5-1-1973

An Analysis of the Role Perception and Role Performance of Superintendents, Principals and Teachers in Selected High Schools in the State of Minnesota

Ronald F. Frohrip

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE PERCEPTION AND ROLE PERFORMANCE OF SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

by

Ronald F. Frohrip

Bachelor of Science, Bemidji State College, 1960
Master of Science, Bemidji State College, 1964

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Grand Forks, North Dakota

May
1973

This dissertation submitted by Ronald F. Frohrip in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Lyle M. Morris
(Chairman)

Royal King

Richard D. Landry

Elton M. Gale

Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE PERCEPTION AND ROLE PERFORMANCE OF SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Department Center for Teaching and Learning

Degree Doctor of Education

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature _____

Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to the many people who contributed to the success of this study.

Special appreciation is expressed to Dr. Clyde Morris, committee chairman, for his professional assistance in the preparation of this study.

Acknowledgment is given to Dr. Richard Landry for his counsel and constructive criticism.

In addition, recognition is given to Dr. Eldon Gade, Dr. Ivan Dahl, and Dr. Rafael Lewy for their help and encouragement.

The author also wishes to express his appreciation to his wife, Ann, whose patience and understanding helped to see the project to its completion and to Stephen, Sharon, Paul and Lisa for their tolerance.

Finally, the author would like to thank Mr. Carl Edeburn for his assistance in technical areas and Mrs. Lorraine Rose for her help in the typing of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Problem

Roles, even when clearly defined, and role perception of incumbents, constitute an area where perfect congruence is impossible. Wide divergence in the perception of superintendents and principals in the performance of their respective roles, and their views of the others' role performance may be related to troublesome incidents, involving superintendents, boards, principals, staff, students, parents and community. The difference in which the superintendent and principal, or principals, regard these roles, and performance in them, may be directly related to the incidents of trouble.

Procedure

The population of the study was limited to 217 schools in the State of Minnesota. Superintendents, principals and teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire designed for this study relating to twenty-five problem areas out of which problems may have arisen during the previous school year. In addition to this instrument, superintendents were asked to complete an additional questionnaire designed to gather demographic information, that only he would have, concerning the school. Principals and teachers were asked to complete a more personal type of instrument.

The statistical techniques utilized were the chi-square and stepwise backward analysis of regression. The .05 level of significance was selected a priori for the determination of significance.

Results

Differences significant at the .05 level were found among superintendents, principals and teachers in 33 areas.

The study showed that the highest levels of significance were found for the superintendents and teachers, whose perceptions were consistently more different from each other than they were from those of principals. Teachers evidently disagreed with principals' perceptions as well. It was evident that most of the significance could be attributed to teachers' perceptions differing from both superintendent and principal. Stepwise backward regression analysis revealed little relationship between demographic variables and the criterion variables.

Recommendations

The results of the study led to the following recommendations:

1. Further study should be conducted to determine why perceptions of principals within schools are not similar to either the superintendents or teachers.

2. Further study needs to be conducted to determine the effect to which differences in perceptions might eventually lead.

3. This study should be replicated with a larger geographical base. This should be done to see if the findings of this study can be duplicated in states other than Minnesota.

4. The study should be conducted on a longitudinal basis to determine if perceptions differ over an extended length of time as opposed to a one-year period.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is a widely accepted tenet of life that human beings perceive other people, ideas, events, places and objects in a wide variety of ways. Since differences are accepted and expected in the society as a whole, it would be improbable that differences should be unacceptable and unexpected in a social system such as a school. It is not critical that differing views are inevitable, but it may be pertinent that such differences as may be identified can and often do exist to so wide a degree that judgments among school staff members may result in varying degrees of disequilibrium ranging from mild disagreement to open hostility. Excessive disagreements among school personnel result from differences in perception, and oftentimes may lead to violence, dismissal, the exchange of invectives, general dysfunction, low morale and a host of unwanted consequences.

Since administrative decisions in schools are often based on the collective judgments of individuals, it becomes apparent that the more proximate the congruity of individual perceptions, the greater the probability of equilibrium.

The identification of events or happenings as "problems" is dependent upon the perception of those who view, or review, those events. The perception a person has is often times colored and affected by the physical location in which the events occurred,

the objects, ideas and/or individuals involved, the time period consumed and the perspective of the viewer.

The administration of a school system, by necessity, involves a highly complex network of interactions among: (1) board members, (2) superintendent, (3) principal(s), (4) teachers, (5) students, (6) parents, and (7) members of the community. Such complex relationships suggest acknowledgment that difficulties or problems could be classified on the basis of their origin in any one of these groups or among groups. The "problems" might be described as minimal or catastrophic, depending on the individual's perception.

How individuals perform in the network of relationships is, in part, a function of their perceptions of ideas. Specific ideas, such as roles are, oftentimes, institutionalized, but the roles may be greatly altered by individual perception. Further, the manner in which a given role is performed is a function of the perception of both the role incumbent and those who observe his performance in that role.

One purpose of the present study was to determine if there was agreement or disagreement in perceptions among the superintendent, high school principal and teachers as to the identification of areas in which problems may have had their origin and to see if they viewed these problems with a similar degree of intensity. A further purpose of the present study was to determine if there were significant differences among superintendents, principals and teachers in their perceptions of the presence of role activity and the quality of the role performance of the superintendents and high school principals.

A preponderance of the early writings concerning educational administration pertained to the role, role function and rationale of the school superintendency. The position of the superintendent is relatively new to the American public school, having developed widely only since the early 1900's. Over the years, there have been many divergent opinions as to what the proper function and role of the superintendent ought to be.

By contrast, the principalship of the American high school is a more mature position which has evolved over a longer period of the history of American education. Initially, the school principalship was filled by a person who was selected by the local governing board to be "the principal teacher" in the local school (Anderson and Van Dyke, 1963). Since that time, the role and function of the principal have changed in many ways.

One of the more common concepts currently being explored by educational administrators is that of "an administrative team." The "team" usually consists of a chief administrator, one or more assistants, and the principals of the schools in the district. The application of this concept might enable the chief administrator to gather around him those people whom he believes would support both the point of view he espouses and believes would be most desirable for the district. The team should not be considered to be a group of "yes" men, but, rather, people in whom the superintendent has confidence, and from whom sound advice may be obtained on matters confronting the school system. In the final analysis it is the superintendent who is solely responsible for administrative decisions at the district level.

When a vacancy occurs in the superintendency, most school district boards of education seek a person from outside the school system to administer the program. In a relatively recent study, Carlson (1962) reported that this practice was evident in 65 per cent of the districts hiring new superintendents. This practice has led, in many instances, to problems in the district where the assistant superintendents and principals were holdovers from the previous administration.

Differences in the roles of the superintendent and the principal are easily defined both by law and by common practice. The law in most states concludes that the superintendent is charged with the overall responsibility of the educational programs of the school district, and is responsible to the state and to the elected officials of that district. The high school principal is primarily responsible for the administration of grades of 9-12, although in certain districts it may be grades 7-12 or 10-12, depending upon the situation and the structure of the individual school system. The high school principal is basically responsible for what takes place in a particular building. These roles have been given definition over the years by all of the literature that has been revealed and by the common practice that exists in many of the states.

Pertinent to the establishment of the definition of the superintendency and high school principalship is the social systems model developed by Getzels and Guba (1957). This system is based on two dichotomous dimensions, the nomothetic, which contains the institutional goals and expectations, and the ideographic, which includes the personality and needs disposition of the individual.

The superintendent, as a designated leader in charge of school organization, is faced with the task of developing a climate that is favorable to carrying out the objectives of a particular school system. In this process, he is faced with two major responsibilities: He must be responsive to members of his own administrative staff and to elected officials of the school district. These two groups, the board and the staff, impose upon him expectations as to how he should behave as a leader of the school system.

The position of the school principal is not unlike that of the superintendent: He is responsible to the superintendent and he must also be responsive to his teaching staff. Therefore, his responsibility for and to these people also will, at times, pose a dilemma. Because of the expectations placed upon each of these incumbents, when a difference in perception of problems arises, the school system may fall into a state of disequilibrium. While it is realized that there oftentimes can be disagreement, there also should be means to express these disagreements and to arrive at a compromise position.

As previously stated, the purpose of the present study was to determine the extent of agreement or disagreement in perceptions of the superintendent and the high school principal as to the identification of areas in which problems may have had their origin, and whether or not they viewed these problems with a similar degree of intensity. As a further check on perceptions, two teachers in each of the high schools were selected, by an impartial person, to determine if the staff members agreed with either the superintendent or

the principal, or if they held different perceptions of the origin of various problems and their intensity.

Questions relating to the purposes were analyzed by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perception of areas out of which problems may have arisen,
2. there are no significant differences among superintendents, principals, and teachers in their perception of the intensity of incidents in problem areas,
3. there are no significant differences among the superintendents', principals', and teachers' perception of the superintendent's role and his performance in it,
4. there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals', and teachers' perception of the principal's role and his performance in it,
5. there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perception of whether the principal was assigned a role or it was assumed by the principal,
6. there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals', and teachers' perception of the frequency of problem occurrence in the areas out of which perceived problems may have arisen,
7. there are no significant differences among certain demographic variables and the superintendents',

principals', and teachers' perceptions of problems and their intensity of incidents.

Limitations

1. The population of the study was limited to 217, or one-half, of the public schools in the State of Minnesota.
2. Only those districts that indicated a desire to participate in the study were sent questionnaires for completion by the superintendent, principal and two selected teachers.
3. The data collected covered problems occurring during one school year rather than over a period of years.
4. The three largest districts in the state, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, were excluded from the study.
5. The study leaves to subsequent researchers the task of taking into account other variables of administrative practices and/or theory.
6. The study excluded those superintendents and principals who had not worked together for at least one year.

Definition of Terms

Superintendent.--This term refers to the chief executive officer of a school district.

Administrator.--This term is used synonymously and interchangeably with superintendent and principal.

Principal.--This refers to the chief administrator of the high school in a district.

Teachers.--Teacher One will be the first teacher in a district. Teacher Two would be the second teacher in a district surveyed. They

will be commonly used and grouped together as teachers except where there is significance of difference in the findings.

Role.--Refers to the expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position.

Role performance.--Refers to how the respondents viewed the incumbent functioning in his role and how the respondents rated the performance based on their individual perceptions.

Intensity.--Refers to how the respondents perceived the seriousness of the problem in the total school context.

Significance of the Study

Recently, increasing attention has been focused on the quality of public education and, particularly, on the effectiveness of those in charge of educational programs. New studies and methods are needed to discover and analyze the characteristics and quality of the educational process. It was the aim of this study to contribute empirical evidence to an understanding of the leadership roles of the school superintendent and his subordinates, and to provide data for subsequent research in educational administration. As a result of the analysis of the role, role performance and role perceptions of superintendents, high school principals and teachers, new insights should be gained into the dynamics of educational leadership. This study should have relevancy in three areas of operation: (1) It should have theoretical value as it probes into the complexity of school administrative behavior. (2) It should have implications for suggesting that present methods of evaluating the job performance and perceptions of superintendents, principals, and teachers are inadequate. (3) It

should have implications for institutions responsible for training school administrators.

The remainder of this investigation is organized in the following manner: Chapter II contains a review of the literature relating to role, role performance, and administrative behavior in public schools, particularly that of the school superintendent and the school principal. Chapter III describes the population of this investigation and the methodology utilized in the study. Chapter IV reports the results of the statistical analysis. Chapter V consists of the conclusions resulting from the study and the recommendations for follow-up activities.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of some pertinent works of sociologists and psychologists was essential in order to establish a framework for the discussion of the concepts of roles and role expectations, role expectations and role perception, role conflict and role expectations, role perception, role conflict and role perception, role performance, and role conflict, all elements upon which the present study is based.

The field of educational administration has borrowed liberally from these disciplines, and roles, role expectations, role performance or behavior and role perception, while they exist as single hypothetical constructs, cannot, in reality, be separated. The practice of school administration recognizes the interrelationships of all of these separate constructs, and its literature reveals many studies that deal with the totality of the broad definition of role.

Roles and Role Expectations

Linton (1936) made the observation that roles exist apart from the individuals who must occupy them, and role performance may require adjustments and adaptations which cause some individuals to experience conflict. Linton's interpretation is substantiated by Getzels (1958, p. 153) when he states:

> Roles are defined in terms of role expectations. A role has certain normative obligations and responsibilities, which may be termed "role expectations," and when

> the role incumbent puts these obligations and responsibilities into effect, he is said to be performing his role. The expectations define for the actor, whoever he may be, what he should or should not do as long as he is the incumbent of the particular role.

Role, then, is given definition by the institution.

Role and role expectation are one and the same so far as an institution is concerned. Within the institution, however, is found a wide variety of sub-systems which, as units, attach to a role expectations which may difer from those of the larger system.

Kretch and Crutchfield (1948) noted that role expectations, as established by the larger system, are further affected by the perceptions of the individual. His expectations, and those of the group of which he is a part, may differ substantially.

Coladarci (1956, p. 284) supported Kretch and Crutchfield's point of view when he wrote:

> The perceptions of what constitutes administrative success vary systematically among reference groups. That is, for instance, teachers and supervisors at the elementary level differ in significant (and often contradictory) ways in their perception of what constitutes success in the principal role.

With regard to role expectations involving parents, school board members, and school staff, the expectations generally held for and by teachers constitute a complex set of beliefs, attitudes, values and needs that will vary according to the community, the personal characteristics and experience of the individuals involved, and even the organization for instruction within a school.

While school boards are the employers of superintendents, their role expectations and those of superintendents may be quite different. Generally, when these differences become quite marked,

the superintendent is either discharged, asked to resign, or submits his resignation of his own volition. Even when these differences do not involve the majority of the board, or are not of such a highly critical nature that they result in the superintendent's resignation, they may impair the day-to-day working relationship of the superintendent. Consequently, irreversible harm may result to the total school program.

In a study by Gross (1958), it was reported that the area of disagreement between the superintendents and boards and among administrators and/or board members oftentimes varies within the groups. The author cited an example: "In the first six grades pupils must reach specified academic standards in order to be promoted" (p. 139). On this question there was found to be a relatively high level of agreement among the board members. Eighty-four per cent of them felt that such a policy was desirable; only fifteen per cent disagreed, and one per cent had no opinion. Among superintendents, however, there was disagreement. Fifty-one per cent felt that the policy was desirable, and forty-one per cent felt it was undesirable.

This illustration shows that on a single issue there was a lack of agreement between superintendents and board members, a high level of agreement among board members, and a lack of agreement among the superintendents.

On another question regarding school policy, disagreement among board members continued to be evident, but the superintendents had a high degree of agreement among themselves. The issue in

question was that of whether or not numerical grades should be given on regular report cards used in the first six grades. Ninety-one per cent of the superintendents felt that the practice was undesirable, and only nine per cent viewed it as desirable. Among the board members, however, 53 per cent felt that the practice was desirable, 46 per cent saw it as undesirable, and two per cent had no opinion (Gross, 1958).

In their report of the Massachusetts study, Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958, p. 122) pointed out that "in formal organizations like public school systems, there are inherent forces which tend to create disagreement between policy makers and their administrators." They felt that the data supported and proved a number of their hypotheses. Four of these are listed below:

1. The superintendent and the board member will assign more responsibility to his own position than the others will assign to it.
2. In specifying the obligations of the superintendent to the board member, people in other positions who deal directly with the board will specify a greater degree of obligation on the part of the superintendent to it than will people who do not deal directly with the board. Board members feel a greater obligation to community members than do superintendents. And the superintendents feel a greater obligation to teachers than do board members.
3. The group with which one is identified influences role expectations. For example, a school board member who is a member of, or is identified with, an external group such as taxpayers organizations will express expectations of the superintendent which are somewhat different from those expressed by a superintendent who is identified with a school administrator group.
4. The person who is by-passed in the hierarchy of authority is more disturbed by the actions than those that participate in the by-pass. For example, a principal who is by-passed "will be less likely to accept or more likely to reject" a by-pass of his position than the subordinate or subordinates who by-pass it.

In a survey of 564 principals and teachers in eight large schools, Andrews (1958) found among male teachers some differences

in values, needs, and attitudes based on subject taught, the institutions in which they studied, and the amount of study they had completed in professional courses in education.

Soles (1964) reported some evidence, from a study in six junior high schools involving 299 teachers, that the teachers' expectations of their role varied according to whether or not they taught in core programs or in single-period programs.

A suggestion offered by Briner (1960) was that an administrator should consider carefully the differences between his own role expectations and those of a prospective subordinate. Briner states that every administrator should consider the role expectations held by a prospective subordinate for himself, his subordinates, and his colleagues. Briner states: "Despite the current practice of many school systems, principals should have some authority with regard to the decisions made in employing new teachers for the schools under their direction."

If the administrator's purpose in considering the differences in role expectation is simply that of avoiding the possibility of having a subordinate who may disagree with him from time to time he will be developing what Briner (1960, pp. 1-4) termed a "stupifying environment" in the school or school system. A staff composed of "yes men" who agree fully with the administrator at all times will "not develop new ideas, adopt improvements, improved procedures, or be aware of its mediocrity." Briner goes on to state:

> No school system should be encouraged to emphasize strict agreement in views, values, experience and preparation, recruitment and selection of personnel. Out of the differences of opinion and dissatisfaction with current practices come discussion, experimentation and constructive change.

Nevertheless, where employment practices are concerned:

> . . . differences in role expectations should be considered, and if they are so pronounced that genuine conflict seemingly is inevitable, the school board and administrator would be wise not to appoint the individual being considered.

Role Expectation and Role Perception

Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958, p. 248) deal with this subject in their study which defines role congruency as a situation "in which an incumbent of a focal position perceives that the same or similar expectations are held for him." An example of this may be where a superintendent perceives that students, teachers, principals, and school board members alike, expect him to handle a discipline problem in the same manner.

One of the more revealing observations concerning agreement or disagreement in selected interactional areas was a study done by Savage (1959). Where the interaction of consultants and school administrators was reported, Savage's basic hypothesis was that consultation services would be ineffective if the school administrator and the consultant do not perceive the complimentary role expectations along the same lines.

Savage (1959, pp. 48-54) was able to identify and single out three patterns of expectations, each defining a distinct type of consultative service:

1. The consultant as expert--in this pattern efforts are directed at arriving at the "right" answer to the particular problem in the specific situation. The consultant is presumed to have expert knowledge which the consultee does not have--knowledge based on absolute principles. The best use of the consultant's time is to get the right answers from him and to apply these

answers to a given problem in order to arrive at the correct solution at the earliest possible moment.

2. The "consultant as a resource person"--in this pattern, efforts are directed at providing a variety of relevant information so that the individuals involved in the situation can have a choice of alternatives applicable to the solution of the problem. The consultant is presumed to possess a wide range of experiences either vicarious or direct, on which the consultee may draw. The best use of the consultant's time is to permit him to provide information to let the consultee himself consider the material in relation to the specific problem.
3. "The consultant as process person"--in this pattern, efforts are directed toward developing a method of working together in order to bring about needed changes so that those involved in the problem will be able to arrive at their own solution. The consultant is presumed to have special skills in human relations, and the best use of his time will allow him to work in such a way as to make the consultee more competent to handle not only the particular problem, but similar problems in the future.

The results of the study by Savage confirmed the basic hypotheses. When an administrator and a consultant agreed on the expectations, they tended to rate the actual consultation favorably; when they disagreed, unfavorably. Apparently, the evaluation of what constituted success and failure was in some manner independent of either the particular expectations or of the demonstrated behavior. The author felt that the critical variable was the extent of overlap in the participants' perception of the expectations, whatever the expectations were.

Savage further implied that the school's administrative personnel could profit from the results of what was posited. He felt that, while the study was between superintendent and consultant, the superintendent could use his "model" in working with his school principals and staff.

An early study that dealt with selective interpersonal perception was conducted by Ferneau (1954). The author's hypothesis was that when two or more persons come in contact with one another over a sufficient length of time, each begins to have certain expectations as to how the other will act or behave. His study examined the expectations of superintendents of schools and consultants from state departments of education as they worked together on curriculum problems.

Within each of the four states involved in the study, Michigan Kansas, Wisconsin and Nebraska, there was greater agreement between consultants and administrators as to the behavior each expected of the other than there was among the consultants and administrators as a group. For example, in one state both administrator and consultants ranked first among the four states in the number of times they expressed preference for behavior classified as the "expert" approach. In another state, both groups ranked last in the number of times they expressed such a preference.

Hencley (1960) explored the groups of people with whom a superintendent of schools has a high degree of contact in carrying out his day-to-day duties. The study was done among selected districts in the states of Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin. The term sub-publics, which Hencley used as a definitive term for the word groups, was used to identify school board members, teaching staff, other school personnel, business personnel, PTA members, and labor council members. The investigation concluded that 82 per cent of the disagreements in perception could be accounted for by three basic errors categorized by Hencley (1960, p. 49) as follows:

1. Trouble-seeking, accounting for 22 per cent of the disagreements. In this type of error the superintendent's own expectations and his perception of the reference group expectations were significantly different, when in fact his expectations and the actual expectations of the reference group were not significantly different. In effect, the superintendents were "trouble-seeking"--they thought their expectations were different from those of their reference groups when in actuality their expectations were the same.
2. Innocent, accounting for 32 per cent of the disagrements. This is the reverse of the preceding type of error. Here the superintendent perceived no differences between his own expectations and those of the reference group when in fact there were significant differences between his own expectations and the actual expectations of the reference groups. In effect, the superintendents were "innocent"--they thought their expectations and those of their reference groups were the same when in actuality their expectations were different.
3. Keen, accounting for 28 per cent of the disagreements. In this type of conflict the superintendent's perception and the actual expectations of the reference groups did not differ, but a significant difference did exist between the superintendent's own expectations and the actual expectations of the reference groups. That is, the perceptions of the superintendents were essentially "keen"--they described the expectations of the reference groups accurately, albeit these expectations did not adhere with their own.

Hencley was able to account also for the remaining 18 per cent of the disagreement, and he provided four separate areas of classification for them. No attempt will be made here to define these areas. It is significant to mention that the study did account for all factors in the disagreement areas.

Role Conflict and Role Expectations

Getzels and Guba (1957, pp. 30-40) described three teacher roles in which there is conflict. The first is the socio-economic role where teachers in many communities are expected to maintain middle-class standards, but their salaries are at such a relatively

low level that they have serious difficulty in attempting to fulfill this expectation. The second is the citizen role that requires that teachers be "responsible citizens whose judgment regarding their own conduct can be trusted." Nevertheless, in many communities teachers are expected to participate in church work, but avoid all political activity. The third role is designated as the expert or professional role. Although the teacher is expected to be a licensed certificated specialist, the public feels it can tell him what and how to teach. Getzels and Guba reported that on the basis of a study involving 166 teachers in the Midwest, the following individuals were those disturbed by role conflict:

1. Male teachers as compared with female teachers.
2. Teachers with one dependent compared with those with no dependents or more than one dependent. (Teachers with more than one dependent were older; they earned more and learned to compromise.)
3. Teachers with part-time employment in addition to their school jobs as compared with those who had no other employment.
4. Teachers coming from communities that they perceived as being quite different from those in which they were teaching as compared to those who perceived little difference.
5. Teachers who felt restricted in their personal lives or who had fewer friends than they desired.
6. Teachers who felt that certain groups of their fellow teachers had more personal influence with the administration than did other groups of those who felt their relationship with the administration were not adequate or satisfying.
7. Teachers who would not enter teaching if they were making a career choice again.

Seeman's (1953, pp. 370-380) study is an example of role conflicts specifically involving the relationships between teachers and administrators. His investigation included 26 randomly selected Ohio communities with populations ranging from 4,500 to 15,000. Some of

the teachers in these communities felt that the superintendent should invite them to his home, where others believed that he should not. Seeman states further, "Generally, the administrator preaches the equality of man but finds himself in a position of status superior to that of staff members."

Teachers and superintendents did not agree on who should make decisions in doubtful areas of pupil promotion. Seeman's study further indicated that even when there is agreement between the superintendent and teachers with regard to expectations, role conflict may arise in implementing the expectations. Both the teachers and superintendents agreed that the social distance between them should be lessened. Both agreed that the teachers should be paid higher salaries. But, Seeman pointed out, if the superintendent is active in seeking higher salaries for teachers, he has less time for contacts with them. He must be working with school board members, other governmental agencies, and citizens who can influence increases in the salary schedule (Seeman, 1953).

Lloyd (1965) recommended a method for attempting to alleviate role conflicts within groups such as teachers, administrators at all levels, and school board members. He suggested an in-service training program which should be able to provide an understanding of role expectations and the areas of interaction in which they are most important. Every school and school system has occasional staff meetings or faculty meetings and these are excellent vehicles through which attention can be given to this important aspect of interpersonal group relations. The author suggests, for example, that the superintendent provide in-service training for board members in areas such

as curriculum, pointing out that the superintendent should serve as the person who interprets trends, problems and needs to the members.

Lloyd further suggests that interpretation of curriculum trends and problems is one means of focusing attention of the role expectations of parents, the professional staff and the board members themselves. Lloyd further states that as the superintendent and board members discuss the school's curricula, and the superintendent interprets the content objectives and trends to the board members, congruence between their expectations is likely to increase. Lloyd states that board members will increase their awareness of expectations, why they differ from those of the superintendents and the attitude necessary to deal constructively with the differences.

Another possible method of reducing role conflicts and the tensions that are concomitant with these role conflicts is for a school system to develop written policies that increase the understanding of the prospective and new administrator, teachers, or board members concerning the expectations held for their positions. Neal Gross (1955, p. 45) emphasized the value of written policies, and added that they "reduce the probability that the new board member will trespass against the right of the superintendent or other school board members or that he will violate his own obligation."

A suggestion by the American Association of School Administrators (1962) offered another possible way of reducing the role conflicts within a social system, and especially in schools. The school administrator should give continuous attention to learning role expectations that others hold for him, members of his staff and themselves. The superintendent should study carefully the minutes

of school board meetings held during the past several years. His analysis of these will assist him in understanding any pattern of role expectations that the board as a group has been exhibiting for the superintendent, other administrators, and the teachers. This is especially true if a superintendent is new to a system.

Campbell (1959, pp. 1-4) offers a method of resolution or at least a possible method of alleviating role conflicts in a school. When an administrator is confronted by an apparent role conflict, Campbell believes that the administrator should evaluate as objectively as possible the alternative actions available to him. "Hopefully, administrators will discuss a normal evolution of differences in role expectations with staff members, board members and parents before many conflicts develop." Campbell further suggests that this discussion will lead to more constructive solutions of role conflicts. However, conflicts will develop even when this groundwork has been laid, and some choice from among several alternatives will be necessary on the part of the administrator.

Concurring with Campbell are Gross, Mason and McEachern (1958, pp. 319-327) where they stated:

> If the expectations involved concerning the behavior of the superintendent are those of the board, superintendent, and the Parent-Teacher Association, and each set of expectations differs from the other two, the superintendent may be confronted with the possibility of the following alternatives:
>
> 1. He may conform to the expectations of the board, taking the position that he has been employed as the board's executive and must behave as the board expects. Many writers certainly would argue that he should take the former position; they would add that when he feels he can no longer conform to the boards' expectations, he should resign or the board should discharge him.

2. He may conform to the expectations of the Parent-Teacher Association. Some superintendents were more concerned with the sanctions that were imposed by external groups such as the Parent-Teacher Association because their sanctions were more negative than were those imposed by their boards. Presumably, therefore, the administrator may decide to conform to the expectations of the group that he decides would be most dangerous to him professionally if he fails to agree with it.
3. He may conform to his own expectations. The authors declare "as moralists, they would conform only to legitimate expectations, regardless of the severity of sanctions" that might be imposed on them. In other words, the superintendent may feel that he cannot violate his expectations of his role as administrator and therefore he must act or take a position contrary to the expectations of either the board or the Parent-Teacher Association.
4. He may attempt to involve the board and the Association in discussions that will result in some compromise among the three conflicting sets of expectations concerning his behavior and leadership in the problem area. This procedure, of course, probably will involve some compromise on his part. If a compromise can be achieved, however, and if the superintendent feels that he retains his integrity and continues to hold to his basic beliefs concerning his behavior, it is the wisest alternative of the four that have been mentioned because it emphasizes a constructive effort to achieve through unity among the conflicting groups to permit a solution to the problem.

Differences in the expectations held for school administrators within a community do not necessarily constitute conflict. It would seem to be a reflection of the different contexts in which persons have contact with a given administrator. The issue can best be illustrated by a study reported by Buffington and Medsker (1955) that involved 30 elementary schools in the Oakland, California, area. In their study three parents and three teachers from each of these schools were selected to participate in the study, which asked for individual impressions of the role of the principal. The teachers viewed the principal's most important job as that of providing leadership for teachers. The parents, on the other hand, placed major

emphasis on the principal's responsibilities to develop effective relationships with parent groups and the community. The teacher viewed such relationships as important, but ranked them third in importance among the principal's responsibilities. Both the parents and teachers ranked the principal's work with and service to children as second in importance among his responsibilities, but the elements of such work and service were stated somewhat differently by the two groups. The parents made little reference to the principal's relationships with the teachers, and neither parents nor teachers said anything about the principal's relationships with the superintendent. Finally, neither group placed any emphasis on the principal's responsibility in the supervision of instruction or in curriculum development. Perhaps a difference in emphasis constitutes one type of conflict, but certainly it is not a serious one. "No dichotomies exist in a situation such as this and there is no real difference of values with regard to a specific act or behavior" (Buffington and Medsker, 1955, pp. 1-4).

Conflicts resulting from the varying role expectations held by teachers for administrators and by administrators for teachers are common, but not necessarily universal. There is congruence in numerous instances. A study that involved three Michigan communities (Brookhover and Gottlieb, 1964, p. 335) reported that "the teachers' expectations of their roles were quite like those they perceived that the administrators held for them, and quite like those the administrators actually held."

Another method mentioned regarding resolution of conflict is that every school board and administrator must attempt to avoid being the cause of what Savage (1968, p. 152) refers to as "role overload."

At times an administrator or other staff member may be confronted with so many expectations with respect to tasks he should perform that he cannot fulfill them. The expectations that are held for his position may be both legitimate and compatible. On the other hand, if their variety, urgency and number exceed the endurance and time of the person for whom they are held, stress will result. When stress increases, there is an increase in a person's sense of insecurity and a decrease in his efficiency in all tasks. Savage further states that the number of cases and discussions found in the literature concerning resolution of role conflict will not prevent or resolve fully all possible role conflicts an administrator probably will encounter. Serious consideration of the problem, however, can reduce some conflicts and prevent others. As Savage concludes, "there seems to be no magic formula that can assure the administrator that he will never be confronted with conflict or that he will always be able to discover a fully satisfactory solution to it."

Role Perception

Many authors have also concerned themselves with questions relating to perception from the point of view of the perceiver. There were many variables found in the writings that should be noted. Current researchers in the area of role and role theory indicate that there is a tendency to use oneself as the norm or standard by which one perceives or judges others.

Norman (1953) concluded that when one is aware of what his own personal characteristics are, he makes fewer errors in perceiving others. Weingarten (1949) found evidence to show that people

with insight are less likely to view the world in black-and-white terms and to give extreme judgments about others. Both writers made similar conclusions that knowing oneself makes it easier to see others accurately.

A supporting study conducted by Bossom and Maslow (1957, pp. 147-148) found that secure people, as compared to insecure people, tend to view others as warm rather than cold. The authors stated that it was their observation, after analyzing the data, that the extent of one's own sociability influences the degree of importance one gives to the sociability of other people when one forms impressions of them. The authors observe that "one's own characteristics affect the characteristics he is likely to see in others."

Omwake (1954, pp. 443-446) concluded that "the person who accepts himself is more likely to be able to see favorable aspects of other people." This, in part, is attributable to the accuracy of his perception. The author went on to state that if the perceiver is accepting of himself as he widens his range of perception in viewing others, he can look at them and be less likely to be very negative or critical. In the areas in which a person feels insecure, he tends to see more problems in other people.

Gage (1953) has shown in his study that accuracy in perceiving others is not a single skill. The perceiver tends to form perceptions of others in terms of what he, the perceiver, feels others hold toward him. Taft (1955) has observed that a person's ability to perceive others accurately may depend on how sensitive one is to differences between people and also to the norms (outside of one's self) for

judging them. Thus, Taft has stated that the ability to judge others does not seem to be a single entity.

Chase (1953) stated that superintendents and principals can learn much from their daily contacts in conversations with parents, teachers, and others. Interviews should be concerned not only with the views expressed by people but also with what people do not say or appear reluctant to say. Chase also suggested the occasional use of questionnaires in which staff members indicate anonymously what they believe the administrator should do in various situations and their perception of what is actually done.

An example of this difference in perception was offered in the Brookhover and Gottlieb study (1964) where administrators were indifferent to the teachers' purchasing groceries or gasoline outside of the school district, while the school board members mildly disapproved of the practice, and the teachers and citizens mildly approved it.

Halpin (1956, p. 303) indicated that there was a "significant" lack of consensus among school board members, teachers and superintendents in the perception of the superintendent's behavior in the "initiating structure" and "consideration" dimensions of leadership activity. He concluded that there was a possible difference in the role the superintendent adopts when working with the board members and another role when working with members of his staff.

Role Conflict and Role Perception

Nevertheless, according to Gross and Herriott (1955, pp. 102-103), conflicts do exist. They explain that in a certain school, for

example, there may be teachers who welcome the principals' observations and visits in their classrooms because they feel a need for evaluation and advice and need to upgrade their level of instruction. But other teachers in that same faculty may view themselves as professional workers who should not be "checked on"; they tend to resent the principal's visits to their classrooms. In another school there may be some faculty members who view discipline as a responsibility of the principal, while other faculty members feel that, except in serious problems of pupil behavior, discipline is the teacher's responsibility.

The Gross and Herriott study reported the responses of 175 elementary school principals and 1303 teachers in 40 school systems. The average teacher in 102 of these schools "desired less control from the principals than the principal felt he should have." In 73 schools, the average teacher desired more control from the principal in such matters as discussing their classroom problems, reporting all major conferences with parents, what is taking place in the classroom "during most of the day," and requiring that the teacher's classroom behavior conform to the principal's standard.

Role Performance

Studies by Buffington (1954) and Medsker (1954) attempted to identify the job of the principal from the perceptual point of view of parents and teachers, respectively. The finding of the writers was that the perceptions of these two groups were far apart.

The role performance is taken to mean the overt, observed behavior of the individual. Behavior can be partitioned, as

suggested by Biddle and Thomas (1966, p. 27), when it relates to approval or disapproval. However, the authors state:

> Evaluation has received little analytic discussion in the role literature. Evaluative behaviors are often said to be "positive" or "negative" depending upon whether they indicate approval or disapproval, respectively, and they are sometimes classified by the objects to which they pertain, such as self or others.

Role performance, then, is the manner in which the incumbent is perceived to perform in a role.

Moser (1957) examined the relationships between the behavior of superintendents and principals in the performance of their different, yet complimentary, roles. His findings indicated that the climate in those schools where the superintendent is considered more effective by the principals and where the principals have high confidence in the superintendent, is generally characterized by principal attitudes which reflect unity, enthusiasm, satisfaction, mutual respect, pride, competency, and a sense of accomplishment.

Moser continues: The climate in most school systems where the superintendent is considered by the principal to be less effective and where he shows less confidence in the superintendent, is generally characterized by principal attitudes which reflect disunity, slow change, frustration, conservatism and confusion in operation on the basis of expediency.

The principal, as well as the superintendent, is in a delicate position as a member of two differing organizational families. The principal's role is of key importance as a connection between the superintendent and the teacher. In the same way that the superintendent of schools is the middle-man between the board of education

and the professional staff, the principal serves as the middle-man between the superintendent and the teaching staff.

Another conclusion reached by Moser was that the respective roles of the superintendent and principal must compliment each other if the objectives of the school system are to be accomplished. The extent to which the superintendent and principal are successful in their schools will depend in large measure upon the extent to which understanding develops between them.

Further evidence of difference in perception of role performance is presented in a study reported by Halpin (1959). He observed that the behavior of the superintendents, as perceived by themselves, by school board members, and by staff members, differed significantly from what the superintendent professed to be appropriate behavior for a superintendent.

Among educators in general, there is little agreement concerning the behavior of effective teachers in the classroom or anywhere else. A study supporting this was done among school districts in Michigan. Brookhover and Gottlieb (1964) reported the lack of agreement among administrators, board members, teachers, and citizens concerning teacher behavior ranging from smoking to the purchase of groceries. The lack of agreement was not always in the form of conflict; frequently it was in the intensity involved by those involved in the study. Again, intensity of the problem is in the realm of perception.

According to Halpin (1956, p. 4), studies conducted at the Ohio State University relating to the first of the two questions concerning perception, examined the administrator's behavior apart

from his personal characteristics or "traits." These studies have concluded that the effective administrator must initiate structure in the interaction among group members. However, the study demonstrated that the administrator must, at the same time, show consideration toward the group members upon whom he depends for the accomplishment of goals.

Role Conflict

There are numerous studies concerning the problem areas in various social systems. These areas might be especially troublesome for a school system due to its high degree of visability in the community. If the superintendent perceives that the board members expect him to act in one way, and his students, teachers, and principals expect a different action, the superintendent is faced with incompatible expectations; a situation commonly referred to as role conflict.

Not all of the role conflicts experienced by an administrator involve other persons or groups directly. To some extent there is ambivalence or conflict within the administrator's own expectations of his role. Seeman (1953, pp. 373-380) reported on four dimensions of such conflict. His study was concerned with:

1. Status dimension--generally, the administrator preaches the equality of man but finds himself in a position of status superior to that of staff members.
2. Authority dimension--this fulfills the administrator's need for independence but it isolates him from others. He may be one on whom others can depend, but he has no one on whom he can depend.
3. Mean-End dimension--the administrator is confronted with a conflict between getting the job done and the process of organizational achievement.
4. Institutional dimension--essentially it involves achieving the purposes of the organization and, at the same time, trying to fulfill some of the needs of staff members.

Seeman's study concluded that there are conflicts or ambivalence within the administrator's own expectation of his behavior in a position of leadership. Frequently, no "fully satisfactory" solution to conflicts can be found, but the administrator will and must make decisions concerning them.

In the analysis of a school system as a whole, and with differing reference groupings, a wide variety of role conflicts may be observed. Many individuals who have a need for status are found in roles that do not provide it. Conversely, roles are filled by individuals who actually prefer a less demanding and less responsible task than required by the system.

Another task confronting the chief administrator in a school district is that of resolving or at least reducing the tensions resulting from role conflicts. The responsibility is a continuing challenge and not a task that can be completed at some point in the administrator's term in office. Whether or not the responsibility for the resolution of the conflict rests with the high school principal or with the superintendent of schools is a problem of ambivalence. Cunningham (1959, p. 4), in discussing administrator-school board relationships, made the observation that:

> Conflict between board members and administration may not be as much a consequence of value differences as it is a failure to understand that value differences are to be expected. If board members and administrators expect to differ, this provides a framework either for compromise or integration.

This observation could also be true if conflict exists between board members and administrators, and the same analogy may be drawn between superintendents and high school principals and teachers. Cunningham's

observation does provide for a recognizable framework from which to begin to resolve role conflicts.

Gross (1955) believes that written policies and a program of communication which enable staff members to remain informed about such matters as change in programs and assignment of duties reduce the role ambiguity which much of the research seems to declare is a major problem in work organizations. Ambiguity seems to result when an individual lacks the information necessary to occupy a role with a sense of certainty with what is expected of him, and a feeling of being part of an organization.

Barnard (1964) suggested that with respect to executive responsibility, the executive cannot disregard the individual in situations that would tend to cause the employees severe personal conflict. Argyris (1961) views the typical organization as a threat to the individual's self-realization.

Most writers are indicating that what is crucial in the functioning of an organization is the nature of the relationship between the job and the man. One of the primary functions of the chief administrator is to integrate the demands of both the organization and the individual into a mutual harmonious relationship.

The interrelationships of the several elements involving role and perception, in its broader context, is expressed by Getzels, Lipham and Campbell (1968, p. 315):

> Involved in the act of perceiving are beliefs, attitudes, values, and dispositions. In a sense, they are prisms of which reality is filtered into experience through the mechanisms of assimilation, rationalization, simplification, and accentuation. It is in terms of such mechanisms that we may understand at least some of the individual differences that

were found in the perception of the same role by the different members of a role-set. It is perhaps also in these terms that we may gain some knowledge of why we do not learn as readily from the new as from the old, why facts, however obvious, are often of little consequence in changing opinions, and why the past may be more important than the present in shaping administrative policy for the future. This is not to say that actual structural and organizational factors are not significant in understanding administrative relationships--as writings have shown. They are significant indeed. But individual dispositional effects must also be included.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The day-to-day operations of a school system necessitate involvement, in one way or another, of the board, superintendent, principal or principals, staff, students, parents and members of the community at large.

Development of the Instrument

Construction of the survey instrument was begun after reviewing many instruments that had been used previously in other studies. Initially, it was thought that there might already be in existence an instrument utilized in a previous study that could be adapted to test the hypotheses as set forth in Chapter I. However, after carefully reviewing the available literature, none was found that seemed appropriate to the purpose of this study. Therefore, an instrument was devised and developed to determine if, in fact, differences in the perception among superintendents, principals and teachers did exist (Appendix A).

From the readings, a list of questions could be developed which would provide data relevant to the hypotheses that were posited. These questions dealt with the areas of role, role perception and role performance of superintendents and high school principals.

The items used in the questionnaire were validated by a jury consisting of eight selected faculty members of the Center for Teaching and Learning, selected practicing administrators in the public schools, and selected graduate students in education at the University of North Dakota. Using the split-halves methods of correlation, the reliability coefficient was found to be .82, the total agreement of the jury was found to be 92 per cent.

The relationships among board members might constitute the source of a problem. Board relationships with the several entities suggest other possible sources of problems. Therefore, the relationships of each entity to every other entity offered a convenient classification scheme for the designation of possible problem sources.

On this basis, respondents were asked to reply to eight questions relating to one of the entities which, in their perception, had been the source of a problem during the course of the previous year. Twenty-five such categories were provided, and respondents identified those in which they believed a problem had originated. For each identified entity, the respondents were asked to indicate (a) the intensity of the problem (rated in five steps from very low to very high), (b) their perception of whether or not the superintendent took an active role in attempting to resolve the problem (answered either yes or no), (c) their perception of the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem (rated in five steps from very low to very high), (d) their perception of whether or not the principal took an active role in attempting to resolve the problem (answered yes or no), (e) their perception of the principal's role performance in meeting the problem (rated in five steps from very low to

very high), (f) their perception of whether or not the principal was assigned an active role or if he assumed the role (answered either yes or no), and (g) their perception of the number of times a problem occurred in the areas identified as problem sources (rated from a low of one to five or more times).

The portion of the survey instrument that was designed to elicit demographic data from the respondents consisted of two forms. One was designed for superintendents only (Appendix B), since many of the questions were of the nature that only the superintendents would have the information available. The demographic portion of the survey instrument that was mailed to the principals and teachers (Appendix C) was designed to acquire information of a more personal nature and did not call for information that would be difficult to report.

Description of the Population

The population for this study consisted of 53 school superintendents, 53 high school principals and 106 public school secondary teachers in schools in the State of Minnesota.

The rationale underlying the selection of schools in the State of Minnesota was that it would offer a sufficient number of school systems of appropriate size for this study.

The schools were selected from the "Directory of Minnesota Public Schools" obtained from the State Department of Education in St. Paul, Minnesota.

On October 6, 1972, a letter was sent to the Superintendent of Schools in every other Kindergarten-12 school listed alphabetically in

the Directory (Appendix D). An addressed, pre-paid envelope was provided for return of the card on which the superintendent indicated whether or not his district would participate in the study (Appendix E).

The letter (Appendix E) also requested that, if the district wished to be included in the sample, a roster of teachers who had taught in the school for one or more years be included in the reply.

It was determined that schools where either the principal or superintendent were new to the system would be eliminated, as the questionnaire pertained to the occurrence of problems during the previous school year. This information was provided on the return card. Since the 1972-73 directory was not yet available, the 1971-72 directory had to be utilized. There was no way to determine, prior to the letter being sent, which schools had experienced a turnover in administrative personnel.

A follow-up letter, mailed October 25 (Appendix F), was designed to encourage a response from those who did not reply to the first letter.

Of the 217 schools to which letters were mailed, replies were received from 99 per cent. Twenty-six per cent of the schools had either a principal or superintendent new to the system; twenty-seven per cent did not send teacher rosters from their system due to board policy that prevented them from providing such information.

Upon receipt of the letter indicating their willingness to cooperate in this study, a packet consisting of four sets of questionnaires, instructions and pre-paid return envelopes was sent to the school superintendent. Letters of instruction were mailed to the superintendent (Appendix G), as well as to each respondent in

the school system. One set was for the superintendent, one for the high school principal and one for each of the two high school teachers selected at random by an impartial person.

The superintendent in each system had the responsibility of seeing that the principal and two teachers received their questionnaires. The questionnaires were coded in order to know when each set was returned complete.

Superintendents, principals, and teachers in seventy schools were sent questionnaires. A follow-up letter was mailed to each school from which complete sets had not been received (Appendix H). Complete sets (superintendent, principal and two teachers) were received from 53 schools for a 76 per cent response.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

The data were retrieved from the questionnaires and placed on Fortran coding sheets. The key punch cards were verified for accuracy and precision.

The cards were then submitted to an I.B.M. 370-35 digital computer for analysis. Program TALLY was used to determine and report frequency of response in different categories. These frequencies were then analyzed by hand calculations using the following chi square formula:

$$\chi^2 = \Sigma \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Significant contingency tables were then gathered and presented in Chapter IV for further interpretation and analysis.

A program was written to sum the frequencies for Column 2, perception of the problem, and Column 3, intensity of the problem.

Program STWMULT was then used to perform a stepwise backward analysis of regression using perception of a problem and intensity of the problem as the criterion variables, and the demographic background variables as predictors. The results of this analyses were presented in Chapter IV for further interpretation.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Data for this study were collected by means of a questionnaire requesting each respondent to answer questions concerning his perceptions of specified areas as sources of problems, the intensity of those perceived problems, administrative roles, administrative effectiveness in those roles, and the frequencies of problem occurrence (Appendix A). A level of .05 was selected a priori to test for significance. After the data were compiled, the chi-square statistical treatment (Downie and Heath, 1970) was used to analyze for significance.

Demographic data were collected on instruments devised for the purpose. Superintendents, principals and teachers received different forms on which to record the variables to be tested (Appendices B and C).

The final portion of Chapter IV presents the relationship of the demographic variables and Perceptions of a Problem and Intensity of the Problem as criterion variables, according to respondent classification as Superintendent, Principal and Teacher.

Selected variables for the stepwise backward regression analysis include those common to all respondents: they are, sex, age, number of years in education, number of years since last degree was earned, philosophical point of view (liberal, moderate, traditional), whether the graduating college was within or outside the State of Minnesota, type of institution from which last degree was earned and years respondents have worked together.

Superintendent variables, in addition to those common to all, include school financial problems, proximity and type of institution closest to the school district (college, junior college, university or vocational school), total population in school district, negotiations for salary between board and staff for 1972-73 complete, negotiations for principal's salary between board and principal for 1972-73 complete, and enrollment K-12.

The data are presented in a series of tables which indicate the relationship between selected criterion variables and areas out of which problems may have arisen.

Further analyses are made of the problem areas for which significant differences were found. In these instances, the relationships between the criterion variable and problem areas are analyzed according to respondent classification as superintendent, principal and teachers.

Perception of Problem Source, Table 1, Column 2, presents the chi-square values for respondent perceptions according to the areas out of which problems may have arisen. The variable, perception of the problem, reveals three areas with chi-square values significant at the .05 level. This indicates that there were differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the areas of Board-Community, Superintendent-Parent and Principal-Board, as sources of problems. Differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of problems in the area of Superintendent-Staff were significant at the .01 level. Tables 2-5 demonstrate these data.

Therefore, Hypothesis One, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of areas

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PROBLEM SOURCES AND PROBLEM INTENSITY

Column 1 Areas where problems might have originated during the past year	Column 2 Did you perceive a problem in this area last year?	Column 3 How would you rate the degree of intensity of the problem?
Internal School Board	1.46	5.03
Board-Superintendent	.03	4.40
Board-Principal	5.65	.77
Board-Staff	.16	9.26
Board-Student	1.84	2.02
Board-Parent	5.18	3.17
Board-Community	6.74*	3.30
Superintendent-Principal	5.38	2.45
Superintendent-Staff	9.45**	6.33
Superintendent-Student	1.03	3.81
Superintendent-Parent	8.26*	8.08
Superintendent-Community	2.91	6.68
Principal-Board	8.73*	.19
Principal-Parent	1.79	1.64
Principal-Student	.96	12.83*
Principal-Staff	1.63	8.24
Principal-Community	.90	1.95
Staff-Student	.17	2.96
Staff-Parent	1.25	5.62
Staff-Community	2.62	2.95
Staff-Staff	.05	4.14
Student-Student	.26	7.45
Student-Parent	.51	1.46
Student-Community	.24	7.16
Community-Community	3.23	3.70

*.05 Level of Significance
** .01 Level of Significance
***.001 Level of Significance

out of which problems may have arisen, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Board-Community, Superintendent-Parent, Principal-Board and Superintendent-Staff.

Perception of Problem Intensity, Table 1, Column 3, displays the chi-square value of respondents' perception according to the areas out of which problems may have arisen. The table indicates that there were differences, significant at the .05 level, among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of problem intensity arising out of the area of Principal-Student relationships.

Therefore, Hypothesis Two, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the intensity of incidents in problem areas, was rejected at the .05 level for the area of Principal-Student relationships.

As indicated in Table 2, the chi-square value of 6.74 for frequency of problems perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Board and the Community, according to responses of superintendents, principals, and teachers, was significant at the .05 level.

Therefore, Hypothesis One, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of areas out of which problems may have arisen, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Board and Community, Superintendent-Staff Superintendent-Parent and Principal-Board.

In Table 3 are found the chi-square values for frequencies of problems perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Superintendent and the Staff, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 9.45, significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 2

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF BOARD COMMUNITY AREA AS SOURCE OF PROBLEMS, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Board Community		
Superintendent	O = 9.00 E = 9.75 χ^2 = .56	O = 49.00 E = 43.25 χ^2 = .56	53
Principal	O = 9.00 E = 9.75 χ^2 = .56	O = 44.00 E = 45.25 χ^2 = .56	53
Teacher	O = 21 E = 19.50 χ^2 = 2.25	O = 85 E = 86.50 χ^2 = 2.25	106
Total	39	173	212

χ^2 = 6.74. Significant at .05 with 2 df; table value 5.991.

TABLE 3

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF SUPERINTENDENT-STAFF AREA AS SOURCE OF PROBLEMS, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Superintendent-Staff		
Superintendent	O = 15.00 E = 22.75 χ^2 = 2.64	O = 38 E = 30.25 χ^2 = 1.99	53
Principal	O = 20.00 E = 22.75 χ^2 = .33	O = 33 E = 30.25 χ^2 = .25	53
Teacher	O = 56.00 E = 45.50 χ^2 = 2.42	O = 50 E = 60.50 χ^2 = 1.82	106
Total	91	121	212

χ^2 = 9.45. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

In Table 4 are found the chi-square values for frequencies of problems perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Superintendents and Parents, according to responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 8.26, significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF SUPERINTENDENT-PARENT AREA AS SOURCE OF PROBLEMS, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Superintendent-Parent		
Superintendent	O = 19 E = 13.50 χ^2 = 2.24	O = 34 E = 39.50 χ^2 = .77	53
Principal	O = 17 E = 13.50 χ^2 = .91	O = 36 E = 39.50 χ^2 = .31	53
Teacher	O = 18 E = 27.00 χ^2 = 3.00	O = 88 E = 79.00 χ^2 = 1.03	106
Total	54	158	212

χ^2 = 8.26. Significant at .05 with 2 df; table value 5.991.

In Table 5 are found the chi-square values for frequencies of problems perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Principal and Board, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals, and teachers.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Principal-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 8.73, significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 5

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-BOARD AREA AS SOURCE OF PROBLEMS, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Principal-Board		
Superintendent	O = 16 E = 9.25 χ^2 = 4.93	O = 37 E = 43.75 χ^2 = 1.04	53
Principal	O = 5 E = 9.25 χ^2 = 1.95	O = 48 43.75 χ^2 = .41	53
Teacher	O = 16 E = 18.50 χ^2 = .33	O = 90 E = 87.50 χ^2 = .07	106
Total	37	175	212

χ^2 = 8.73. Significant at .05 with 2 df; table value 5.991.

The data collected from the questionnaire indicated only one problem area, Principal-Student, that realized the a priori level of .05. Table 6 displays these data.

Table 6 shows the chi-square values for intensity of the problem perceived in the relationships between the Principal and Student, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contributions of two cells, Superintendent-Low and Teacher-Low, contributed the most to the value of 12.83, significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 6

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS, PROBLEM INTENSITY, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Principal-Student			
Superintendent	O = 14 E = 8.16 χ^2 = 4.18	O = 13 E = 15.26 χ^2 = .33	O = 3 E = 6.58 χ^2 = 1.84	30
Principal	O = 9 E = 7.07 χ^2 = .52	O = 12 E = 13.23 χ^2 = .11	O = 5 E = 5.70 χ^2 = .08	26
Teacher	O = 8 E = 15.77 χ^2 = 3.82	O = 33 E = 24.51 χ^2 = .41	O = 17 E = 12.72 χ^2 = 1.44	58
Total	31	58	25	

χ^2 = 12.83. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

Therefore, Hypothesis Two, there are no significant differences among superintendents, principals, and teachers in their perceptions of the intensity of incidents in problem areas, was rejected for the area of Principal-Student relationships.

Superintendent's Role Activity, Table 7, Column 4, reveals that in eleven areas, chi-square values are significant at the .05 level. Significant differences in perceptions are apparent in the areas of Board relationships with the Principal, the Student and the Parent. Significance was found also in the area of Superintendent-Parent relationships. Principal relationships to Parent, Student,

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS' ROLE ACTIVITY AND ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY AREAS

Column I Areas where problems might have originated during the past year.	Column IV Did superintendent take an active role in attempting to resolve the problem?	Column V Rate the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem.
Internal School Board	3.34	12.40*
Board-Superintendent	.38	4.81
Board-Principal	15.65***	8.15
Board-Staff	5.55	17.40**
Board-Student	11.77**	3.35
Board-Parent	9.43**	3.38
Board-Community	1.54	4.82
Superintendent-Principal	.44	6.73
Superintendent-Staff	.14	13.92**
Superintendent-Student	.15	3.10
Superintendent-Parent	13.54**	9.13
Superintendent-Community	1.56	6.70
Principal-Board	19.48***	5.76
Principal-Parent	9.93**	13.55**
Principal-Student	9.69**	8.19
Principal-Staff	15.43***	8.68
Principal-Community	10.06**	9.98*
Staff-Student	5.48	7.23
Staff-Parent	7.06*	4.11
Staff-Community	5.01	16.57**
Staff-Staff	10.00**	5.42
Student-Student	2.76	.57
Student-Parent	2.40	5.19
Student-Community	5.59	2.31
Community-Community	.20	5.62

*.05 Level of Significance
**.01 Level of Significance
***.001 Level of Significance

Staff and Community were perceived differently by superintendents, principals, and teachers. Significant differences were also found in the three groups' perceptions of Staff-Parent, and Staff-Staff relationships. Tables 8-18 demonstrate these data.

Therefore, Hypothesis Three, there are no significant differences among the superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the superintendent's role and his performance in it, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Board-Principal, Board-Student, Board-Parent, Superintendent-Parent, Principal-Board, Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Principal-Community, Staff-Parent and Student-Student relationships.

Superintendent's Role Performance, Table 7, Column 5, displays data of a significant nature at the .05 level in the areas of Internal School Board, Board-Staff, Superintendent-Staff, Principal-Parent, Principal-Community, and Staff-Community relationships. Tables 19-24 demonstrate these data.

Therefore, Hypothesis Three, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the superintendent's role and his performance in it, was rejected at the .05 level in the areas of Internal School Board, Board-Staff, Superintendent-Staff, Principal-Parent, Principal-Community and Staff-Community relationships.

In Table 8 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Board and the Principal.

TABLE 8

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF BOARD-PRINCIPAL RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Board-Principal		
Superintendent	O = 15 E = 6.75 χ^2 = 10.08	O = 38 E = 46.25 χ^2 = 1.47	53
Principal	O = 3 E = 6.75 χ^2 = 2.08	O = 50 E = 46.25 χ^2 = .30	53
Teacher	O = 9 E = 13.50 χ^2 = 1.50	O = 97 E = 92.50 χ^2 = .22	106
Total	27	185	212

χ^2 = 15.65. Significant at .001 with 2 df; table value 13.815.

The contribution of one cell, Superintendent-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 15.65, significant at the .001 level.

Therefore, Hypothesis Three, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the superintendent's role and his performance in it, was rejected at the .05 level for the area of Board-Principal, Board-Student, Board-Parent, Superintendent-Parent, Principal-Board, Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Principal-Community, Staff-Parent and Student-Student relationships.

In Table 9 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding their perceptions

of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Board and Student.

The contribution of one cell, Teacher-Yes contributed the most to the value of 11.77, significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 9

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF BOARD-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Board-Student		
Superintendent	O = 13 E = 9.75 χ^2 = 1.08	O = 40 E = 43.25 χ^2 = .24	53
Principal	O = 7 E = 9.75 χ^2 = .98	O = 46 E = 43.25 χ^2 = .17	53
Teacher	O = 19 E = 9.50 χ^2 = 9.50	O = 87 E = 86.50 χ^2 = .00	106
Total	39	173	212

χ^2 = 11.77. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

In Table 10 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Board and Parent.

TABLE 10

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF BOARD-PARENT RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Board-Parent		
Superintendent	0 = 18 E = 10.75 χ^2 = 4.89	0 = 35 E = 42.25 χ^2 = 1.24	53
Principal	0 = 11 E = 10.75 χ^2 = .01	0 = 42 E = 42.25 χ^2 = .00	53
Teacher	0 = 14 E = 21.50 χ^2 = 2.62	0 = 92 E = 84.50 χ^2 = .67	106
Total	43	169	212

χ^2 = 9.43. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 9.43, significant at the .01 level.

In Table 11 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Superintendent and Parent.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 13.54, significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 11

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF SUPERINTENDENT-PARENT RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Superintendent-Parent		
Superintendent	0 = 19.00 E = 11.00 χ^2 = 5.82	0 = 34.00 E = 42.00 χ^2 = 1.52	53
Principal	0 = 13.00 E = 11.00 χ^2 = .36	0 = 40.00 E = 42.00 χ^2 = .10	53
Teacher	0 = 12 E = 22.00 χ^2 = 4.55	0 = 94.00 E = 84.00 χ^2 = 1.19	106
Total	44	168	212

χ^2 = 13.54. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

In Table 12 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Principal and the Board.

The contribution of one cell, Superintendent-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 19.48, significant at the .001 level.

In Table 13 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals, and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to

TABLE 12

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-BOARD RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Principal-Board		
Superintendent	O = 16 E = 6.75 χ^2 = 12.68	O = 37 E = 46.25 χ^2 = 1.85	53
Principal	O = 3.00 E = 6.75 χ^2 = 2.08	O = 50.00 E = 46.25 χ^2 = .30	53
Teacher	O = 8.00 E = 13.50 χ^2 = 2.24	O = 98 E = 92.50 χ^2 = .33	106
Total	27	185	212

χ^2 = 19.48. Significant at .001 with 2 df; table value 13.815.

TABLE 13

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-PARENT RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Principal-Parent		
Superintendent	O = 12 E = 6.25 χ^2 = 5.29	O = 41 E = 46.75 χ^2 = .71	53
Principal	O = 7 E = 6.25 χ^2 = .09	O = 46 E = 46.75 χ^2 = .01	53
Teacher	O = 6 E = 12.50 χ^2 = 3.38	O =100 E = 93.50 χ^2 = .45	106
Total	25	187	

χ^2 = 9.93. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Principal and Parent.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 9.93, significant at the .01 level.

In Table 14 are found the chi-square values for responses to superintendents, principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Principal and the Student.

The contribution of one cell, Superintendent-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 9.69, significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 14

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-STUDENT RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Principal-Student		
Superintendent	O = 17 E = 9.00 χ^2 = 7.11	O = 36.00 E = 44.00 χ^2 = 1.45	53
Principal	O = 8.00 E = 9.00 χ^2 = .11	O = 45.00 E = 44.00 χ^2 = .02	53
Teacher	O = 11 E = 9.00 χ^2 .44	O = 95.00 E = 88.00 χ^2 = .56	106
Total	36	176	212

χ^2 = 9.69. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

In Table 15 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Principal and Staff.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 15.43, significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 15

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-STAFF RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Principal-Staff		
Superintendent	O = 19 E = 10.25 χ^2 = 7.47	O = 34 E = 42.75 χ^2 = 1.79	53
Principal	O = 11 E = 10.25 χ^2 = .05	O = 42 E = 42.75 χ^2 = .01	53
Teacher	O = 11 E = 20.50 χ^2 = 4.40	O = 95 E = 85.50 χ^2 = 2.44	106
Total	41	171	212

χ^2 15.43. Significant at .001 with 2 df; table value 13.815.

In Table 16 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to

resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Principal and Community.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 10.06, significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 16

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Principal-Community		
Superintendent	O = 6.00 E = 2.50 χ^2 = 4.90	O = 47.00 E = 55.00 χ^2 = 1.16	53
Principal	O = 3.00 E = 2.50 χ^2 = .10	O = 50.00 E = 55.00 χ^2 = .45	53
Teacher	O = 1.00 E = 5.00 χ^2 = 3.20	O =105.00 E =100.00 χ^2 = .25	106
Total	10	202	212

χ^2 = 10.06. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

In Table 17 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of the Staff and Parents.

TABLE 17

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF STAFF-PARENT RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Staff-Parent		
Superintendent	O = 13.00 E = 7.25 χ^2 = 4.56	O = 40.00 E = 45.75 χ^2 = .72	53
Principal	O = 5.00 E = 7.25 χ^2 = .70	O = 48 E = 45.75 χ^2 = .11	53
Teacher	O = 11.00 E = 14.50 χ^2 = .84	O = 95 E = 91.50 χ^2 = .13	106
Total	29	183	212

χ^2 = 7.06. Significant at .05 with 2 df; table value 5.991.

The contribution of one cell, Superintendent-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 7.06, significant at the .05 level.

In Table 18 are found the chi-square values for responses of superintendents, principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of the superintendent having taken an active role in attempting to resolve the problem which was perceived to have originated in the problem area of Staff and Staff.

The contribution of one cell, Superintendent-No, contributed the most to the value of 10.00, significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 18

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF STAFF-STAFF RELATIONSHIP, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Staff-Staff		
Superintendent	0 = 13.00 E = 6.50 χ^2 = .91	0 = 40.00 E = 46.50 χ^2 = 6.50	53
Principal	0 = 5.00 0 = 6.50 χ^2 = .05	0 = 48.00 E = 46.50 χ^2 = .35	53
Teacher	0 = 8.00 E = 13.00 χ^2 = .27	0 = 98 E = 93.00 χ^2 = 1.92	106
Total	26	186	212

χ^2 = 10.00. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

In Table 19 are found the chi-square values for the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have been Internal School Board in origin, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of three cells, Superintendent-Average, Principal-Average, and Principal-High, contributed the most to the value of 12.40, significant at the .05 level.

Therefore, Hypothesis Three, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions

TABLE 19

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF INTERNAL SCHOOL BOARD, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Internal School Board			
Superintendent	O = 1.00 E = 2.87 χ^2 = 1.21	O = 10.00 E = 5.38 χ^2 = 3.98	O = 3.00 E = 5.74 χ^2 = 1.31	14
Principal	O = 2.00 E = 2.05 χ^2 = .00	O = 1.00 E = 3.84 χ^2 = 2.10	O = 7 E = 4.10 χ^2 = 2.05	10
Teacher	O = 5.00 E = 3.07 χ^2 = 1.21	O = 4.00 E = 5.77 χ^2 = .54	O = 6.00 E = 6.15 σ^2 = .00	15
Total	8	15	16	39

χ^2 = 12.40. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

of the superintendent's role and his performance in it, was rejected at the .05 level in the areas of Internal School Board, Board-Staff, Superintendent-Staff, Principal-Parent, Principal-Community and Staff-Community relationships.

In Table 20 are found the chi-square values for the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Board and Staff, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 20

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF BOARD-STAFF, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

	Chi-Square Value			
	Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Board-Staff			
Superintendent	O = 0 E = 4.57 χ^2 = 4.57	O = 12 E = 8.57 χ^2 = 1.37	O = 14 E = 12.85 χ^2 = .10	26
Principal	O = 2 E = 4.04 χ^2 = 1.03	O = 5.00 E = 7.59 χ^2 = .88	O = 16.00 E = 11.37 χ^2 = 1.86	23
Teacher	O = 14.00 = 7.38 χ^2 = 5.94	O = 13.00 E = 13.84 χ^2 = .05	O = 15.00 E = 20.76 χ^2 = 1.60	42
Total	16	30	45	91

χ^2 = 17.40. Significant at .01 with 4 df; table value 13.277.

The contributions of two cells, Superintendent-Low and Teacher-Low, contributed the most to the value of 17.40, significant at the .01 level.

In Table 21 are found the chi-square values for the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between Superintendent-Staff, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Low and Superintendent-High, contributed the most to the value of 13.92, significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 22

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF SUPERINTENDENT-STAFF, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Superintendent-Staff			
Superintendent	O = 0 E = 5.04 χ^2 = 5.04	O = 5.00 E = 3.92 χ^2 = .30	O = 9.00 E = 5.04 χ^2 = 3.11	14
Principal	O = 5 E = 6.48 χ^2 = .34	O = 5 E = 5.04 χ^2 = .00	O = 8.00 E = 6.48 χ^2 = .36	18
Teacher	O = 22 E = 15.48 χ^2 = 2.75	O = 11.00 E = 12.04 χ^2 = .09	O = 10.00 E = 15.48 χ^2 = 1.94	43

χ^2 = 13.92. Significant at .01 with 4 df; table value 13.277.

In Table 22 are found the chi-square values for the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Principal and Parent, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of three cells, Superintendent-Low, Superintendent-High and Teacher-High, contributed the most to the value of 13.55, significant at the .01 level.

In Table 23 are found the chi-square values for the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have

TABLE 22

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-PARENT, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Principal-Parent			
Superintendent	O = 1 E = 4.31 χ^2 = 2.54	O = 4 E = 4.31 χ^2 = .02	O = 7 E = 3.38 χ^2 = 3.87	12
Principal	O = 4 E = 3.94 χ^2 = .00	O = 3 E = 3.94 χ^2 = .90	O = 4 E = 3.10 χ^2 = .26	11
Teacher	O = 9 E = 5.74 χ^2 = 1.85	O = 7 E = 5.74 χ^2 = .27	O = 0 E = 4.51 χ^2 = 4.51	16
Total	14	14	11	39

χ^2 = 13.55. Significant at .01 with 4 df; table value 13.277.

TABLE 23

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-COMMUNITY, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Principal-Community			
Superintendent	O = 0 E = 1.64 χ^2 = 2.69	O = 3 E = 3.29 χ^2 = .08	O = 4 E = 2.05 χ^2 = 3.80	7
Principal	O = 0 E = .70 χ^2 = .49	O = 2 E = 1.41 χ^2 = .35	O = 1 E = .88 χ^2 = .01	3
Teacher	O = 4 E = 1.64 χ^2 = 5.57	O = 3 E = 3.29 χ^2 = .08	O = 0 E = 2.05 χ^2 = 4.20	7
Total	4	8	5	17

χ^2 = 9.98. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

originated in the relationships between the Principal and Community, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of three cells, Superintendent-High, Teacher-Low and Teacher-High, contributed the most to the value of 9.98, significant at the .05 level.

In Table 24 are found the chi-square values for the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Staff and Community, accoring to the response of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 24

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF-COMMUNITY, SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Staff-Community			
Superintendent	O = 0 E = 3.33 χ^2 = 3.33	O = 4 E = 3.33 χ^2 = .14	O = 7 E = 4.33 χ^2 = 1.65	11
Principal	O = 0 E = 1.81 χ^2 = 1.81	O = 2 E = 1.81 χ^2 = .02	O = 4 E = 2.36 χ^2 = 1.14	6
Teacher	O = 10 E = 4.85 χ^2 = 5.49	O = 4 E = 4.85 χ^2 = .06	O = 2 E = 6.30 χ^2 = 2.93	16
Total	10	10	13	33

χ^2 = 16.57. Significant at .01 with 4 df; table value 13.277.

The contribution of three cells, Superintendent-Low, Teacher-Low and Teacher-High, contributed the most to the value of 16.57, significant at the .01 level.

Principal's Role Activity, Table 25, Column 6, reveals that in three areas, chi-square values are significant at the .05 level. Significant differences in perceptions are apparent in the areas of Principal-Board, Staff-Student, and Student-Student. In one area, there was found to be significance at the .01 level and this was the area of Superintendent-Parent. Tables 26-29 demonstrate these data.

Therefore, Hypothesis Four, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the principal's role and his performance in it, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Principal-Board, Staff-Student, Student-Student and Superintendent-Parent Relationships.

Principal's Role Performance, Table 25, Column 7, displays the respondents' replies. Five problem areas that reached significance at the .05 level were Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Staff-Staff and Student-Student relationships. Tables 30-34 demonstrate these data.

Therefore, Hypothesis Four, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the principal's role and his performance in it, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Staff-Staff and Student-Student relationships.

In Table 26 are found the chi-square values for responses regarding the principal taking an active role in attempting to resolve the

TABLE 25

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL'S ROLE ACTIVITY AND ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY AREAS

Column 1 Areas where problems might have originated during the past year.	Column 6 Did principal take an active role in attempting to resolve the problem?	Column 7 Rate the Principal's role performance in meeting the problem.
Internal School Board	3.38	.62
Board-Superintendent	1.97	2.67
Board-Principal	5.12	2.42
Board-Staff	4.69	7.27
Board-Student	.67	8.36
Board-Parent	4.82	6.06
Board-Community	1.00	4.41
Superintendent-Principal	1.49	4.64
Superintendent-Staff	2.11	7.75
Superintendent-Student	2.76	6.45
Superintendent-Parent	12.03**	2.33
Superintendent-Community	.73	7.25
Principal-Board	7.95*	2.63
Principal-Parent	3.21	10.60*
Principal-Student	.68	10.82*
Principal-Staff	4.88	11.17*
Principal-Community	1.73	5.29
Staff-Student	6.02*	4.97
Staff-Parent	1.65	8.07
Staff-Community	.76	8.04
Staff-Staff	6.21*	12.40*
Student-Student	2.29	11.83*
Student-Parent	4.41	8.46
Student-Community	1.55	6.20
Community-Community	.08	4.85

*.05 Level of Significance
**.01 Level of Significance
***.001 Level of Significance

problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between Superintendent and Parent, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 26

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF SUPERINTENDENT-PARENT RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Superintendent-Parent		
Superintendent	0 = 10.00 E = 6.00 χ^2 = 2.67	0 = 43.00 E = 47.00 χ^2 = .34	53
Principal	0 = 10.00 E = 6.00 χ^2 = 2.67	0 = 43.00 E = 47.00 χ^2 = .34	53
Teacher	0 = 4.00 E = 12.00 χ^2 = 5.33	0 =102.00 E = 94.00 χ^2 = .68	106
Total	24	188	212

χ^2 = 12.03. Significant at .01 with 2 df; table value 9.210.

The contribution of three cells, Superintendent-Yes, Principal-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 12.03, significant at the .01 level.

Therefore, Hypothesis Four, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perception of the principal's role and his performance in it, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Staff-Staff and Student-Student relationships.

In Table 27 are found the chi-square values for responses regarding the principal taking an active role in attempting to resolve the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between Principal and Board, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 27

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-BOARD RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Principal-Board		
Superintendent	O = 14.00 E = 8.00 χ^2 = 4.5	O = 39.00 E = 45.00 χ^2 = .8	53
Principal	O = 4.00 E = 8.00 χ^2 = 2.0	O = 49.00 E = 45.00 χ^2 = .36	53
Teacher	O = 14.00 E = 16.00 χ^2 = .25	O = 92.00 E = 90.00 χ^2 = .04	106
Total	32	180	212

χ^2 = 7.95. Significant at .05 with 2 df; table value 5.991.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Yes and Principal-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 7.95, significant at the .05 level.

In Table 28 are found the chi-square values for responses regarding the principal taking an active role in attempting to resolve the

problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Staff and Student, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of two cells, Principal-No and Teacher-No, contributed the most to the value of 6.02, significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 28

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF STAFF-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Staff-Student		
Superintendent	O = 27.00 E = 22.75 χ^2 = .79	O = 26 E = 25.25 χ^2 = .02	53
Principal	O = 22.00 E = 22.75 χ^2 = .02	O = 31.00 E = 25.25 χ^2 = 1.31	53
Teacher	O = 64.00 E = 50.50 χ^2 = .27	O = 42.00 E = 45.50 χ^2 = 3.61	106
Total	91	101	212

χ^2 = 6.02. Significant at .05 with 2 df; table value 5.991.

In Table 29 are found the chi-square values for responses regarding the principal taking an active role in attempting to resolve the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between Staff and Staff, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 29

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF-STAFF RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Staff-Staff		
Superintendent	0 = 15.00 E = 11.75 χ^2 = .90	0 = 38.00 E = 41.25 χ^2 = .26	53
Principal	0 = 16.00 E = 11.75 χ^2 = 1.75	0 = 37.00 E = 41.25 χ^2 = .44	53
Teacher	0 = 16.00 E = 23.50 χ^2 = 2.39	0 = 90 E = 82.50 χ^2 = .68	106
Total	47	165	212

χ^2 = 6.21. Significant at .05 with 2 df; table value 5.991.

The contribution of two cells, Principal-Yes and Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 6.21, significant at the .05 level.

In Table 30 are found the chi-square values for the principal's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Principal and Parent, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of three cells, Teacher-Low, Teacher-Average, and Teacher-High, contributed the most to the value of 10.60, significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 30

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-PARENT RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Principal-Parent			
Superintendent	O = 0 E = .92 χ^2 = .92	O = 5.00 E = 7.97 χ^2 = 1.11	O = 18 E = 14.10 χ^2 = 1.08	23
Principal	O = 0 E = .82 χ^2 = .82	O = 6.00 E = 7.24 χ^2 = .23	O = 15.00 E = 12.88 χ^2 = .35	21
Teacher	O = 3.00 E = 1.24 χ^2 = 2.5	O = 15.00 E = 10.74 χ^2 = 1.68	O = 13.00 E = 19.02 χ^2 = 1.91	31
Total	3	26	46	75

χ^2 = 10.60. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

Therefore, Hypothesis Four, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the principal's role and his performance in it, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Staff-Staff and Student-Student relationships.

In Table 31 are found the chi-square values for the principal's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the principal and student, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 31

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Principal-Student			
Superintendent	O = 1.00 E = 2.85 χ^2 = 1.2	O = 5.00 E = 8.00 χ^2 = 1.13	O = 24.00 E = 19.14 χ^2 = 1.23	30
Principal	O = 0.00 E = 2.19 χ^2 = 2.19	O = 7.00 E = 6.03 χ^2 = .16	O = 16.00 E = 14.67 χ^2 = .12	23
Teacher	O = 9.00 E = 4.95 χ^2 = 3.31	O = 16.00 E = 13.86 χ^2 = .33	O = 27.00 E = 33.18 χ^2 = 1.15	52
Total	10	28	67	105

χ^2 = 10.82. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

The contribution of two cells, Principal-Low and Teacher-Low, contributed the most to the value of 10.82, significant at the .05 level.

In Table 32 are found the chi-square values for the principal's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Principal and Staff, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of one cell, Teacher-Low, contributed the most to the value of 11.17, significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 32

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL-STAFF RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Principal-Staff			
Superintendent	O = 3.00 E = 6.48 χ^2 = 1.87	O = 5.00 E = 5.86 χ^2 = .13	O = 17.00 E = 12.65 χ^2 = 1.50	25
Principal	O = 3.00 E = 4.66 χ^2 = .59	O = 5.00 E = 4.22 χ^2 = .14	O = 10.00 E = 9.11 χ^2 = .09	18
Teacher	O = 15.00 E = 8.29 χ^2 = 5.43	O = 9.00 E = 8.91 χ^2 = 0	O = 14.00 E = 19.23 χ^2 = 1.42	38
Total	21	19	41	81

χ^2 = 11.17. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

In Table 33 are found the chi-square values for the principal's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Staff and Staff, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of one cell, Teacher-Low, contributed the most to the value of 12.40, significant at the .05 level.

In Table 34 are found the chi-square values for the principal's role performance in meeting the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Student and Student, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 33

CHI-SQUARE VALUES OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF STAFF-STAFF RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi=Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Staff-Staff			
Superintendent	O = 1.00 E = 3.62 χ^2 = 1.90	O = 8.00 E = 7.54 χ^2 = .03	O = 7.00 E = 4.83 χ^2 = .98	16
Principal	O = 1.00 E = 3.39 χ^2 = 1.68	O = 8.00 E = 7.07 χ^2 = .12	O = 6.00 E = 4.52 χ^2 = .48	15
Teacher	O = 10.00 E = 4.98 χ^2 = 5.06	O = 9.00 E = 10.37 χ^2 = .18	O = 3.00 E = 6.64 χ^2 = 1.97	22
Total	12	25	16	53

χ^2 12.40. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

TABLE 34

CHI-SQUARE VALUES OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF STUDENT-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS, PRINCIPAL'S ROLE PERFORMANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Student-Student			
Superintendent	O = 1 E = 3.48 χ^2 = 1.77	O = 5 E = 4.55 χ^2 = .04	O = 9 E = 6.96 χ^2 = .60	15
Principal	O = 1 E = 3.71 χ^2 = 1.98	O = 5 E = 4.85 χ^2 = 0	O = 10 E = 7.42 χ^2 = .90	16
Teacher	O = 11 E = 5.81 χ^2 = 4.66	O = 7 E = 7.58 χ^2 = .05	O = 7 E = 11.61 χ^2 = 1.83	25
Total	13	17	26	56

χ^2 = 11.83. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

The contribution of one cell, Teacher-Low, contributed the most to the value of 11.83, significant at the .05 level.

Superintendent's Assignment or Principal's Assumption of Role to Principal, Table 35, Column 8, reveals that in one area, chi-square values are significant at the .05 level. Significant differences in perceptions are apparent in the area of Student-Student relationships. Table 35 demonstrates these data.

Therefore, Hypothesis Five, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of whether the principal was assigned a role or it was assumed by the principal, was rejected at the .05 level for the area of Student-Student relationships.

In Table 36 are found the chi-square values regarding the principal assuming or being assigned a role in the problem as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Student-Student, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of one cell, Teacher-Yes, contributed the most to the value of 6.80, significant at the .05 level.

Therefore, Hypothesis Five, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of whether the principal was assigned a role or it was assumed by the principal, was rejected at the .05 level for the area of Student-Student relationships.

Problem Occurrence, Table 35, Column 9, reveals that in three areas, chi-square values are significant at the .05 level. Significant

TABLE 35

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF FREQUENCY OF PROBLEM OCCURRENCES

Column 1 Areas where problems might have originated during the past year.	Column 8 Did Superintendent assign principal to an active role or did principal assume a role?	Column 9 How many times did problem occur?
Internal School Board	.48	1.64
Board-Superintendent	.87	9.29
Board-Principal	2.7	11.88*
Board-Staff	3.3	7.11
Board-Student	2.48	5.69
Board-Parent	.69	2.65
Board-Community	.91	10.24*
Superintendent-Principal	5.86	1.66
Superintendent-Staff	5.48	4.02
Superintendent-Student	5.31	.82
Superintendent-Parent	3.54	1.23
Superintendent-Community	3.15	.43
Principal-Board	1.07	5.88
Principal-Parent	.69	5.85
Principal-Student	1.34	2.32
Principal-Staff	1.57	7.63
Principal-Community	1.17	4.31
Staff-Student	1.68	5.81
Staff-Parent	1.84	6.97
Staff-Community	2.58	7.57
Staff-Staff	3.71	7.28
Student-Student	6.80*	4.10
Student-Parent	1.66	12.87*
Student-Community	.19	1.07
Community-Community	1.12	8.12

*.05 Level of Significance
**.01 Level of Significance
***.001 Level of Significance

TABLE 36

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL'S ASSIGNMENT OR ASSUMPTION OF ROLE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Yes	No	N
	Area: Student-Student		
Superintendent	O = 0 E = 1.22 χ^2 = 1.22	O = 14 E = 12.78 χ^2 = .12	14
Principal	O = 0 E = 1.22 χ^2 = 1.22	O = 14 E = 12.78 χ^2 = .12	14
Teacher	O = 4 E = 1.57 χ^2 = 3.76	O = 14 E = 16.43 χ^2 = .36	18
Total	4	42	46

χ^2 = 6.80. Significant at .05 with 2 df; table value 5.991.

differences in perception are apparent in the area of Student-Student. Tables 37-39 demonstrates these data.

Therefore, Hypothesis Six, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perception of the frequency of problem occurrence in the areas out of which perceived problems may have arisen, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Board-Principal, Board-Community and Student-Parent Relationships.

In Table 37 are found the chi-square values for the number of times the problem occurred as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Board and Principal, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 37

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION, FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Board-Principal			
Superintendent	O = 11 E = 8.11 χ^2 = 1.03	O = 3 E = 2.84 χ^2 = .01	O = 1 E = 4.05 χ^2 = 2.30	15
Principal	O = 2 E = 3.24 χ^2 = .47	O = 3 E = 1.14 χ^2 = 3.03	O = 1 E = 1.62 χ^2 = .24	6
Teacher	O = 7 E = 8.65 χ^2 = .31	O = 1 E = 3.03 χ^2 = 1.36	O = 8 E = 4.32 χ^2 = 3.13	16
Total	20	7	10	37

χ^2 = 11.88. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

The contribution of three cells, Superintendent-High, Principal-Average, Teacher-High, contributed the most to the value of 11.88, significant at the .05 level.

Therefore, Hypothesis Six, there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perception of the frequency of problem occurrence in the areas out of which perceived problems may have arisen, was rejected at the .05 level for the areas of Board-Principal, Board-Community, and Student-Parent relationships.

In Table 38 are found the chi-square values for the number of times the problem occurred as perceived to have originated in the

relationships between the Board and Community, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

The contribution of three cells, Superintendent-Average, Superintendent-High and Principal-Average, contributed the most to the value of 10.24, significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 38

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS, FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Board-Community			
Superintendent	O = 6 E = 7.03 χ^2 = .15	O = 7 E = 3.51 χ^2 = 3.47	O = 0 E = 2.46 χ^2 = 2.46	13
Principal	O = 5 E = 3.78 χ^2 = .39	O = 0 E = 1.89 χ^2 = 1.89	O = 2 E = 1.32 χ^2 = .32	7
Teacher	O = 9 E = 9.19 χ^2 = 0	O = 3 E = 4.59 χ^2 = .55	O = 5 E = 3.22 χ^2 = .98	17
Total	20	10	7	37

χ^2 = 10.24. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

In Table 39 are found the chi-square values for the number of times the problem occurred as perceived to have originated in the relationships between the Student and Parent, according to the responses of the superintendents, principals and teachers.

TABLE 39

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE BY SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

Personnel	Chi-Square Value Low	Medium	High	N
	Area: Student-Parent			
Superintendent	O = 4 E = 4.39 χ^2 = .03	O = 6 E = 2.47 χ^2 = 5.04	O = 4 E = 7.14 χ^2 = 1.38	14
Principal	O = 4 E = 3.76 χ^2 = .02	O = 3 E = 2.12 χ^2 = .37	O = 5 E = 6.12 χ^2 = .20	12
Teacher	O = 8 E = 7.84 χ^2 = 0	O = 0 E = 4.41 χ^2 = 4.41	O = 17 E = 12.75 χ^2 = 1.42	25
Total	16	9	26	51

χ^2 = 12.87. Significant at .05 with 4 df; table value 9.488.

The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Average and Teacher-Average, contributed the most to the value of 12.87, significant at the .05 level.

The stepwise backwards regression for superintendent's demographic variables, with perceptions of the problem as the criterion, was presented in Table 40. It was observed that most of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable "Years Since Last Degree" was not significant, therefore, none of the demographic variables by themselves were significantly related to the perception of the problem. Hence, the only significant relationships resulted

TABLE 40

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR SUPERINTENDENT'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, WITH PERCEPTION OF THE PROBLEM AS THE CRITERION (N=53)

Step	Variable Eliminated	R	F
1	None	.688	1.85
2	Distance From College	.687	2.01*
3	Type of Institution (State College)	.686	2.19*
4	Size of District	.685	2.40*
5	Financial Problems	.683	2.62*
6	Type of Institution (Junior College)	.679	2.87**
7	Population of District	.673	3.10**
8	Years Worked with Principal	.668	3.38**
9	Age	.663	3.75**
10	Negotiations Complete	.651	4.04**
11	Negotiations for Principal Salary Complete	.637	4.40**
12	Type of Institution - Degree	.617	4.71**
13	Degree in Minnesota	.589	4.98**
14	Type of Institution (University)	.545	5.08**
15	Type of Institution (Area Vocational School)	.483	4.96**
16	Philosophical Point of View	.410	5.04*
17	Years in Education (Years Since Last Degree)	.244	3.25

*Significant at .05
**Significant at .01

from the different combinations of variables. The most significant combination of variables was noted at step 14 and included Type of Institution-Area Vocational School, Philosophical Point of View, Years in Education and Years Since Last Degree.

Therefore, Hypothesis Seven, there are no significant differences among certain demographic variables and the superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of problems and their intensity, was rejected at the .05 level in the areas of Type of Institution-Area Vocational School, Philosophical Point of View, Years in Education, Years Since Last Degree and Degree Held.

The stepwise backwards regression for superintendent's demographic variables, with intensity of the problem as the criterion, was presented in Table 41. It was observed that most of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable, Years Since Last Degree, was not significant, therefore, none of the demographic variables by themselves were significantly related to the intensity of the problem. Hence, the only significant relationships resulted from the different combinations of variables. The most significant combination of variables was noted at step 16 and included Years in Education and Years Since Last Degree.

Correlations of the superintendent's demographic variables for perception and intensity of the problem were presented in Table 42. As was inferred by the stepwise backwards regression analysis (see Tables 39 and 40), none of the individual variables were significantly related to either perception or intensity of the problem.

TABLE 41

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR SUPERINTENDENT'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH INTENSITY OF THE PROBLEM AS THE CRITERION (N=53)

Step	Variable Eliminated	R	F
1	None	.729	2.33*
2	Type of Institution (Junior College)	.729	2.55**
3	Size of District	.729	2.80**
4	Distance From College	.729	3.07**
5	Type of Institution (College)	.727	3.37**
6	Financial Problems	.722	3.64**
7	Age	.710	3.79**
8	Type of Institution (Degree)	.700	4.03**
9	Years Worked with Principal	.685	4.23**
10	Population of District	.673	4.56**
11	Type of Institution (Area Vocational School)	.649	4.68**
12	Negotiations Complete	.629	5.01**
13	Type of Institution (University)	.601	5.34**
14	Negotiations for Principal Salary Complete	.562	5.55**
15	Degree in Minnesota	.500	5.45**
16	Philosophical Point of View	.441	6.04**
17	Years in Education (Years Since Last Degree)	.244	3.24

*Significant at .05
**Significant at .01

TABLE 42

CORRELATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENT'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND PERCEPTION AND INTENSITY OF THE PROBLEM

	Predictor Demographic	Criteria Perception of Problem	Intensity of Problem
1	Age	.022	.048
2	Financial Problems	.174	.175
3	Distance From College	-.008	-.001
4	Type of Institution (Junior College)	-.078	.009
5	Type of Institution (College)	-.072	-.095
6	Type of Institution (University)	.161	.111
7	Type of Institution (Area Vocational School)	-.219	-.155
8	Population of District	.045	-.016
9	Years Worked with Principal	-.021	-.042
10	Type of Institution (Degree)	-.122	-.090
11	Years Since Last Degree	-.245	-.244
12	Negotiations Complete	-.101	-.092
13	Negotiations for Principal Salary Complete	-.139	-.218
14	Size of District	-.150	-.156
15	Philosophical Point of View	.248	.227
16	Years in Education	.104	.135
17	Degree in Minnesota	-.116	.161

The stepwise backwards regression for principal's demographic variables with perception of the problem as the criteria was presented in Table 43. It was observed that there was no significance in this area.

TABLE 43

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPAL'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH PERCEPTION OF THE PROBLEM AS THE CRITERION (N=53)

Step	Variable Eliminated	R	F
1	None	.314	.524
2	Years in Education	.314	.601
3	Years in District	.313	.698
4	Years Under Present Superintendent	.311	.819
5	Philosophical Point of View	.307	.980
6	Degree Earned in Minnesota	.302	1.21
7	Age	.271	1.29
8	Type of Institution	.231	1.41
9	Years Since Last Degree	.183	1.77
	(Remaining Variable - Degree Held)		

The stepwise backwards regression for principal's demographic variables, with intensity of the problem as the criteria, was presented in Table 44. Reading the table from bottom to top it was noted that the remaining variable "Degree Held" was significant at step 9.

TABLE 44

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPAL'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH INTENSITY OF THE PROBLEM AS THE CRITERION (N=53)

Step	Variable Eliminated	R	F
1	None	.348	.659
2	Years in District	.348	.758
3	Degree Earned in Minnesota	.348	.883
4	Year Since Last Degree	.347	1.05
5	Age	.344	1.26
6	Years Under Present Superintendent	.337	1.53
7	Philosophical Point of View	.332	2.03
8	Type of Institution	.320	2.87
9	Years in Education	.314	5.59*
	(Remaining Variable - Degree Held)		

*Significant at .05

Correlations of principal's demographic variables and perception and intensity of the problem were presented in Table 45. As was inferred by the stepwise backward regression analysis (see Tables 43 and 44), variable 2, Degree Held, was by itself significant in the case of intensity of the problem. Further examination indicated that none of the other variables were significant.

The stepwise backwards regression for teacher's demographic variables, with perception of the problem as the criteria, was presented in Table 46. It was observed that most of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to

TABLE 45

CORRELATIONS OF PRINCIPAL'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND PERCEPTION AND INTENSITY OF THE PROBLEM

	Predictor Demographic	Criteria Perception of Problem	Criteria Intensity of Problem
1	Age	-.059	.003
2	Degree Held	.183	.314*
3	Years Since Last Degree	.066	-.070
4	Type of Institution	.046	.007
5	Years in Education	.106	.062
6	Years in District	.099	-.009
7	Years Under Present Superintendent	.049	.005
8	Philosophical Point of View	-.048	-.042
9	Degree Earned in Minnesota	.108	-.010

*Significant at .05

TABLE 46

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR TEACHER'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH INTENSITY OF THE PROBLEM AS THE CRITERION (N=106)

Step	Variable Eliminated	R	F
1	None	.436	2.51*
2	Degree Held	.435	2.83**
3	Age	.432	3.21**
4	Years in District	.421	3.56**
5	Years in Education	.416	4.19**
6	Philosophical Point of View	.398	4.75**
7	Years Under Present Superintendent	.378	5.67**
8	Years Since Last Degree	.320	5.86**
9	Degree Earned in Minnesota	.237	6.20*
	(Remaining Variable - Type of Institution)		

*Significant at .05; **Significant at .01

top it was noted that the remaining variable, Type of Institution, was significant.

The stepwise backwards regression for teachers' demographic variables, with intensity of the problem as the criteria, was presented in Table 47. It was observed that all of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable, Type of Institution, was significant.

TABLE 47

STEPWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR TEACHER'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH PERCEPTION OF THE PROBLEM AS THE CRITERION (N=106)

Step	Variable Eliminated	R	F
1	None	.454	2.77**
2	Degree Held	.454	3.15**
3	Age	.447	3.49**
4	Philosophical Point of View	.424	3.63**
5	Years in District	.399	3.81**
6	Years in Education	.391	4.56**
7	Years Under Present Superintendent	.360	5.04**
8	Years Since Last Degree	.312	5.57**
9	Degree Earned in Minnesota	.274	8.48**
	(Remaining Variable - Type of Institution)		

**Significant at .01

Correlations of teacher's demographic variables and perception and intensity of the problem were presented in Table 48. As was

inferred by the stepwise backward regression analysis (see Tables 45 and 46) variable 4, Type of Institution, was by itself significantly related to both perception and intensity of the problem. Further examination indicated that none of the other variables were significant.

TABLE 48

CORRELATIONS OF TEACHER'S DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND PERCEPTION AND INTENSITY OF THE PROBLEM

	Predictor	Criteria	
	Demographic	Perception of Problem	Intensity of Problem
1	Age	-.061	-.083
2	Degree Held	.116	.058
3	Years Since Last Degree	-.138	-.145
4	Type of Institution	-.275**	-.237*
5	Years in Education	-.013	-.040
6	Years in District	-.037	-.041
7	Years Under Present Superintendent	.066	.035
8	Philosophical Point of View	-.172	-.184
9	Degree Earned in Minnesota	.097	.168
	(Remaining Variable - Type of Institution)		

*Significant at .05
**Significant at .01

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was agreement or disagreement in perception among the superintendent, principal and teachers as to the identification of areas in which problems may have had their origin, and to see if these problems were perceived with a similar degree of intensity. In addition, another purpose of the study was to determine if there were significant differences among superintendents, principals and teachers in their perceptions of the presence of role activity on the part of the superintendent and high school principal, and the perceptions of the quality of the role performances.

This investigation was undertaken to determine if, in fact, such differences did exist. While current available literature suggests that there are differences in perception among superintendents, principals and teachers, there were no studies available that dealt with differences in perceptions of the possible origins of school problems as well as differing perceptions of role and role performances of administrators in meeting problems.

To test for differences, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

1. there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perception of areas out of which problems may have arisen,
2. there are no significant differences among superintendents, principals, and teachers in their perception of the intensity of incidents in problem areas,
3. there are no significant differences among the superintendents', principals', and teachers' perception of the superintendent's role and his performance in it,
4. there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals', and teachers' perception of the principal's role and his performance in it,
5. there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perception of whether the principal was assigned a role or it was assumed by the principal,
6. there are no significant differences among superintendents', principals', and teachers' perception of the frequency of problem occurrence in the areas out of which perceived problems may have arisen,
7. there are no significant differences among certain demographic variables and the superintendents', principals', and teachers' perception of problems and their intensity of incidents.

The research population consisted of 53 superintendents, 53 principals and 106 teachers drawn from 434 schools in the State of Minnesota. The data were collected through a survey instrument.

The statistical techniques utilized for this study were the chi-square technique to test for differences among superintendents, principals and teachers, and the stepwise backward regression method was used to analyze the demographic variables.

Conclusions and Discussion

Hypothesis One

Significant differences at the .05 level were found among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of areas out of which problems may have arisen. Differences were found in the areas of Board-Community, Superintendent-Staff, Superintendent-Parent, and Principal-Board relationships.

In Perception of the Problem, Column 2, significant chi-squares were noted in the problem areas of Board-Community, Superintendent-Staff, Superintendent-Parent and Principal-Board. For the problem area Board-Community, it was noted that the largest amount of difference was evident in the Yes Column for Teachers. It was evident that teachers perceived more problems as originating in the area of Board-Community than did either superintendents or principals.

In the problem area identified as Superintendent-Parent, it was noted that the largest amount of difference was in the Yes Column for Teachers. It was evident that the teachers' responses contributed the largest amount of differences.

It might be concluded that teachers, having a closer relationship to parents than does either the principal or superintendent, tend to see more problems in the area.

For the problem area designated Principal-Board, it was noted that the largest value was evidenced in the Yes Column for Superintendents. It was therefore apparent that the superintendents' responses contributed the largest amount of difference.

Apparently, superintendents, being the intermediary between the board and the high school principal, are able to observe more problems arising out of this area than do either the teachers or principal.

Hypothesis Two

There were significant differences among superintendents, principals and teachers in their perceptions of the intensity of incidents in problem areas. Differences significant at the .05 level were found in the area of Principal-Staff relationships.

In Intensity of the Problem (Column 3), a significant chi-square was noted in the problem area referred to as Principal-Student. The largest value was evidenced in the superintendents' high rating. It was, therefore, concluded that the superintendents' responses contributed the largest amount of difference in this area. It is apparent that the superintendents perceived the intensity of problems between the principal and students to be greater than did either the principal or teachers.

Hypothesis Three (Role Activity)

There were significant differences among the superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the superintendent's role and his performance in it. Differences were significant at the .05 level in the areas of Board-Principal, Board-Student, Board-Parent, Superintendent-Parent, Principal-Board, Principal-Parent, Principal-Student,

Principal-Staff, Principal-Community, Staff-Parent and Staff-Staff relationships.

In Superintendent's Role Activity (Column 4), significant chi-squares were noted in the problem areas designated Board-Principal, Board-Student, Board-Parent, Superintendent-Parent, Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Principal-Community, Staff-Student and Staff-Staff. In the area of Board-Principal relationships, it was noted that the largest value was evidenced in the Yes Column for Superintendents. It could be conjectured that if the superintendent was a number of problems arising out of this area, he also saw himself as taking a more active role in attempting to resolve these problems than was seen by principals and teachers.

For the Board-Student problem area, it was noted that the greatest amount of difference appeared in the Yes Column for Teachers. The teachers' perception was that the superintendent took a more active role in attempting to resolve Board-Student problems than the superintendent reportedly believed himself to have done.

For the areas of Board-Parent, Superintendent-Parent, Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Principal-Community and Staff-Student it was observed that the greatest amount of difference was evidenced in the Yes Column for Superintendents.

It is apparent from the above areas, that the superintendent felt that he took an active role in attempting to resolve these problems, while the principals and teachers did not perceive that he did.

For the area of Staff-Staff relationships, it was observed that the greatest amount of difference was evidenced in the No Column for Superintendents.

Apparently, superintendents were not aware of problems arising between members of the staff.

Hypothesis Three (Role Performance)

There were significant differences among the superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the superintendent's role and his performance in it. Differences were significant at the .05 level in the areas of Internal School Board, Board-Staff, Superintendent-Staff, Principal-Parent, Principal-Community and Staff-Community relationships.

In Superintendent's Role Performance (Column 5), significant chi-square values were noted in the problem areas of Internal School Board, Board-Staff, Superintendent-Staff, Principal-Board, Principal-Community and Staff-Community relationships.

For the problem area, Internal School Board, it was observed that the largest value was evidenced in the Average Column for Superintendents. It was apparent that the superintendents' reported perceptions of the effectiveness of their roles in dealing with internal school board problems was significantly different from the reported perceptions of either principals or teachers. The latter group reported superintendents' role performance as less effective than did superintendents themselves.

For the problem area Board-Staff, it was noted that the largest difference was evidenced in the Low Column for Teachers. It was,

therefore, concluded that the teachers' responses indicated that their perceptions of the effectiveness of the superintendent in dealing with Board-Staff problems was significantly less favorable than those of superintendents.

For the problem area of Superintendent-Staff, it was observed that the largest value was obtained in the Low Column for Superintendents. Apparently, superintendents did not feel that their performance was as effective in this area as principals and teachers believed it to be.

For the problem area Principal-Board, it was noted that the largest value was evidenced in the High Column for Teachers. This rating would tend to show that teachers felt that the superintendents' performance in helping to resolve Principal-Board problems was high.

For the problem area Principal-Community, it was observed that the greatest amount of difference was contributed by the cell Low Column for Teachers. The teachers reportedly perceived that the superintendents were not as effective in the performance of their roles in meeting problems involving the principal and the community as the superintendent believed himself to be.

For the problem area Staff-Community, it was observed that the largest value was contributed by the cell for Low Column, Teachers.

Teachers rated the superintendent lower in helping them to resolve problems that may have arisen between members of the staff and members of the community, than the superintendent rated himself.

Hypothesis Four (Role Activity)

There were significant differences at the .05 level among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the principal's role and his performance in it in the areas of Superintendent-Parent, Principal-Board, Staff-Student and Staff-Staff relationships.

In Principal's Role Activity, Column 6, significant chi-squares were obtained for the problem areas of Superintendent-Parent, Principal-Board, Staff-Student and Staff-Staff relationships.

For the problem area of Superintendent-Parent, it was observed that the largest value was evidenced in the Yes Column for Teachers. The teachers apparently felt that the principal did take an active role in attempting to resolve problems occurring between the superintendent and parent, where this belief was not shared by neither the principals themselves, nor the teachers.

For the problem area of Principal-Board, it was noted that the largest value was evidenced in the Yes Column for Superintendents.

Apparently, superintendents saw their principals as taking an active role in attempting to resolve problems between board and principal, but that this perception differed significantly from the perceptions of both principals and teachers, for neither group saw the principal taking an active part in the resolutions of Principal-Board problems.

In the problem area Staff-Student, it was noted that the largest value was obtained for the No Column for Teachers.

It would seem that in the area of Staff-Student problems, the teachers believed that the principal was not taking as active a role

in attempting to resolve problems that arise between them and their students, than the principal perceived himself as taking.

In the problem area of Staff-Staff, it was observed that the largest value was evidenced in the Yes Column for Teachers. It was therefore concluded that the teachers perceived the principals as taking a more active role in resolving problems arising among staff members than did the principals themselves.

Hypothesis Four (Role Performance)

There was significant differences at the .05 level among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions of the principal's role, and his performance in it, in the areas of Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Staff-Staff and Student-Student relationships.

In Principal's Role Performance, Column 7, significant chi-squares were noted in the problem areas of Principal-Parent, Principal-Student, Principal-Staff, Staff-Staff and Staff-Student relationships.

For all of these areas it was noted that the largest value was obtained in the No Column for Teachers. Therefore, it was concluded that the teachers' responses indicated that they perceived the principal's performance as being less effective than did superintendents and principals themselves.

Hypothesis Five

There were significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions as to whether the principal was assigned a role or it was assumed by the principal. Differences were significant at the .05 level in the area of Student-Student relationships.

In Principal's Assignment or Assumption of a Role, Column 8, a significant chi-square was noted in the problem area of Student-Student relationships.

In this area it was observed that the largest value was evidenced in the Yes Column for Teachers.

The teachers believed that the principal was assigned the role of mediating problems in the Student-Student relationships. It is conjectured that in the remaining areas, the principal assumed a role in attempting to resolve problems that occurred.

It was noted in Column 7 that the teachers rated the principal's role performance as low in this area, whereas principals rated themselves as average.

Hypothesis Six

There were significant differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perception of problem occurrence. Differences were significant at the .05 level in the areas of Board-Principal, Board-Community and Student-Parent relationships.

In Problem Occurrence, Column 9, significant chi-squares were found in the problem areas designated Board-Principal, Board-Community, and Student-Parent. In the area of Board-Principal relationships, it was observed that the greatest amount of difference was evidenced in the High Column for Teachers.

It is concluded that the teachers perceived more problems arising in this area than did either the superintendent or principal.

In the area of Board-Community relationships, it was noted that the greatest difference appeared in the Average Column for Superintendents, who perceived fewer problems arising between board members and the community than did principals and teachers.

In the area of Student-Parent, it was observed that the greatest amount of difference was evidenced in the Average Column for Superintendents.

Apparently, superintendents perceived the frequency of problems in this area as being greater than did the principals or teachers.

Hypothesis Seven

There were significant differences among certain demographic variables and the perceptions of problems and the intensity of incidents among superintendents, principals and teachers. Differences were found at the .05 level in the areas of Type of Institution, Philosophical Point of View, Years in Education, Years Since Last Degree and Degree Held.

In the relationship of the superintendent and selected demographic variables, significance was found only in combinations of variables. None, individually, was significantly related to perception of the problem.

The most significant combination of variables included proximity of the school district to Type of Institution (Area Vocational School), Philosophical Point of View, Years in Education and Years Since Last Degree was Earned.

The data revealed that superintendents whose districts were located closer to an Area Vocational school than to a college or

university tended to see more incidents with greater intensity than did other superintendents.

In addition, the data revealed that the majority of superintenddents reportedly hold a philosophical point of view lying between liberal and traditional. Therefore, it may be concluded that they perceived more problems than did those superintendents holding either liberal or traditional points of view.

The data further showed that superintendents who had been in the field of education for 16-25 years perceived problems in more areas than did those superintendents who had more (26-40+) or less (11-15) years in education.

Superintendents who had earned their latest degrees within the last 11-15 years saw problems in more areas than did those superintendents earning degrees more (16-40) or less (2-10) years ago.

The only significant relationships resulting from the different combinations of variables, using intensity of the problem as the criterion, were Years in Education and Years Since Last Degree. None individually was significantly related to the intensity of the problem.

It might be concluded that superintendents with 16-25 years in education saw a greater intensity of problems than did superintendents with more or less years in the field.

Apparently, superintendents who had earned a degree in the last 11-15 years perceived the intensity of problems as being greater than did superintendents who earned degrees prior to or after that period of time.

In the relationship of the principal and selected demographic variables, using perception of the problem as the criterion, no significance was found.

The most significant variable, using intensity of the problem as the criterion, was Degree Held. Only one, Years in Education, was significantly related to the intensity of the problem.

It might be concluded that principals holding Masters Degrees with 6-25 years in education perceive a higher intensity in the problem areas than do principals holding a lesser degree or with more or fewer years in education.

In the relationship of the teachers and selected demographic variables, using intensity and perception of the problem as the criterion, a significance was found only for all variables considered together. None, by itself, or in any combinations, was significant.

The largest differences among superintendents', principals' and teachers' perceptions were found in responses to the question of the superintendents' taking an active role in attempting to resolve problems. Seeman's (1953) study is supported in that the teachers and principals do not see the superintendent taking an active role in resolving problems, while the superintendent does. According to Seeman's study, teachers feel that the superintendent does not perform up to their expectations in relation to their problems, but, at the same time, they see the superintendent taking active participation in helping to resolve problems involving the principal.

The study revealed marked differences in perception among superintendents, principals and teachers not only in origin of problems and

their intensity, but in the perception of the superintendents and principals role activities and their performance in them. It appeared that teachers were unaware of the principals' role assignment, generally believing that he merely assumed an active role. This was true for all except for the Student-Student problem area.

It can be inferred from the study that, while marked differences are evident among the three groups, superintendents, principals and teachers, it is not severe enough in these areas to cause a dysfunction of the schools.

Recommendations

The results of the study lead to the following recommendations:

1. Further study should be conducted to determine why perceptions of principals within schools are not similar to either the superintendents or teachers.

2. Further study needs to be conducted to determine the effect to which the differences in perception might eventually lead.

3. This study should be replicated with a larger geographical base. This should be done to see if the findings of this study can be duplicated in states other than Minnesota.

4. The study should be conducted on a longitudinal basis to determine if perceptions differ over an extended length of time as opposed to a one-year period.

APPENDIX A

Column 1	Column 2		Column 3					Column 4		Column 5					Column 6		Column 7					Column 8		Column 9
Areas where problems might have originated during the past year	Did you perceive a problem in this area last year? Check one		How would you rate the degree of intensity of the problem? Circle one					Did Superintendent take an active role in attempting to resolve the problem? Check one		Rate the superintendent's role performance in meeting the problem. Circle one					Did principal take an active role in attempting to resolve the problem? Check one		Rate the principal's role performance in meeting the problem Circle one					Did Superintendent assign principal to an active role or did principal assume a role? Check one		How many times did problem occur? Circle approximate number.
	Yes	No	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High	Yes	No	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High	Yes	No	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High	Assigned	Assumed	
Internal School Board			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Board-Superintendent			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Board-Principal			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Board-Staff			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Board-Student			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Board-Parent			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Board-Community			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Superintendent-Principal			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Superintendent-Staff			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Superintendent-Student			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Superintendent-Parent			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Superintendent-Community			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Principal-Board			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Principal-Parent			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Principal-Student			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Principal-Staff			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Principal-Community			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Staff-Student			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Staff-Parent			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Staff-Community			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Staff-Staff			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Student-Student			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Student-Parent			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Student-Community			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more
Community-Community			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5			1 2 3 4 5 or more

Male_____

Age_____

Female_____

1. Is your school district having financial problems in relation to gaining more revenue for school expenditures? Yes No
2. How far away is the nearest junior college, college, university or vocational school? ( ) in town ( ) within 25 miles ( ) within 50 miles ( ) within 100 miles ( ) over 100 miles.
3. Type of institution(s) referred to in Question 2_____
4. Total population in school district. ( ) under 1,000 ( ) between 1,000 and 4,000 ( ) between 4,000-10,000 ( ) between 10,000-15,000 ( ) between 15,000-25,000 ( ) between 25,000-50,000 ( ) over 50,000
5. Number of years superintendent and high school principal have worked together in system. ( ) one year ( ) two years ( ) three years ( ) 4-6 years ( ) 7-10 years ( ) over 10 years
6. What type of institution was last earned degree from? ( ) university ( ) private liberal arts college ( ) state college
7. How many years ago was last degree earned_____
8. Has your staff and board completed negotiations for the 72-73 school year? Yes No
9. Have salaries for principals been agreed to by board and principals? No Yes
10. Enrollment K-12_____
11. In matters of education, would you categorize yourself as leaning more towards the liberal point of view ( ) traditional ( ) or in between ( ).

12. Total number of years in education_____

13. Did you graduate with your highest degree from a school in Minnesota_____ or out of state_____

APPENDIX C

Male _____

Age_____

Female_____

1. Highest degree held_____

2. How many years ago was last degree earned?_____

3. What type of institution was last degree earned from ( ) university ( ) private liberal arts college ( ) state college

4. Total number of years in education_____

5. Years in present school district_____

6. Years you have worked under present superintendent_____

7. In matters of education, would you categorize yourself as leaning more towards the liberal point of view ( ) or as being more traditional ( ) or in between ( )?

8. Did you graduate with your highest degree from a school in Minnesota_____ or out of state_____

Ada
Adrian
Akeley
Albert Lea
Alexandria
Amboy-Good Thunder
Anoka
Argyle
Ashby
Atwater
Aurora-Hoyt Lakes
Babbitt
Badger
Balaton
Barnum
Battle Lake
Becker
Belle Plaine
Belview
Benson
Big Lake
Biwabik
Blooming Prairie
Blue Earth
Braham
Brandon
Brewster
Brooklyn Center
Browerville
Brownton
Buffalo Lake
Burnsville
Byron
Cambridge
Canby
Carlton
Circle Pines
Chandler
Chatfield
Chisholm
Clara City
Clarissa
Clearbrook
Climax
Cloquet
Coleraine
Comfrey
Cosmos
Cromwell
Crosby
Danube
Dawson
Deer River
Delavan
Dilworth
Dover-Eyota
Eagle Bend
East Grand Forks
Eden Prairie
Edgerton
Elbow Lake
Elk River
Ellsworth
Ely
Erskine
Eveleth
Fairmont
Farmington
Fertile
Fisher
Foley
Fosston
Frazee
Fridley
Fulda
Gary
Gibbon
Glencoe
Glenwood
Golden Valley
Goodhue
Graceville
Grand Meadow
Granite Falls
Grey Eagle
Hallock
Hastings
Hayfield
Henderson
Hendrum
Herman
Heron Lake
Hill City
Hinckley
Holdingford
Houston
Humboldt
International Falls
Isle
Jackson
Jasper
Karlstad
Kelliher
Kensington
Kerkhoven
Kimball
Lake Benton
Lake County
    Two Harbors
Lake Park
Lake of the Woods
    Baudette
Lakeville
Lancaster
Laporte
Leroy
Lester Prairie
Litchfield
Littlefork
Luverne
Lynd
Madelia
Magnolia
Mahtomedi
Maple Lake
Marietta
Maynard
McIntosh
Melrose
Mentor
Milaca
Milroy
Minneota
Minnetonka
Montgomery
Moorhead
Mora
Morris
Morton
Mound
Mountain Iron
Murdock
Nevis
New London-Spicer

New Richland
New York Mills
North Branch
North St. Paul
Ogilvie
Oklee
Onamia
Ortonville
Oslo
Owatonna
Parkers Prairie
Pelican Rapids
Perham
Pierz
Pine City
Pine River
Plainview
Preston
Prior Lake
Randolph
Red Lake
Red Wing
Remer
Richfield
Rochester
Roseau
Roseville
Round Lake
Rush City
Russell
Sacred Heart
St. Charles
St. Cloud
St. James
St. Louis Park
St. Peter
Sandstone
Sauk Centre
Sebeka
Sherburn
Slayton
South St. Paul
Springfield
Spring Lake Park
Staples
Stephen
Stewartville
Storden-Jeffers
Swanville
Thief River Falls
Tintah
Tracy
Truman
Tyler
Underwood
Verdi
Villard
Wabasha
Waconia
Waldorf-Pemberton
Walnut Grove
Warren
Waseca
Waterville-Elysian
Wayzata
Wells
West Concord
Wheaton
Willmar
Windom
Winona
Winthrop
Worthington
Wykoff

APPENDIX E

Date

Name
Address
City, State Zip

Dear Sir:

This letter is a request for your assistance.

My doctoral dissertation is going to be a study involving role perceptions of superintendents and high school principals in randomly selected school districts in Minnesota. I would like to ask your cooperation in helping me obtain the data needed to complete the study.

Your assistance is asked in completing a two page questionnaire and in distributing copies of the questionnaire to your principal(s) and two members of your high school faculty. The faculty members will be those who have been on the staff one or more years, and hopefully, since most faculties are equally distributed on basis of sex, one member will be male, one female.

In order for the data to be useable, all questionnaires from each school must be returned. For this reason, each questionnaire is coded to assure that each set is complete. You are asked not to sign your name on the questionnaire. Moreover, after the data are sorted by number, these questionnaires will be destroyed. No individual data will be released under any circumstances.

If you, your principal, and teachers are willing to assist me, it would be greatly appreciated. Please return the enclosed postcard indicating your decision.

Sincerely yours,

Ronald F. Frohrip

The principal is in his first year of employment with the school district and could not give you the necessary information_____

The superintendent is in his first year of employment with the school district and could not give you the necessary information_____

The principal teaches at least one regularly scheduled class_____

APPENDIX F

Date

Superintendent
School
City, State

Dear Superintendent:

This letter is a follow-up to the one I sent you on October 6 requesting your assistance in helping me obtain data for my dissertation.

My committee has set a certain number of schools I must have responses from in order to make the study valid; therefore, it is very important that I receive a response from each school.

Please check the appropriate space at the bottom of this letter and return it to me in the enclosed addressed, stamped envelope.

Sincerely yours,

Ronald F. Frohrip

Enclosure

The superintendent_____principal_____is in his first year of employment

We will not participate_____

Our faculty roster is enclosed, we will participate_____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUPERINTENDENT:

Would you please distribute these sets of questionnaires to the appropriate personnel:

Set 1 - Superintendent
Set 2 - Principal(s)
Sets 3 & 4 - Teachers whose names appear on the front of the set

When the questionnaires are completed, please ask the principal(s) and teachers to return them to me in the stamped, addressed envelope provided in their set of materials.

Your cooperation will be appreciated.

General Instructions for Completion of Questionnaire:

Column 1 - Lists general areas where problems affecting school can originate.

Column 2 - Did you perceive that there was a problem in this area last year?

Column 3 - Based on your perception, rate the intensity of the problem.

Column 4 - Did the superintendent take an active role in the problem category?

Column 5 - Based on your perception, rate the performance of the superintendent in his efforts to resolve the issue.

Column 6 - Did the high school principal take an active role in the problem area?

Column 7 - Rate the principal's role performance in meeting the problem.

Column 8 - Was the principal assigned the role by the superintendent, or did the principal assume the role he took?

Column 9 - If the problem occurred in your school more than a single time, please mark appropriate column.

APPENDIX H

Date

Superintendent
School
City, State

Dear Superintendent:

On October 15 I mailed you the set of questionnaires that you agreed to assist me with in gathering data for my dissertation.

As of this date I have not received a response from (name of person). As I stated in my original letter to you, all sets must be returned before the data is useable.

I know that you have a very busy schedule, but could I again request your assistance in asking (name) to return his/her questionnaire? If he is not willing to cooperate, please give the questionnaire to another male member of your staff who has been with the district for more than one year. I have enclosed another questionnaire.

I would like to thank (names of those returned) for your prompt responses. Your help is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Ronald F. Frohrip

Enclosure

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

American Association of School Administrators. Hints to the Beginning Superintendent of Schools. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1962, pp. 7-9.

Anderson, Lester W., and Van Dyke, Lauren A. Secondary School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Andrews, John H. M. "A Deterrent to Harmony Among Teachers." Administrator's Notebook, VI (March 1958), pp. 1-4.

Argyris, Chris. "Personal vs. Organizational Goals." In Robert Dubin, Human Relations in Administration, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961, Pp. 68-77.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Biddle, Bruce J., and Thomas, Edwin. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966, p. 27.

Bossom, J., and Maslow, A. H. "Security of Judges as a Factor in Impressions of Warmth in Others." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 55 (1957), pp. 147-148.

Briner, Conrad. "The Superintendent and the Selection of Subordinate Administrators." Administrator's Notebook, VIII (February 1960), pp. 1-4.

Brookhover, Wilbur B., and Gottlieb, David A. A Sociology of Education, 2nd ed. New York: American Book Company, 1964.

Buffington, Reed L. "The Job of the Elementary School Principal as Viewed by Parents." Dissertation Abstracts, Ed.D. dissertation (Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1954), Vol. 14, No. 6, pp. 943-944.

Buffington, Reed L., and Medsker, Leland. "Teachers and Parents Describe the Effective Principal's Behavior." Administrator's Notebook, IV (September 1955), pp. 1-4.

Campbell, Roald. "Teacher-Principal Agreement on the Teacher Role." Administrator's Notebook, VII (February 1959), pp. 1-4.

Carlson, Richard O. Executive Succession and Organizational Change. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1962.

Chase, Francis S. "How to Meet Teachers' Expectations of Leadership." Administrator's Notebook, I (April 1953), pp. 1-4.

Coladarci, Arthur P. "Administrative-Success Criteria." The Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1956), Vol. 37, p. 284.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "The Process of Educational Policy Development." Administrator's Notebook, VII (January 1959), p. 4.

Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. Evanston, Illinois: Harper & Row, Co., 1970.

Ferneau, Elmer F. "Which Consultant?" Administrator's Notebook 2 (April, 1954), p. 2.

Gage, N. L. "Accuracy of Social Perception and Effectiveness in Interpersonal Relationships." Journal of Personality, 22 (1953) pp. 128-141.

Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process," Administrative Theory in Education. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.

Getzels, Jacob W., and Guba, Egon G. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation." Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (September 1955), pp. 30-40.

Getzels, Jacob W., and Guba, Egon G. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." School Review, LXV (Winter, 1957), pp. 423-41.

Getzels, Jacob W., and Lipham, James M., and Campbell, Roald, Educational Administration as a Social Process. Harper & Row Publishers, 1968, p. 315.

Gross, Neal. "Easing Strains and Tensions Between Superintendents and Board Members." Nation's Schools, LVI (October 1955), p. 45.

Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958, pp. 113-125.

Gross, Neal and Herriott, Robert E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1955.

Gross, Neal and Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W., Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

Halpin, Andrew W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1956.

Hencley, Stephen P. "A Typology of Conflict Between Superintendents and Their Reference Groups." Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1960.

Hilgard, Ernest R., and Atkinson, Richard C. Introduction of Psychology, 4th ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1967.

Kretch, David and Crutchfield, Richard S. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948.

Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1936.

Lloyd, Frances V. Jr. "Curricular Responsibilities of Today's School Board." Administrator's Notebook, XIV (October 1965), pp. 1-4.

Medsker, Leland L. "The Job of the Elementary Principal as Viewed by Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts, Ed.D. dissertation (Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1954), Vol. 16, No. 6, pp. 946-947.

Moser, Robert P. "The Leadership Patterns of School Superintendents and School Principals." Administrator's Notebook, VI (September 1957), p. 2.

Norman, R. D. "The Interrelationships among Acceptance-Rejection, Self-Other Identity, Insight into Self, and Realistic Perception of Others." Journal of Social Psychology, 37 (1953), pp. 7-9.

Omwake, K. T. "The Relation between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18 (1954), pp. 443-446.

Savage, William W. Consultative Services to Local School Systems. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959, pp. 48-54.

_____. Interpersonal and Group Relations in Educational Administration, Atlanta: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.

Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership." American Sociological Review, XVIII (August 1953), pp. 373-380.

Soles, Stanley. "Teacher Role Expectations and the Internal Organization of Secondary Schools." Journal of Educational Research, LVII (January 1964), pp. 227-235.

Taft, R. "The Ability to Judge People." Psychological Bulletin, 52 (1955), pp. 1-21.

Weingarten, E. "A Study of Selective Perception in Clinical Judgment." Journal of Personality, 17 (1949), pp. 369-400.