1981

An investigation of various group perceptions on task performance of curriculum specialists

Vasti DeLoatch
College of William & Mary - School of Education

DeLoatch, Vasti

AN INVESTIGATION OF VARIOUS GROUP PERCEPTIONS ON TASK PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS

The College of William and Mary in Virginia ED.D. 1981

An Investigation of Various Group Perceptions on Task Performance of Curriculum Specialists

---

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the School of Education
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

---

by
Vasti DeLoatch
January 1981

APPROVAL SHEET

We the undersigned do certify that we have read this dissertation and that in our individual opinions it is acceptable in both scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Accepted Spring, 1981

Robert Maidment 2.11.81

Robert Maidment, Ed.D.,
Chairman

Royce W. Chesser

Royce W. Chesser, M.Ed.

Robert Hanny

Robert Hanny, Ed.D.

Acknowledgements

Sincere appreciation is extended to the many people who contributed so freely of their time, effort and support toward the completion of this doctoral dissertation. A special debt of gratitude is extended to Dr. Robert Maidment, my advisor, for his continued guidance and support. Special thanks also to Mr. Royce Chesser and Dr. Robert Hanny for their constructive criticism as members of the Doctoral Committee.

It is impossible to acknowledge the efforts and contributions of all who contributed, including teachers, principals and curriculum specialists who gave of their time and their opinions, my co-workers who supported my efforts, and the members of my family for their encouragement and understanding.

The investigator wishes also to express her appreciation to Dr. Nathaniel Lee, Dr. Armand Galfo and Dr. Elmer Gish for their assistance.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	xiii
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Hypothesis	6
Significance of the Study	7
Definition of Terms	10
Limitations of the Study	12
Organization of the Remainder of the Study	12
2. Review of Related Literature	14
A Theoretical Framework	14
Perception and Behavior	15
Role of Supervision	21
Perceptions of the Role of Supervision	26
Summary	34
3. Methods and Procedures	37
Subjects	37
Instrumentation	38

Page

Method of Collecting Data 43

Treatment of the Data 48

4. Presentation and Analysis of the Data 49

Summary 73

5. Summary of Study, Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations 80

Summary 80

Conclusion 86

Discussion 87

Recommendations 92

Appendices

Appendix A. Letter of Approval 95

Appendix B. Task Force on Supervision Report 97

Appendix C. Letters of Transmittal 104

Appendix D. Planning, Program and Development Questionnaires . . 107

Appendix E. Supplementary Tables: Analysis of Variance 117

Appendix F. Supplementary Tables: Scheffé Test of Comparisons for Independent Variables . . . 126

Page

Bibliography 131

Vita

Abstract

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Reliability Analysis of PPDQ	42
2.	Factor Loading from Analysis of PPDQ	44
3.	Group Means of Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perception of Curriculum Specialists in the Task Area of PPD	52
4.	Overall Test of Significance of Group Differences	54
5.	Scheffé's Test of Comparison of Mean Differences of Groups for all Variables . .	55
6.	Wilks' Lambda, F-Ratio and Significance Before Application of Stepwise Procedue . .	59
7.	Variables in the Analysis after Each Step in the Stepwise Procedure	62
8.	Summary of Discriminant Analysis	65
9.	F-Statistics and Significance Between Pairs of Groups After Application of Stepwise Procedure	66
10.	Classification Before Application of Stepwise Procedure	68
11.	Classification After Application of Stepwise Procedure	68

Table Page

12. Distribution of Teachers' Ratings of Curriculum Specialists' Performance Relevant to the "Best" Set of Discriminating Variables 70

13. Distribution of Principals' Ratings of Curriculum Specialists' Performance Relevant to the "Best" Set of Discriminating Variables 71

14. Distribution of Curriculum Specialists' Ratings of Curriculum Specialists Performance Relevant to the "Best" Set of Discriminating Variables 72

15. Summary of Ratings Relevant to the "Best" Set of Discriminating Variables 74

A. Analysis of Variance for Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Total Area of Program Planning and Development 118

Table Page

B. Analysis of Variance for Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Identification of Needs 119

C. Analysis of Variance for Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Development of Objectives 120

D. Analysis of Variance for Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Program Implementation 121

Table Page

E. Analysis of Variance for Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Program Modification 122

F. Analysis of Variance for Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category Testing Program 123

G. Analysis of Variance for Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category Professional Growth 124

Table Page

H. Analysis of Variance for Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category Program Supervision 125

I. Scheffé's Multiple Range Test of Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Total Area of Program Planning and Development 127

J. Scheffé's Multiple Range Test of Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Identification of Needs 127

Table Page

K. Scheffé's Multiple Range Test of Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Development of Objectives 128

L. Scheffé's Multiple Range Test of Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Program Implementation 128

M. Scheffé's Multiple Range Test of Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Program Modification 129

Table Page

N. Scheffé's Multiple Range Test of Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Testing Program 129

O. Scheffé's Multiple Range Test of Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Professional Growth 130

P. Scheffé's Multiple Range Test of Mean Differences Among Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perceptions of Performance of Curriculum Specialists in the Sub-Category of Program Supervision 130

List of Figures

Figure		Page
1.	The Evolution of Supervision Roles	22
2.	Definition of Supervision 1960-1980	24
3.	Overlap of Supervisory Activities	27

Chapter 1

Introduction

Instructional supervisors, whether in central offices or schools, are expected to assist teachers in ways that will improve their effectiveness. However, teachers often have a different view of supervision. From their vantage point as professionally certified, highly trained and competent teachers who have earned tenure status, supervisory activities can seem to call into question their professional integrity (Munnelly, 1970). With increased professionalism has come increased militancy (Osborne and Bowling, 1977). The professional attitude of teachers may cause them to interpret attempts at influence by supervisors as an invasion of their professional prerogatives, especially if such efforts are not congruent with thier professional expectations (Parsons, 1972).

After an extensive review of the research, Neville (1966) concluded that teachers want supervisors who will help them attack instructional problems, but they do not see supervision as focusing on the improvement of instruction. Recently, this point was reiterated by Sturges, Krajewski, Lovell, McNiel and Ness (1978) who stated that research on the expectations teachers have for instructional supervisors indicates that teachers desire supportive

and non-threatening services that are highly related to the improvement of their classroom performance, but teachers perceive that they are not getting the services they need.

Blumberg (1974) describes the relationship between teachers as a group and supervisors as a group as somewhat of a "cold war" in which neither side trusts the other, and each side is convinced of the correctness of its position. Recently, Crews (1979) supported this notion with his belief that a "private cold war" between teachers and supervisors still continues.

Disagreement over the definition of supervision and the specific role responsibilities of supervisors has contributed to the criticism of instructional supervision. Esposito and Burbach (1974) alluded to this in a role study when they stated:

> New research and long standing criticism indicate that the practice of educational supervision has been impeded by the lack of a clear cut role conceptualization. This ambiguity and the resultant dysfunction have fostered negative attitudes among teachers which have crystallized into doubts about the effectiveness and worth of supervision.

The majority of researchers have not provided practical answers to problems in supervision. Frymier (1973) feels that there has not been any in-depth analysis of what

supervision is and what supervisors do. Harris (1975) alluded to this when he stated that expansion of supervisory positions, growing controversy over the importance of the character of supervision, and urgent demands for accountability have failed to generate as many studies of supervisory behavior as might be expected.

Many studies that deal with both teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of what constitutes effective supervisory practices concentrate, for the most part, on central level supervisory services (Gordon, 1976). Granite (1969) indicated that this type of service is limited:

> The central office consultant is limited in his contributions because he necessarily must spread his energies and resources among many schools in the system. He probably lacks intimate insight into the nature of the individual school's student population, the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty, close and continuing acquaintance with the building and equipment, evolving local modes of operation, shifting patterns of interrelationships among the staff, and prevalent feelings and attitudes toward change.

An investigation of teachers' perceptions of supervisory roles by Parsons (1972) indicated that as physical distance between the supervisor and the teacher increases, the rated influence and effectiveness of the supervisor

decreased. He concluded that persons in roles far removed from the teachers will not likely affect teachers' behavior regardless of their supervisory skills. This notion was supported by Eye (1975) who stated that the internal-external assumptions about supervision to date have not led to any helpful conclusions except in those cases where the internal organization has taken the supervisory function closer to those who are to be supervised.

In discussing supervision at the building level Lee (1974) wrote:

> It seemed possible that having a curriculum specialist assigned to each school building to provide instructional supervision on a constant basis would increase the frequency of interaction between teachers and the curriculum specialist. Those conditions might affect the perceptions of teachers in regard to the leadership capacity of the curriculum specialist.

Such conditions might also affect the perceptions of principals and curriculum specialists. However, most perception studies in supervision seem to focus on the perceptions of teachers or central office supervisors as a group or the supervisory role of the principal.

Lee (1974) investigated teachers' perceptions of curriculum specialists (building level supervisors of instruction) in the public school system involved in this

study. He found various degrees of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their performance. Lee's study did not include perceptions of either the principals or the curriculum specialists. This research attempts to explore the perceptions of teachers, curriculum specialists, and principals in the belief that it will provide valuable information on the curriculum specialists. It is, in some respects, a modified replication of Lee's study.

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of this study to determine whether there are differences between the viewpoints of teachers, principals and curriculum specialists relevant to the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of program planning and development.

Answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Are there differences between the perceptions of teachers, principals and curriculum specialists relevant to the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of program planning and development?

2. If there are differences, can particular variables in which the differences are pronounced be identified?

Since practical implications from the outcomes of numerous studies of elementary supervisors are "suprisingly sparse" (Nasca, 1976), the present study will attempt to provide some information to help fill this void.

Hypothesis

Some discrepancies between the perceptions of teachers, supervisors and principals are revealed throughout the literature on perceptions of supervision (Parsons, 1971; Nasca, 1976; Esposito and Burbach, 1974; Beach, 1976; Steber, 1977; Hetzel, 1978; and Blumberg, 1974). In his study of supervisory practices in Indiana, Sibbitts (1972) found a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding whether or not a specific practice was being used. An investigation by Gordon (1976) found a sharp contrast in what teachers and supervisors perceived to be effective behaviors. Hetzel's (1978) investigation of the perceptions of teachers, principals and supervisors toward supervisory practices showed that most of the time both supervisors and principals perceived the same technique as being most helpful, while teachers perceptions tended to be different.

Research related to certain variables also accents discrepancies. An investigation conducted by Siddiqui (1978) concluded that there are significant differences concerning selected supervisory methods with respect to age, sex, marital status, educational background and years of experience for teachers studied.

In this research, the following hypothesis was tested:

There are statistically significant differences in how the performance of curriculum specialists is viewed by teachers, principals and the curriculum specialists themselves as measured by the Program Planning and Development Questionnaire (PPDQ).

Authorities suggest that when looking at social perception, both the perceiver and the perceived should be considered. In this investigation, the test of the hypothesis provides information on both the perceived and perceivers.

Significance of the Study

As the society which the public schools serve rapidly changes, the demands of the public and its expectations of schools increase. As a result, greater emphasis is being placed on the school's responsibility to provide quality instruction for all children. Since the primary purpose of supervision is the improvement of instruction, it would seem important that researchers continue exploring ways to upgrade supervision. Ellis, Smith, and Abbot (1979) gave added emphasis to this point when they stated that the kind of supervisory programs that would assist teachers in their efforts to provide effective instruction exist in far too few schools.

According to Unruh (1977), supervisors are unsure in some instances of how to work with present day, mature, tenured faculties who are scornful of persons in supervisory

positions. He feels that the field of instructional supervision may have arrived at a critical moment in history and supervisors will either rise to the challenge of effective leadership or find that their functions have been taken over by other individuals or agencies.

Similarly, Harris (1976) lamented that supervision is still an urgent need in the American schools:

> Supervisors of instruction...must lead more aggressively in the improvement of instruction. They must demonstrate competencies more adequately, enter into collaborative arrangements that are genuinely cooperative, and become involved in building level instructional evaluation systems to guide the improvement process.

Neagley and Evans (1979) continue this emphasis on leadership. They stated that effective supervision requires a high level of leadership. Sergiovanni and Starrett (1979) stated that changing present conditions provide a new set of leadership demands on the school that increase the importance of supervision. Sturges et al. (1978) contend that it is reasonable to expect the instructional supervisory behavior system to be a primary source of leadership for instructional change and improvement. Implications from this study may assist supervisors in their attempts to lead more aggressively during this period of rapid change in our

society.

Supervisory behavior in its most dynamic application is among the most complex and demanding forms of educational leadership (Harris, 1977). Not only must the supervisor have a clear perception of the job of supervision, with its many ramifications, but those with whom he comes in direct contact must also have a compatible perception, if he is to be successful in his endeavors (Unruh and Turner, 1970). Handy (1978) alluded to this when he stated:

> Roles and perceptions of roles underlie all interactions between individuals. More understanding of role perception and of the parts that roles play in interactions would surely help to reduce the misunderstandings so common with all of us. Many of the problems in organizations rise from role strain, misconceptions about role, role underload or bad communications because of false role expectations.

This point of view is consistent with the ideas of Koehn and Goens (1977) who contend that crucial to the development of talent in teachers are supervisors' perceptions of people, organizations, and their own roles. They argue that the nature of the supervisory program depends upon the perceptions of the supervisor toward people, organizations, and his or her own role and that these will

determine whether or not new trends and tools will grow and flourish. Unruh and Turner (1970) supported this argument when they stated that teachers will react to the supervisor and to the instructional program according to how they perceive them.

It was believed that with this study perceptions can be analyzed and areas that need improvement can be identified. This study can provide information that can be used to plan a program for improving relationships among members of the instructional team (the teacher, the principal and the curriculum specialist), thereby increasing their effectiveness. Furthermore, this study investigates teachers', principals', and curriculum specialists' perceptions of the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of program planning and development which is a major responsibility of the curriculum specialists. Recommendations generated from the data should help to increase the effectiveness of curriculum specialists in this area.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for the purpose of this study:

Role refers to functions expected of the curriculum specialists (See Appendix A).

Curriculum Specialist (building level supervisor) refers to the person in each school building who, under

the supervision of the principal and the director for elementary instruction, is responsible for supervising the instructional program in the school.

Program Planning and Development refers to a group of activities identified as desirable for curriculum specialists: (1) assist in identifying and assessing the curriculum and instructional needs of children within the school and school system; (2) contribute to the development of programs to meet the instructional needs of children within the school; (3) provide support in the implementation of instructional objectives; (4) work with immediate administrator to plan strategies for accomplishing objectives; (5) help to set instructional objectives for the individual school (Lee, 1974); (6) assist in implementing the school testing program; and (7) plan, coordinate, and implement staff development in the school.

Teachers' Perceptions refers to the teachers' degree of satisfaction with the performance of curriculum specialists as revealed by their responses to items on a questionnaire.

Principals' Perceptions refers to the building principals' degree of satisfaction with the performance of curriculum specialists as revealed by their responses to items on a questionnaire.

Curriculum Specialists' Perceptions refers to curriculum specialists' degree of satisfaction with their own

performance as revealed by their responses to items on a questionnaire.

Limitations of the Study

There was a possibility that some of the common weaknesses inherent in the questionnaire as an approach for gathering data might be present in the instrument used in this study. Although questions were framed to elicit specific answers, the interpretation of the questions by the groups of respondents may not be the same. Because a few of the teachers involved in the study had questioned the position of building level supervisor, the opportunity to rate the helpfulness of the role might be accompanied by a higher degree of interest than was present in the other two groups.

This study was limited to one urban school system that has a full-time, building level supervisor and a full-time principal in each elementary school. Therefore, comparisons and generalizations with respect to the findings should be made only to other systems with a similar organization. Also, the person conducting the study works directly with the curriculum specialists which suggests the possibility of investigator bias.

Organization of the Remainder to the Study

The remainder of this investigation is presented in four chapters. Chapter II is a review of related literature and the conceptual framework. In Chapter III, the research

design and procedures used in the study are described. The data are presented, analyzed, and discussed in Chapter IV. In Chapter V the study is summarized and recommendations are presented.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

A review of selected literature was made to determine the role and function of supervision as they have emerged and to establish the nature and scope of perceptions and behavior as used in this study. Certain demographic characteristics of groups of individuals and of schools are explored in an attempt to provide additional insight into the problem.

A Theoretical Framework

The school is a social system. A theoretical framework for understanding the congruences and conflicts concerning perceptions of performance in supervision at the school level may be found in social systems theory. This theory has been drawn upon for a contrasting view of supervision (Harris, 1975).

For analytic purposes Getzels (1968) conceives of the social system as involving the following two classes of phenomena which are at once conceptually independent and phenomenally interactive: (1) the institutions with certain roles and expectations, that will fulfill the goals of the system; and (2) the individuals, with certain personalities and dispositions, inhabiting the system, whose observed interactions comprise that we call social behavior.

Social systems are subject to stress and tension. Differences in personnel and environmental influences appear to be the two major contributors to the development of stress and tension (Feyereisen, Florine, and Novak, 1970). Each individual in a system brings with him certain attitudes, beliefs and values that help determine the way he perceives his surroundings.

Perception and Behavior

Massarik and Welchsler (1976) defined social perception as the means by which people form impressions of, and hopefully understanding of, one another. Much friction in a social system is created by a lack of congruence in perceptions. Our opinions of people are influenced by our perceptions. Thus, it seems important to focus on social perception and behavior in this brief review of selected literature.

Authorities agree that many factors should be considered when looking at social perception, because each perception and any event are based on a combination of factors. Three basic factors emphasized by Massarik and Welchsler are the perceiver, the perceived, and the situation, "the setting of social and societal forces within which the act of social perception is lodged." The perceived and the perceiver possess complex personalities and the situation is surrounded by their feelings. Catril (1957) stated that a

process of negotiation takes place between the perceiver and the perceived in which the end product is a result of both influences within the perceiver and of characteristics of the perceived. The ability to form accurate impressions of others is likely to be disproportionately affected by the type of situation or surroundings in which the impression is made (Soskin, 1953).

Bruner (1973) called attention to perceptual readiness. He believes that perception involves categorization, and the perceiver brings a category system to the perceiving process. Getzels (1968) supports this point of view. He states that forces within the individual are varied and patterned, and each individual perceives his situation idiosyncratically. Support for this point of view also comes from Napier and Gersenfeld (1973) who state that what we eventually perceive, from the thousands of clues from the world we are attempting to understand, is the result of a sorting process that arranges stimuli in a manner most easily disgestible, a process that facilitates our self-maintenance for security.

According to Mehrabian (1968), the clues to which a person attends are influenced by the generalized expectations he has about others that positively or negatively reinforce qualities for himself. The person tends to behave in ways which confirm his generalized expectations to make

judgments. Individual differences in cognitive function contribute to the weighing of clues. However, Mehrabian and Ksionsky (1974) state that although studies have shown "cognitive complex" persons to be generally more accurate in forming impressions of others than cognitive simple persons, the contribution of "cognitive complexity" to interpersonal judgment was formulated as being significant only when the judgment being made relates to an important (i.e., emotion-ladden) attitude of personality disposition.

Bruner (1973) also focused on the personal determinants of the perceptual process. He stated that subjective influences such as needs, cultural background, values, and interest are very important in the process of perceiving others. The individual brings to the task of understanding others two sets of interrelated characteristics: his general background, demographic characteristics, and his unique self, personality characteristics (Alport, 1955).

From (1971) elaborated on interest as a factor. He stated that if we are not specifically interested in the mental life of the other person, the intention, meaning, or purpose of the behavior will often be given as something which determines the situation of which we perceive the acting person as being a part, and only if we adopt a more specific attitude will we experience the actions as a form under which man's intention, will and wishes, manifest

themselves. From also expressed the belief that the greater the importance of a decision made by someone else for us, the more we are inclined to perceive his ideas, feelings, and attentions as implicit in every detail of his behavior.

In discussing needs as a factor, Getzels (1968) expressed the belief that the individual has certain needs-dispositions, forces within him such as preferences, interests, attitudes, drives, and needs that are determinants of cognitive and perceptual as well as other forms of behavior and govern the way one cognizes and perceives his environment. Studies by Eriksen (1951) revealed that needs which are not accepted by the individual may function in the direction of the creation of perceptual defense against stimuli that are related to these needs.

Combs and Syngg (1959) stated that what governs the behavior from the point of the individual are his unique perceptions of himself and the world in which he lives, the meaning these have for him. Along these lines, Massarik and Welchsler (1976) stated that one's self-concept provides a kind of psychological base of operations that inevitably affects relations with others. They wrote:

> Some aspects of the self-concept are at the surface of personality; these are the <u>public need attitudes-</u> the things we don't mind telling other people about ourselves and our view of the world. And there are

> some feelings about the self of which we are aware, but which we do not want to share with others - these are privately held attitudes to self. And buried still deeper are the subconscious and unconscious aspects - feelings about "who" we are and "what" we are that somehow we cannot face up to ourselves.

These authorities believe that a fundamental self-acceptance at all levels, public to unconscious, is necessary for accurate perceptions.

Corey, Foshay, and Maskenzie (1963) support Comb and Syngg's point of view. In their summary of findings with respect to relationship between perception and behavior they stated that most of our behavior, particularly as it involved relations with others, can be explained as our attempt to preserve our integrity, our self-respect - maintain or build our self-esteem.

Zalkind and Costello (1974) also focused on self. They contend that the thread which ties together many current findings relevant to characteristics of the perceived and the perceiver is that tendency to use one's self as the norm by which one perceives or judges. Zalkind and Costello stated that an examination of current literature suggests the following:

(1) Knowing oneself makes it easier to see others ac-

curately. (2) One's own characteristics affect the characteristics he is likely to see in others. (3) The person who accepts himself is more likely to be able to see favorable aspects of other people. (4) Accuracy in perceiving others is not a single skill.

Our perceptions may be distorted by our judgment of the outside world. After reviewing Johnson's 1944 review of literature related to influences that distort one's judgment of the outside world, Zalkind and Costello (1974) suggested the following about the perceiver:

1. He may be influenced by considerations that he may not be able to identify, responding to cues that are below the threshold of his awareness.

2. In making abstract or intellectual judgments, he may respond to irrelevant cues to arrive at a judgment.

3. In making abstract or intellectual judgments, he may be influenced by emotional factors - what is liked is perceived as correct.

4. He will weigh perceptual evidence coming from respected (or favored) sources more heavily than that which comes from other sources.

5. He may not be able to identify all factors on which his judgments are based. Even if he is aware of these factors he is not likely to realize how much weight he gives to them.

Authorities agree that our behavior is highly related to our perceptions. Thus, perceptions held by individuals seem to influence strongly their behavior in a social system. That people behave differently because of their perceptions of the siutations to which they react differently was emphasized throughout the literature.

Role of Supervision

According to Taguiri and Petrullo (1958), an important form of person perception concerns the perception of roles. They believe that appropriate behavior depends not so much upon the idiosyncratic characteristics of the other person but upon his role. Harris (1975) pointed out the role theory has been drawn upon to predict and explain behavior in a social system.

Each individual in a social system must interpret his own role. The extent to which there is a consensus among significant role definers as perceived by an actor is an important factor in the proper functioning of social systems and the achievement of goals (Getzels, 1968). Thus, it is important to note the role of supervision as it has emerged and how the role is being conceived.

Eye (1975) stated that historically the role of supervision has emerged from that of inspection to one that includes a broader perspective in instructional improvement. Wiles and Bondi (1980) state the evolution succinctly in Figure 1.

Figure 1

The Evolution of Supervision Roles

1750-1910	Inspection and Enforcement
1910-1920	Scientific Supervision
1920-1930	Bureaucratic Supervision
1930-1955	Cooperative Supervision
1955-1965	Supervision as Curriculum Development
1965-1970	Clinical (instructional) Supervision
1970-1980	Supervision as Management

From their point of view, which is consistent with the literature, the role of supervision has evolved from that of inspection to one that includes more complex and diversified behaviors that can be defined in six major roles: administration, curriculum, human relations, instruction, leadership, and management. Wiles and Bondi outline the major definitions, by contemporary researchers, in Figure 2.

Alfonsa, Firth and Neville (1975) used social systems as a way of thinking about supervision. They conceptualized instructional supervision as a behavior system formally provided by the educational organization for the purposes of interacting with the teaching behavior system to facilitate the learning of students. This point of view was empahsized by Sturges et al. (1978) who reported that most writers, including Harris (1975) and Blumberg (1974), conceptualized instructional supervision in a similar way.

Sturges et al. (1978) contend that the conceptualization of instructional supervision as a social system includes the following areas which are similar to the major roles identified by Wiles and Bondi:

1. Direct psychological and technical support service and help for teachers;

2. Curriculum development, coordination, and evaluation;

3. Organization for development, coordination, and

Figure 2

Definitions of Supervision 1960-80

Focus	Names	Year
Administration	Harris and Bessent	1969
	Eye, Netzer, and Krey	
Curriculum	Curtin	1964
	Cogen	1973
Human Relations	K. Wiles	1967
	Sergiovanni and Starrett	1971
	ASCD Yearbook (draft)	1982
Instruction	1965 ASCD Yearbook	1965
	Marks, Stoops, and	1978
	King-Stoops	
Leadership	Mosher and Purpel	1972
	Wiles and Bondi	1980
Management	Alfonso, Firth, and	1975
	Neville	

evaluation of instruction, including the provision of facilities, equipment and materials;

4. Development and evaluation of educational goals;
5. Professional development of personnel;
6. Evaluation of personnel performance;
7. Evaluation of educational outcomes.

Nasca (1976) investigated elementary supervisors and their role. His study supported the generalization that supervisory tasks may be divided into several general task areas. Testing, curriculum, instruction, classroom management, professional and administration are the categories he used. Nasca further stated that the general literature on supervision adds little to clarifying the specific nature of supervisory roles because a major portion of it is devoted to interpersonal dynamics, the significance of goal setting, and sensitivity to internal and external pressures.

Esposito, Smith and Burbach (1975) attempted to delineate the role of supervision. They found four general categories: (1) indirect service to teachers, (2) direct service administrator and evaluator, (3) administrative, and (4) evaluative. Esposito et al. stated that 70% or more of the teachers indicated a desire for an increase in the first two categories of supervisory services.

Wiles and Bondi (1980) pointed out that the many supervisory activities included in the job of supervision

frequently overlap with administrative, curricular, and instructional roles. Figure 3 is their illustration of how the flow of supervisory activity overlaps and coordinates administrative, curricular and instructional concerns and tasks.

Esposito and Burbach (1974) support Wiles and Bondi's idea of the overlapping of supervisory tasks. They studied the role of supervision in Virginia and concluded that supervisors delegate time to numerous activities which can be classified as either administration or helping. The writers argued that by performing activities which may fit into two divergent role conceptualizations, confusion on the part of their clients (teachers) may exist with respect to supervisory role and function.

An investigation of supervision in Tennessee by Beach (1976) expanded Esposito's point of view. It revealed that Tennessee supervisors had a role identification problem in that they placed a higher priority on their administrative role than on their instructional role. Matters other than instructional improvement had a higher priority with principals and supervisors.

Perceptions of the Role of Supervision

The literature related to interpretations of the role of supervisors shows areas of agreement as well as discrepancies between the perceptions of teachers, supervisors and

Figure 3

Overlap of Supervisory Tasks

Administration Tasks	Curriculum Tasks	Instructional Tasks
1) Set and prioritize goals	Determine instructional objectives	Develop instructional plans
2) Establish standards and policies	Survey needs and conduct research	Evaluate programs according to standards
3) Provide long-range planning	Develop programs and plan changes	Initiate new programs
4) Design organizational structures	Related programs to special services	Redesign instructional organization where needed
5) Identify and secure resources	Select materials and allocate resources	Deliver instrucional resources
6) Select personnel and staff	Orient and renew instructional staff	Advise and assist teachers

Figure 3 (continued)

Administration Tasks	Curriculum Tasks	Instructional Tasks
7) Provide adequate facilities	Suggest modifications in facilities	Oversee modifications and facilities
8) Secure necessary funding	Estimate expenditure needs for instruction	Disperse and apply funds
9) Organize for instruction	Prepare instructional programs	Coordinate in-service activities
10) Promote school-community relations	Disseminate descriptions of school programs	React to community inquires about school programs

principals. Some of the studies that follow indicate this.

A study of the practice of instructional supervision in Tennessee revealed that fifty percent of the teachers felt that the services listed below were not usually provided when needed, while most of the supervisors and principals perceived that they usually provide the services with few exceptions:

1. Involving teachers in district-wide instructional programs.

2. Assisting in developing effective disciplinary techniques.

3. Planning in-service activities.

4. Providing teaching demonstrations.

5. Consulting with teachers on instructional problems.

6. Serving as a two-way communications link with the central office.

7. Helping describe and analyze instructional objectives.

8. Helping define instructional objectives.

9. Helping select appropriate instructional activities.

10. Helping choose methods for evaluating student progress.

11. Aiding in development of curricula.

12. Conducting or directing research.

13. Acting as a change agent.

14. Providing psychological support.

15. Suggesting new ideas and approaches for instruction.

16. Assisting in classroom organization and arrangement (Lovell and Phelps, 1977).

Sibbitt (1972) analyzed the reactions of classroom teachers and principals to a list of 75 supervisory practices in a selected public school of Indiana. His study revealed similar findings. In 60 of the 75 supervisory practices, a statistically significant difference was found between the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding whether or not the specific practice was being used. Only six practices were reported by a majority of both the principals and teachers as being used in the selected sample school.

Gordon (1976) investigated teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of effective behaviors in the individual conference setting. He found a sharp contrast in what teachers and supervisors perceived to be effective behaviors.

In contrast to these findings, Berlin (1974) found significant agreement between teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of certain aspects of the supervisory conference. Sixty percent of the time, supervisors and teachers shared at least two common objectives for the supervisory conference. Slightly more than one-fourth of the time, both teachers and supervisors agreed on all conference objectives.

Hetzel (1978) investigated the perceptions and attitudes of teachers, principals, and supervisors toward the supervisory role and the practice of supervision in the elementary schools of Philadelphia. The results support Gordon's (1976) findings. Principals and supervisors generally perceived one technique as being most helpful, while teachers perceived another. However, there were certain techniques that all groups agreed upon as well as techniques that they did not agree to as being the most helpful. For example:

1. Giving encouragement to take the initiative in designing programs for the improvement of instruction was perceived as the most helpful by all respondents.

2. Stimulating self-confidence in teachers by positive comments and suggestions and helping faculty members to attain a feeling of security and satisfaction in their work through encouragement and recognition of efforts were perceived as the most helpful professional growth techniques by both supervisors and principals.

3. Opportunity to attend conferences, other in-service opportunities and the provision of a professional library were perceived as the most helpful by teachers.

Steber's (1977) study of perceptions of teaching effectiveness in Brunswick, New Jersey, found that principals, teachers, and supervisors have varying perceptions of

teacher effectiveness. Discrepancies between principal and teacher ratings were far greater for the "least effective" than for the "most effective."

Nasca (1976) examined elementary supervisors and their roles in an attempt to discover how teachers and supervisors value the role of elementary supervision. He used job descriptions of elementary supervisors from ten local school districts and interviews with supervisors to develop two survey instruments. Nasca reports the following generalizations:

1) There is relatively high agreement around the frequency of participation in supervisory responsibilities in the area of instruction and teacher perceived value of these responsibilities.
2) The greatest discrepancies between frequency of participation in supervisory responsibilities and teacher perceived value of responsibilities occurred in the area of professional development. Teachers' perceived value of tasks in this area was higher than frequency of supervisor participation. There is also some discrepancy between supervisors' rating of frequency of participation and teachers' perception of supervisors' frequency of participation. Supervisors tended to indicate more participation in the area of instruction than teachers attributed to them.

Both agreement and disagreement surround the findings of many of the studies reviewed relevant to the effect of certain demographic characteristics of groups of indviduals and of schools involved. In some instances perceptions were not significantly affected by demographic characteristics while in others they were. Typical among the investigations are the ones that are discussed below.

Size of school, sex, experience and professional preparation of the teacher were not significant factors related to teachers' perceptions of influence of principals in Parson's (1972) investigation of style and behavior of effective supervisors whose influence, teachers felt, improved their teaching. Over 93 percent of the 556 teachers responding perceived the principals' supervisory behavior as effecting their behavior.

The Lee (1974) study of perceptions of curriculum specialists revealed significant differences in teachers' perceptions of supervisors in certain tasks included in the area of program planning and development as a function of sex, race, years of classroom teaching experience, years of supervisory experience, years of experience in the school building to which currently assigned, age and size of school. However, there were tasks in which no differences occurred.

Siddiqui (1978) examined the relationship between the attitudes of teachers and supervisors in Region X, Texas,

and Karachi, Pakistan toward certain supervisory practices. He concluded the following:

> There was no significant difference concerning selected supervisory methods with respect to sex, age, marital status, educational background, and years of experience for teachers and supervisors of Region X, Texas, teachers and supervisors of Karachi, Pakistan, and supervisors of Region X, Texas, and Karachi, Parkistan.

Bedwine (1978) studied teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership. He found no significant differences in the way female and male teachers responded to the items related to the principal as an instructional leader and to the teacher evaluation process.

Mock (1977) explored the relationship between the teacher desired and perceived interpersonal relations of the central administration supervisor and respective teacher as it relates to the supervisory process. He found teachers' personal characteristics (sex, experience, college degree, employment status) and teachers' institutional setting (size, structure and schedule) had little affect on their perception of interpersonal relations as related to the supervisory process.

Summary

This review of the literature and research related to this study revealed that our behavior is very highly

related to our perceptions. People, in a social system, respond differently because of their perceptions of the situation to which they react differently. The extent to which there is consensus among individuals is an important factor in the proper functioning of a social system, because much friction is created by a lack of congruence in perceptions. Feedback on how others view the accuracy of our perceptions can increase our understanding of people.

Our perceptions are based on a combination of factors relevant to the perceived, the perceiver and the situation. The following are drawn from this review of the literature:

1) Interests, attitudes, drives, beliefs, and values govern the way we perceive.

2) There is a tendency to use one's self as the norm by which one perceives. Concept of self is important in forming accurate perceptions. Self accuracy is necessary for accurate perceptions.

3) Each individual perceives his situation idiosyncratically. His perceptions may be distorted by his judgment of the outside world which may be influenced by irrelevant clues, emotional factors and sources of evidence.

Interpretations of the supervisory role bring divergent views, as to whether the tasks are provided and the effectiveness of the tasks, from the teacher receiving the act, the curriculum specialist administering the act and the

principal, monitoring the act. Contributing to this problem is the fact that the role of instructional supervision has not been clearly defined and there is disagreement over the definition.

Certain demographic characteristics of principals, teachers, curriculum specialists and of the school seem to influence perceptions of other people.

Chapter 3

Method and Procedures

This study investigated teachers', principals', and curriculum specialists' perceptions of the performance of elementary curriculum specialists. Since it is concerned with the collection and analysis of data which enable the researcher to trace interrelationships between facts so that deeper insights into the phenomena are gained (Van Dalen, 1966), it is an interrelationship type of survey. This chapter presents the research questions and the methods and procedures used to answer them.

Subjects

The population was chosen from an urban Virginia public school system with 32 elementary schools. The school enrollments range from 250-1200 students from predominately low socio-economic levels. Of the 600 full-time regular classroom teachers, 73% are black and 27% are white. A full-time curriculum specialist (building level supervisor) as well as a principal is assigned to each school. A computerized procedure was used to select a 20% random sample of the teachers. One hundred and three of the 122 teachers, 28 of the 32 principals and 28 of the 33 curriculum specialists participated in this study. The four principals and five curriculum specialists who did not participate possibly

misplaced their questionnaires. The forms were distributed during a meeting and follow-up telephone reminders were made to all principals and curriculum specialists.

Appropriate permissions to investigate teachers', principals', and curriculum specialists' perceptions of curriculum specialists were secured.

Instrumentation

Data for the proposed study were collected through the use of a 28-item questionnaire which was modified from the 20-item questionnaire used by Lee (1974) to determine teachers' perceptions of curriculum specialists in the system involved in this study. This Program Planning and Development Questionnaire (Hereafter referred to as PPDQ) is a Likert-type measurement scale. A Likert scale is a five-point scale in which the interval between each point is assumed to be equal. It is used to register the extent of agreement or disagreement with a particular statement of an attitude, belief, or judgment (Tuckman, 1978). The scale in the Lee study ranges from very satisfied to very dissatisfied. Permission for a modified replication of Lee's study is in Appendix A.

The original instrument included the following five sub-categories in the area of Program Planning and Development: Identification of Needs, Development of Objectives, Program Implementation, Program Modification and Program

Supervision. Lee (1974) pointed out that these categories were determined by a Task Force on Supervision that defined the actual role of curriculum specialist relevant to the curriculum specialist's official job description. The role in the area of Program Planning and Development includes:

- Provides support in the implementation of instructional objectives.

- Contributes to the development of a program to meet instructional needs of children within the schools.

- Assists in identifying and assessing the curriculum and instructional needs of children within the school and school system.

- Works with immediate administrator to plan strategies for accomplishing objectives.

- Helps to set instructional objectives for the individual school. (RPS, 1974).

The section of the Task Forces' report that focuses on the curriculum specialists role is in Appendix B.

In giving an account of the planning and construction of the original instrument, Lee (1974) stated:

> A list of activities related to each of the five task areas was compiled from the literature. To ensure validity of the activities for the purpose of this study, a random sample of five schools was selected from one of the three geographical areas of the

school system to pilot test the activities with teachers and the curriculum specialist. Meetings were held in each of the five schools with those persons who served as a jury of experts, to evaluate the activities in relation to appropriateness of the task areas and for clarity of statements. Activities were deleted and statements modified as a result of consensus reached through those meetings. A final list of twenty activities, four for each of the five task areas, was deemed valid by the teachers and curriculum specialists involved in the evaluation. Those activities were included on the questionnaire.

The modified PPDQ, developed by the writer, includes two additional task areas: (1) Testing (Selecting, Administering and Interpreting) and (2) Professional (Staff Development). Four items were developed for each area. These items were added to the instrument because the school system involved in this study has placed much empahsis on the two additional areas in the last five years. In constructing the items, the following from Remmers' (1973) criteria for judging rating scale appropriateness for measuring were considered:

Reliability - it should yield the same values, within limits of allowable error, under the same set of conditions;

Validity - the instrument's content, in this case the

rating scale categories, should relate to the defined area of investigation and relevant constructs.

The modified part of the PPDQ includes items 27-34 inclusively. The items were refined by having members of the Expanded Elementary Cabinet in the school system involved in this study to respond to possible items. The Elementary Cabinet includes the assistant superintendent for elementary education, director for elementary administration, director for elementary instruction, director of federal programs, director of special education and subject supervisors. It was considered the committee of expert judges that helped to establish content validity of the eight items added to the original instrument. The expert judgments of various members of the cabinet were continually utilized throughout the developmental stage continuing to the final product. Modification, deletions and revisions were based on their review. The instrument is in Appendix D.

Reliability coefficients for the total scale were computed by SPSS Subprogram Cronback's Alpha (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975) which is perhaps the most widely used reliability coefficient. The analysis of the PPDQ showed a strong relationship among the items. It yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.96276 for the total test. Table 1 shows coefficients for each area of the scale. According to this reliability data, the PPDQ is judged to

Table 1

Reliability Coefficients of Areas of PPDQ

Areas	Reliability Coefficients
Needs	Alpha = 0.89152
Objectives	0.9533
Program Implementation	0.84366
Program Modification	0.79422
Testing Program	0.88225
Professional Growth	0.87074
Program Supervision	0.83017

be highly reliable. It tends to measure what it purports to measure consistently.

Factor analysis of the instrument indicated that factor loadings were consistently high for all items. When all of the items were factor analyzed, Factor 1 explained 74% of the variance. Thus the instrument is a highly unified one. These data are presented in Table 2.

Method of Collecting Data:

The PPDQ was used to collect data that determined teachers', curriculum specialists' and principals' perceptions of the performance of the curriculum specialists by measuring the following group variables and the individual variables in Table 2 associated with them:

1. Total area of Program Planning and Development
2. Identification of Needs
3. Development of Objectives
4. Program Implementation
5. Program Modification
6. Testing Program
7. Professional Growth
8. Program Supervision

The PPDQ and a letter of explanation of the nature of the study, which included assurance that neither the names of the participants nor the names of the schools would be published, were distributed to principals and curriculum

Table 2

Factor Loading from Analysis of Scale

	Item	Factor 1
11.	Assist in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.	0.80217
12.	Assist in analyzing the curriculum content and instructional procedures in relation to identified student needs.	0.89219
13.	Assist in developing instructional techniques and procedures to meet the identified student needs.	0.77681
14.	Assist in developing an understanding of the school community.	0.6601
15.	Assist in relating instructional objectives to identified student needs.	0.76713
16.	Assist in formulating measurable objectives.	0.81049
17.	Assist in developing instruments to evaluate the outcome of instructional activities.	0.82922
18.	Assist in interpreting the results of evaluation.	0.76004

Table 2 (continued)

	Item	Factor 1
19.	Assist in making organizational arrangements to help accomplish school-wide objectives. (e.g., grouping of students, planning class schedules, etc.)	0.74799
20.	Assist in conducting periodic evaluations of instructional activities.	0.69777
21.	Provide suggestions for implementing alternative approaches to achieving instructional objectives.	0.84149
22.	Provide encouragement to teachers during program implementation.	0.66677
23.	Observe instructional procedures in the classroom.	0.59609
24.	Conduct individual conferences with teachers subsequent to classroom observations.	0.71042
25.	Define and write objectives with teachers.	0.63150
26.	Suggest structuring or re-structuring content to be taught and/or instruc-	0.72271

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Factor 1
tional procedures to be utilized.	
27. Assist in the orientation aspect of testing.	0.73525
28. Assist in monitoring the testing.	0.64574
29. Assist in interpreting test results.	0.75450
30. Assist in developing instructional programs, activities, etc., based on test results.	0.80545
31. Involve staff in planning staff development activities.	0.49488
32. Select and arrange in-service activities for the individual teacher, groups of teachers or the entire faculty.	0.64154
33. Assist with the implementation of new ideas gained during staff development.	0.74337
34. Conduct in-service activities relevant to the needs of the faculty.	0.57270
35. Plan with the principal for the supervision of the instructional program.	0.66599
36. Keep the principal informed of progress	0.64900

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Factor 1
and problems in relation to the instructional program.	
37. Secure services of resource persons in the school and persons not assigned to your school.	0.45884
38. Devote full-time to instructional activities.	0.57509

Factor	Eignvalue	Pic Of Var	Com Pic
1	14.10154	74.0	74.0

specialists during one of their regular meetings in May, 1979. The participants were given oral as well as written directions. The letter, the PPDQ and an addressed, return envelope were mailed to each teacher during the same month. Telephone calls reminding participants to send in the PPDQ followed the letter. Eighty-five percent of the teachers, 87% of the curriculum specialists, and 90% of the principals responded. According to Fox (1976) and Kerlinger (1973), an 85% return is important if results are to be accurate. The letter of explanation is contained in Appendix C.

Treatment of the Data

The data were computer analyzed. One-way Analysis of Variance was followed by a Scheffé multiple comparisons test, when appropriate, and used to compare the differences between the means of the teacher, principal, and curriculum specialist. Discriminant analysis was used to identify the "best set" of variables that discriminated between the groups. An analysis of the data is presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

Presentation and Analysis of Data

This chapter presents and analyzes the data obtained from a questionnaire that determined whether or not significant differences existed between the views of teachers, curriculum specialists and principals relevant to the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of program planning and development (hereafter referred to as PPD). The hypothesis stated that there would be significant differences in how the performance is viewed by these groups of individuals.

As noted in Chapter 2, "Review of Related Literature," there is concrete evidence of discrepancies between the perceptions of teachers, supervisors and principals. Because the literature provided substantial evidence of the crucial relationship between perceptions and behavior, the hypothesis seems justified for this investigation. This chapter consists of the analysis of the data which supports the hypothesis and answers the two research questions presented in Chapter 1. The eight grouped variables measured were the total area of PPD and the following seven sub-categories:

1) Identification of Needs

2) Development of Objectives

3) Program Implementation

4) Program Modification

5) Testing Program

6) Professional Growth

7) Program Supervision

Question 1:

Are there differences between the perceptions of teachers, curriculum specialists and principals relevant to the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of program planning and development?

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to answer this question. This technique is one of the most powerful tests available for determining whether there are significant differences among sets of measurements (Gilford, 1965). The data analysis tested the means of the three groups. An F-ratio was obtained to determine if there were significant amounts of variability between them. There was a tendency toward significance which indicated that the means of the groups were significantly different. The Bartlett test for homogeneity of variances showed that the variances were significantly different at the .05 level. The Scheffé Multiple range test for paired comparison was applied in cases where the F-test indicated significant differences.

Analysis of the data is presented in summary Tables 3 through 5. Tables showing the specific analysis for each variable are in Appendix E (Tables A-H) and Appendix F (Tables I-P).

The means and standard deviations for all variables are shown in Table 3. An inspection of these indicates that the means for teachers are consistently greater, in each category, than the means for curriculum specialists and principals. The mean for principals is greater than the mean for curriculum specialists in each category except Needs. Standard deviations for principals are less than those for curriculum specialists in sub-categories Program Modification and Program Supervision. The total means are greater than the means for curriculum specialists and the means for principals. However, the means for teachers are greater than the total means.

Table 4 shows that the analysis of variance produced significant F ratios for each of the variables. The total PPD F is 8.448 (P=.000) which is about the same as the Testing Program F (F=8.647, P=.0003). The program supervision F of 13.673 (P=.0000) is highly significant. Significant F ratios are also shown for Needs (F=5.579, P=.0046), Objectives (F=3.221, P=.00426), Program Implementation (F=3.821, P=.0240) and Program Modification (F=5.533, P=.0048).

Table 3

Group Means of Teachers', Curriculum Specialists', and Principals' Perception of Curriculum Specialists in the Task Area of PPD

			Variables						
Group	N	Total	IDF NEEDS	DEV OBJ	PROG IMPL	PROG MOD	TEST PROG	PROF GROWTH	PROG SUPV
Tea	103	52.8	7.9	7.2	7.4	7.6	8.0	7.2	7.5
	(SD)	(20.0)	(3.7)	(3.3)	(3.2)	(3.2)	(3.9)	(3.2)	(3.8)
Curr	28	39.0	6.2	5.6	5.8	5.9	5.9	5.5	4.2
Spec	(SD)	(12.9)	(2.5)	(1.8)	(2.2)	(2.5)	(2.5)	(1.9)	(4.5)
Prin	28	43.4	6.0	1.5	6.3	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.1
	(SD)	(9.9)	(1.8)	(1.9)	(2.1)	(1.6)	(1.6)	(1.8)	(1.9)
Total	159	48.7	7.2	6.7	6.9	7.1	7.1	6.7	6.7
	(SD)	(18.3)	(3.3)	(2.9)	(2.9)	(2.9)	(2.9)	(2.9)	(3.2)

Tea = Teachers

Curr Spec = Curriculum Specialists

Prin = Principals

Since the analysis of variance evidenced significance for each variable, Scheffé tests were made. Table 5 shows that the results of these tests yielded significant difference between certain groups. For the variables total PPD, needs and testing program, significant differences were noted between the means for teachers and the means for principals. Significant differences were also noted between the means for the teachers and the means for curriculum specialists for each variable except needs. Significant differences between principals and curriculum specialists were not noted. Tables I-P in Appendix F illustrate specific data on the Scheffé comparison.

Question 2:

Can particular variables in which the mean differences among the groups are pronounced be identified?

To determine whether there were particular variables in which differences between the perceptions of teachers, curriculum specialists and principals are pronounced, discriminant analysis was used. The stepwise, a multiple linear regression procedure, was employed to select the "best" discriminators. According to Nie, et al., this method allows variables to be entered in the analysis through a variety of stepwise methods designed to locate the "best set" of discriminating variables. The stepwise

Table 4

Overall Test of Significance of Group Differences

(df = 2 and 156)

Variable	F	P
Total	8.448	.0003
Needs	5.579	.0046
Objectives	3.221	.0426
Program Implementation	3.821	.0240
Program Modification	5.533	.0048
Testing Program	8.647	.0003
Professional Growth	4.316	.0150
Program Supervision	13.673	.0000

Table 5

Scheffé's Test of Comparison of Mean Differences of Groups for All Variables (P Value .05)

Comparison Groups	Variables TOTAL PPD	NEEDS	OBJ	IMPL	PROG MOD	TEST PROG	PROF GROWTH	PROG SUPV
Tea. vs. Curr. Spec.	*	-	*	*	*	*	*	*
Tea. vs. Prin	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-
Curr. Spec. vs. Prin.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level

(-) Denotes pairs of groups not significantly different

NOTE: Tables I through P in Appendix F show the data related to the Scheffé contrasts for paired comparison.

procedure sequentially selects the next best discriminator at each step by choosing the one that minimizes the value obtained for Wilks' lambda, a multivariate measure that indicates the power of the selected variables to discriminate between groups. It varies between 0.00 for perfect between group seperation to 1.00 for complete and overlap of groups. Wilks' lambda and a tolerence level of.01 were designated as selection criteria. The overall multivariate F ratio was used to test difference between the means of the three groups.

The individual variables considered in the stepwise procedure are the following 28 items related to the seven grouped variables:

Identification of Needs

Q11. Assist in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.

Q12. Assist in analyzing the curriculum content and instructional procedures in relation to identified student needs.

Q13. Assist in developing instructional techniques and procedures to meet the identified student needs.

Q14. Assist in developing an understanding of the school community.

Development of Objectives

Q15. Assist in relating instructional objectives to

identified students needs.

Q16. Assist in formulating measureable objectives.

Q17. Assist in developing instruments to evaluate the outcomes of instructional activities.

Q18. Assist in interpreting the results of evaluation.

Program Implementation

Q19. Assist in making organizational arrangements to help accomplish school-wide objectives (e.g. grouping of students, planning class schedules, etc.).

Q20. Assist in conducting periodic evaluations of instructional activities.

Q21. Provide suggestions for implementing alternative approaches to achieving instructional objectives.

Q22. Provide encouragement to teachers during program implementation.

Program Modification

Q23. Observe instructional procedures in the classroom.

Q24. Conduct individual conferences with teachers subsequent to classroom observation.

Q25. Define and write objectives with teachers.

Q26. Suggest structuring or restructuring content to be taught and/or instructional procedures to be utilized.

Testing Program

Q27. Assist in the orientation aspect of testing.

Q28. Assist in monitoring the testing.

Q29. Assist in interpreting test results.

Q30. Assist in developing instructional programs, activities, etc., based on test results.

Professional Growth

Q31. Involve staff in planning staff development activities.

Q32. Select and arrange in-service activities for the individual teacher, groups of teachers or the entire faculty.

Q33. Assist with the implementation of new ideas gained during staff development.

Q34. Conduct in-service activities relevant to the needs of the faculty.

Program Supervision

Q35. Plan with the principal for the supervision of the instructional program.

Q36. Keep the principal informed of progress and problems in relation to the instructional program.

Q37. Secure services of resource persons in the school and persons not assigned to your school.

Q38. Devote full-time to instructional activities.

Table 6 shows the Wilks' lambda and F value for each of the variables before the stepwise procedure was employed. As may be noted, each of the variables possessed some discriminating power. Variable Q38 (Devotes full-time to instructional activities) with a F of 45.83 possessed the

Table 6

Wilks' Lambda, F-Ratio and Significance

Before Stepwise Procedure

(2 and 156 df)

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	F	Significance
Needs			
Q11	0.89778	8.881	0.0002
Q12	0.94635	4.422	0.0135
Q13	0.97006	2.407	0.0934
Q14	0.95401	3.760	0.0254
Objectives			
Q15	0.95289	3.856	0.0232
Q16	0.95900	3.334	0.0382
Q17	0.03451	5.466	0.0051
Q18	0.95237	3.901	0.0222
Program Implementation			
Q19	0.97741	1.803	0.1683
Q20	0.95411	3.751	0.0256
Q21	0.95114	4.007	0.0201
Q22	0.98186	1.441	0.2398
Program Modification			
Q23	0.92735	6.110	0.0028

Table 6 (continued)

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	F	Significance
Program Modification			
Q24	0.97916	1.660	0.1934
Q25	0.96799	2.580	0.0790
Q26	0.94108	4.883	0.0088
Testing Program			
Q27	0.92785	6.065	0.0029
Q28	0.91966	6.814	0.0015
Q29	0.93526	5.399	0.0054
Q30	0.89990	8.676	0.0003
Professional Growth			
Q31	0.96883	2.509	0.0846
Q32	0.97128	2.307	0.1030
Q33	0.94910	4.183	0.0170
Q34	0.93966	5.009	0.0078
Program Supervision			
Q35	0.96044	3.213	0.0429
Q36	0.94473	4.563	0.0119
Q37	0.95947	3.295	0.0397
Q38	0.62991	4.583	P> 0.00009

greatest amount of discrimination.

Table 7 provides an analysis of the stepwise criteria by which the "best set" of discriminating variables was selected. It shows the tolerence level and the "significance of F to remove." As shown in this table, the following six variables were selected for the analysis:

Q38 Devote full-time to instructional supervision.

Q37 Secure services of resource persons in the school and services not assigned to your school.

Q11 Assist in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.

Q15 Assist in relating instructional objectives to identified student needs.

Q17 Assist in developing instruments to evaluate the outcome of instructional activities.

Q18 Assist in interpreting the results of evaluation. Table 7 also shows that as variables were entered into the the analysis, the variables that were previously selected gained more discriminating power (The Wilks' lambda decreased).

Table 8 is a summary of the discriminant analysis. It shows that the Wilks' lambda for the identified variables varied from .426 for Q18 to .630 for variable Q38. As may be noted, the variable entered at step 6 had a F value of 13.38. Variables not entered into further analysis had F

Table 7

Variables in the Analysis After

Each Step in the Stepwise Procedure

Step	Variable	Tolerance	Significance F to Remove	Wilks' Lambda
1	Q38	1.000	0.000	
2	Q37	0.772	0.003	0.630
	Q38	0.772	0.000	0.959
3	Q11	0.851	0.009	0.583
	Q37	0.764	0.007	0.584
	Q38	0.704	0.000	.886
4	Q11	0.538	0.000	0.567
	Q15	0.550	0.000	0.548
	Q37	0.754	0.012	0.511
	Q38	0.777	0.000	0.771
5	Q11	0.503	0.001	0.494
	Q15	0.398	0.000	0.545
	Q17	0.411	0.005	0.483
	Q37	0.740	0.025	0.473
	Q38	0.674	0.000	0.721
6	Q11	0.502	0.001	0.467
	Q15	0.379	0.000	0.486
	Q17	0.299	0.000	0.480
	Q18	0.360	0.015	0.450

Table 7 (continued)

Step	Variable	Tolerance	Significance F to Remove	Wilks' Lambda
6	Q37	0.536	0.023	0.448
	Q38	0.666	0.000	0.676

(-) The new variable in the analysis, after each step, is underlined

levels below this and did not meet the significance level for variable entry. The six variables selected turned out to be powerful enough to show a discriminant function.

Table 8 also illustrates the data for the discriminant function that was computed at each step. The results were quite strong. The eigen value, the measure computed in the process of deriving the discriminant function, equaled to 68% which was relatively high and indicated that the function was important. The canonical correlation shows that the variance accounted for in the six variables was about 64% which indicated that the discriminant function is moderately correlated with the "group" variables at the 0.000 level of significance.

Table 9 shows the F-statistics and significance between the pairs of groups after application of the stepwise procedure. As may be noted, there was a significant difference between the pairs of groups for each variable. The significant levels for teachers vs. curriculum specialists and curriculum specialists vs. principals were at the 0.000 consistently. The F for the principals was at .0353 after step 1 and increased to .042 by the completion of step 3. Then it decreased to 0.000 and stayed at this level through the completion of step 6.

From the coefficients developed in the discriminant analysis, a classification was computed to determine the

Table 8

Summary of Discriminant Analysis

Significant Variables and their Value in Order of their Selection

Step	Variable Entered	Variables Included	Wilks' Lambda	Equivalent F	Sig.
1	Q38	1	0.630	45.83	0.0
2	Q37	2	0.583	23.99	0.000
3	Q11	3	0.548	17.99	0.000
4	Q15	4	0.483	16.80	0.000
5	Q17	5	0.450	14.90	0.000
6	Q18	6	0.426	13.38	0.000

Discriminant Functions Value

Eigen Value	Canonical Correlation	Wilks' Lambda	Chi Square	DF	Sig.
0.679	0.636	0.426	130.93	12	0.000

(Q) - See variables on pages 56-58 for interpretation of "Q."

Table 9

F - Statistics and Significances Between Pairs of Groups After Application of Stepwise Procedure

	Variables					
Group	Q38	Q37	Q11	Q15	Q17	Q18
Tea vs.	91.648	51.321	34.092	25.872	20.591	17.047
Curr Spec	(0.0)	(0.0000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Tea vs.	4.5103	3.3375	5.1572	9.5530	10.034	10.118
Prin	(0.0353)	(0.0381)	(0.0420)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Curr Spec	35.291	25.117	19.259	16.198	14.784	13.386
vs. Prin	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)

effectiveness of the discriminating variables. Nie et al. (1975) stated that by classifying the cases used to derive the discriminant functions and comparing predicted group membership with actual group membership, one can empirically measure the success in discrimination by observing the proportion of correct classifications. Table 10 presents data on the classification computed when all variables were considered in the analysis, before the discriminant stepwise procedure was employed. The classification routine was able to identify correctly 86.6% of the "grouped" cases as members of the groups to which they actually belong. It identified 82.5% of the teachers as teachers, 9% as curriculum specialists and 9% as principals. There was perfect classification of the curriculum specialists. The procedure further classified 86.6% of the principals as principals and 14% as teachers.

Table 11 presents data on the classification that resulted from the stepwise procedure. The routine correctly identified 82.39% of the "grouped" cases. It classified 76.6% of the teachers as teachers, 94.4% of the curriculum specialists as curriculum specialists and 78.6% of the principals as principals. Some misclassifications occurred in each group. The procedured misclassified 10.7% of the teachers as curriculum specialists and 9% as principals, 3.6% of the curriculum specialists as principals, and 6% of

Table 10

Classification Before Stepwise Procedure

Actual Group	Number of Cases	Predicted Group Membership 1	2	3
Group 1	103	85	9	9
		82.5%	8.7%	8.7%
Group 2	28	0	28	0
		0.0%	100%	0.0%
Group 3	28	4	0	24
		14.3%	0.0%	85.7%
Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 86.16%				

Table 11

Classification After Stepwise Procedure

Actual Group	Number of Cases	Predicted Group Membership 1	2	3
Group 1	103	82	11	10
		79.6%	10.7%	9.7%
Group 2	28	0	27	1
		0.0%	96.4%	3.6%
Group 3	28	6	0	22
		21.4%	0.0%	78.6%
Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 82.39%				

the principals as curriculum specialists.

Tables 12, 13, and 14 present the frequency distribution and percentages for the responses of teachers, curriculum specialists and principals to the six discriminating variables. The data reveal that 92 to 100% of the principals responded either "satisfied" and above to each of the variables. Eighty-eight to 100% of the curriculum specialists responded similarly to six of the variables (Q11, Q15, Q17, Q16, and Q37). Only 53% of the curriculum specialists responded "satisfied" and above to variable Q38. Fifty-three to eighty-three percent of the teachers responded similarly to the variables. Variable Q15 received the highest percent of "satisfied" and ratings (100% of the curriculum specialists, 96% of the principals and 82% of the teachers responded with these ratings). One hundred percent of the principals and the curriculum specialists responded "satisfied" and above to Q11.

The data in Tables 12, 13, and 14 also reveal that 28.3% of the teachers and 17.9% of the curriculum specialists responded "uncertain" to variable Q38, and 16.1% of the teachers and 28% of the curriculum specialists responded "dissatisfied" and below to this variable. No principal responded uncertain to this variable; however, 7.6% responded "dissatisfied" and below. This was the only variable where a dissatisfied response was noted for

Table 12

Distribution for Teachers' Ratings of Curriculum Specialists Performance Relevant to the "Best Set" of Discriminating Variables

	Variables					
Degree of Satisfaction	G38	G37	G11	G15	G17	G18
Very Satisfied	12	17	15	17	15	15
	46.2%	60.7%	53.6%	60.7%	53.6%	53.6%
Satisfied	12	11	13	10	11	13
	46.2%	39.3%	46.4%	35.7%	39.3%	46.4%
Uncertain	0	0	0	1	2	0
				3.6%	7.1%	
Dissatisfied	1	0	0	0	0	0
	3.8%					
Very Dissatisfied	1	0	0	0	0	0
	3.8%					

Table 13

Distribution for Principals' Ratings of Curriculum Specialists Performance Relevant to the "Best Set" of Discriminating Variables

	Variables					
Degree of Satisfaction	G38	G37	G11	G15	G17	G18
Very Satisfied	12	17	15	17	15	15
	46.2%	60.7%	53.6%	60.7%	53.6%	53.6%
Satisfied	12	11	13	10	11	13
	46.2%	39.3%	46.4%	35.7%	39.3%	46.4%
Uncertain	0	0	0	1	2	0
				3.6%	7.1%	
Dissatisfied	1	0	0	0	0	0
	3.8%					
Very Dissatisfied	1	0	0	0	0	0
	3.8%					

Table 14

Distribution for Curriculum Specialists' Ratings of Curriculum Specialists Performance Relevant to The "Best Set" of Discriminating Variables

	Variables					
Degree of Satisfaction	G38	G37	G11	G15	G17	G18
Very Satisfied	4	15	21	6	9	11
	14.3%	53.6%	75.0%	21.4%	32.1%	41.7%
Satisfied	11	11	7	19	16	14
	39.3%	39.3%	25.0%	67.9%	57.1%	51.9%
Uncertain	5	1	0	2	2	1
	17.9%	3.6%		7.1%	7.1%	3.7%
Dissatisfied	6	1	0	1	1	1
	21.4%	3.6%		3.6%	3.6%	3.7%
Very Dissatisfied	2	0	0	0		
	7.1%					

principals. However,"uncertain"was noted for variables Q17 and Q18. Table 15 is a summary of ratings

Summary

In the preceding report, the major hypothesis that there are significant differences between the perceptions of teachers, curriculum specialists, and principals relevant to the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of PPD was tested by a one-way analysis of variance.

Tables 3 through 5 reported the results of the analysis which indicate that there appear to be significant differences between two pairs of groups relevant to certain grouped variables. Significant differences were noted between the teachers and the curriculum specialists for each grouped variable expect sub-category "Needs" and between teachers and principals for three variables ("Total PPD," "Needs" and "Testing Program"). No significant differences were noted between principals and curriculum specialists.

Tables 6 through 8 presented the results of the stepwise discriminant analysis procedure that was conducted to identify the set of individual variables that was "best" able to distinguish between the groups of teachers, curriculum specialists and principals. Each of the twenty-eight individual variables possessed some discriminating power before the stepwise procedure was conducted. The stepwise procedure identified the following set of six of them as

Table 15

SUMMARY OF RATINGS RELEVANT
TO THE "BEST" SET OF DISCRIMINATING VARIABLES

	Q38			Q37			Q11			Q15			Q17			Q18		
	T	CS	P	T	CS	P	T	CS	P	T	CS	P	T	CS	P	T	CS	P
Very Satisfied	30 30.3%	4 14.3%	12 46.2%	41 41.4%	15 53.6%	17 60.7%	29 28.7%	21 75.0%	15 53.6%	39 39.0%	6 21.4%	17 60.7%	36 35.6%	9 32.1%	15 53.6%	33 33.0%	11 47.7%	15 53.6%
Satisfied	25 25.3%	11 39.3%	12 46.2%	33 33.3%	11 39.3%	11 39.3%	48 47.5%	7 25.0%	13 46.4%	43 43.0%	19 67.9%	10 35.7%	41 40.6%	16 57.1%	11 39.3%	51 51.0%	14 51.9%	13 46.4%
Uncertain	28 28.3%	5 17.9%	0	17 17.2%	1 3.6%	0	6 5.9%	0	0	8 8.0%	2 7.1%	1 3.6%	12 11.9%	2 7.1%	2 7.1%	7 7.0%	1 3.7%	0
Dissatisfied	11 11.1%	6 21.4%	1 3.8%	5 5.1%	1 3.6%	0	15 14.9%	0	0	7 7.0%	1 3.6%	0	10 9.9%	1 3.5%	0	7 7.0%	1 3.7%	0
Very Dissatisfied	5 5.1%	2 7.1%	1 3.8%	3 3.0%	0	0	3 3.%	0	0	3 3.0%	0	0	2 2.0%	0	0	2 2.0%	0	0

P = Principal

C = Curriculum Specialists

T = Teacher

strong enough to distinguish between the groups; they are listed in order of discriminating power:

Program Supervision

Q38 Devotes full-time to instructional supervision.

Q37 Secures services of resource persons in the school and service not assigned to your school.

Identification of Needs

Q11 Assists in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.

Development of Objectives

Q15 Assists in relating instructional objectives to identified student needs.

Q17 Assists in developing instruments to evaluate the outcome of instructional activities.

Q18 Assists in interpreting the results of evaluation.

This set of variables was selected from three of the seven sub-categories: (1) Program supervision (variables Q38 and Q37), (2) Needs (variable Q11), and (3) Objectives (variables Q15, Q17 and Q18).

Table 9 presented the F-statistics and significance between the pairs of groups relevant to the "best" set of discriminators. The data indicated that there were significant differences between each pair of groups: teachers and curriculum specialists, teachers and principals, and curriculum specialists and principals. It was noted that

significance between teachers and principals was weaken slightly when variables related to "Needs" and supervision entered the analysis. However, it became stronger when variables related to "objectives" were involved.

Tables 10 and 11 presented the classification of the groups before and after the stepwise procedure. The data revealed that the classification after the procedure involving the set of six discriminators was almost as good as classification before the procedure involving the complete set of variables. The following results were reported on the groups:

Group 1: Teachers - The stepwise procedure classified almost 80% of the teachers correctly. Of the 21 that were misclassified, 11 were classified as curriculum specialists and 10 were classified as principals. This compares with 19 misclassifications before the stepwise procedure. Thus, the set of six discriminating variables appears to be almost as good as the complete set in classifying teachers.

Group 2: Curriculum Specialists - This was the best classified group. Before the stepwise procedure, the procedure correctly classified 100% of the curriculum specialists. The stepwise procedure correctly classified 94.4% of the curriculum specialists. Only one curriculum specialist was misclassified as a principal. The set of discriminating variables appears to be almost as good as the complete set

in classifying curriculum specialists. Not one curriculum specialists was classified as a teacher.

Group 3: Principals - The stepwise procedure correctly classified 79% of the principals. This compares with the 85.7% that was indicated before the stepwise procedure. The principal group had the highest percent of misclassifications. The procedure misclassified 21% of the principals as teachers. Not one principal was classified as a curriculum specialist. Classification of principals appears to be slightly better when the complete set of variables are involved, before the stepwise procedure was employed.

Tables 12, 13 and 14 presented the ratings of the "best set" of discriminating variables by the teachers, curriculum specialists and principals. The data reveal the differences in responses made by the groups. The following results were reported:

Group 1: Teachers - The satisfied responses indicated by the teachers ranged from 54% for "Devote full-time to instructional supervision" to 84% for "Assist in interpreting the results of evaluation." Twenty-eight percent indicated uncertain to "Devote full-time to instructional supervision." "Assist in relating objectives to identified student need" received the second highest percent of satisfied responses. The teachers indicated more dissatisfied and very dissatisfied responses than the principals and

curriculum specialists.

Group 2: Curriculum Specialists - The satisfied responses indicated by the curriculum specialists for their performance of tasks ranged from 54% for "Devote full-time to instructional supervision" to 100% for "Assist in relating objectives to instructional objectives to identified student needs." The curriculum specialists indicated a larger percent of satisfactory responses for their own performance than the teacher for each task except "Devote full-time to instructional supervision." Twenty-eight percent indicated "dissatisfied" for their performance in this task and 18% indicated "uncertain."

Group 3: Principals - The satisfied responses indicated by the principals were the highest noted. They ranged from 92% for "Devote full-time to instructional supervision" to 100% for "Secure services and resources" and "Assist in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs." "Assist in relating instructional objectives to identified needs" also received a high percent of satisfied ratings from this group. Only one dissatisfied response was indicated by the principals and it was for "Devote full-time to instructional supervision."

Finally, the responses indicated that the largest percent of satisfied responses came from the principals and the second largest came from the curriculum specialists.

Teachers consistently indicated less satisfied responses.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, Discussion and Recommendations for Future Study

This final chapter presents a summary of the study and conclusions regarding the research questions. Implications drawn from the conclusions are also included.

Summary

It was the purpose of this study to determine if there are differences between the perceptions of teachers, principals, and curriculum specialists relevant to the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of program planning and development. The problem was stated in the following questions:

1. Are there differences between the perceptions of teachers, principals and curriculum specialists relevant to the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of program planning and development?

2. If there are differences, can particular variables in which the differences are pronounced be identified?

To achieve the purpose the following hypothesis was tested:

> There are statistically significant differences in how the performance of curriculum specialists is viewed by teachers, principals and the curriculum

specialists themselves as measured by the Program Planning and Development Questionnaire (PPDQ).

This hypothesis was drawn from the literature which revealed that some discrepancies exist between the perceptions of teachers, principals and supervisors relevant to the performance of supervisors (Neville, 1966; Stibbits, 1972; Blumberg, 1974; Esposito and Burbach, 1974; Beach, 1976; Gordon, 1976; Nasca, 1976; Stebber, 1977; Hetzel, 1978; and Siddiqui, 1979).

The subjects for this investigation were 103 of the 122 randomly selected teachers, 28 of the 32 principals and 28 of the 33 curriculum specialists in the sample school system.

Data for the study were collected through use of a 36-item questionnaire that was a modification of the one used by Lee (1974) in a similar investigation. This instrument met the criteria for reliability and validity.

The compilation and statistical anlaysis of data from the questionnaire were accomplished through the use of a computer. The eight grouped variables measured were:

1. Identification of Needs
2. Development of Objectives
3. Program Implementation
4. Program Modification
5. Testing Program
6. Professional Growth

7. Program Supervision

8. Total PPD

The 28 individual variables measured were:

Identification of Needs

Q11. Assist in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.

Q12. Assist in analyzing the curriculum content and instructional procedures in relation to identified student needs.

Q13. Assist in developing instructional techniques and procedures to meet the identified student needs.

Q14. Assist in developing an understanding of the school community.

Development of Objectives

Q15. Assist in relating instructional objectives to identified student needs.

Q16. Assist in formulating measurable objectives.

Q17. Assist in developing instruments to evaluate the outcomes of instructional activities.

Q18. Assist in interpreting the results of evaluation.

Program Implementation

Q19. Assist in making organizational arrangements to help accomplish school-wide objectives (e.g. grouping of students, planning class schedules, etc.).

Q20. Assist in conducting periodic evaluations of

instructional activities.

Q21. Provide suggestions for implementing alternative approaches to achieving instructional objectives.

Q22. Provide encouragement to teachers during program implementation.

Program Modification

Q23. Observe instructional procedures in the classroom.

Q24. Conduct individual conferences with teachers subsequent to classroom observation.

Q25. Define and write objectives with teachers.

Q26. Suggest structuring or restructuring content to be taught and/or instructional procedures to be utilized.

Testing Program

Q27. Assist in the orientation aspect of testing.

Q28. Assist in monitoring the testing.

Q29. Assist in interpreting test results.

Q30. Assist in developing instructional programs, activities, etc. based on test results.

Professional Growth

Q31. Involve staff in planning staff development activities.

Q32. Select and arrange in-service activities for the individual teacher, groups of teachers or the entire faculty.

Q33. Assist with the implementation of new ideas

gained during staff development.

Q34. Conduct in-service activities relevant to the needs of the faculty.

Statistical tests employed to test the hypothesis were: (1) one-way analysis of variance followed with Scheffé Multiple Range comparisons to determine if significant differences existed between the groups of teachers, curriculum specialists and principals and (2) discriminant analysis, stepwise procedure to determine the variables that discriminated "best" between the groups.

The statistical tests revealed the following findings:

1. There appear to be significant differences between two pairs of groups relevant to the perceptions of curriculum specialists' performance in certain sub-categories in the task area of program planning and development when the eight grouped variables (tasks), are considered:

   a. Significant differences were revealed between teachers and curriculum specialists in the sub-categories Development of Objectives, Program Implementation, Program Modification, Testing Program, Professional Growth and Program Supervision. Curriculum specialists perceived their own performance to be significantly better than teachers perceived it to be in these sub-categories.

   b. Significant differences were revealed between

teachers and principals in the sub-categories Needs and Testing Program. Principals were more satisfied with the performance of the curriculum specialist than teachers.

c. No statistical significant differences were revealed between the curriculum specialists and principals.

2. There appears to be a set of six individual variables among the 28 individual variables that discriminates "best" between the groups:

a. Devote full-time to instructional supervision.

b. Secure services of resource persons in the school and services not assigned to your school.

c. Assist in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.

d. Assist in relating instructional objectives to identified student needs.

e. Assist in developing instruments to evaluate the outcomes of instructional activities.

f. Assist in interpreting the results of evaluation.

3. There appear to be significant differences between the three pairs of groups (teachers and curriculum specialists, teachers and principals and curriculum specialists and principals) relevant to this set of discriminators.

4. The classification of group members relevant to the set of "best" discriminators approached the classification relevant to the complete set of variables.

Conclusion

Although this study focused on supervision at the building level rather than central office level, the findings verified those discrepancies found in a majority of research studies assessing the conflict between teachers and central office supervisors. Within the limitations of this study, the following conclusions relevant to discrepancies between the perceptions of principals and teachers were drawn:

1. There is a statistically significant difference in the way the performance of curriculum specialists in the task area of program planning and developmet is perceived by teachers, curriculum specialists and principals.

2. There is a set of six tasks, among the 22 individual tasks in the area of planning and development that were identified in the literature, that are worthy of consideration beyond initially identifying them as potential discriminators. These six tasks approached the 28 individual tasks in classifying teachers, principals, and curriculum specialists.

3. The performance of curriculum specialists is rated higher by principals than by teachers or curriculum specialists. Teachers appear to be the most dissatisfied with

the curriculum specialists' performance.

Discussion

The six variables that were identified as "best" able to distinguish between the groups and the misclassification of certain group members suggest several possible explanations that might be considered for the differences in the perceptions of the performance of curriculum specialists held by teachers, principals and the curriculum specialists themselves relevant to the task area of program planning and development.

Initially, program planning and development is a major responsibility of the curriculum specialists. It is possible that the sample school system's heavy emphasis on this area has created much enthusiasm and interest on the part of the curriculum specialists as well as developed their skills. Curriculum specialists are expected to guide the development of the school's annual plan as well as assist teachers in the development of their plans for instruction. The specialists focus on analyzing needs and developing objectives and strategies to meet identified needs which are two sub-categories in the area of program planning and development. Individual tasks in these sub-sub-categories were among the set of strongest discriminators, although Development of Needs was the only sub-category where there was not a significant difference when the

22 individual variables were considered. An alternative explanation for this might be that the close supervision given to teachers in the area of program planning and development contributed to discrepancies in their perceptions and the perceptions of curriculum specialists and principals. A few of the teachers might interpret supervisory services as "questioning their professional integrity" (Munnelly, 1970). This suggests that school officials need to focus on a role for principals that enhances their active involvement in program planning and development.

Another explanation for discrepancies between the groups is that the instructional orientation of the curriculum specialists might have contributed to the differences between their perceptions of their performances and the perceptions of principals and teachers. Staff development in such areas as "clinical supervision," "effective teaching," "utilizing test results," and "teacher evaluation" has helped the curriculum specialists refine their role and become more skillful in instructional supervision. As a result curriculum specialists are highly instructional orientated and probably interpret supervisory tasks in light of the ideal. Principals have not had this training, and they do not assist the teachers directly in these areas. Most of the principals tend to include all the tasks performed by the curriculum specialists, administrative as

well as supervisory, when considering the curriculum specialist's instructional role. On the other hand, teachers tend to interpret tasks and performance in light of the specific help they have received for what they perceive to be their "real" classroom problems. The best possible relationship requires that perceptions be congruent. This suggests that the sample school officials consider providing training in instructional areas for principals as well as curriculum specialists and teachers. Some attention should be given to the role of the curriculum specialists and how administration and supervision overlap. Some emphasis should be placed on recognizing the principal and curriculum specialists as an instructional team rather than an administrative team.

It is also possible that the task "Devotes full-time to instructional supervision" was included in the set of strong discriminators because of the varied degrees of instructional orientation of the groups. Curriculum specialists are very much aware of what their role is and what it should be in the schools. They seem to realize that the school system's focus on "effective teaching" demands more time for instructional orientated activities than they can find in a school day. Also, curriculum specialists' comments indicate they feel that many "other" tasks prohibit them from devoting full-time to instructional supervision. A small

percent of the teachers also indicated the curriculum specialists have too many tasks to perform to devote full-time to instructional supervision. Principals tend to feel that curriculum specialists devote full-time to instructional supervision. This suggests that some emphasis should be placed on clarification of role and the establishment of priorities relevant to supervisory tasks.

The principals in the sample system often state that they are very fortunate in having curriculum specialists assigned to their individual schools full-time to supervise instruction. It is possible that this was reflected in the positive ratings they gave curriculum specialists. Of the three groups, principals appear to be most satisfied with the performance of the curriculum specialists and teachers appear to be least satisfied.

The errors in classification of the groups tended to fall in the principals' group. One possibility for the misclassification of six (21.4%) of the principals as curriculum specialists is that six (20.6%) of the principals were curriculum specialits before they were principals. Also three (10.3%) of the principals were either mathematics or reading specialists. Principals with this background seem to be more instructional orientated. Experience as reading specialist is also background of some of the curriculum specialists.

The possibility for the classification of one curriculum specialist as a principal is that a least three of the curriculum specialists voiced preference for administrative positions, such as principal or assistant principal, before they became curriculum specialists. These persons have a tendency to desire and to focus on the administrative aspect of supervision.

Many of the teachers in the sample school system have expressed a desire to become administrators, and some of them are studying for their masters degrees in educational administration and supervision. It seems possible that the twenty teachers (20.4%) who were misclassified as curriculum specialists and principals came from this group.

The analysis of the data on classification suggests that background and or ambition contributed to misclassifications relevant to perceptions. It seems very important to consider these in assigning persons to the position of curriculum specialist and in assessing staff development needs of the groups.

Finally, in terms of statistical analysis, another relevent contribution to the various degrees of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the performance of the curriculum specialists might be the unequal sizes of the groups. Gillford (1965) pointed out that the analysis of variance technique has been derived on the basis of mathematical reasoning which

assumes that the variances within sets of measures are approximately equal. Although the unequal sizes of the groups in this study seem to raise a question, the differences between the means, especially the variance for the teachers, are so great until where the F-ratios so indicate, the means are probably different.

Reasons unknown to the writer might have also contributed to the discrepancies between the perceptions of the groups.

Recommendation for Further Research

Although the present study added considerable support to the view that there are discrepancies between the ratings of the performance of supervisors by various groups in the educational arena, the findings and conclusions left some questions and suggested answers in need of further research. Thus, the following are recommended:

1. Further investigation of the various groups is needed to determine whether demographic variables of the group members and of the schools affect their perceptions.

2. A modified replication of this study that includes other task areas is needed to determine if perceptions vary from one task area to another.

3. A modified replication of this study is needed to determine the attitude of the groups toward the various task areas.

4. A modified replication of this study that includes central office supervisors as a group is needed to provide additional insight into perceptions of supervision held by various groups in the educational arena.

The implications and recommendations drawn from this study might contribute to the kind of building level supervisory program that would assist in providing quality instruction for all students during this period of rapid change in our society.

Appendices

Appendix A

Letter of Approval

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF APPROVAL

April 25, 1979

Miss Vasti DeLoatch
Director for Elementary Instruction
Richmond Public Schools
301 North 9th Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dear Miss DeLoatch:

I am pleased to know that you are interested in replicating my study, "Teachers' Perceptions of Curriculum Specialists." During the time that I conducted the study, 1974, the position was new and at times perceptions of the role were not clear, even to curriculum specialists themselves. Therefore, a replication at this time, five years after the initial study, should provide you with valuable information.

Good Luck!

Sincerely yours,

Nathaniel Lee
Assistant Superintendent
Community and Governmental
Relations

/t

Appendix B

Task Force on Supervision Report

APPENDIX B

TASK FORCE ON SUPERVISION REPORT

ANALYSIS BY THE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT OF THE RICHMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS of the TASK FORCE ON SUPERVISION QUESTIONNAIRES. The questionnaires were sent to Richmond Public School personnel for their interpretations of the responsibilities of the positions of

- AREA COORDINATOR
- PRINCIPAL
- K-12 SUPERVISOR
- INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANT

TASK FORCE ON SUPERVISION COMMITTEE

Mr. Tanner Collins
Miss Eleanor Douthat
Mr. Harvey Freeman
Mrs. Beresenia Hill
Mrs. Mary Payne
Mr. Charles Spurlock
Mr. Sidney Parker
Mr. Ralph Dickens
Mr. Harry Savage
Mrs. Mabel Pace
Miss Helen Cynthia Rose, Chairman

III. Job Description - Instructional Assistant
(Curriculum Specialist)

The Instructional Assistant is primarily concerned with the planning and development of programs designed to meet the instructional needs of children within the school. The Instructional Assistnat is informed on current educational trends and developments and offers leadership and assistance to the school staff in planning and implementing new programs.

The responsibilities of the Instructional Assistant are in the following major areas:

Program Planning and Development

- Provides support in the implementation of instructional objectives.
- Contributes to the development of a program to meet instructional needs of children within the schools.
- Assists in identifying and assessing the curriculum and instructional needs of children within the school and school system.
- Works with immediate administrator to plan strategies for accomplishing objectives.
- Helps to set instructional objectives for the individual school.

Instructional Assistant (Curriculum Specialist) continued

Personnel Management and Services

- Keeps informed and participate in current educational trends and developments.
- Assists school staff in planning and implementing new programs and provides continuing support for them.
- Establishes effective working relationship with instructional personnel in assigned area of responsibility.
- Provides guidance and material help to administrators, department chairmen, classroom teachers and special area teachers.
- Plans and conducts in-service for instruction and curriculum development.

School personnel assigned the highest importance to the Instructional Assistant's role of implementing instructional objectives, of identifying and assessing the curriculum and instructional needs of students, and of developing a program to meet students' instructional needs. Secondary emphases were placed on the Instructional Assistant's role of setting instructional objectives and working with the immediate administration to plan strategies for accomplishing objectives. Little importance was attached to the Instructional Assistant's role of submitting for approval a plan for carrying out assigned responsibility.

Instructional Assistant (Curriculum Specialist) continued

A. Program Planning and Development

Questionnaire Item		Transformed Mean	Original Mean	Standard Deviation
I	A	4.46	4.44	.99
	B	4.79	4.50	.85
	C	3.38	4.24	1.01
	D	3.65	4.29	.96
	E	1.01	3.80	1.15
	F	5.00	4.54	.77

B. Personnel Management and Services

Questionnaire Item		Transformed Mean	Original Mean	Standard Deviation
II	A	1.01	3.07	1.21
	B	4.50	4.38	.90
	C	2.95	3.80	1.05
	D	4.26	4.29	.81
	E	4.23	4.28	.94
	F	4.66	4.44	.78
	G	3.99	4.19	1.05
	H	3.49	4.00	1.18
	I	5.00	4.57	.81

ADDENDUM

The following addendum presents a further analysis of the data generated in the "Task Force on Supervision Questionnaires." While permitting the reader to view the importance of subscales of the original questionnaire by supervisory position, it is important to emphasize that the reader should investigate the items that comprise the subscales to understand the importance of various functions delineated within each subscale.

Following the presentation of this analysis by supervisory position, an additional table is presented. The Comparative Ranking of Subscales Across All Questionnaires. This table is presented for the convenience of the reader, and is an attempt to assist the reader in conceptualizing the same functions across the four supervisory positions.

It would be emphasized that regardless of ranking, all subscales represent legitimate functions of the four supervisory positions. However, the relative importance of each subscale is assessed through this type of investigation.

Instructional Assistant (Curriculum Specialist)

Frequency Distribution of Means

Subscale	above 4.40	4.25-4.49	4.00-4.24	3.75-3.99	below 3.75
A	2	2	2	1	0
B	1	4	2	1	1
C	0	0	1	3	0
D	0	0	0	3	3
E	0	0	0	0	4
F	0	0	0	1	2
G	0	0	2	2	1
H	0	2	4	0	1

School personnel are concerned with the Instructional Assistant's ability to plan and develop the program and his ability in personnel management. School personnel are least concerned with his ability in community-public relations. In descending order of importance, the ranking of the subscales are as follows:

1. Program planning and development
2. Personnel management services
3. Interpersonal leadership
4. Evaluation of program and personnel
5. Administrative functions
6. Procuring and collecting resources
7. Interacting and articulating within the school system
8. Community-public relations

Appendix C

Letters of Transmittal

APPENDIX C

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL

TO: CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE JOINT ELEMENTARY CABINET

Mrs. Lois H. Jones, Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Education
Mr. Bob L. Sigmon, Director, Elementary Administration
Dr. Russell Busch, Director, Federal Programs
Dr. George McClary, Director, Special Education
Dr. Delores R. Greene, Administrator II, Elementary Education
Mrs. Ruth T. Gayles, Supervisor, Elementary Communicative Arts
Dr. Lucien T. Hall, Jr., Supervisor, Elementary Mathematics/Science
Mrs. Dale S. Nelson, Supervisor, EPAH

FROM: Miss Vasti DeLoatch
Director, Elementary Instruction

SUBJECT: Instrument for Evaluating the Value of the Role of Elementary Supervision at the Building Level

I am in the process of studying the Role of Elementary Supervision of Instruction at the Building Level. I have expanded the instrument used by Dr. Lee in 1974 to include two additional task areas: Testing Program and Professional Growth. Please review these two sections of the enclosed instrument and give me your feedback on the content of the items by Monday, May 14, 1979. Your suggestions will be considered in the revision of certain items.

Thank you!

/b

Enclosure

May 24, 1979

TO: Certain Elementary Teachers

FROM: Vasti DeLoatch
Director for Elementary Instruction

SUBJECT: Attached Research Instrument

The role of supervision at the building level has become increasingly important as we focus on "quality education" for all children in Richmond Public Schools. In an attempt to improve this role, I am undertaking a research project. You can greatly assist in this effort by completing the enclosed questionnaire. This is a modified version of the instrument used by Dr. Nathaniel Lee in 1974.

Please return this form on or before June 12, 1979. Your responses will not be identified by name or by school. The information provided by you will be kept confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation.

REMEMBER: Please return questionnaire to me by June 12, 1979.

NOTE: Please return in the enclosed envelope!

/b

Enclosure

Appendix D

Program Planning and Development Questionnaires

APPENDIX D
PROGRAM PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

QUESTIONNAIRES

CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTARY CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS

PART A

Please indicate your response to the items below by placing the letter of the correct choice in the space to the left of each item.

____ 1. Indicate your title

a) Curriculum Specialist
b) Curriculum Specialist/Assistant Principal

____ 2. Indicate the range which contains your age

a) 18 - 27
b) 28 - 37
c) 38 - 47
d) 48 or older

____ 3. Indicate your sex

a) Male
b) Female

____ 4. Indicate your race

a) Black
b) White
c) Other

____ 5. Indicate your teaching experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 6. Indicate your supervisory experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 7. Indicate your administrative experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 8. Indicate the number of years in present school

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 9. Indicate whether there is a discrepency in your undergraduate training assignment

a) Grade levels the same as undergraduate training
b) Grade levels different from undergraduate training

____ 10. Indicate school size

a) Less than 600
b) 600 - 1199
c) 1200 or more

PART B

The curriculum specialist supervises instruction at the building level.

DIRECTIONS: In the appropriate column to the right of each statement, please indicate your degree of satisfaction with your performance as it relates to helping teachers.

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Uncertain	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Identification of Needs (Needs Assessment) Curriculum specialists are to provide assistance to teachers in the identification and assessment of curriculum and instructional needs of students. To what degree are you satisfied that you:					
11. Assist in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.					
12. Assist in analyzing the curriculum content and instructional procedures in relation to identified student needs.					
13. Assist in developing instructional techniques and procedures to meet the identified student needs.					
14. Assist in developing an understanding of the school community.					
Development of Objectives Curriculum specialists are to provide assistance to teachers in formulating instructional objectives. To what degree are you satisfied that you:					
15. Assist in relating instructional objectives to identified students needs.					
16. Assist in formulating measurable objectives.					
17. Assist in developing instruments to evaluate the outcome of instructional activities.					
18. Assist in interpreting the results of evaluation.					
Program Implementation Curriculum specialists are to assist administrators and teachers in implementing strategies to accomplish instructional objectives. To what degree are you satisfied that you:					
19. Assist in making organizational arrangements to help accomplish school-wide objectives. (e.g., grouping of students, planning class schedules, etc.)					
20. Assist in conducting periodic evaluations of instructional activities.					
21. Provide suggestions for implementing alternative approaches to achieving instructional objectives.					
22. Provide encouragement to teachers during program implementation.					

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Uncertain	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Program Modification Curriculum specialists are to assist teachers in modifying an instructional program to meet the instructional needs of students. To what degree are you satisfied that you:					
23. Observe instructional procedures in the classroom.					
24. Conduct indiviudal conferences with teachers subsequent to classroom observations.					
25. Define and write objectives with teachers.					
26. Suggest structuring or re-structuring content to be taught and/or instructional procedures to be utilized.					
Testing Program The curriculum specialists are to assist in implementing the school testing program. To what degree are you satisfied that you:					
27. Assist in the orientation aspect of testing.					
28. Assist in monitoring the testing.					
29. Assist in interpreting test results.					
30. Assist in developing instructional programs, activities, etc., based on test results.					
Professional Growth Curriculum specialists are to plan, coordinate, and implement staff development in the school. To what degree are you satisfied that you:					
31. Involve staff in planning staff development activities.					
32. Select and arrange in-service activities for the individual teacher, groups of teachers, or the entire faculty.					
33. Conduct in-service activities relevant to the needs of the faculty.					
34. Assist with the implementation of new ideas gained during staff development.					
Program Supervision Curriculum specialists are to perform supervisory duties under the administration of the principal. To what degree are you satisfied that you:					
35. Plan with the principal for the supervision of the instructional program.					
36. Keep the principal informed of progress and problems in relation to the instructional program.					
37. Secure services of resource persons in the school and persons not assigned to your school.					
38. Devote full time to instructional activities.					

PART A

Please indicate your response to the items below by placing the letter of the correct choice in the space to the left of each item.

____ 1. Indicate the range which contains your age

a) 18 - 27
b) 28 - 37
c) 38 - 47
d) 48 or older

____ 2. Indicate your sex

a) Male
b) Female

____ 3. Indicate your race

a) Black
b) White
c) Other

____ 4. Indicate your teaching experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 5. Indicate your supervisory experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 6. Indicate your administrative experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 7. Indicate the number of years in present school

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 8. Indicate whether there is a discrepency in your undergraduate training assignment

a) Grade levels the same as undergraduate training
b) Grade levels different from undergraduate training

____ 9. Indicate school size

a) Less than 600
b) 600 - 1199
c) 1200 or more

PART B

The curriculum specialist supervises instruction at the building level.

DIRECTIONS: In the appropriate column to the right of each statement please indicate your degree of satisfaction with the performance of your curriculum specialist as it relates to you as a principal.

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Uncertain	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Identification of Needs (Needs Assessment) Curriculum specialists are to provide assistance to teachers in the identification and assessment of curriculum and instructional needs of students. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
10. Assists in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.					
11. Assists in analyzing the curriculum content and instructional procedures in relation to identified students needs.					
12. Assists in developing instructional techniques and procedures to meet the identified student needs.					
13. Assists in developing an understanding of the school community.					
Development of Objectives Curriculum specialists are to provide assistance to teachers in formulating instructional objectives. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
14. Assists in relating instructional objectives to identified students needs.					
15. Assists in formulating measurable objectives.					
16. Assists in developing instruments to evaluate the outcome of instructional activities.					
17. Assists in interpreting the results of evaluation.					
Program Implementation Curriculum specialists are to assist administrators and teachers in implementing strategies to accomplish instructional objectives. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
18. Assists in making organizational arrangements to help accomplish school-wide objectives. (e.g., grouping of students, planning class schedules, etc.)					
19. Assists in conducting periodic evaluations of instructional activities.					
20. Provides suggestions for implementing alternative approaches to achieving instructional objectives.					
21. Provides encouragement to teachers during program implementation.					

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Uncertain	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Program Modification Curriculum specialists are to assist teachers in modifying an instructional program to meet the instructional needs of students. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
22. Observes instructional procedures in the classroom.					
23. Conducts individual conferences with teachers subsequent to classroom observations.					
24. Defines and writes objectives with teachers.					
25. Suggests structuring or re-structuring content to be taught and/or instructional procedures to be utilized.					
Testing Program The curriculum specialists are to assist in implementing the school testing program. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
26. Assists in the orientation aspect of testing.					
27. Assists in monitoring the testing.					
28. Assists in interpreting test results.					
29. Assists in developing instructional programs, activities, etc., based on test results.					
Professional Growth Curriculum specialists are to plan, coordinate, and implement staff development in the school. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
30. Involves staff in planning staff development activities.					
31. Selects and arranges in-service activities for the individual teacher, groups of teachers, or the entire faculty.					
32. Conducts in-service activities relevant to the needs of the faculty.					
33. Assists with the implementation of new ideas gained during staff development.					
Program Supervision Curriculum specialists are to perform supervisory duties under the administration of the principal. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
34. Plans with the principal for the supervision of the instructional program.					
35. Keeps the principal informed of progress and problems in relation to the instructional program.					
36. Secures services of resource persons in the school and persons not assigned to your school.					
37. Devotes full time to instructional activities.					

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTARY CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS

PART A

Please indicate your response to the items below by placing the letter of the correct choice in the space to the left of each item.

____ 1. Indicate the range which contains your age

a) 18 - 27
b) 28 - 37
c) 38 - 47
d) 48 or older

____ 2. Indicate your sex

a) Male
b) Female

____ 3. Indicate your race

a) Black
b) White
c) Other

____ 4. Indicate your teaching experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 5. Indicate your supervisory experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 6. Indicate your administrative experience

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 7. Indicate the number of years in present school

a) Less than 1 year
b) 1 - 2 years
c) 3 - 4 years
d) 5 or more years

____ 8. Indicate whether there is a discrepency in your undergraduate training assignment

a) Grade levels the same as undergraduate training
b) Grade levels different from undergraduate training

____ 9. Indicate school size

a) Less than 600
b) 600 - 1199
c) 1200 or more

PART B

The curriculum specialist supervises instruction at the building level.

DIRECTIONS: In the appropriate column to the right of each statement please indicate your degree of satisfaction with the performance of your curriculum specialist as it relates to you as a teacher.

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Uncertain	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Identification of Needs (Needs Assessment) Curriculum specialists are to provide assistance to teachers in the identification and assessment of curriculum and instructional needs of students. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
10. Assists in diagnosing individual student and class instructional needs.					
11. Assists in analyzing the curriculum content and instructional procedures in relation to identified students needs.					
12. Assists in developing instructional techniques and procedures to meet the identified student needs.					
13. Assists in developing an understanding of the school community.					
Development of Objectives Curriculum specialists are to provide assistance to teachers in formulating instructional objectives. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
14. Assists in relating instructional objectives to identified students needs.					
15. Assists in formulating measurable objectives.					
16. Assists in developing instruments to evaluate the outcome of instructional activities.					
17. Assists in interpreting the results of evaluation.					
Program Implementation Curriculum specialists are to assist administrators and teachers in implementing strategies to accomplish instructional objectives. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
18. Assists in making organizational arrangements to help accomplish school-wide objectives. (e.g., grouping of students, planning class schedules, etc.)					
19. Assists in conducting periodic evaluations of instructional activities.					
20. Provides suggestions for implementing alternative approaches to achieving instructional objectives.					
21. Provides encouragement to teachers during program implementation.					

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Uncertain	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Program Modification Curriculum specialists are to assist teachers in modifying an instructional program to meet the instructional needs of students. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
22. Observes instructional procedures in the classroom.					
23. Conducts individual conferences with teachers subsequent to classroom observations.					
24. Defines and writes objectives with teachers.					
25. Suggests structuring or re-structuring content to be taught and/or instructional procedures to be utilized.					
Testing Program The curriculum specialists are to assist in implementing the school testing program. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
26. Assists in the orientation aspect of testing.					
27. Assists in monitoring the testing.					
28. Assists in interpreting test results.					
29. Assists in developing instructional programs, activities, etc., based on test results.					
Professional Growth Curriculum specialists are to plan, coordinate, and implement staff development in the school. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
30. Involves staff in planning staff development activities.					
31. Selects and arranges in-service activities for the individual teacher, groups of teachers, or the entire faculty.					
32. Conducts in-service activities relevant to the needs of the faculty.					
33. Assists with the implementation of new ideas gained during staff development.					
Program Supervision Curriculum specialists are to perform supervisory duties under the administration of the principal. To what degree are you satisfied that your curriculum specialist:					
34. Plans with the principal for the supervision of the instructional program.					
35. Keeps the principal informed of progress and problems in relation to the instructional program.					
36. Secures services of resource persons in the school and persons not assigned to your school.					
37. Devotes full time to instructional activities.					

Appendix E

Supplementary Tables: Analysis of Variance

APPENDIX E

TABLE A

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE TOTAL AREA OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

SOURCE	D.F.	SS	MS	F RATIO	F PROB.
Between Groups	2	5194.7542	2597.3770	8.448	0.0003
Within Groups	156	47960.4333	307.4385		
Total	158	53155.1875			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teachers	103	52.8349	20.0059
Curriculum Specialists	28	39.0000	12.9329
Principals	28	43.3571	9.8515
Total	159	48.7296	18.3419

Bartlett-Box F = 10.207, P = 0.000

TABLE B

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY OF IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

SOURCE	D.F.	SS	MS	F RATIO	F. PROB.
Between Groups	2	115.9681	57.9840	5.579	0.0046
Within Groups	156	1621.4574	10.3940		
Total	158	1737.4253			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teachers	103	7.8738	3.6560
Curriculum Specialists	28	6.1786	2.4803
Principals	28	6.0000	1.8459
Total	159	7.2453	3.3161

Bartlett-Box F = 9.197, P = 0.000

TABLE C

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY OF DEVELOPMENT OF OBJECTIVES

SOURCE	D.F.	SS	MS	F RATIO	F PROB.
Between Groups	2	53.6725	26.8362	3.221	0.0426
Within Groups	156	1299.6133	8.3309		
Total	158	1353.2856			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teachers	103	7.1650	3.3080
Curriculum Specialists	28	5.6429	1.7683
Principals	28	6.5000	1.9149
Total	159	6.7799	2.9266

Bartlett-Box F = 10.274, P = 0.000

TABLE D

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

SOURCE	D.F.	SS	MS	F RATIO	F PROB.
Between Groups	2	64.5727	32.2863	3.821	0.0240
Within Groups	156	1318.1852	8.4499		
Total	158	1382.7578			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teachers	103	7.3689	3.2206
Curriculum Specialists	28	5.8214	2.2287
Principals	28	6.3214	2.1612
Total	159	6.9119	2.9583

Barlett-Box F = 4.664, P = 0.010

TABLE E

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY PROGRAM MODIFICATION

SOURCE	D.F.	SS	MS	F RATIO	F PROB.
Between Groups	2	90.8427	45.4212	5.533	0.0048
Within Groups	156	1280.6327	8.2092		
Total	158	1371.4753			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teachers	103	7.6796	3.1845
Principals	28	5.9643	2.5456
Curriculum Specialists	28	6.2500	1.6245
Total	159	7.1258	2.9462

Bartlett-Box F = 7.640, P = 0.000

TABLE F

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY TESTING PROGRAM

SOURCE	D.F.	SS	MS	F RATIO	F PROB.
Between Groups	2	181.2159	90.6079	8.647	0.0003
Within Groups	156	1634.6231	10.4784		
Total	158	1815.8389			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teachers	103	8.0097	3.7872
Curriculum Specialists	28	5.6071	1.8726
Principals	28	5.9643	1.6883
Total	159	7.2264	3.3901

Bartlett-Box F = 16.153, P = 0.000

TABLE G

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

SOURCE	D.F.	SS	MS	F RATIO	F PROB.
Between Groups	2	70.5089	35.2545	4.316	0.0150
Within Groups	156	1274.3865	8.1691		
Total	158	1344.8953			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teachers	103	7.2039	3.2550
Curriculum Specialists	28	5.5357	1.9717
Principals	28	6.2143	1.8127
Total	159	6.7358	2.9175

Bartlett-Box F = 8.949, P = 0.000

TABLE H

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY PROGRAM SUPERVISION

SOURCE	D.F.	SS	MS	F RATIO	F PROB.
Between Groups	2	249.5476	124.7738	13.673	0.0000
Within Groups	156	1423.5494	9.1253		
Total	158	1673.0969			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teachers	103	7.5340	3.5058
Curriculum Specialists	28	4.2500	1.5546
Principals	28	6.1071	1.9690
Total	159	6.7044	3.2541

Bartlett-Box F = 14.140, P = 0.000

Appendix F

Supplementary Tables: Scheffé Test of Comparisons for Independent Variables

APPENDIX F

TABLE I

SCHEFFÉ'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE TOTAL AREA OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

GROUP	MEAN	DECISION	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
1) Teachers	52.8349	$M_1 \neq M_2$	.05
2) Curriculum Specialists	39.0000	$M_1 \neq M_3$	.05
3) Principals	43.3571	$M_2 = M_3$	n.s.

TABLE J

SCHEFFÉ'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY OF IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

GROUPS	MEAN	DECISION	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
1) Teachers	7.8738	$M_1 \neq M_3$	.05
2) Curriculum Specialists	6.1786	$M_1 = M_2$	n.s.
3) Principals	6.000	$M_2 = M_3$	n.s.

TABLE K

SCHEFFÉ'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY DEVELOPMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Scheffé Comparisons

GROUP	MEAN	DECISION	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
1) Teachers	7.1650	$M_1 = M_2$	.05
2) Curriculum Specialists	5.6429	$M_2 = M_3$	n.s.
3) Principals	6.5000	$M_3 = M_1$	n.s.

TABLE L

SCHEFFÉ'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPLAS PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

GROUP	MEAN	DECISION	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
1) Teachers	7.3689	$M_1 = M_2$	.05
2) Curriculum Specialists	5.8214	$M_2 = M_3$	n.s.
3) Principals	6.3214	$M_3 = M_1$	n.s.

TABLE M

SCHEFFÉ'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY PROGRAM MODIFICATION

GROUP	MEAN	DECISION	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
1) Teachers	7.6796	$M_1 \neq M_3$	.05
2) Curriculum Specialists	5.7643	$M_2 = M_3$	n.s.
3) Principals	6.2500	$M_3 = M_1$	n.s.

TABLE N

SCHEFFÉ'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY TESTING PROGRAM

GROUP	MEAN	DECISION	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
1) Teachers	8.0097	$M_1 \neq M_2$	.05
2) Curriculum Specialists	5.6071	$M_1 \neq M_3$	.05
3) Principals	5.9643	$M_2 = M_3$	n.s.

TABLE O

SCHEFFÉ'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Scheffe Comparisons			
GROUP	MEAN	DECISION	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
1) Teachers	7.2039	$M_1 \neq M_2$	.05
2) Curriculum Specialists	5.5357	$M_2 = M_3$	n.s.
3) Principals	6.2143	$M_3 = M_1$	n.s.

TABLE P

SCHEFFÉ'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST OF MEAN DIFFERENCES AMONG TEACHERS', CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS', AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS IN THE SUB-CATEGORY PROGRAM SUPERVISION

GROUP	MEAN	DECISION	LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE
1) Teachers	7.5340	$M_1 \neq M_2$	.05
2) Curriculum Specialists	4.250	$M_2 = M_3$	
3) Principals	6.1071	$M_3 = M_1$	

Bibliography

Bibliography

Alfonsa, R. J., Firth, G. R., & Neville, R. F. Instructional Behavioral System. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1975.

Alport, F. H. Theories of Perception and the Concept of Structure: A Review and Critical Analysis with an Introduction to a Dynamic-Structural Theory of Behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1955.

Beach, T. The Perceptions of Teachers, Principals and Supervisors of the Instructional Supervisory Support Services in the Public Schools of Texas. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 31/09-A,5466.

Bedwine, J., & Dubrock, R. Teachers' Perceptions of Instructional Leadership. 1978 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 157 892).

Berlin, M. I. Supervisors and Teachers Perceptions of the Supervisory Conference. (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35/04-1892.

Blumberg, A. Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War. Berkley: McCuchan Publishing Co., 1974.

Bruner, J. S. Beyond the Information Given: Studies in the Psychology of Knowing. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1973.

Burch, G. Supervisory Role A Self-Assessment. NASSP Bulletin. 1980, 64, 91-97.

Catril, H. Perception and Interpersonal Relations. Americal Journal of Psycharity, 1957, 44, 119-126.

Combs, A. W., & Snygg, D. Individual Behavior: A Suggested Approach to Behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Corey, S., Foshay, M., & Maskenzie, G. N. Instructional Leadership and the Perception of the Individual Involved. Educational Psychology. New York: American Book Co., 1963.

Crews, C. Instructional Supervision: The Winter and the Warm. Educational Leadership, 1979, 36, 519-521.

Ellis, C., Smith, J., & Abbot, W. Peer Observation: A Means for Supervisory Acceptance. Educational Leadership, 1979, 36, 423-425.

Eriksen, C. N. Perceptual Defense as a Function of Unacceptable Needs. Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 557-564.

Esposito, J., & Burbach, H. A Role Study: The Supervisor in Virginia. Virginia: Virginia Association for Supervisor and Curriculum Development - Virginia Education Association, 1974.

Esposito, J., Smith, G. E., & Burbach, H. A Delination of the Supervisory Role. Education, Fall, 1975, 96.

Eye, G. Supervisory Skills: The Evolution of the Art. Journal of Educational Research, 1975, 69, 14-19.

Feyereisen, K. V., Florino, A. J., & Novak, A. T. Supervision and Curriculum Renewal: A Systems Approach. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft. Educational Division Meredith Corportion, 1970.

Fox, D. J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

From, F. Perception of Other People. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

Frymier, J. R. Foreword. In Fred T. Wilhelm Supervision in a New Key. Washington: ASCD, 1973.

Getzels, J., Lipham, J., & Campbell, R. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Gillford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1965.

Gordon, B. Teachers Evaluate Supervisory Behavior in Individual Conference. Clearing House, 1976, 49, 231-233.

Granite, H. Supervising Supervisors in an Urban School District. Educational Leadership, 1969, 382-388.

Handy, C. Understanding Organizations. New York: Penguin Books, 1978.

Harris, B. Supervisor Competence and Strategies for Improving Instruction. Educational Leadership.

February, 1976, 332-335.

Harris, B. Altering the Thrust of Supervision Through Greater Leadership. Educational Leadership, 197, 34, 567-571.

Harris, B. Supervisory Behavior in Education. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Hetzel, M. A. Perceptions and Attitudes of Supervisors, Principals and Teachers toward Supervision in the Elementary Schools of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39/04-A,1953.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Koehn, J., & Goens, G. The Talent We Nourish: A Word for Supervisors. Educational Leadership, 1977, 34, 585-588.

Lee, N. Teachers Perceptions of Curriculum Specialists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1974.

Lovell, J., & Phelps, M. Supervision in Tennessee as Perceived by Teachers, Principals, and Supervisors. Educational Leadership, December, 1977, 226-228.

Massarik, F.,& Welchsler, I. R. Empathy Revisited: The Process of Understanding People. In R. Kolb and McIntyre, J. (Ed.), Organizational Psychology: A Book of Readings. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1976.

Mehrabian, A. An Analysis of Personality Theories. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1968.

Mehrabian, A., & Ksionzky, S. A Theory of Affiliation. Massachusetts: D. C. Heath Co., 1974.

Mock, V. W. A Study for the Perceptions of Supervisors by Selected Elementary Teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38/04-A,1858.

Munnelly, R. Teacher Supervisor Conflicts and the Issue of Academic Freedom. Educational Leadership, 1970, 27, 673-677.

Napier, R. W., & Gershenfeld, M. Groups: Theory and Experience. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1973.

Nasca, D. How Do Teachers and Supervisors Value the Role of Elementary Supervision? Educational Leadership, 1976, 33, 513-518.

Neagley, R. L., & Evans, M. D. Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1979.

Neville, R. The Supervisor We Need. Educational Leadership, May, 1966, 23, 634-640.

Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Osborne, A., & Bowling M. The Context of In-service

Education. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Virginia: 1977, 12-58.

Parsons, G. Effective Supervision: Teachers' Views of Supervisory Roles in School Systems. Memorial University, St. John's Newfoundland, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EA 005 430).

Parsons, G. Review of Related Research Literature on Supervision. Memorial University, St. John's Newfoundland, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EA 006 179).

Remmers, T. Rating Methods in Research on Teaching. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Richmond Public Schools. An Analysis of Activities Performed by Curriculum Specialists in Richmond Public Schools. A report by the Department of Planning and Development. Virginia: Richmond Public Schools, 1974.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starrett, R. J. Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979.

Sibbitt, A. Principals and Teachers Perception of Supervisory Practices. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 60334.

Siddiqui, H. A Comparison of Attitudes of Secondary Teachers and Supervisors in Region X, Texas, and Karachi, Pakistan,

toward Selected Supervisory Practices. (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39/07-4, 3965.

Soskin, W. E. Influence of Information on Bias in Social Perception. Journal of Personality, 22, 1953, 118-127.

Steber, J. A Study of the Perceptions of Teaching Effectiveness by Supervisors and Classroom Teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1977). Dissertation Abstract International, 1977, 38/07-4, 3922.

Sturges, A., Krajewski, R., Lovell, J., McNiel, E., & Ness, M. The Role and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors. Unpublished Report from ASCD Working Group on Roles and Responsibilities of Supervisors, October, 1978.

Tagiuri, R., & Petrullo, L. Person Perception and Individual Behavior. Stanford University Press, 1958.

Tuckman, B. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1978.

Unruh, A., & Turner, H. Supervision for Change and Innovation. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970.

Unruh, G. Instructional Supervision: Issues and Trends. Educational Leadership, May, 1977, 34, 563-565.

Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding Educational Research.

New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1966.

Wiles, J., & Bondi, B. Supervision: A Guide to Practice. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1980.

Wiles, K., & Lovell, J. Supervision for Better Schools. New York: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Zalkind, S. S., & Costello, T. W. Perceptions: Implications for Administrations. In R. Kolb & J. McIntyre (Eds.), Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974.

AN INVESTIGATION OF VARIOUS GROUP PERCEPTIONS ON TASK PERFORMANCE OF CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS

Vasti DeLoatch
The College of William and Mary, 1981

Chairman: Dr. Robert Maidment

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the possibility that congruences and conflict surround group perceptions on task performance of building level supervisors in the area of Program Planning and Development (PPD). It was hypothesized that teachers, principals and curriculum specialists perceive the task performance of curriculum specialists in certain task areas in PPD with varying degrees of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Research Procedure

The subjects were 103 of 122 randomly selected teachers, 28 principals and 28 curriculum specialists in an urban school system. A 38-item PPD Questionnaire, developed by Nathaniel Lee and modified by the investigator, was used to collect data. Statistical tests employed to test the hypothesis were: (1) one-way analysis of variance followed with Scheffé Multiple Range comparisons to determine if significant differences existed between the groups of teachers, curriculum specialists and principals and (2) discriminant analysis (stepwise procedure) to determine the variables that discriminated "best" between the groups.

Findings

The hypothesis was accepted. There appear to be significant differences between teachers and curriculum specialists in such areas of PPD as Program Implementation and Program Supervision and between teachers and principals in such areas as Identification of Needs and Testing Program. There also appears to be a set of six individual tasks that discriminates "best" between the groups.

Conclusion

Although this study focused on supervision at the building level rather than central office level, the findings verified many of the discrepancies found in a majority of research studies assessing the conflict between teachers and central office supervisors. Of the three groups, teachers appear to be least satisfied with the performance of curriculum specialists and principals appear to be most satisfied. However, the curriculum specialists reported less satisfaction with their own performance than did the principals, when reporting on this performance. Recommendations for further research are included.