all principals reported receiving the major part of their graduate school education from MSU or U of M.

2. A total of seventy-three principals indicated receiving their graduate school education outside of Michigan.

Major Field of Graduate Work

1. Nearly 77 percent reported that their major field of work was specifically oriented toward the elementary school and elementary school principalship.

2. Replies to general school administration occupied 16 percent of the responses.

3. The typical Michigan principal was more likely to have taken graduate work in areas pertaining to the elementary principalship than had the national principal.

Highest College Degree Earned

1. Ninety-six percent reported earning at least a master's degree. Only seven principals reported less than a master's degree.

2. More than 12 percent had completed degree work beyond the master's, including 1.68 percent who had achieved the doctorate.

3. The ranks of the Michigan principalship have within them a considerable number of principals who have graduate school preparation and coursework in areas pertaining to the elementary principalship.

4. The Michigan principal is a more highly trained and educated person than was his 1951-1952 counterpart. The educational level reported in this

study appeared to be higher than the national or other related state studies, except at the doctoral level where a lesser percentage report the terminal degree.

Last Enrollment for College

1. Presently enrolled for college credit courses, 19 percent; less than one year, 18 percent; and one year, 10 percent.

2. Two years since last enrollment, 17 percent; three years, 10 percent; four years, 7 percent; and five years or more, 19 percent.

3. A total of 47 percent reported enrollment within a period of one year or less.

Final Occupational Goal

1. Less than half, or 47 percent, reported that they considered the elementary principalship as their final occupational goal.

2. One in four reported that the elementary principalship was not their terminal occupation, while 28 percent were undecided.

3. Of those who expressed other ambitions, the largest numbers, 33 percent, preferred to become directors of elementary education. The superintendency and central office supervisory positions were selected

by 18 and 15 percent, respectively. One in ten expressed a desire to become an elementary classroom teacher.

4. Compared to other principals across the nation, Michigan principals are less likely to be content with the principalship and to view it as their final occupational goal. Proportionately fewer Michigan principals than national principals expressed ambitions to achieve the superintendency.

Interest in Becoming a Principal Again

1. Of those reporting that they would start over again in the principalship, 46 percent indicated that they certainly would; 34 percent reported that they probably would. Combining these two categories, nearly 80 in 100 responded with a positive degree of satisfaction toward their selection of occupational position. This was a higher percentage than appeared in the 1968 national study of the principalship.

2. Only 8 percent indicated a "certainly not" or "probably not" response, which was similar to results in the 1968 national study.

WELFARE AND CONDITIONS
OF EMPLOYMENT

Length of Annual Employment

1. Michigan principals have proportionately similar contractual arrangements as the national principal.

2. The terms of contracted service were ranked as follows: 42-43 weeks, 38 percent; 44-45 weeks, 21 percent; 40-41 weeks, 19 percent; 48-49 weeks, 9 percent; 46-47 weeks, 7 percent; 39 or less weeks, 4 percent; and 50 or more weeks, 2 percent.

Plan to Continue in Principalship
if Offered Same Salary to
Return to Teaching

1. The removal of financial advantage was shown to affect the desire of 40 percent of Michigan principals to continue in the principalship. In this study four in ten principals stated that they would return to classroom teaching if offered the same salary received as principals.

2. Sixty percent stated that they would continue in the principalship if offered the same salary to become a full-time classroom teacher.

Summer Employment of Principals

1. Only 13 percent reported that they normally worked during the summer months in a field other than education.
2. Fewer Michigan principals have accepted summer employment than is the practice across the nation.

Hours Spent on School Duties

1. Fifty-six percent reported putting in overtime (time beyond normal expectation of 48 hours per week).
2. Close to 36 percent indicated working 1-6 hours overtime; 14 percent reported 7-12 hours overtime; and six persons were working 13-18 hours overtime.
3. Michigan principals are working a similar pattern when compared to the national principalship.
4. Principals in high-expenditure districts were less likely to spend fewer than 42 hours per week on the job and were more likely to spend at least 54 hours per week.

Opportunities for Professional Improvement

1. Fifteen percent indicated that they received no opportunity for administrator inservice. Ten percent

reported no opportunity for visitation to other schools, while 9 percent reported no opportunity for attendance at non-AESP workshops and conferences.

2. Fifty-eight percent replied that all conference and convention expenses were handled by their school systems. Six percent indicated that they were required to handle their own expenses, while 36 percent reported sharing the costs of participation.

District-Wide Responsibilities

1. Thirty in 100 responded that they were assigned district-wide responsibilities in addition to their principalships.

2. Seventy percent reported no district-wide responsibilities.

Method of Filling Principalship Openings

1. A majority of districts, 62 percent, hire principals both from within and without their school systems.

2. Nearly one-third reported that their districts promoted from within ranks only.

Determination of Salary

1. Forty in 100 reported that their salary was determined by an offer from their superintendent or a

schedule, whereas only 13 percent felt that their salary should be determined in this manner.

2. Seventy-four percent reported that their salary should be an amount negotiated by an administrator group.

3. Almost 54 percent reported negotiating for their salaries presently, while 83 percent reported a desire to determine salary through individual or group negotiation.

Principals' Salary Increases Lagging Behind Teacher Increases

1. Fifty-one percent reported that salary increases for principals were lagging behind salary increases for teachers.

2. No significant relationship was determined when comparing the sexes of respondents to their views regarding whether salary increases were lagging behind teacher increases.

Satisfaction with Salary and Working Conditions

1. The distribution of principals' level of satisfaction regarding salary and working conditions was as follows: very satisfied, 27 percent; somewhat

satisfied, 36 percent; both satisfied and dissatisfied, 27 percent; somewhat dissatisfied, 8 percent; and very dissatisfied, 2 percent.

2. More than one-third of those persons serving in Michigan principalships indicated some level of dissatisfaction with salary and working conditions.

Value and Future Direction of MAESP Services and Activities

1. Of those responding, 26 percent stated that MAESP membership was of much value; 60 percent, of some value; and 13 percent of little or no value.

2. Ninety-one percent indicated that the future direction of MAESP services and activities should involve a balance of welfare and leadership development activities.

ADMINISTRATIVE/SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AND VIEWPOINTS

Principals' Role When Teachers Negotiate

1. Forty-eight percent reported sitting with the board team; 32 percent indicated that they served only as advisors to the board team; and 20 percent reported no involvement whatsoever.

2. It was apparent that principals from low-expenditure districts were less involved in the teacher negotiations process than were principals from higher-expenditure districts (.001).

Existence of Personal Performance Objectives and/or Annual Goals

1. Only one-third of Michigan principals reported the existence of personal objectives or annual goals as a district requirement.

2. Study data indicate that the principal serving in a lower-expenditure district was less likely to be required to submit personal objectives or annual goals to the central office than were other principals (.001).

Principals' Evaluation

1. One in five reported that they were not evaluated as to their performance as principals.

2. Forty-three percent replied that they were evaluated, but that no policy existed to guide or govern the process.

Attitude Toward Major Functions

1. Most principals, or 59 percent, are spending a majority of their time organizing and managing their schools.

2. Forty percent reported a desire to spend more time in program development and curriculum. Only 14 percent indicated satisfaction with their present time allotment.

3. These data were similar to data on the national principalship.

Central Office View of Principalship

1. Only 54 percent felt that their central office viewed them as heads of their schools, with considerable independent authority.

2. Many principals, 42 percent, felt that they were assigned primarily to carry out central office policies and plans, with some encouragement to plan. Only 4 percent reported that they were neither encouraged nor authorized to proceed independently.

3. Michigan principals were less likely to feel that they were viewed by the central office as complete leaders in their buildings than were their counterparts across the nation.

4. A comparison of the variables of expenditure level and the principals' perception of the central office view of the elementary principalship revealed that the principal in the lower-expenditure district was more likely to be viewed as a follower (.05).

Extent Staff Has Individualized Instructional Program of School

1. Thirty percent reported that considerable individualization has taken place in their schools.

2. Fifty-nine percent indicated that their teachers had individualized somewhat, while 11 percent reported that little or no individualization had taken place.

3. Principals from low-expenditure districts viewed their staffs to be less highly individualized than did principals from high-expenditure districts (.001).

Most Important Improvement

The areas most often selected in which the most important improvement had taken place within the past five years were as follows: curriculum and program development, 27 percent; methodological approaches, 25 percent; new instructional materials and facilities, 18 percent; and organizational change, 14 percent.

Extent Corporal Punishment Used

1. Of all reporting principals, 1.09 percent indicated using spanking often; 17 percent, occasionally; and 21 percent, seldom.

2. The highest percentage, 35 percent, reported using corporal punishment rarely, while 26 percent indicated that they never used it.

3. It was noted that male principals indicated a greater incidence of employing spanking than did female principals.

4. Principals in lower-expenditure districts tended to employ corporal punishment more frequently than did principals from high-expenditure districts (.001).

Use of Grades in Reporting Pupil Progress

1. Sixty-five percent replied that grades were used in the process of reporting pupil progress to parents.

2. Thirty-five percent indicated that the majority of teachers in their schools were not involved with the use of report-card grades.

Satisfaction with Overall Performance

1. Twenty percent reported feeling very satisfied with their overall performance; 38 percent felt somewhat satisfied; 37 percent indicated both satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

2. Only thirty-six Michigan principals reported feeling somewhat or very dissatisfied with their overall performance as elementary school principals.

3. Satisfaction regarding overall performance was not found to be related to the amount of money expended by the school system in which the principal was employed (.05).

STUDY IMPLICATIONS

Implications were derived from relating the investigator's opinions and beliefs to the major study findings. These implications were as follows:

1. The Michigan elementary school principalship is definitely a male principalship. A comparison of national studies and an earlier Michigan study with present data clearly indicates that the proportion of women principals has decreased over the past two decades. It is speculated that the large number of male principals is directly attributable to the increase in social and economic status which renders the principalship more attractive to men. This investigator believes that Michigan school children need a reasonable number of both sexes in the principalship for a balanced feminine and masculine influence.

Recent changes in the social milieu are expected to have an appreciable effect upon the numbers of women who are mixing principalship careers with personal family responsibilities.

2. The Michigan elementary school principalship is definitely a white principalship. Because the Michigan elementary school principalship needs individuals of all racial and ethnic groups within its ranks, the extremes identified give credence to the call for increased numbers of minority group members in principalships as inspirations and examples of persons holding leadership positions.

3. Due to the fact so many principals reside outside the boundaries of the school districts which employ them, it would appear that most Michigan principals are not required by school-board edicts to reside within school-district boundaries. Although data are unavailable as to why such a higher percentage of Michigan principals are commuting from residences outside the communities in which they work, it is speculated that Michigan's well-developed system of rapid transit highways and the development of suburban areas may have facilitated principals' employment in school systems outside their residential area.

4. Principals have reportedly become involved in the administration of more than one school for reasons

of economy, for lack of qualified personnel, and for the purpose of spreading an effective administrator to more than one building. Whatever the reason, the difference between simply administering a school and providing sound, full-time instructional and supervisory leadership must be kept clearly in mind when multischool principalships are contemplated.

5. This study has demonstrated that our prevailing system of paying for public schools in Michigan denies the guarantees of equal educational opportunity by producing educational situations including programs, facilities, and personnel which vary with the relative wealth of the school districts' residents. School revenue are primarily a function of the value of the property of a school district, coupled with the willingness of the district's residents to tax themselves for education. As a practical matter, principals in school districts with small tax bases find that taxes cannot be levied at a rate sufficient to produce the educational dollars that more affluent districts reap with minimal tax efforts.

More than 40 percent of Michigan principals reported serving in districts in which austerity budget conditions were necessitated by a lack of local community support for proposed millage. Principals serving in these districts are torn between the challenges of high ideals

and the eroding forces of nagging realities caused by a lack of wherewithal to do the job. If the quest for quality and equality in public schools is to have meaning, it is essential that something drastic be done to produce greater financial parity between Michigan school systems. The needs of schools must be forcefully called to the attention of the public, the courts, the legislature, and others who can influence and change the educational financing methods in Michigan.

6. The problem of class size perplexes principals and other persons concerned with cost-quality relationships in instruction. While no precise ideal class size can be established, it is apparent that as larger numbers of children are assigned to a teacher, the possibility of meeting individual needs decreases.

It is speculated that the lack of pupil-teacher ratio differences among school districts grouped according to expenditure levels could be attributed to any of a number of factors, including: the tendency of the collective bargaining process in Michigan to have standardized classroom "overload"; the employment of proportionately larger numbers of para-professional personnel in higher-expenditure districts; or the possibility that high-expenditure districts are spending more of their dollars in areas other than producing low pupil-teacher ratios, including higher salaries and instructional materials.

7. Study figures tend to indicate that, contrary to popular opinion, male principals do hire male teachers and that they may not be fearful of having their position of leadership threatened by other males on their staffs. On the other hand, the figures may indicate that there may be more fact than fancy to the often-heard quip that male teachers do not want to work under the direction of female principals. Whatever the reason, individual potential and competency, not sex, should be the determinants for selecting teachers.

8. To operate any modern elementary school program effectively, adequate personnel, facilities, and equipment are essential. Traditionally, the burden of routine clerical tasks has intruded heavily upon the truly instructional and administrative aspects of the principalship. Michigan school districts have apparently realized this as the trend over the past two decades has been for Michigan principals to increasingly receive secretarial assistance.

Whenever office arrangements and office equipment are inadequate, they adversely affect the elementary principal's time, making him more a clerical aide than a director of instruction. In the replies to the Michigan study, nearly one-third were to the effect that the principal had an office that was perceived to

be unsatisfactory, a figure too high for such an important factor to the operation of these schools.

The growing complexity of the educational operation has increased the need for the principal having various specialized personnel available to serve the staff and students of the school. Such specialized personnel help provide for the enrichment and coordination of learning experiences essential to the superior educational program. When resource personnel are not available in sufficient numbers to meet adequately the needs in a school building, an increased burden is placed on that principal and his staff.

The availability of federal government aid, under the aegis of the various title programs, might best explain the large number of respondents reporting that teaching materiel was adequate.

9. Due to the fact that 14 percent reported that an organized P.T.A. or p.t.o. did not exist in their schools, and half of the respondents revealed that their parent-teacher organization was something less than an active and dynamic operation whose meetings have been reasonably well attended, it would appear that parent organizations present a problem of some magnitude to many Michigan principals. These figures tend to indicate that greater attention to providing leadership

and careful planning are needed to create more active and productive parent-teacher organizations in Michigan schools.

10. Although the years of experience of the typical Michigan school principal has not changed significantly over the past twenty years, his educational background has. It is apparent that Michigan principals recognize the value of adequate professional preparation for the principalship. Although the educational standards have been raised considerably for principals in Michigan, relatively few principals appear to be attaining the doctorate. This situation might be due to the fact that either the attainment of the degree is a stepping stone to another position, or the hurdles in the path of doctoral-degree attainment are considerably higher than can be generally overcome.

The profession has additional cause to congratulate itself on the raising of educational standards over the past two decades. Few principals are being appointed from the ranks of secondary-school teaching or administrative positions. The elementary classroom represents the best path leading to the elementary principalship in Michigan schools.

11. Agreements reached in negotiations must be administratively viable at the building level. Participating in the process of developing contracts,

either individually or through a representative, is one way to preclude being caught in the middle of conflicts between the public and employees guaranteed one-sided working conditions.

Many Michigan principals desire to have a larger voice in decision-making and the use of their own ideas concerning the operation of the schools which they administer. Michigan school boards and central office administrators should take cognizance of this desire and take steps to facilitate a greater degree of meaningful participation by elementary principals on management teams.

12. Many Michigan principals are not in agreement with the manner in which their salaries are presently determined. Many principals appended comments to the question which requested their opinion as to how their salary was presently determined. Typical responses were: "That's a good question!"; "Who knows!"; "I don't know"; "It's a big mystery how the superintendent comes up with the amount!" Should such concern be representative of a general dissatisfaction on the part of many principals over methods of salary determination, further study and investigation would appear to be needed.

It appears that many more principals are desirous of becoming involved in the process of administrator group negotiation than are presently involved. Such a

differential between the way in which many principals' salaries are determined and how principals believe salaries should be determined can be expected to create the need for MAESP consultant services as more and more Michigan elementary principals become members of collective bargaining groups.

It is apparent to many elementary principals that their economic status has suffered due to the demands by other negotiating groups, but it is doubtful that such a trend will continue as more and more principals seek and secure administrator bargaining agreements.

13. It is very apparent that MAESP members believe that the future direction of Association services and activities should involve a balance of welfare and leadership inservice activities. Through their state organization, Michigan principals have the opportunity to speak with a collective voice on matters pertinent to the advancement of the principalship. Improvement of both elementary education and the status of the principalship necessitates the cooperative efforts of principals throughout the state of Michigan. As a group and as individuals there is an urgent responsibility to work toward the elimination of conditions which deter some elementary administrators from doing the job that they may want to do and should do. This study has offered

evidence that many principals need and deserve improvements and recompense for professionalism, time, and service.

14. Although career morale within the Michigan elementary principalship appears to be relatively high, with eight in every ten positively disposed toward selecting the position if starting a career again, a significant number of Michigan principals appear to be attracted to their positions by the financial advantages which are offered. A considerable number reported they would return to teaching if offered the same salary. The investigator ponders the devotion to duty of persons performing in job roles sought mainly due to financial advantages. The majority of Michigan elementary school administrators did, however, indicate they were satisfied with their overall performance as principals.

15. The best in educational facilities, materials, programs, and organizational plans are important, but should not be the first consideration of a school. Instead, it is whether the staff has effectively utilized these elements to individualize and tailor the instructional program to the needs of every child. With the exception of the high-expenditure districts, most Michigan school districts do not appear to have extensive individualized learning programs that are tailored to the needs of children in their schools.

16. Thoughtful educators realize that professional proficiency is not gained solely from pre-service preparation. It is highly important that persons in principalships be provided with opportunities for growth on their jobs. Therefore, one of the more valid earmarks of a progressive school system is the continuing provision for administrators to engage in professional activities which encourage self-improvement. The investigator feels it is somewhat unreasonable to expect a high level of conference attendance by principals who are not encouraged or who must cover their own professional expenses. It is known that just slightly more than half the membership of MAESP attends the Annual Conference of the Association in any one year.

17. The Michigan principalship is a position which involves considerable time beyond a 48-hour work week. A large number of elementary principals reported responsibilities which extended district wide and beyond the confines of their individual buildings. The investigator believes that regardless of the nature of the job, time can be conserved and better deployed when principals become involved with efforts to undertake long-range planning. Planning is really a time-saving, an effort-saving, and a money-saving activity. Setting annual objectives allows principals to select widely from many programs of action, and lessens the need to push the

panic button and to operate by expediency. One respondent commented on this area, saying "there never seems to be time for everything that needs doing. Every decision must be ready like 'yesterday!'"

STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

The investigator's recommendations and suggestions for adjunctive research pertinent to Michigan elementary school principals and principalships were as follows:

1. That in view of evidence which indicates a decreasing trend of employing women in the position of elementary principal, a study be made to determine what factors are necessary to influence a trend of employing more women for Michigan elementary principalship positions.
2. That a study be undertaken to determine the course of action needed to facilitate the training and employment of elementary principals who are members of minority groups.
3. That a study be undertaken to determine the extent and wisdom of board of education policies which restrict the residency of elementary principals within school district boundaries.
4. That every effort be made by school boards and superintendents to place each elementary school in the state under the direction of a qualified, full-time supervising elementary principal.

5. That an intensive research study be undertaken to investigate all aspects of the multischool principalship.

6. That persons in positions of influence and decision making move to eliminate the inequity among K-12 Michigan school districts in the financing of public education, thereby providing each child attending Michigan schools with a more equal opportunity for quality education.

7. That Michigan school boards and superintendents make every effort to strive for and maintain low pupil-teacher ratios by employing adequate numbers of competent professional personnel.

8. That an in-depth study be made to determine why male principals are more likely to have a greater percentage of male classroom teachers on their staffs than are female principals.

9. That an adequate staff of general and specialized personnel should be available in all Michigan schools to render consultant services and assistance with group and individual problems of instruction.

10. That a detailed study be undertaken to determine specific factors responsible for proportionately

more austerity budget conditions occurring in high-expenditure districts than in lower-expenditure districts.

11. That MAESP initiate plans to conduct inservice programs at state conventions and regional meetings in order to improve principals' effectiveness in providing leadership to parent-teacher organization groups.

12. That a study be undertaken to discover why so few Michigan elementary school principals are completing doctoral programs. And to ascertain what hurdles, if any, are blocking the path of principals in this state toward doctoral degree attainment.

13. That consideration be given in future studies to investigating the professional commitment and performance of those persons serving in the principalship due to financial determinants.

14. That central office administrators and boards of education should provide the encouragement, opportunities, and funding needed to enable elementary principals to participate in professional improvement opportunities.

15. That an investigation be made of the desirability and effect of district-wide responsibilities on the morale and performance of elementary school principals.

16. That MAESP Board of Directors take cognizance of the projected need to employ field-service consultants to handle the rising concerns and interests of principals regarding welfare and conditions of employment.

17. That a study be undertaken to determine specifically why some Michigan principals are dissatisfied with conditions of their employment and, in addition, to ascertain how these dissatisfactions might be remedied.

18. That many more superintendents and boards of education of Michigan school districts provide opportunities for principals, either individually or collectively, to become involved in the teacher negotiation process.

19. That central office administrative personnel provide the encouragement and, if needed, the inservice training that will enable elementary principals to formulate personal performance objectives and/or annual goals.

20. That many Michigan principals should exercise more leadership in assisting teachers to establish individualized learning programs that are tailored to the needs of each child.

21. That additional study be made to determine whether the variations in the incidence of employing corporal punishment expressed by principals in this study is supported by variations in behavior on the part of their general student bodies.

22. That Michigan school districts which are presently utilizing grades to report elementary pupil progress should move to discontinue this invidious practice.

23. That MAESP leadership continue to involve the membership of the organization in a balance of inservice and welfare programs and activities.

24. That elementary school principals who do not hold memberships in their local, state, and national principals' associations give serious consideration to their professional obligation of joining, supporting, and participating in the activities and programs of these organizations.

25. That MAESP Board of Directors actively seek dialogue with leader members of the Detroit Public Schools principals' group in an attempt to determine areas of mutual benefit and collective concern.

26. That periodic studies of the Michigan elementary school principalship be undertaken every decade which would correspond to the national survey and would provide meaningful data for elementary principals to ascertain their prevailing status, thought, and practices and to establish trends. In addition, MAESP should commission annual studies of adjunctive research pertinent to the elementary principalship.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The problem of this study was to identify a statistical portrayal of the status of the elementary school principalship in Michigan that could serve as information for various educational groups. The study problem has been investigated and the data analyzed. Of concern now is that decisions made in the light of these findings be directed toward the goal of improving and equalizing the quality of education within all of the schools in the state of Michigan. Hopefully, Michigan elementary school principals, university faculty members who are charged with professional preparation of principals, boards of education members, superintendents and central office personnel, and others who are concerned with the improvement of the elementary principalship will take the responsibility, individually and collectively, for bringing about this goal.

REFERENCES CITED

REFERENCES CITED

1. Arms, Walter E. "The Elementary School Principalship in Indiana." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.
2. Andlauer, Herbert R. "The Elementary School Principal in New Jersey, A Comparative Study." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Rutgers University, 1969.
3. Brothers, John E. "The Elementary School Principalship in Oklahoma." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969.
4. Gill, Donald, and Merigis, Harry. "A Study of the Status and Functions of the Elementary School Principalship in Illinois." Charleston, Illinois: Eastern Illinois University, 1967.
5. Lepick, John A., Jr. "Personal and Professional Characteristics of Elementary School Principals." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Southern California, 1961.
6. Jarvis, O. T., Parker, C. A., and Moore, A. A., Jr. "Status Survey of the Elementary School Principalship in Georgia, 1969." Georgia Department of Elementary School Principals, GEA, and Bureau of Education and Field Studies, University of Georgia, 1970.
7. Modeland, Lemuel O. "The Status of the Elementary School Principalship in Kansas, 1966-1967." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.
8. Moss, Robert H. "A Comparative Study of the Job-Status of the Elementary School Principals in Wyoming and Selected Other States." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1966.

9. Perkins, Lawrence H. "The Status of the Elementary School Principal in Oregon." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Oregon, 1965.
10. Shelton, Aubrey W. "The Arkansas Elementary School Principalship of 1963." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1964.
11. Stoker, W. M., and Rascoe, John. "The Elementary School Principalship in Texas." Canyon, Texas: West Texas State University, 1966.
12. Warren, Harold L. "Characteristics and Selected Educational Views of Missouri's Public Elementary School Principals of 1967." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, St. Louis University, 1968.
13. Youngblood, Chester E. "A Study of the Elementary School Principalship in Texas." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, North Texas State College, 1961.
14. Department of Elementary School Principals, MEA. "Eleven Hundred Principals of Michigan Examine Their Status in 1951-1952." The Study Commission of the MDESP, 1952.
15. Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. The Elementary School Principalship--Today and Tomorrow. Twenty-Seventh Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1948.
16. _____. The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study. Thirty-Seventh Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1958.
17. _____. The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1968.

APPENDICES



Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals

Affiliated with the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations

POST OFFICE BOX 1455 • EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN 48823 • PHONE 517 353-8770

A STUDY OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN MICHIGAN

November 12, 1971

DEAR MICHIGAN ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL:

Your cooperation is needed to carry out an MAESP-sponsored research study to determine the present status, viewpoints, and practices of Michigan elementary school principals.

The survey data being collected are expected to have direct benefits for you and your profession. Published results will become a formidable weapon in MAESP's arsenal for upgrading the status and welfare of its membership. When presented to boards of education and superintendents, it may offer evidence that principals need and deserve help to improve their performance and conditions of employment.

The DEADLINE for insuring that your response will be included in the study data is DECEMBER 1st. Although you will find the questionnaire quite comprehensive, all questions can be answered with a single checkmark.

Note that you are not to sign your name and that the survey is not coded in any way which will permit identification. This, we hope, will encourage forthright answers. In order to provide this anonymity, yet enable us to follow up with reminder notices to non-respondents, we have enclosed a stamped postcard to identify ineligibles and principals who have completed and mailed the form. Follow-up reminders are costly but necessary to this study because every individual response is really important to assure the necessary validity and accuracy in our results.

Postage and a mailing label are also enclosed for your convenience in returning the survey to MAESP State Office. Please set aside a 15-20 minute period of time in your busy schedule to complete and return the postcard and questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation.

James M. Jennings

James M. Jennings
Study Researcher

R. L. Featherstone

Dr. R. L. Featherstone
Directing Professor, MSU

Edward P. Keller

Edward P. Keller
Exec. Sec., MAESP

THE STATUS OF THE MICHIGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP

A STUDY OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

1971 - 1972

ELIGIBILITY FOR STUDY

To be eligible for the study, the respondent should meet the following criteria:

1. You should be a full-time principal with no regularly required teaching assignment.
2. Your principalship may include any combination including grades K-6 (e.g., K-8, K-3, 4-6, 5-8).

If your answer is NO to these conditions, your survey is not necessary to this study. Please sign and return the postcard withholding any completion reminder notices.

If your answer is YES to both these conditions, please complete the questionnaire and mail it to MAESP State Office. You are then requested to sign and return the postcard indicating study completion.

STUDY DIRECTIONS FOR THE FULL-TIME ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL:

Please check ALL items in the survey as they apply to you in your present situation and past experiences. All questions can be answered with a single checkmark within a 15-20 minute period.

Upon completion, attach the enclosed stamp and address label to the envelope in which you received the survey and mail before DECEMBER 1st. You are also requested to return the postcard in order that we can withhold any completion reminder notices.

I. PERSONAL INFORMATION

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Please indicate your SEX: | Male (1) _____ | -01 |
| | Female (2) _____ | |
| 2. What is your AGE? (nearest birthday) | Less than 35 (1) _____ | -02 |
| | 35-49 years (2) _____ | |
| | 50-64 years (3) _____ | |
| | 65 or older (4) _____ | |
| 3. Please indicate your RACIAL-ETHNIC group: | Afro-American (1) _____ | -03 |
| | American Indian (2) _____ | |
| | Oriental American (3) _____ | |
| | Spanish-surnamed American (4) _____ | |
| | Caucasian (5) _____ | |
| | All others (6) _____ | |

4. Do you LIVE WITHIN the boundaries of the school district which employs you? YES (1) _____ -04
NO (2) _____
5. Please indicate your BIRTHPLACE:
In district where presently employed (1) _____ -05
In Michigan, within 50 miles of present district (2) _____
Elsewhere in Michigan (3) _____
Outside of Michigan (4) _____
6. What is your current MARITAL STATUS? Single (1) _____ -06
Married (2) _____
Divorced (3) _____
Separated (4) _____
Widowed (5) _____
7. Are you the sole WAGE EARNER in your family? YES (1) _____ -07
NO (2) _____
8. What is your POLITICAL PREFERENCE? Democrat (1) _____ -08
Republican (2) _____
independent (3) _____
Specify _____ Other (4) _____

II. YOUR SCHOOL AND ITS RESOURCES

1. How many elementary schools are there in your SCHOOL DISTRICT? 1 - 5 (1) _____ -09
6 - 10 (2) _____
11 - 15 (3) _____
16 - 20 (4) _____
21 - 25 (5) _____
26 - 30 (6) _____
31 or more (7) _____
2. What is your school system ENROLLMENT? 100 to 2999 (1) _____ -10
3000 to 24999 (2) _____
25000 or more (3) _____
3. How would you characterize the COMMUNITY of your total school district? Suburban (1) _____ -11
Urban (2) _____
Rural (3) _____
4. What was your school district's 1970-71 OPERATING EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL? \$800 & above (1) _____ -12
per pupil
\$700 - \$799 (2) _____
per pupil
\$600 - \$699 (3) _____
per pupil
\$599 & below (4) _____
per pupil
- (Please consider carefully as this item is of critical importance to this study. You can request the information from your business office or leave the item for MAESP to check by providing us with the following:)

SCHOOL DISTRICT _____ COUNTY _____
(write in) (write in)

5. How many SEPARATELY NAMED SCHOOLS are under your direction? One (1) _____ -11
Two (2) _____
Three (3) _____
Four or more (4) _____
6. Please indicate what GRADES ARE TAUGHT under your direction: Grades K-6 (1) _____ -14
Pre-K-6 (2) _____
K-5 (3) _____
K-8 (4) _____
4-6 (5) _____
K-3 (6) _____
Specify _____ Other (7) _____
7. Please indicate the total PUPIL ENROLLMENT of the school(s) under your direction: Below 100 (1) _____ -15
100 - 399 (2) _____
400 - 699 (3) _____
700 - 999 (4) _____
1000 or more (5) _____
8. How would you characterize the NEIGHBORHOOD your school serves? (indicate its primary economic character) Above average (1) _____ -16
Average (2) _____
Below average (3) _____
Distinct diversity (4) _____
9. What is the average number of STUDENTS PER CLASSROOM TEACHER in your school(s)? 15 or fewer (1) _____ -17
16 - 20 (2) _____
21 - 25 (3) _____
26 - 30 (4) _____
31 - 35 (5) _____
36 - 40 (6) _____
41 or above (7) _____
10. How many FULL-TIME classroom teacher POSITIONS are under your direction? Below 5 (1) _____ -18
5 - 14 (2) _____
15 - 24 (3) _____
25 - 34 (4) _____
35 - 44 (5) _____
45 - 54 (6) _____
55 & above (7) _____
11. What PERCENTAGE of your classroom teaching staff is MALE? Zero (1) _____ -19
1 - 5% (2) _____
6 - 10% (3) _____
11 - 20% (4) _____
21 - 30% (5) _____
31 - 40% (6) _____
41 - 50% (7) _____
51% & above (8) _____
12. How much SECRETARIAL HELP is available to you on a regular basis? None (1) _____ -20
One-half position (2) _____
One position (3) _____
One and one-half positions (4) _____
Two positions (5) _____
More than two positions (6) _____

13. Does your school have an ADEQUATE supply and selection of LIBRARY BOOKS for students? YES (1) _____ -21
NO (2) _____
14. Do your teachers have available ADEQUATE TEACHING MATERIALS and INSTRUCTIONAL AIDS? YES (1) _____ -22
NO (2) _____
15. Which ONE item best describes your OFFICE FACILITIES:
- Exceptionally good (1) _____ -23
Satisfactory in space and equipment (2) _____
Have enough space but need office equipment (3) _____
Have enough equipment but need space (4) _____
Just room for a desk; not much else (5) _____
Have no real office for principal at present time (6) _____
16. Do you feel your school RECEIVES as much SERVICE from SPECIALIZED PERSONNEL in areas related to curriculum and learning problems as other Michigan schools? (e.g., reading specialist, social worker, music teacher, testing specialist, science consultant, psychologist) Much more (1) _____ -24
More (2) _____
About the same (3) _____
Less (4) _____
Much less (5) _____
17. Did your district operate during the 1971-72 school year under an AUSTERITY BUDGET necessitated by a lack of local community support for proposed millage? YES (1) _____ -25
NO (2) _____
18. What type of PARENT ORGANIZATION GROUP presently serves your school?
P.T.A. (associated with Michigan & National Congress) (1) _____ -26
p.t.o. (independent organization; includes councils) (2) _____
No formalized organizational body exists (3) _____
19. Is your parent-teacher group an active and dynamic operation whose meetings have been reasonably well-attended during the past twelve months? YES (1) _____ -27
NO (2) _____

III. EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND ASPIRATIONS

1. Indicate your TOTAL NUMBER YEARS of EXPERIENCE in education: (include current year) Less than 10 (1) _____ -28
10 - 19 years (2) _____
20 - 29 years (3) _____
30 - 39 years (4) _____
40 or more (5) _____
2. How many YEARS have you served as a full-time elementary principal? (include current year) 1 - 3 years (1) _____ -29
4 - 9 years (2) _____
10 - 19 years (3) _____
20 - 29 years (4) _____
30 - 39 years (5) _____
40 or more (6) _____
None; I'm part-time (7) _____

3. What position did you hold just prior to your FIRST elementary school principalship? -30
- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| Classroom teacher (elementary) | (1) | |
| Classroom teacher (secondary) | (2) | |
| Assistant principal (elemen.) | (3) | |
| Assistant principal (second.) | (4) | |
| Secondary principal | (5) | |
| Central office specialist | (6) | |
| Member of college faculty | (7) | |
| Graduate student in college | (8) | |
| Other (write in) _____ | (9) | |
4. Please indicate where you received the major part of your GRADUATE SCHOOL EDUCATION: -31
- | | | |
|------------------|-----|--|
| CMU | (1) | |
| EMU | (2) | |
| MSU | (3) | |
| NMU | (4) | |
| UD | (5) | |
| UM | (6) | |
| WMU | (7) | |
| WSU | (8) | |
| Outside Michigan | (9) | |
5. Indicate the area that best describes your MAJOR FIELD of graduate work: -32
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|--|
| Elementary-school administration | (1) | |
| Elementary-school instruction | (2) | |
| Elem. supervision & curriculum | (3) | |
| Secondary-school administration | (4) | |
| General school administration | (5) | |
| An academic subject | (6) | |
| No graduate work or specialization | (7) | |
6. What is the highest COLLEGE DEGREE you have earned? -33
- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| Less than Bachelor's degree | (1) | |
| Bachelor's degree | (2) | |
| Master's degree | (3) | |
| Specialist's Sixth Year degree | (4) | |
| Doctoral degree | (5) | |
7. How long since you were LAST ENROLLED for credit courses at a college or university? -34
- | | | |
|--------------------|-----|--|
| Presently enrolled | (1) | |
| Less than 1 year | (2) | |
| 1 year | (3) | |
| 2 years | (4) | |
| 3 years | (5) | |
| 4 years | (6) | |
| 5 or more years | (7) | |
8. Do you consider the elementary school principalship as your FINAL OCCUPATIONAL GOAL? -35
- | | | |
|-----------|-----|--|
| YES | (1) | |
| NO | (2) | |
| Undecided | (3) | |
- If your answer to the question above is "NO", to what position do you ASPIRE? -36
- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|--|
| Classroom teacher (elementary) | (1) | |
| Classroom teacher (secondary) | (2) | |
| Secondary principalship | (3) | |
| Supervisor (central office) | (4) | |
| Director of elem. education | (5) | |
| Superintendent of schools | (6) | |
| Position outside education | (7) | |
| Other (write in) _____ | (8) | |

9. Suppose you were starting over again, would you BECOME an elementary principal? Certainly would (1) _____
Probably would (2) _____
About even for & against (3) _____
Probably not (4) _____
Certainly not (5) _____ -37
10. If you were offered the SAME SALARY to become a full-time CLASSROOM TEACHER as you presently earn as an administrator, would you continue in the elementary school principalship?
YES, I would continue as principal (1) _____
NO, I would return to teaching (2) _____ -38

IV. WELFARE & WORK CONDITIONS

1. What is the LENGTH of your current EMPLOYMENT? (include any summer school duties; exclude vacation weeks) 39 weeks or less (1) _____
40 - 41 (2) _____
42 - 43 (3) _____
44 - 45 (4) _____
46 - 47 (5) _____
48 - 49 (6) _____
50 or more (7) _____ -39
2. Do you normally work during the SUMMER MONTHS in a field OTHER than education? (consider only years served as principal) YES (1) _____
NO (2) _____ -40
3. On the average, how many HOURS PER WEEK do you spend at school on regular duties and school-related activities? (include lunch periods, and any evening and/or weekend service) Less than 36 (1) _____
36 - 41 (2) _____
42 - 47 (3) _____
48 - 53 (4) _____
54 - 59 (5) _____
60 - 65 (6) _____
66 - 71 (7) _____
72 or more (8) _____ -41
4. To what extent do you receive opportunities and encouragement to participate in PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT activities:

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>MUCH OPPORTUNITY</u>	<u>SOME OPPORTUNITY</u>	<u>NO OPPORTUNITY</u>	
Inservice for administrators	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	-42
Visitation to other schools	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	-43
MAESP/NAESP association meetings & conventions	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	-44
Attendance at non-AESP workshops & conferences	(1) _____	(2) _____	(3) _____	-45
If you have indicated conference and convention participation in the questions above, indicate how your EXPENSES were handled:		100% Self	(1) _____	-46
		100% District	(2) _____	
		Comb. of 1 & 2	(3) _____	

5. Do you have any DISTRICT-WIDE administrative responsibilities in addition to your principalship? (e.g., transportation, cafeteria) YES (1) _____ -47
NO (2) _____
6. Please indicate how your district generally fills principalship OPENINGS: Promotes from within ranks (1) _____ -48
Hires outside applicants (2) _____
Combination of 1 & 2 above (3) _____
7. Please indicate HOW your principalship SALARY IS DETERMINED:
By individual negotiation (1) _____ -49
By administrator group negotiation (2) _____
By superintendent's offer or schedule (3) _____
Other (write in) _____ (4) _____
8. What is your opinion about HOW salary SHOULD BE DETERMINED:
By individual negotiation (1) _____ -50
By administrator group negotiation (2) _____
By superintendent's offer or schedule (3) _____
Other (write in) _____ (4) _____
9. Do you feel salary increases for PRINCIPALS are lagging behind salary increases for TEACHERS in your district? YES (1) _____ -51
NO (2) _____
10. Taking everything into consideration, are you presently SATISFIED with your SALARY AND WORKING CONDITIONS? Very satisfied (1) _____ -52
Somewhat satisfied (2) _____
Both satis. & dissat. (3) _____
Somewhat dissatisfied (4) _____
Very dissatisfied (5) _____
11. What should be the FUTURE direction of MAESP services & activities?
Professional welfare services only (1) _____ -53
Leadership inservice activities only (2) _____
Balanced welfare & leadership activity (3) _____
12. What is your opinion concerning the benefits of MAESP membership to the principalship? Of much value (1) _____ -54
Of some value (2) _____
Of little value (3) _____
Of no value (4) _____

V. ADMINISTRATIVE/SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES & VIEWPOINTS

1. What is the principal's ROLE in your school system when TEACHERS NEGOTIATE with the board of education?
A representative of the principals sits on the board negotiating team (1) _____ -55
Principals serve only as advisors to the board negotiating team (2) _____
Principals are not involved in the teacher negotiation process (3) _____
Other (write in) _____ (4) _____

2. Are principals in your district required to submit personal PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES and/or GOALS for the year ahead to the central office administration? YES (1) _____ -56
NO (2) _____

3. How are principals in your school district EVALUATED?
According to formal policy developed WITHOUT principal involvement (1) _____ -57
According to formal policy developed WITH principal involvement (2) _____
No policy exists, but we're evaluated (3) _____
We are not evaluated (4) _____
Other (write in) _____ (5) _____

4. In what ONE AREA do you find your most personally REWARDING DUTIES as an elementary principal:
Organization and management of the school (1) _____ -58
Periodic classroom teaching (2) _____
Working with the teaching staff (3) _____
Pupil adjustment and guidance (4) _____
Program development and curriculum (5) _____
Public relations: building understanding (6) _____

5. In what ONE AREA do you SPEND the greatest amount of TIME:
Organization and management of the school (1) _____ -59
Periodic classroom teaching (2) _____
Working with the teaching staff (3) _____
Pupil adjustment and guidance (4) _____
Program development and curriculum (5) _____
Public relations: building understanding (6) _____

6. In what ONE AREA would you MOST LIKE TO SPEND MORE TIME:
Am satisfied with my present time allotment (1) _____ -60
Organization and management of the school (2) _____
Periodic classroom teaching (3) _____
Working with the teaching staff (4) _____
Pupil adjustment and guidance (5) _____
Program development and curriculum (6) _____
Public relations: building understanding (7) _____

7. In your school system, what is your perception of the CENTRAL OFFICE VIEW of the elementary principalship?
a. The elementary principal is recognized publicly as the head of his school with considerable authority to plan, organize, and administer his school's educational program. (1) _____ -61
b. The principal is viewed as the administrative head of the school, assigned primarily to carry out the policies and plans of the central office. He is given some encouragement to plan for his own building. (2) _____
c. The principal is neither encouraged nor authorized to proceed independently to alter his own school's program in any significant manner. (3) _____

8. Please indicate the extent to which your teachers have INDIVIDUALIZED and tailored the instructional program to the needs of each child in your school:
- | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-------|-----|
| Considerable | (1) | _____ | -62 |
| Somewhat | (2) | _____ | |
| Little | (3) | _____ | |
| None | (4) | _____ | |
9. Please indicate the one most SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT that has taken place in your school within the past FIVE years:
- | | | | |
|---|-----|-------|-----|
| Curriculum and program development | (1) | _____ | -63 |
| Organizational change (e.g., team teaching) | (2) | _____ | |
| New instructional materials & facilities | (3) | _____ | |
| Methodological approaches (e.g., individualizing) | (4) | _____ | |
| Professionalization of teaching staff | (5) | _____ | |
| Para-professional involvement | (6) | _____ | |
10. To what extent have you used CORPORAL PUNISHMENT (spanking) as a disciplinary measure within the past twelve months:
- | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-------|-----|
| Often | (1) | _____ | -64 |
| Occasionally | (2) | _____ | |
| Seldom | (3) | _____ | |
| Rarely | (4) | _____ | |
| Never | (5) | _____ | |
11. What method(s) do the majority of teachers in your school use in communicating PUPIL PROGRESS to parents?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|-------|-----|
| a. Grades (e.g., ABC's, S + U) | (1) | _____ | -65 |
| b. Parent-teacher conferences | (2) | _____ | |
| c. Item checklists | (3) | _____ | |
| d. Written commentary | (4) | _____ | |
| e. Combination of a & b | (5) | _____ | |
| f. Combination of a & d | (6) | _____ | |
| g. Combination of d & b | (7) | _____ | |
| h. Combination of c & d | (8) | _____ | |
| i. Other (write in) _____ | (9) | _____ | |
12. Taking everything into consideration, to what extent are you SATISFIED with your overall PERFORMANCE as an elementary principal: (please be frank)
- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|-----|
| Very satisfied | (1) | _____ | -66 |
| Somewhat satisfied | (2) | _____ | |
| Both satis. & dissat. | (3) | _____ | |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | (4) | _____ | |
| Very dissatisfied | (5) | _____ | |

OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

About Question _____ in section _____ I want to say:

About Question _____ in section _____ I want to say:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN THIS STUDY OF THE MAESP MEMBERSHIP

Survey Mailing: The enclosed postage and mailing label may be attached to the envelope in which you received the questionnaire.

Postcard Mailing: You may now mail the enclosed postcard indicating you are returning the study questionnaire. This will notify MAESP that costly follow-up reminder letters need not be sent.



Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals

Affiliated with the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations

POST OFFICE BOX 1455 • EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN 48823 • PHONE 517 353-8770

A STUDY OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN MICHIGAN

Professor Directing Study: Dr. R. L. Featherstone, M.S.U.
Researcher Conducting Study: James Jennings, PhD Candidate

Dear Michigan Elementary School Principal:

Acting upon the endorsement of the Professional Standards Commission, your MAESP Executive Board is sponsoring a comprehensive research study of our Association membership.

STUDY DESCRIPTION

The study will determine the present status, thought, and practice of the elementary school principalship in Michigan. A thorough investigation will be made of the Michigan elementary principal's personal characteristics, duties and functions, welfare and conditions of employment. It will compare the prevailing status with a 1951-52 MAESP-sponsored status study of the Michigan principalship and with a recent national study. Relationships will be examined among principals grouped according to expenditure level of school district.

STUDY METHOD

The information for this study will be obtained from a questionnaire sent to the membership of MAESP in November. Each MAESP member will receive the survey instrument.

BENEFITS TO THE ASSOCIATION AND MEMBERSHIP

The survey data being collected are expected to have direct benefits for you and your profession. The study information will be used to develop a statistical portrayal of the rapidly changing personal and professional characteristics of elementary school principals. Published results will become a formidable weapon in MAESP's arsenal for upgrading the status and welfare of its membership. When presented to superintendents and boards of education, it may offer evidence that principals need and deserve help to improve their performance and conditions of employment.

OUR RECOMMENDATION

We commend this study as being in your professional interest. We hope you will set aside a period of time in your busy schedule to promptly complete and return the survey form.

MAESP STUDY COMPLETION NOTIFICATION**FOR ELIGIBLE PRINCIPALS:**

I have filled out my questionnaire and mailed it to MAESP State Office. Please withhold any forthcoming completion reminder letters.

(Signature)

(Date)

IF INELIGIBLE:

I am not a full-time elementary principal and do not qualify for the MAESP study. Please withhold any forthcoming completion reminders.

(Signature)

(Date)

P.S. Thank you for your professional interest and prompt return of the survey and this card.

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN MICHIGAN

A Research Project Proposal

Presented to

the Board of Directors

Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals

FALL - 1971

by

James M. Jennings

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN MICHIGAN

PROPOSAL TO THE ASSOCIATION

It is proposed that the Executive Board of MAESP sponsor a comprehensive research study of the status of the membership of the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals.

STUDY DESCRIPTION

The study will determine the present status, thought, and practice of the elementary school principalship in the state of Michigan. A thorough investigation will be made of the Michigan elementary principal's personal characteristics, duties and functions, welfare and conditions of employment, community and professional involvements. His professional growth, training and experience, educational views, aspirations, and sources of job gratification will be explored as well.

The study will compare the prevailing status with a 1951-52 MAESP sponsored status study of the Michigan principalship and with a recent national study. Relationships will be examined among principals of differing types and from different kinds of communities.

STUDY METHOD

The information for this study will be obtained from a questionnaire sent to the membership of MAESP. Each MAESP member will receive the survey instrument. It is an extensive, general study of the Michigan principalship rather than an intensive study of one segment.

AESP SPONSORSHIP PRECEDENCE

There exists considerable precedence for state elementary principal associations granting study sponsorship to researchers undertaking status studies. Within the past ten years, the following state AESP groups have provided financial assistance to status study projects similar to the one being proposed: Indiana, Georgia, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Ohio, Wyoming, Utah, Oklahoma, Arkansas, California.

Sponsorship of studies undertaken as dissertation projects has included such considerations as:

1. direct commissioning of the total project
2. provision of endorsement letters
3. printing of the questionnaire
4. supplying mailing costs and clerical assistance
5. arranging project publicity in Association media and meetings

MAESP SPONSORSHIP REQUESTED

It is felt both MAESP and the researcher can mutually benefit by joining forces in producing what should become the most extensive and comprehensive status study of a state elementary principal group ever attempted. The Board of Directors should note that a "dust collecting" study of lesser dimension and scope, involving considerably less cost and effort, could be produced without MAESP support and assistance. Instead, the investigator offers to produce a study of significance that should be of real value to the Association and its membership in improving their status and welfare.

In order to gain the opportunity to become associated with the proposed status study of Michigan elementary principals, the Association is being requested to provide the following sponsorship support:

1. use of the Association mailing list
2. advance notification of the project in Association publications and at the state conference
3. designation of the state office for the return of the completed questionnaires
4. assistance from members of the Board who might communicate with fellow principals in their regions about the importance of the study and the need for a prompt return of the survey
5. assistance with selected phases of questionnaire preparation and mailing costs used in surveying the membership:

\$66 - mailing and return envelopes
 \$47 - letterhead stationery and paper
 \$300 - mailing and return postage
 \$20 - bound copy of study for MAESP files
 \$17 - clerical costs to state office

\$450 - PROJECTED COST TO ASSOCIATION BASED ON ESTIMATED SAMPLE SIZE (membership expected to be processed by 11/12/71 survey mailing date)

Note: So as not to unduly affect the operation of the state office, the researcher has made other arrangements for the collating, stapling, stamping, and envelope stuffing of the survey instruments (\$100). Furthermore, he will assume computer analysis charges, including data card, code sheet, and key punching costs (\$300), as well as production costs for the dissertation itself (\$600).

BENEFITS TO THE ASSOCIATION AND MEMBERSHIP

Possible national attention and identification with the most comprehensive and extensive status study of the elementary principalship to date.

This study should become a formidable weapon in MAESP's arsenal for improving conditions and practices of elementary principals. When presented to boards and superintendents, it may offer evidence that principals need and deserve help to improve their status and welfare.

For an organization that has recently instituted a dues increase, it would seem wise to demonstrate immediate interest in each principal's personal situation and viewpoints. The involvement of the total membership in contributing to the study data will do much to make them more cognizant of MAESP's concern for their welfare and status. In addition, total sampling involvement will lead to greater interest in an utilization of published results in upgrading and improving themselves in position.

The study may serve as a guideline for local superintendents and boards of education in developing policies and formulating realistic job descriptions for principals.

Results should provide meaningful data for colleges and universities regarding the professional preparation of the elementary principalship.

The results may aid in helping local districts develop improved plans for recruiting, selecting, and preparing candidates for the principalship.

The study may indicate and suggest the need for improvements in Association inservice programs.

Findings may be applied to increase MAESP efforts in achieving state certification standards.

The study should provide a meaningful base from which MAESP leaders and members may make more adequately confirmed judgments regarding current administrative issues and practices.

A current 1971-72 research study would update the 1951-52 status study that was sponsored by the Association. No comprehensive study of the elementary principalship has been made in the past two decades.

In light of scarcity of past studies which assess the status of the elementary principal in Michigan, it has been conjectured that this study might serve as a guide to future periodic studies of MAESP. Hopefully, the Association will undertake the project as a part of the organization's long-range planning program.

BENEFITS REALIZED BY THE RESEARCHER

Sponsored endorsement of a study of this magnitude by a recognized and respected state professional organization would accomplish the following for the researcher:

1. encourage a greater response to the survey questionnaire
2. provide needed financial and service assistance made necessary by the breadth and depth of the proposed study
3. increase the probability that study results will reach the attention of those interested in improving the status and welfare of elementary principals
4. consultation with the Executive Secretary and MAESP leadership leading to project improvement

CONSIDERATIONS GRANTED BY THE RESEARCHER

The investigator submits that in return for the sponsorship necessitated to conduct the study at the level indicated, the Association will be granted the following considerations:

1. complete access to and full use of the collected data will be rendered to the Association and its members
2. recognition of all support and assistance provided by MAESP will be made within the publication of the study. The Association's endorsement and Executive Secretary's name/title will appear on the transmittal letter and/or questionnaire
3. authorization will be given to MAESP to publish wholly or in part sections being pertinent to Association members. Monies derived from any sale of material published by MAESP for member distribution will be used to further the work of the organization.
4. Consideration will be given to the inclusion of special data-seeking questions within the questionnaire which MAESP leadership considers pertinent
5. Collected literature and research material dealing with status studies will be turned over to the MAESP Library (over \$100 in purchased materials to date)

NAESP ENCOURAGES STATE STATUS STUDIES

Statewide studies of the status of elementary principal groups are recommended by the National Association of Elementary School Principals in their Twenty-seventh Yearbook. The National Association recommends:

"If principals, through their own professional groups, are to help lift the principalship to higher standards they need to begin by examining the characteristics of principals serving the schools today. From these basic facts and self-appraisal they can set in motion the plans and programs necessary to produce the levels of experience and preparation desired both in the principals of today and those yet to be born professionally."

"State and local associations in the next few years should make studies of the principalship so as to bring out further details with respect to the ages, experience, and preparation of principals now in service."

COMMENT BY IDA MCGUIRE, PRESIDENT OF MICHIGAN DESP, 1950-52

(Excerpt from 1951-52 status study of Michigan principals)

"The Elementary Principal must have professional status. He must be freed from routine and clerical tasks, to take his rightful place of leadership in the elementary school program. This problem of Elementary Principal status, of his identifying himself in his role in elementary education for the purpose of raising the present standard, was taken as the major work effort by the Executive Board in 1951-52."

- - - - -

ASSOCIATION REQUIREMENT MET

The research project has received unanimous approval from the investigator's doctoral committee and satisfies dissertation requirements of the Department of Educational Administration, College of Education, Michigan State University. The study is being directed by a former vice-president of MAESP, Dr. Richard Featherstone. A letter from Dr. Featherstone on behalf the committee has been forwarded to the Association requesting support for the project.

ABOUT THE RESEARCHER

The researcher has been a practicing elementary principal in Michigan schools for the past ten years. He has participated in Association activities at the regional, state, and national levels while serving principalships at Galesburg-Augusta (Region 3), Waterford Township, Pontiac (Region 7), and East Lansing (Region 8). He has been working concurrently toward the doctoral degree in Educational Administration since his 1968 appointment to the principalship of Whitehills School, East Lansing Public Schools.