## INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

**Xerox University Microfilms**
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-788

ROSS, Naomi Draper, 1918-
AN ANALYSIS OF URBAN SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF DECISION MAKING ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN DEFINING ACCOUNTABILITY.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1974
Education, administration

**Xerox University Microfilms,** Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

**THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.**

# AN ANALYSIS OF URBAN SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF DECISION MAKING ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN DEFINING ACCOUNTABILITY

by

Naomi Draper Ross

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1974

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Alvin Loving, Co-Chairman
Assistant Professor Charles Moody, Co-Chairman
Professor Finley Carpenter
Assistant Professor Terrence Tice
Associate Professor Floyd Wylie

Dedicated to the memory of my parents,
Mr. and Mrs. Paris Draper

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer expresses sincere gratitude to all persons who assisted in the completion of this dissertation.

Special thanks to my committee members, co-chairmen Dr. Alvin Loving, Sr. and Dr. Charles Moody, Dr. Finley Carpenter, Dr. Terrence Tice and Dr. Floyd Wylie. These committee members were pillars of strength in my moments of need to pull the study together.

Many thanks to Carolyn Jagacinski, Ellen Armstrong--Research Assistants, Freddie Long, Jasper Mims, Jr., Dr. Ferdinand Galante, Rose Diem, John Wenzel, Detroit Public School Region Superintendents and Diane Greene, who spent many hours typing the study.

I am indebted to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paris Draper who unselfishly loved and trusted me. Finally, to my husband--Glenwood Ross, my children--Joya Ross, Glenwood Ross, II, Creed Judkins, II and Nacretia Chapman, my sister, Ruth Harper--all were kind and understanding.

To these persons and many more, I say thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION . . . . . ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . iii

LIST OF TABLES . . . . . vi

CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM . . . . . 1

Introduction
Need for the Study
Statement of the Problem
Assumptions
Definition of Terms
The Study Population
Description of Detroit, Michigan
Limitations of Study
Summary

CHAPTER TWO: THE REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . 13

Introduction
History of Accountability Movement
Who Should be Held Accountable?
Summary

CHAPTER THREE: THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . . . . 29

Introduction
Instrument
Analysis of Data
Rationale of Survey Instrument
Summary

CHAPTER FOUR: THE PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . . 42

Introduction
Presentation and Interpretation of the Data
Instrument
Statistical Hypothesis
Analysis of Principals Attitudes Toward Sharing Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities with Parents

Analysis of Principals' Perceptions Toward Sharing Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities with Teachers
Analysis of Principals' Attitude Toward Student Involvement
Analysis of Principals' Attitude Toward Community Involvement
Findings
Summary

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . 80

Summary
Recommendations
Suggested Areas for Further Study

APPENDICES . . . . . 87

A. Perceptions of School/Community Accountability Questionnaire and Cover Letters
B. Composite Histogram Table of Observed Frequency
C. Composite Percentage Table

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 100

## LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 4-1 | Principals in Detroit, Michigan . . . . . | 44 |
| 4-2 | Analysis of Contengency Table for Race of Principals Toward Parent Involvement . | 47 |
| 4-3 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Age of Principal Toward Parent Involvement . . . . . | 48 |
| 4-4 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Socio-Economic Level of School Toward Principals' Attitude of Parent Involvement . . . . . | 49 |
| 4-5 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Region Location of School Toward Principals' Attitude of Parent Involvement . . . . . | 49 |
| 4-6 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Education Toward Parent Involvement . . . . . | 51 |
| 4-7 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Teaching Experience in Relation to Their Attitude Toward Parent Involvement . . . . . | 51 |
| 4-8 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Amount of Principals' Administrative Experience Toward Parent Involvement . . | 52 |
| 4-9 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Level of School on Principal/Parent Attitude . | 52 |
| 4-10 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Race of Principal Toward Teacher Involvement . . . . . | 54 |
| 4-11 | Analysis of Contingency Table for Age of Principal Toward Teacher Involvement . . . . . | 55 |

4-12 Analysis of Contingency Table for Socio-Economic Level of School Toward Principals' Attitude of Teacher Involvement . . . . . 56

4-13 Analysis of Contingency Table for Region Location of School Toward Principals' Attitude of Teacher Involvement . . . . . 57

4-14 Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Education Toward Teacher Involvement . . . . . 58

4-15 Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Teaching Experience in Relation to His/Her Attitude Toward Teacher Involvement . . . . . 58

4-16 Analysis of Contingency Table for Amount of Principals' Administrative Experience Toward Teacher Involvement . . . . . 59

4-17 Analysis of Contingency Table for Level of School on Principals' Attitude Toward Teacher Involvement . . . . . 60

4-18 Analysis of Contingency Table for Race of Principal/Student Involvement . . . . 61

4-19 Analysis of Contingency Table for Age of Principal/Student Involvement . . . . 62

4-20 Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Socio-Economic Level of School and Its Influence on His Attitude Toward Student Involvement . . . 63

4-21 Analysis of Contingency Table for Region Location of Principals' School on His/Her Attitude Toward Student Involvement . . . . . 64

4-22 Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Amount of Education/Student Involvement . . . . . 64

4-23 Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Teaching Experience/Student Involvement . . . . . 64

4-24 Analysis of Contingency Table for Amount of Principals' Administrative Experience/Student Involvement . . . . . 66

4-25 Analysis of Contingency Table for Level of Principals' School/Student Involvement . . . . . 66

4-26 Analysis of Contingency Table for Race of Principal/Community Involvement . . . . 68

4-27 Analysis of Contingency Table Age of Principal/Community Involvement. . . . . 69

4-28 Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Socio-Economic Level of School/Community Involvement . . . . . 69

4-29 Analysis of Contingency Table for Region Location of Principals' School/ Community Involvement . . . . . 70

4-30 Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Amount of Education/ Community Involvement. . . . . 71

4-31 Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Teaching Experience/ Community Involvement . . . . . 72

4-32 Analysis of Contingency Table for Amount of Principals' Administrative Experience/Community Involvement . . . . . 72

4-33 Analysis of Contingency Table for Level of Principals' School/Community Involvement . . . . . 73

# CHAPTER ONE

# THE PROBLEM

## Introduction

New societal forces are changing the roles--especially the decision making roles--school principals traditionally held and are making obsolete many ground rules under which they now operate. Accountability is one of the forces exerting pressure on the educational system to reflect more authentically the society in which we live. The demand of accountability is imposing corresponding anxieties. Adjusting and adapting to this changing and challenging world is the means by which schools and other institutions endeavor to stay relevant to current needs and to justify their existence.

Demand for accountability is not completely new to education. To some degree it has been present in every era. But the space-age prototypes of accountability present new wrinkles, for example, performance contracting--known as "the heart of the education engineering process," setting performance objectives, and developing external student achievement audits. Now stress is often placed on the output of education rather than the input. The public wants to know what the student will be able to do. It wants a

guarantee that the student will be able to obtain certain skills in school which will enable that person to be productive in the future world of work.

Dyer acknowledges the social forces currently making an impact on the educational institution by suggesting goals and objectives be derived from a cooperative effort of administrators, teachers, board members, parents and students.[1]

As the participatory base in school decision making is broadened, the model of accountability in education is viewed more as a social system and less as a product management model. Each actor in such a social system brings his own perceived expectations of decision making both in regard to his own role and that of the other actors. The identifiable participants, who hold varying degrees of power and who have varying channels for voicing their needs, include the school personnel, the students, parents and the community. Within each group a range of perceived expectations can be anticipated.

Talmage and Monroe define accountability in an education social systems framework. Accountability is derived from the negotiation of perceived expectations among those groups participating in a school-community social system. As a process, accountability is characterized by six attributes:

1. It involves a reciprocal relationship.

2. It recognizes each party as having differing responsibilities relative to the other groups.

3. It acknowledges that relationships exist between the various groups and the educational institution.

4. It holds that relationships exist among the various groups.

5. It maintains that these interacting relationships carry differing expectations of the others' role.

6. It assumes that through the process of negotiation the interacting groups can bring their differing perceptions into closer congruence.[2]

Through the process of negotiation decision making roles relative to the education of children are mutually established which leads to accountable roles and behavior. Thus accountability, decision making and responsibility have interdependent relationships. Until responsibility is fixed by being mutually perceived as a given group's function in school decision making, accountability cannot be made operational. Furthermore, school principals' decision-making roles and responsibilities must be delineated to the most effective tie-in with the education of the child. If the school principalship is to survive, it must meet the challenges of the disenchanted taxpayers who are impatiently questioning what are educators giving them for their money from the multi-billion dollar American educational system.

## Need for the Study

There is a need for a study which contributes toward an assessment of the relationship of decision making roles

and responsibilities of urban school principals in defining accountability. The absence of research on this topic in conjunction with society's apparent mandate that schools be now accountable, is the catalytic action that precipatated the need for researching this topic. Furthermore, there exists a need to make clear that all persons involved in the education process have important responsibilities and that these persons are accountable, not for or to each other, but for the effort to reach agreed-upon goals. Students, parents, other community persons, school personnel at the local school level all have responsibilities to work together to help students improve their performance.

## Statement of The Problem

The problem of this investigation is (1) To examine the perceptions of urban school principals within a social system model of accountability in education as defined by Talmage and Monroe (see pages 2 and 3). (2) To ascertain how the perceptions of urban school principals on their own decision making roles and responsibilities in the educational social system can effectively define accountability. (3) To ascertain how the urban school principals' perceptions of decision making roles and responsibilities of other partners, such as, teachers, students, parents and community people in the educational social system can define accountability.

The hypoyheses of this study are:

1. Principals' group perceptions between elementary and secondary levels will differ on their own decision making roles and responsibilities.

2. Principals' perceptions will differ on the basis of age.

3. Principals' perceptions will differ on the basis of ethnicity.

4. Principals' perceptions will differ on the basis of sex.

5. Principals' perceptions in different socio-economic locations will differ.

6. Principals' perceptions with more years of teaching experience will differ with those of less teaching experience.

7. Principals' perceptions with more years of administrative experience will differ with those of less administrative experience.

8. Principals' perceptions who hold degrees beyond Master's will differ with those who have only the Master's degree.

## Assumptions

The following are assumptions underlying this study:

1. It is assumed that the concept of accountability within a social system is concerned with cooperative relationships.

2. Accountability within a social system is concerned with a broad base of decision making input.

3. Accountability within a social system is concerned with reciprocal responsibilities.

4. It is assumed that perceptions of goals, objectives and responsibilities differ.

5. It is assumed that all participants in the educational social system need to bring their perceptions of perceived roles and responsibilities in line with the perceptions of the other participants in order to gain agreement on role responsibilities.

6. It is assumed through mutual consent accountability roles can more easily be worked out among the concerned parties--if the parties are given a chance to participate in the educational social system.

7. The more positive principals perceive their own decision making roles and responsibilities, the more positive perceptions he will have about permitting teachers, students, parents, and other community persons decision making roles and responsibilities in the educational social system.

## Definition of Terms

### Accountability

For the purposes of this study "accountability" is defined in its most generic and inclusive sense. Lessinger in describing accountability, coined the phrase "educational engineering" meaning the bringing together of resources and technology in such a way as to assure the guaranteed acquisition of basic skills by all children.[3]

Henry S. Dyer carries the concept of accountability one step further by adding to the input characteristics a broader participatory base in defining objectives. He acknowledges the social forces making an impact on the educational institution by suggesting that goals and objectives be derived from a cooperative effort of teachers, administrators, board members, parents, and students. Dyer proposes a model of joint accountability.[4]

The researcher's idea of accountability is one of broad participation in the decision making roles relative to the education of children. Thus accountability responsibility and decision making are interdependent terms. The broader the participation the more likelihood of successful accountability. When a participant in a social system has decision making obligations he or she tends to accept responsbilities which form the basis for being held accountable. Support for the researcher's position is found among the previously mentioned writers: Dyer, Talamge and Monroe.

Decision-making

According to Richard M. McKean, the process of decision making is divided into four steps: (1)obtaining information, (2) applying decision rules, (3) reflection, and (4) confirmation of the indicated choice of recycling.[5]

Clients

Parents, students, and other community persons form the clients in public schools.

## The Study Population

The total group with which the study is concerned are urban school principals. They may be quite atypical in any number of respects. The three hundred three principals in Detroit, Michigan comprise a small proportion of the total urban school principals. One hundred school principals

will be randomly selected on a stratified basis from the total of Detroit, Michigan. The table below shows the distribution of principals working in the eight regions within the elementary, junior high and senior high levels:

| | Number of Principals | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Elementary | Junior High | Senior High |
| I | 33 | 7 | 3 |
| II | 40 | 6 | 4 |
| III | 29 | 6 | 2 |
| IV | 31 | 8 | 3 |
| V | 26 | 6 | 2 |
| VI | 23 | 6 | 2 |
| VII | 21 | 6 | 2 |
| VIII | 30 | 4 | 3 |
| | 233 | 49 | 21 |

TOTAL--303 Detroit School Principals*

*Key Personnel Information--Detroit Public Schools, Directory, 1973-1974

233 elementary school principals of a total of 303 equal 77%--77 principals of this group will be selected;

49 junior high school principals of a total of 303 equal 16%--16 principals of this group will be selected;

21 senior high school principals of a total of 303 equal 7%--7 principals of this group will be selected for study.

The random sample will reflect the above mentioned distribution for the population study. One hundred school principals (n = 100) will be mailed the survey test and they will be requested to return responses in the stamped return envelope. In case, a representative number of respondents' responses is unreturned, a follow up interview by the researcher is planned. Since the selection of the

one hundred principals will be made on a stratified random basis, the results will have generalizable significance for the whole population of urban school principals in Detroit, Michigan.

## Description of Detroit, Michigan

The City of Detroit, Michigan with 1,492,914 inhabitants is the fifth largest city in the United States.[6] The city, covering an area of 139.6 square miles, has the general shape of a right-angle triangle resting upon its hypotenuse. The generally northeast-southwest Detroit River is an international boundary between Detroit and Windsor, its Canadian neighbor. Detroit's northern boundary is east-west Eight Mile Road, which also functions as the Wayne County boundary and the Base Line for Michigan's survey system. The western boundary is formed by a series of north-south arteries, before it is indented by the city of Dearborn to the south. Three significant disruptions complicate the otherwise neat triangular shape. To the east, the wealthy Grosse Pointe suburbs effectively cut off the city from the shore of lake St. Clair. To the southwest, a complicated series of industrial suburbs chops off a substantial part of the corner of the triangle. In the center, the towns of Highland Park and Hamtramck stand out as unique enclaves within the city limits.

Detroit was the fastest growing major city in the country for much of the first three decades of the century.

The city continued to grow until the early 1950's when its population declined by almost twenty per cent as residents moved to suburbs and as former residential land was used for other purposes. Much of the Detroit area's productive capacity and most of its wealthy residents have established outside the city limits.

## Limitations of Study

The study is limited to the responses received from the pre-tests and post-tests of the selected elementary, junior high and senior high school principals in Detroit, Michigan. Dependence on the respondents' responses to the mailed test poses a limitation on the exact number of known representatives who will participate in the study. As mentioned, a follow-up interview is planned in case there are too few respondents to provide a valid sampling.

Insofar as occupational status, it will be a rather homogeneous group; therefore, findings should be accepted "per se" as a pattern for urban school principals as a whole.

With reference to the time factor, opinions will reflect the current thinking of a given group at a given time on the issue of how urban school principals perceive their decision making roles and responsibilities in defining accountability--accountability means everyone has to share responsibility. Paul F. Lazarsfeld indicates that some people change their opinions as they grow older or

as they are subjected to persuasive face-to-face contacts with those who hold different opinions. As a result, he suggests that the opinions of the same group of respondents should be assessed at different intervals over a long period of time.[7] Due to lack of time and money no attempt is planned to resurvey the selected principals, at this time, in an effort to discover the trends or changes in opinion.

## Summary

Chapter One discusses the background and need for the study, the hypotheses of the study, the underlying assumptions of the study, definitions of key terms employed in the study, the study population, description of Detroit, Michigan and limitations of study. Chapter Two reviews related literature.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

[1]Henry S. Dyer, "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City," Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (1970), pp. 206-211.

[2]Harriet Talmage and George E. Monroe, "Accountability as Negotiation of Perceived Expectations," Contemporary Education, 53 (1972), pp. 245-250.

[3]Leon Lessinger, Every Kid a Winner, Accountability in Education (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970) pp. 3-231.

[4]Henry S. Dyer, Ibid., pp. 206-211.

[5]Richard N. McKean, Efficiency in Government Through Systems Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958) p. 81.

[6]United States Bureau of the Census, Preliminary Count 1970 Report No. 16, May 1970.

[7]Paul F. Lazarsfeld, The People's Choice (New York: Columbia University, 1948) pp. i-xxvi; 16-27; 65-72.

## CHAPTER TWO

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### Introduction

Despite the sense of urgency and frustration over the current status of public education, there is no general agreement on what results the schools are expected to produce, what criteria and evaluative scales they should be judged by, how to constructively use the results obtained from a program of accountability, or perhaps more importantly, what is meant by the term accountability. Regarding accountability, Leon Lessinger relates " . . . Accountability is an independent, unbiased review, feedback, and report of effectiveness; that is, the extent to which an enterprise or any defineable part of the enterprise achieves its objectives. Effectiveness is the central concern of school leadership."[1] Lessinger continues by stating that in order to meet the demands of accountability, the principal's job has to be defined in terms of "out-comes" rather than "in-comes," by what a principal achieves in the way of desired results rather than by the process he uses to achieve them. This is not to say that a process is unimportant. If a particular process is found to produce results, under accountability that process would be eagerly

pursued; the principal would be motivated to employ it or to seek it or to make it occur.

William Trumbull relates that the word, "Accountability," has as many meanings as people care to give it.[2] John Porter believes that accountability means the guarantee that all students without respect to race, income or social class will acquire the minimum school skills necessary to take full advantage of the choice that accure upon successful completion of public schooling.[3] Wilbur Cohen writes that new methods must be developed to establish accountability. The shift of emphasis from evaluation of "input" to "output" must be accompanied by working out specific measures for assessment of skills and critical evaluation of results.[4]

Public education in America is close to the people and consequently dependent upon the public understanding of the issues, the public willingness to permit or initiate change and the public willingness and ability to pay for the changed program of education. Education reflects the hopes and fears and aspirations of the society it serves. In retrospect, the American society has placed great faith in education and its resultant potentiality. Our society has considered the schools to be second only to family in terms of safeguarding and extending those traditional values that are held dear. Consequently, the schools are especially susceptible to attacks during times when those values are disappearing or when societal changes are taking place faster than society is able to adjust. Such periods are

characterized by mounting uncertainties, confusing interrogation, and search for direction, new values and greater tranquility.

## History of Accountability Movement

What has brought about the accountability movement engulfing the educator at all levels and in all capacities? There is little doubt that accountability has been the key word in the early seventies and from all indications will continue to be increasingly important. The connotations of "accountability in education" have widened recently. Originally referring only to fiscal responsibility, the phrase now is used in reference to student achievement in cognitive and affective domains, curricular programing, and teaching and administrative performance, among others. In administrative performance, where much new ground is being broken, concerted efforts are directed toward determining how administrators might undergo formal evaluation and thus be classified in the accountability spectrum. This obviously is an extension of the scrutiny from a variety of groups of the typical line officers, principals and superintendents, who have always undergone intensive evaluations of an informal nature. Such groups include parents, students teachers, custodians, school board members, and other interested publics from the community in which the administrator performs. Indeed Peter F. Drucker sees the school administrator becoming extremely visable to individuals and community groups.[5]

Regarding the origin of present day accountability, N Estes and D. Waldrip contend accountability's origin coincides with the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the resultant evaluation that the educational results were not justifying the investment of federal monies. Hence, the public expression for education to produce the results for which the tax dollars are being spent.

Estes and Waldrip further contend national attention was drawn to the product emerging from American schools with the launching of Sputnik. Sputnik also marked the beginning of the infusion of massive amounts of federal funds into education through the passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958. In order to catch up with the Russians, attention was focused on college bound youth. Criticism was directed at the public schools because of continued failure in their attempts to serve the needs of all children.[6]

In addition, the issue of the disadvantaged youth was brought into sharp focus by the Negro revolution, which began in the 1950's and came to national prominence in the 1960's. The awakening of America's conscience to the inadequacies of public education in relation to the disadvantaged child and minority groups contributed to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The increased expenditure of federal funds on the public schools brought into sharp focus the issue of accountability. In the late 1960's, congressmen intensified their concern for

objective evaluation of the educational system. In response, Dr. Leon Lessinger, then Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, promised that his administration would take into account their concern. From this beginning Dr. Lessinger became the main spokesman for the concept of accountability. This concept of accountability was incorporated into the U.S. Office of Education Guidelines in the Dropout Prevention Amendment in March 1968. The Guidelines called for stated goals that could be measured objectively and certified by an independent audit.[7]

Educational goals, as commonly formulated by educational philosophers, have tended to be cast in such sweeping generalities and remote ideals that they have left school people at a loss to use them meaningfully. Lawrence Cremin suggests the following reasons for this present state of educational affairs:

> . . . too few educational leaders in the United States are genuinely preoccupied with educational issues because they have no clear ideas about education . . . They have too often been managers, facilitators, politicians, in the narrow sense. They have been concerned with building buildings, balancing budgets, and pacifying parents, but they have not been prepared to spark a debate about the ends and means of education.[8]

Samuel Goldman questions whether schools are becoming irrelevant and losing touch with an emerging society: "There is a great paradox in today's American system of schooling. Conceived to free the learner's spirit of inquiry, the schools are now in danger of becoming so organized as to

deny and subvert the spirit. The education structure (bureaucracy and establishment are synonyms) is unresponsive, lacking in positive purpose, spending enormous resources to maintain and justify itself.[9]

The concept of a form of accountability was not unknown to early American settlers. In the year 1647 the Massachussetts Bay Colony enacted the Old Deluder Satan Law which directed that every child in the Colony be taught to read and write. It held each town accountable for providing this instruction out of its own funds. A penalty of five pounds would be levied on any town that failed to comply. All children were taught to read so that they could have direct and personal access to the Holy Scriptures and thereby hope to avoid eternal damnation.

Harvey Sherman reports a recent letter writer to the Phi Delta Kappan has noted:

> The Education Code at Sierria Leone in 1870 provided for a "result" grant of sixpence for each pass in an examination in the three R's. This policy was followed in Gambia, the Gold Coast and Nigeria. The policy was the imitation of the Middle Ages English system which was abandoned in 1897 by England.[10]

Regarding historical accountability, Stanley Elam reports that in Ontario, Canada from 1879 to 1882, a system of "payment by results" made financial aid from the Province to high schools largely dependent on the number of students who passed an intermediate examination after a year or two of attendance. The system caused teachers to concentrate

on the average and below-average pupils with whom their efforts would pay dividends through a larger percentage of passes and to neglect other students--the bright--because they would pass anyway.

According to Elam the state of Georgia in 1819 began paying schools on the basis of their product. However, this experiment ended quickly. In 1946, James B. Conant and Roy E. Larsen appeared in a meeting with other educators to establish The National Citizens Commission for Public Education.[11]

The uneasiness about the quality of education in America was further evidenced by the wide acceptance of certain terms and phrases, such as "Why Johnny Can't Read," in the 1950's and most recently, "Accountability."

Henry Dyer has dealt most thoughtfully on accountability. He embraces three general principles: (1) the professional staff of a school is held collectively responsible for knowing as much as it can (a) about the intellectual and personal-social development of the pupils in its charge and (b) about the conditions and educational service that may be facilitating or impeding the pupils' development; (2) the professional staff of a school is to be held collectively responsible for using this knowledge as best it can to maximize the development of its pupils toward certain clearly defined and agreed-upon pupil performance objectives; (3) the board of education has a corresponding responsibility to provide the means and technical assistance

whereby the staff of each school can acquire, interpret, and use the information necessary for carrying out the two foregoing functions.[12]

According to John E. Morris, accountability is not new to teachers and schools (although the use of the term in connection with teacher performance did not appear in The Education Index until June 1970). For we have always been accountable to some one or some constituted authority. One of the most revered teachers, Socrates was accountable unto death for his teaching. The Sophists were accountable to their students, for herein lay their means of livelihood. The first universities were, to a great extent, accountable to the student body and to the local community. Today, the classroom teacher is legally accountable to the local school board and morally accountable to self, profession, community, and nation.[13]

The form of accountability has varied from time to time, but the end product, performance has remained relatively constant. Since the family was the first educational institution, parents were accountable for the instruction of their children in the form of skills necessary for survival. With the development of clans, tribes, and states were more or less determined by the performance of the educational system. In western education accountability has often taken the form of examinations administered at prescribed levels of the educational ladder.

Although the term, accountability, in its present conception is so new a precise definition has yet to emerge even from a historical perspective, its general meaning and thrust are quite clear. The condition of being accountable, liable, or responsible is Webster's New World Dictionary's definition. Basically, accountability means that public schools must prove that students at various levels meet some reasonable standard of achievement. The concept further implies that schools must show they use funds wisely--that expenditures justify educational outcomes. In essence, accountability has been transformed from a theoretical notion to a formidable force in American education. Charles R. Hilston considers the principal to be an important force in the area of accountability. He states the following:

> "The principal must be held responsible for the impact the school has on the students coming to its door, whether that impact be positive or negative. He must help to establish the job--targets for the school; and once these are established, he must not evade the responsibility for the success or failure of the school in reaching these goals. Ideally, all the professionals involved in the school--teachers, central office personnel, and principal alike--should share that accountability but in his role of educational leader, the principal bears a unique responsibility that cannot be delegated.[14]

Don E. Glines emphasizes the importance of the school principal's role in affecting change:

> The first and foremost factor in planning and affecting needed changes in a school is that of developing creative and committed leadership. The school reflects its principal, as well as, the climate of the school system. Most schools are

> rather dull, unimaginative, conventional 1930 kinds of institutions because most principals in America today are products of obsolescent educational and additional experiences. Most are afraid to venture very far off the time-worn path.[15]

According to Conrad Briner, educational accountability geared to the continual improvement of teaching and learning must involve participative communication and decision-making opportunities both for the public and the educator. Administrators must be directly accountable. It is their essential reason for being. They are the ones upon whom the hands of approval and disapproval will be laid.[16]

Stephen M. Barro explains his position that an individual in the educational process should be held accountable only for those outcomes over which his actions or decisions have an effect. He reports that the educational results obtained in a classroom are determined by many things other than the skill and effort of the teacher.[17] James . Coleman writes that a large fraction of variations in performance levels is accounted for by out-of-school variables, such as the pupils' socio-economic status and home environment.[18]

According to Everett W. Nicholson,

> . . . The schools, bombarded by several forces both externally and internally, have become enmeshed in an accountability syndrome. The school principal, as usual, is right in the middle and is being asked with greater frequency to become accountable for his administrative performance.
>
> In order to cope with this, the principal must take the initiative and respond to the syndrome. A

> beginning for the principal could well rest in the realm of proficiency in the development, implementation, and evaluation of performance objectives. Three steps to achieving adroitness in this area are (1) establishment of a strong frame of reference for the development of performance objectives, (2) development of the ability to create a viable hierarchy of administrative task areas in which to devote time and energy, and (3) acquisition of skill in applying the techniques of analyzing administrative performance.[19]

The basic strategy of accountability is to employ participative decision-making to shaping educational policy and evaluation, according to Conrad Briner. He continues:

> What should be incorporated in educational management is careful reasoning about teaching and learning that is similar to engineering work. Tying together these two basic strategies of participation and engineering is continuing assessment of both governance and technology. This is a matter of always knowing how well any educational job is being done according to the beliefs and perceptions of the people involved. Students, teachers, parents, and others will be asked repeatedly how well the participative decision making arrangements are working. Instructional and management technologies will be judged similarly. Where possible, formal evaluation of instructional results such as standardized testing will add significance to the effects of assessment.[20]

Leon M. Lessinger relates that administrators must be the ones to acknowledge eloquently what is being done in education, what should be done, and why, to strive to free hopeless educational conditions. Administrators cannot be sufficient masters of all forces buffeting schools, but they will be helped to overcome the liabilities because the management will be a public affair and therefore represent all the power of the democratic political system. Localized popular participation--

give-and-take between the public and the educators is still the most productive way to determine educational policy and administration. Schools are the people's business.[21]

According to Aaron Wildavsky,

> . . . No plan for accountability can succeed unless all the major participants in the educational process--parents, teachers, students, principals, superintendents and board members--see something in it for themselves. It is worthwhile therefore, to explore the advantages and disadvantages of this plan as the various participants might see it.[22]

Wildavsky recommends focusing accountability on the principal of the school because he is the essential power in the system. The district superintendent, although nominally responsible for what the teacher does, usually gives the principal wide latitude. The principal, therefore, is the one who is capable of limiting and usually does limit the teacher's discretion.

Benjamin Bloom is convinced that all students can master learning tasks. But he cautions . . . "If the schools are to provide successful and satisfying learning experiences for its students, major changes must take place in the attitude of students, teachers, and administrators; changes must also take place in teaching strategies and in the decision making roles of evaluation."[23]

Accountability in the abstract is a concept to which few take exception. However , the problem arises in making the concept operable. The major devices to be reported thus far for making the schools accountable differ

greatly in structure and practice. In order to supposedly effectuate greater accountability in education there are models or systems outlining the specifics that will achieve that goal. A brief look at the currently more commonly discussed devices for greater accountability should merit our attention. Systems Approach primarily is a management decision making device involving the comparison of alternative means of carrying out some function when those means are rather complicated and comprise a number of related events. Until now, industry and the federal government have been major proponents of this approach.

Who should be held accountable? From the studies, it appears that everyone--administrators, teachers, students, other community persons--has to share responsibility in the scheme of accountability. However, when one ponders the extensive reponsibilities of the urban school principal, it becomes apparent that the task involves shock waves, a redefining of the role of the school principal, and techniques for devising practical procedures for making accountability work.

## Summary

This chapter--Chapter Two--reviewed the literature related to the study. The purpose of the review was to examine and report the concepts and conclusions of those concerned with accountability, perceptions of decision

making and responsibilities in defining accountability

Chapter Three discusses the design of this study.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

[1]Leon Lessinger, Every Kid a Winner, Accountability in Education, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970) pp. 3-231.

[2]William Trumbull, "A School's Responsibility for Results," New York Times, March 28, 1971.

[3]John Porter, "A School's Responsibility for Results," New York Times, March 28, 1971.

[4]Wilbur Cohen, Innovator, Newsletter published by The University of Michigan, School of Education, March 11, 1971.

[5]Peter F. Drucker, "Decision-Making and the Effective Executive," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. 52, No. 328, May 1968, pp. 24-39.

[6]N. Estes and D. Waldrip, "Their Lives and Our Careers: Accountability As a Fair Trade in Education," Proceedings of the Conference by Educational Testing Service on Educational Accountability, Washington, D.C., March, 1971, pp. 1-9.

[7]Lessinger, Ibid., pp. 3-231.

[8]Lawrence A. Cremin, The Genius of American Education, (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1966) p. 111.

[9]Samuel Goldman, "The Question of Relevancy," Preparing Educators to Meet Emerging Needs, ed. by Edgar L. Morphet and David L. Jesser (New York: Citation Press, 1969) p. 151.

[10]Harvey Sherman, "Accountability Not New," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1970, p. 253.

[11]Stanley S. Elam, "The Chameleon's Dish," Phi Delta Kappan, March 1971, p. 401.

[12]Henry Dyer, "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1970, pp. 206-211.

[13]John E. Morris, "Accountability: Watchword the 70's," The Clearing House, Vol. 45, February, 1971, pp. 323-327.

[14]Charles R. Hilston, "The Principalship," National Association of Secondary School Principals, Washington, D.C., 1970.

[15]Don E. Glines, "Planning and Effecting Needed Change in Individual Schools," Designing Education or the Future, ed. by Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan (New York: Citation Press) p. 166.

[16]Conrad Briner, "Administrators and Accountability," Theory into Practice (October 1969) College of Education, The Ohio State University, pp. 203-206.

[17]Stephen Barro, "An Approach to Developing Accountability Measures for the Public Schools, Phi Delta Kappan No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 196-205.

[18]James F. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunities, Pffoce pf Education, Washington, D.C., 1966.

[19]Everett W. Nicholson, "Principals in the Accountability Syndrome," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. 57, No. 362, May 1972, p. 101.

[20]Briner, Ibid., pp. 203-206.

[21]Leon Lessinger, "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 52, December, 1970, pp. 217-225.

[22]Aaron Wildavsky, "A Program of Accountability for Elementary School," Phi Delta Kappan, 52, December, 1970, p. 215.

[23]Benjamin Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," Evaluative Comments, published by UCLA, May 1, 1968, p. 2.

# CHAPTER THREE

# DESIGN OF STUDY

## Introduction

The purpose of the study is exploratory. It examines the perceptions of urban school principals, one of the accountable parties, within a social system model of accountability in education as defined by Harriet Talmage and George E. Monroe. In defining accountability in an educational social system framework, they state, ". . . Accountability is derived from the negotiation of perceived expectations among those groups participating in a school/community social system."[1] The perceptions of principals' own decision making roles and responsibilities as well as principals' perceptions of decision making roles and responsibilities of students, teachers, parents, and other community persons in the educational social system are probed.

In this study the procedure for gathering the data on the perceptions of urban school principals' roles and responsibilities in defining accountability is the questionnaire survey technique. In this chapter consideration is given to the research design which includes (1) a statement of the method used in this survey, (2) the

preparation of a survey instrument (3) analysis of data, (4) rationale of survey instrument, (5) sampling and method of questionnaire distribution, and (6) summary.

## Statement of Method Used

The form of scientific inquiry utilized in this particular study on accountability may be referred to as the survey research study. By the turn of the present century many psychologists were convinced that experimental and laboratory methods did not answer certain questions about childhood and youth. G. Stanley Hall and his students expecially promoted wide use of the questionnaire, which more recently has appeared in the form of the history blank, clinical syllabus, and personality inventory or questionnaire. The term questionnaire may be considered equivalent for present purposes, although sometimes a technical distinction is made. The questionnaire is generally regarded as a form distributed through the mail or filled out by the respondent under the supervision of the investigator or interviewer.[2]

As to uses and applications, the questionnaire extends the investigator's powers and techniques of observations by reminding the respondent of each item, helping insure response to the same item from all respondents, and tending to standardize and objectify the observations of different enumerators (by singling out particular aspects of the situation and by specifying the units and terminology

for describing the observations). While many questionnaires seek factual information, others are concerned with opinions, attitudes, and interests. In frequency of use, the questionnaire probably is outranked only by the survey test. One estimate is that 90 percent of all social science research is based upon interviews and questionnaires.[3]

The questionnaire is particularly well adapted for assessing public opinion with respect to educational issues and problems since it produces results that are relatively free from the bias, prejudice, and pressure usually prevailing in large group or organizational meetings. An additional value lay in its power to educate those surveyed on the real problems of education. However, we must recognize that the questionnaire intrudes as a foreign element into the social setting it seeks to describe and that it creates as well as measures attitudes. It is limited to the subjects who are accessible and will cooperate with the responses affected by individual differences irrelevant to the topic under study. Therefore, some errors may be traced to the persons under study, other errors come from the investigator himself, and yet other errors are related to sampling imperfections.[4]

## Survey Instrument

The instrument was developed to measure the urban school principals' perceptions of school/community

accountability. No appropriate instrument was available. With the advice of the Institute of Social Research at The University of Michigan a 30-item Likert type instrument was developed by the researcher. (A copy of this survey test is included in this chapter). Eight independent variables will be studied: (1) sex: male, female; (2) ethnic background: minority, white; (3) age; (4) level of school: elementary or secondary; (5) socio-economic level of students; (6) level of education: degrees above Master's (possession of Master's degree is requirement for all principals in Detroit, Michigan); (7) teaching experience; (8) administrative experience. Three dependent variables will be studied: (1) decision making roles, (2) responsibility, and (3) accountability.

The items include perceptions on topics of concern to principals, teachers, students, parents and community persons. The categories of the 30 items instrument is divided into six groups: (1) evaluation, (2) instruction, (3) curriculum, (4) personnel matters, (5) academic standards, (6) behavior standards. Responses to the pre-testing of the instrument were used in improving the wording of statements and questions, sequence, understanding and eliminating ambiguities of the instrument.

The study utilized the closed question. The closed form was chosen because it is probably desirable for reasons of respondent motivation and rapport.

## Analysis of Data

The design of the analysis of the data includes a non-statistically independent eight-way analysis of variance. All interactions (where estimable) will be studied. The responses to the test items will be analyzed both as a total score and by item. Analysis by items guards against losing information about perceptions that might be cancelled out in analyzing data solely by total score.

Each item on the instrument is made up of a four point scale which the respondents indicates his approval or disapproval. (Too many middle scores were given on the original five point pre-test.) The wording of the four points of each item is as follows: strongly approve--4 points; approve--3 points; disapprove--2 points; strongly disapprove--1 point. The assumption is that the higher the total score the more likely principals will have positive perceptions about permitting students, teachers, parents, and community persons decision making roles and responsibilities in school concerns. Further, these perceptions are assumed to be the basis for negotiating accountability among all participants in school affairs.

The second step in building the methodological system was the development of a demographic questionnaire. This questionnaire was designed to elicit from the school principals information regarding:

1. School Level--Secondary or Elementary
1a. Region I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII

2. Age

3. Sex

4. Race

5. Education

6. Teaching Experience

7. Administrative Experience

8. Socio-Economic Level of Community

Perceptions of School/Community Accountability Questionnaire

Please indicate whether you strongly approve, approve, disapprove, or strongly disapprove with the following statements by circling the appropriate response.

Evaluation Concerns

1. Teachers should be consulted on the procedures used to evaluate their instruction.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

2. Principals should be consulted on the procedures used to evaluate their leadership ability.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

3. Parents should be allowed to observe the instruction of the teacher.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

4. Students should be allowed to participate in the evaluation of their cognitive and affective domain.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

5. Principals should perform in such a way in the improvement of instruction that a favorable rating would be given by their teaching staff.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Instruction Concerns

6. The more a principal utilizes the community human and ethnic mores in the instruction program, the greater the relevance of the instructional program.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

7. Teachers should be expected to justify to a parent the grades given to the parent's child.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

8. A cooperative relationship between the principal and the community will improve the behavior of the children in the instructional process.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

9. Local community members have much to add to the school's instructional program in their artifacts.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

10. The cooperation of the teachers is related to the attitudes of the principal in improving the instructional program.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Curriculum Concerns

11. The local community's participation in helping to plan the curriculum will not lead to the lowering of academic standards.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

12. Parents should be members of the school's curriculum committees.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

13. Principals and teachers should be required to consult with students before initiating curriculum changes.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

14. Principals and teachers should be required to consult with parents before initiating curriculum changes.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

15. Students should be members of the school's curriculum committees.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Personnel Matters

16. Parents should be included on the interviewing committee on the hiring of new personnel (principal, teachers, and other staff).

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

17. The principal should not be expected to cover up the teacher's weaknesses from local community attack.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

18. The local community should be consulted on decisions concerning transferring a teacher.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

19. Teachers should have a role in hiring the new school personnel (principal, teachers and other staff members).

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

20. Principals and teachers should be held responsible to the students toward learning.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Academic Standards

21. Pupils are responsible for their own academic achievement.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

22. The principal should be expected to improve the academic achievement of students whether the community is academically oriented or not.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

23. The pupils should help determine the nature of an academic assignment.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

15. Students should be members of the school's curriculum committees.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Personnel Matters

16. Parents should be included on the interviewing committee on the hiring of new personnel (principal, teachers, and other staff).

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

17. The principal should not be expected to cover up the teacher's weaknesses from local community attack.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

18. The local community should be consulted on decisions concerning transferring a teacher.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

19. Teachers should have a role in hiring the new school personnel (principal, teachers and other staff members).

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

20. Principals and teachers should be held responsible to the students toward learning.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Academic Standards

21. Pupils are responsible for their own academic achievement.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

22. The principal should be expected to improve the academic achievement of students whether the community is academically oriented or not.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

23. The pupils should help determine the nature of an academic assignment.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

24. People who do not have children attending a given school should be permitted to advise and make recommendations in curriculum and personnel/hiring matters.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

25. Pupils should expect the teacher to take responsibility for the pupil's success in the classroom.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Behavior Standards

26. The more parents participate in helping set standards of pupils' behavior, the less confusion around the building.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

27. Teachers should be expected to improve the attitudes of their students toward learning even though parents may not cooperate.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

28. Most parents which serve as teacher aides can be depended on to keep pupil personnel records confidential.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

29. Parents should be held responsible for the discipline of their children in school.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

30. Teachers should not protect the principal from local community criticism.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Demographic Information

This questionnaire has been designed to obtain information about the background and experiences of the study population.

I.D. (Do not write anything here) _____

Directions: Please answer by circling one of the categories for each item.

1. School: Elementary, Junior High, Seniro High

1a. Region: I II III IV V VI VII VIII

2. Age (last birthday):

under 26
26 to 35
36 to 45
46 to 55
over 56

3. Sex/4. Race:

white male
white female
black male
black female
other male
other female

5. What is your highest academic degree?

Bachelors
BA + 30 but no Masters
Masters
Masters + 30
Masters + 60
Doctorate
Other

6. How many years of full time teaching experience in Detroit, Michigan have you had prior to becoming a principal?

1 - 3 years
4 - 6 years
7 - 10 years
11 - 16 years
17 - 20 years
21 - 30 years

7. How many years have you been an administrator in Detroit, Michigan?

1 - 3 years
4 - 6 years
7 - 10 years
11 - 16 years
17 - 20 years
21 - 30 years
over 31 years

8. **Socio-Economic Level of Community**

**High Income Area**
**Medium Income Area**
**Low Income Area**

## Rationale of Survey Instrument

The rationale in the establishment of the survey instrument is to measure the urban school principals' understanding that all persons involved in the education process have important responsibilities and that these persons are accountable, not for or to each other, but for the effort to reach agreed upon goals. Students, parents, other community persons, and school personnel all have responsibilities.

In order to guarantee the anonymity of the principals, the researcher along with the Education Research Department will develop a number code, known only to themselves, by which to identify and locate the categories No completed response will be able to be identified by the name of a school or a principal.

Data from the study will be key punched and prepared for analyzing by the Education Research Laboratory and the researcher.

## Sampling and Method of Questionnaire Distribution

Detroit, Michigan has 233 elementary principals, 49 junior high and 21 senior high principals. In selecting the total sample, every fifth school was chosen. The results: 80 elementary, 19 junior high and 9 senior

high--comprising a total sample of 108 school principals. The 80 elementary principals received questionnaries printed on white paper, 19 junior high principals received questionnaries printed on green paper and 9 senior high principals received questionnaires printed on yellow paper. Dr. Ferdinand Galante of the Research Department, Detroit Public Schools, reviewed and approved the authorization to conduct the study in Detroit, Michigan and he distributed the questionnaires to the eight regional superintendents in order for them to send their principals the questionnaires. These questionnaires were sent to the Regional Superintendents May 3, 1974.

The aim of this study was to devise a research design that would produce practical data in a useable form. Data that would be of value to a superintendent of schools, to a principal, to a teacher or a lay person in the practical art of school administration.

## Summary

Chapter Three presented the methodology employed in this study. Chapter Four presents the analysis and findings of this study.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

[1]Harriet Talmage and George E. Monroe, "Accountability at Negotiation of Perceived Expectations," Contemporary Education, 53 (1972) pp. 245-250.

[2]G. Stanley Hall, Founders of Modern Psychology, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1924) vii, 470 pp.

[3]Carter V. Good, Essentials of Educational Research, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972) pp. 226-227.

[4]Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates, Methods of Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954) p. 271.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

### Introduction

The data analyzed in this Chapter were collected from Detroit elementary, junior high, and senior high school principals' responses on a school/community accountability questionnaire. The data examined principals' perceptions of decision making roles and responsibilities of teachers, students, parents, and other community persons in which principals' group perceptions would differ. The study also examined principals perceptions in relation to race, sex, age, amount of education, amount of teaching experience, amount of administrative experience, socio-economic level of school and region location of school. Further the data collected from the principals purport to examine the attitude of the principals toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with other partners in the educational-social system as a basis for negotiating accountability.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain how the urban school principals' perceptions of decision making roles and responsibilities of other partners, such as teachers, students, parents and community persons in the

educational social system can define accountability. Talmage and Monroe (1972) defined accountability in an educational social systems framework. "Accountability is derived from the negotiation of perceived expectations among those groups participating in a school/community social system."[1] Accountability means everyone has to share responsibility. It is assumed that the more positive the principal is toward sharing certain decision making roles and responsibilities with partners in matters of school concerns, the more he helps to define accountability.

## Presentation and Interpretation of the Data

The data used in this study were compiled from responses of elementary, junior high and senior high school principals to a 30-item questionnaire (see Appendix A).

One hundred eight questionnaires were sent to the three groups of principals. Eighty questionnaires were sent elementary principals, of which 37 or 46% were returned; 19 questionnaires were sent to the junior high school principals, of which 9 or 47% were returned; and 9 questionnaires were sent to high school principals, of which 4 or 44% were returned by the cut-off date, May 29, 1974.

Table 4-1 shows a profile of the study sample.

## Instrument

The questionnaire developed for use in this study was composed of data related to topics of school concerns

TABLE 4-1.--Principals in Detroit, Michigan

| Region | Elementary | | | Junior High | | | Senior High | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Principals in Region | Number of Principals Contacted | Number of Returned Questionnaires | Number of Principals in Region | Number of Principals Contacted | Number of Returned Questionnaires | Number of Principals in Region | Number of Principals Contacted | Number of Returned Questionnaires |
| I | 33 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| II | 40 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| III | 29 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| IV | 31 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| V | 26 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| VI | 23 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| VII | 21 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| VIII | 30 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 233 | 80 | 37=46% | 49 | 19 | 9=47% | 21 | 9 | 4=44% |

to principals, teachers, parents and community persons. Histograms were used to examine frequencies of observations on the overall count of the fifty respondents to the thirty items on the questionnaire. A composite histogram table of the observed frequency and a composite histogram table of percentage can be found in Appendices B and C. In order to measure the responses of the principals in relation to attitude toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with partners in the educational social system the Chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of homogeneity was used. Significance was valued at the 0.05 level. Responses were analyzed in terms of frequency of distribution and/or proportions of agreement and disagreement.

The scale of range for the research instrument was coded on levels ranging from strongly approve, to approve, to disapprove and strongly disapprove. Numerical code levels (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) were used.

## Statistical Hypothesis

In the data collected, the items on the questionnaire were grouped into four main categories: parents, teachers, students and community persons. The attitude of the principals toward the four categories was tested on the basis of the principals' race, age, socio-economic level of school, region location of school, amount of education, amount of teaching experience, amount of administrative experience, sex and level of school (elementary, junior high

and senior high). Chi-square was used to test the agreement between observed and expected experimental results. For significant comparative purposes, the middle of the road responses (approve and disapprove) were not included in the test (Chi-square).

## Analysis of Principals' Perceptions Toward Sharing Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities with Parents

Principals were asked to reply to the following questions based upon parent involvement in school matters. The following items comprise the parent category:

(3) Parents should be members of the school's curriculum committee

(7) Teachers should be expected to justify to a parent the grades given to the parent's child.

(14) Principals and teachers should be required to consult with parents before initiating curriculum changes.

(16) Parents should be included on the interviewing committee on hiring new personnel (principal, teachers, and other staff).

(26) The more parents participate in helping set standards of pupils' behavior, the less discipline problems around the school.

(28) Most parents who serve as teacher's aides can be depended on to keep pupil personnel records confidential.

(29) Parents should be held responsible for the discipline of their children in school.

These seven items were used as the basis for testing principals' attitudes toward parents.

Table 4-2 shows race of the principal in relation to his attitude toward parent involvement in school matters.

TABLE 4-2.--Analysis of Contengency Table for Race of Principals Toward Parent Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | 4 | 7 | 3 | 16 | 30 |
| Black | 10 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 20 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 11 | 3 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 1 Level of Significance=0.0796
Chi-Square = 3.0739

The $\chi^2$ was 3.0739 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. However, according to the frequency of the high scores of black principals, they were more positive than white principals in their attitude towards sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with parents. Twenty-two principals out of 50 played safe by responding as a middle of the roader. Table 4-2 shows the results of the responses.

Table 4-3 shows how the age of principals affects their attitude toward parent involvement.

The age factor's $\chi^2$ was 3.6791 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. The principals who were 56 years old and over were less positive in their attitude

toward parent involvement than younger principals. Table 4-3 shows the results of the responses.

TABLE 4-3.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Age of Principal Toward Parent Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Less than 26 yrs. | | | | | |
| *26 yrs. - 35 yrs. | | | | | |
| 36 yrs. - 45 yrs. | 6 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 17 |
| 46 yrs. - 55 yrs. | 5 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 21 |
| over 56 yrs. | 3 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

*None of the principals were represented in this age group.

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.1589
Chi-Square = 3.6791

Table 4-4 shows the relation of socio-economic level of the school on the attitude of the principal toward parent involvement.

The $\chi^2$ was 2.3662 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. The Table 4-4 summarizes the principals' responses.

Table 4-5 shows the relation of Region location on principals' attitude toward parent involvement.

**TABLE 4-4.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Scio-Economic Level of School Toward Principal's Attitude of Parent Involvement**

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low Income | 10 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 30 |
| Middle Income | 4 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 18 |
| High Income | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 1 Level of Significance = 0.3063
Chi-Square = 2.3662

TABLE 4-5.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Region Location of School Toward Principals' Attitude of Parent Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| Region 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Region 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Region 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Region 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| Region 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Region 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Region 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 4 | 19 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 7 Level of Significance = 0.0539
Chi-Square = 13.849

The $\chi^2$ was 13.849 which showed some difference among regions in the attitude of principals toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with parents. Regions 3 and 4 principals were more negative toward parent involvement. Principals scores showed Region 8 to be more positive toward parent involvement although the $\chi^2$ factor bordered at the 0.05 + level.

Table 4-6 shows the relation of the amount of education of the principal on his attitude toward parent involvement.

The $\chi^2$ was 3.9119 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Attitudes of the principals toward parents does not differ based on amount of education.

Table 4-7 shows attitude of principals toward parents based on amount of principals' teaching experience.

The $\chi^2$ was 2.6332 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Table 4-7 shows the results of the responses. Results showed that the amount of principals' teaching experience does not affect their attitude toward parent-involvement.

Table 4-8 shows amount of administrative experience in relation to principals' attitude toward parent involvement.

The $\chi^2$ was 7.9587 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Results showed that principals with less administrative experience are more positive in their attitude toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with parents.

TABLE 4-6.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principal's Education Toward Parent Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Bachelors | | | | | |
| *Bachelors + 30 | | | | | |
| Masters | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Masters + 30 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 21 |
| Masters + 60 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 13 |
| Doctorate | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

*No principals in this group

Degrees of Freedom = 3 Level of Significance = 0.2711
Chi-Square = 3.9119

TABLE 4-7.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Teaching Experience in Relation to Their Attitude Toward Parent Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-6 years | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 7-10 years | 4 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| 11-16 years | 7 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 24 |
| 17-20 years | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| Above 21 years | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 4 Level of Significance = 0.6209
Chi-Square = 2.6332

TABLE 4-8.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Amount of Principals' Administrative Experience Toward Parent Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-6 years | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 12 |
| 7-10 years | 7 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 22 |
| 11-16 years | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
| Above 17 years | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 3 Level of Significance = 0.0469
Chi-Square = 7.9587

Table 4-9 shows the level of the school's influence on the principals' attitude toward sharing decimaking roles and responsibilities with parents.

TABLE 4-9.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Level of School on Principal/Parent Attitude

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 9 | 13 | 0 | 15 | 37 |
| Junior High | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 |
| Senior High | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 2 | 21 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.0579
Chi-Square = 5.6981

The $\chi^2$ was 5.6981 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Results show that elementary principals' trend is less positive than junior high or senior high principals in matters of parent involvement in school concerns.

There is not a table to show the relation of principals' sex toward attitude of parent involvement since female principals tended to be middle of the roaders. There were 7 female principals out of 50 respondents, 2 strongly approved, 1 strongly disapproved and 4 scored middle of the road.

Table 4-2 through Table 4-9 shows the results of principals attitude toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with parents.

## Analysis of Principals' Perceptions Toward Sharing Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities with Teachers

Principals were asked to reply to the following questions based upon teacher involvement in school matters. The following items comprise the teacher category:

(1) Teachers should be consulted on the procedures used to evaluate their instruction.

(5) Principals should perform in such a way in the improvement of instruction that a favorable rating would be given them by their teaching staff.

(7) Teachers should be expected to justify to a parent the grades given to the parent's child.

(10) The cooperation of the teachers is related to the attitude of the principal in improving the instructional program.

(17) The principal should not be expected to cover up the teacher's weaknesses from local community attack.

(25) Pupils should expect the teacher to take responsibility for the pupil's success in the classroom

(27) Teachers should be expected to improve the attitudes of their students toward learning even though parents may not cooperate.

(30) Teachers should not protect the principal from local community criticism.

Table 4-10 shows race of the principal in relation to his attitude toward teacher involvement in school matters.

TABLE 4-10.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Race of Principal Toward Teacher Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | 6 | 7 | 3 | 14 | 30 |
| Black | 8 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 20 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 11 | 3 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 1 Level of Significance = 0.3019
Chi-Square = 1.0656

The $\chi^2$ was 1.0656 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. However, the raw score shows that black principals were more positive than white principals toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with teachers.

Table 4-11 shows age of the principal in relation to his attitude toward teacher involvement.

TABLE 4-11.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Age of Principal Toward Teacher Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Less than 26 yrs. | | | | | |
| *26 yrs. - 35 yrs. | | | | | |
| 36 yrs. - 45 yrs. | 6 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 17 |
| 46 yrs. - 55 yrs. | 6 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 21 |
| over 56 yrs. | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 12 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

*None of the principals were represented in this age group.

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.8415
Chi-Square = .34525

The age factor's $\chi^2$ was .34525 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Results are summarized in Table 4-11.

Table 4-12 shows the relation of socio-economic level of the school on the attitude of the principal toward teacher involvement.

The $\chi^2$ was .94228 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. However the table shows that principals

in the middle income school area are more positive in sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with teachers.

TABLE 4-12.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Socio-Economic Level of School Toward Principal's Attitude of Teacher Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low Income | 6 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 30 |
| Middle Income | 8 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
| High Income | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 2 | 21 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 1 Level of Significance = 0.3317
Chi-Square = .94228

The $\chi^2$ was .94228 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. However the table shows that principals in the Middle Income school area are more positive in sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with teachers.

Table 4-13 shows the relation of Region location of school on principals' attitude toward teacher involvement.

The $\chi^2$ was 5.8376 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Results are shown in the Table 4-13.

**TABLE 4-13.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Region Location of School Toward Principals' Attitude of Teacher Involvement**

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| Region 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Region 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| Region 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| Region 5 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Region 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Region 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Region 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 2 | 21 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 7 Level of Significance = 0.5588
Chi-Square = 5.8376

Table 4-14 shows the relation of the amount of principal's education on his attitude toward teacher involvement.

The $\chi^2$ was .39727 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Attitudes of the principals toward teachers do not differ based on amount of principals' education.

Table 4-15 shows attitude of principals toward teachers based on the amount of principals' teaching experience.

TABLE 4-14.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principals' Education Toward Teacher Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Bachelors | | | | | |
| *Bachelors + 30 | | | | | |
| Masters | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Masters + 30 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 21 |
| Masters + 60 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 13 |
| Doctorate | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

*No principals in this group

Degrees of Freedom = 3 Level of Significance = 0.9408
Chi-Square = .39727

TABLE 4-15.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principal's Teaching Experience in Relation to His/Her Attitude Toward Teacher Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-6 years | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 7-10 years | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 |
| 11-16 years | 7 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 24 |
| 17-20 years | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| above 21 yrs. | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 4 Level of Significance = 0.5505
Chi-Square = 3.0441

The $\chi^2$ was 3.0441 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Results show that the amount of principal's teaching experience does not affect his/her attitide toward teacher involvement.

Table 4-16 shows amount of administrative experience in relation to principals' attitude toward teacher involvement.

TABLE 4-16.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Amount of Principals' Administrative Experience Toward Teacher Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-6 years | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| 7-10 years | 6 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 22 |
| 11-16 years | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
| above 17 years | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 3 Level of Significance = 0.2876
Chi-Square = 3.7681

The $\chi^2$ was 3.7681 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Responses are summarized in the Table 4-16.

Table 4-17 shows the level of the school's influence on the principals' attitude toward teacher involvement.

The $\chi^2$ was 3.7300 which was not significant at the

0.05 level. However, the raw score shows that elementary principals were less positive toward teacher involvement than junior or senior high principals.

TABLE 4-17.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Level of School on Principal's Atttiude Toward Teacher Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 9 | 12 | 0 | 16 | 37 |
| Junior High | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| Senior High | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.1549
Chi-Square = 3.7300

Tables 4-10 through 4-17 show the results of principal's attitude toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with teachers.

## Analysis of Principals' Attitude Toward Student Involvement

Principals were asked to reply to the following questions based upon student involvement in school affairs:

(4) Students should be allowed to participate in the evaluation of their cognitive and affective domains.

(13) Principals and teachers should be required to consult with students before initiating curriculum changes.

(15) Students should be members of the school's curriculum committee.

(20) Principals and teachers should be held responsible to the student regarding learning outcomes.

(21) Pupils are responsible for their own academic achievement.

(22) The principal should be expected to improve the academic achievement of students whether the community is academically oriented or not.

(23) The pupils should help determine the nature of an academic assignment.

Table 4-18 shows principal's attitude toward student involvement in school affairs based on race of principal.

TABLE 4-18.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Race of Principal/Student Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | 5 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 30 |
| Black | 9 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 20 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 10 | 3 | 23 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 1 Level of Significance = 0.0977
Chi-Square = 2.7429

The $\chi^2$ was 2.7429 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Results show black principals were more positive toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with students than white principals.

Table 4=19 shows how the age of the principal affects his attitude toward student involvement.

TABLE 4-19.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Age of Principal/Student Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Less than 26 yrs. | | | | | |
| *26 yrs. - 35 yrs. | | | | | |
| 36 yrs. - 45 yrs. | 6 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 17 |
| 46 yrs. - 55 yrs. | 6 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 21 |
| Over 56 yrs. | 2 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

*No principals represented in this group

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.3099
Chi-Square = 2.3428

The $\chi^2$ was 2.3428 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Responses are summarized in the table.

Table 4-20 shows the effect of socio-economic level of the school on the attitude of the principal toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with the students.

The $\chi^2$ was .42237 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Responses are summarized in Table 4-20.

TABLE 4-20.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principal's Socio-Economic Level of School and Its Influence On His Attitude Toward Student Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low Income | 8 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 30 |
| Middle Income | 6 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 18 |
| High Income | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 2 | 21 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 1 Level of Significance = 0.5158
Chi-Square = .42237

Table 4-21 shows the effect of region location of school in relation to the principal's attitude toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with students.

The $\chi^2$ was 13.419 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Results show that principals in Regions 1 and 7 were more positive toward student involvement in school affairs.

Table 4-22 shows the amount of principal's education in relation to his attitude toward student involvement.

The $\chi^2$ was 1.1073 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4-22.

TABLE 4-21.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Region Location of Principal's School on His/Her Attitude Toward Student Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Region 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Region 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Region 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Region 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| Region 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Region 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Region 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 4 | 19 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 7 Level of Significance = 0.0625
Chi-Square = 13.419

TABLE 4-22.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principal's Amount of Education/Student Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Bachelors | | | | | |
| *Bachelors + 30 | | | | | |
| Masters | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Masters + 30 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 21 |
| Masters + 60 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 13 |
| Doctorate | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

*No principals in this group. Degrees of Freedom = 3
Level of Significance = 0.7753 Chi-Square = 1.1073

Table 4-23 shows attitude of principal's toward students based on his/her amount of teaching experience.

TABLE 4-23.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principal's Teaching Experience/Student Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-6 years | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 7-10 years | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| 11-16 years | 7 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 24 |
| 17-20 years | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Above 21 years | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 4 Level of Significance = 0.8617
Chi-Square = 1.2981

The $\chi^2$ was 1.2981 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Table 4-23 summarizes the results of this analysis.

Table 4-24 shows amount of administrative experience in relation to principal's attitude toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with students.

The $\chi^2$ was 9.3667 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Table 4-24 summarizes the results of this analysis.

Table 4-25 shows the level of the school's effect on the principal's atttiude towards sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with students.

TABLE 4-24.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Amount of Principal's Administrative Experience/ Student Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
| 1-6 years | 7 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| 7-10 years | 6 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 22 |
| 11-16 years | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| Above 17 years | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 3 Level of Significance = 0.0431
Chi-Square = 9.3667

TABLE 4-25.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Level of Principal's School/Student Involvment

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 7 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 37 |
| Junior High | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 |
| Senior High | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.0431
Chi-Square = 6.2874

The $\chi^2$ was 6.2874 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Elementary school principals deviated from the normal distribution more than junior or senior high principals. Elementary principals were less positive in their attitude toward sharing decision making roles with students.

Tables 4-18 through 4-25 analyzed principals' attitude toward student participation in school affairs.

## Analysis of Principals' Attitude Toward Community Involvement

Principals were asked to reply to the following questions based upon community involvement in school affairs (the community included persons who had no children attending school):

(2) Principals should be consulted on the procedures used to evaluate their leadership ability.

(6) The more a principal utilizes the community's human and ethnic mores in the instructional program, the greater the relevance of the instructional program.

(9) Local community members have much to add to the school's instructional programs in their artifacts.

(11) The local community's participation in helping to plan the curriculum will not lead to the lowering of academic standards.

(18) The local community should be consulted on decisions concerning transferring a teacher.

(24) People who do not have children attending a given school should be permitted to advise and make recommendations in curriculum and personnel/hiring matters.

Table 4-26 shows attitude of principals toward community involvement based on principal's race.

TABLE 4-26.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Race of Principal/Community Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | 4 | 7 | 3 | 16 | 30 |
| Black | 10 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 20 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 10 | 3 | 23 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 1 Level of Significance = 0.0446
Chi-Square = 4.0328

The $\chi^2$ was 4.0328 which was significant at the 0.05 level. It appears that white principals are less positive toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with the community.

Table 4-27 shows principal's attitude toward community involvement based on his age.

The $\chi^2$ was 1.1984 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Results are summarized in Table 4-27.

Table 4-28 shows the attitude of principals toward community involvement based on socio-economic level of the school.

The $\chi^2$ was 1.1600 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Responses are summarized in Table 4-28.

TABLE 4-27.--Analysis of Contingency Table of Age of Principal/Community Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Less than 26 yrs. | | | | | |
| *26 yrs. - 35 yrs. | | | | | |
| 36 yrs. - 45 yrs. | 6 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 17 |
| 46 yrs. - 55 yrs. | 5 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 21 |
| Over 56 yrs. | 3 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 50 |

*No principals represented in this group.

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.5493
Chi-Square = 1.1984

TABLE 4-28.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principal's Socio-Economic Level of School/ Community Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Low Income | 10 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 30 |
| Middle Income | 4 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
| High Income | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.5599
Chi-Square = 1.1600

Table 4-29 shows the attitude of principals toward community involvement based on region location of school.

TABLE 4-29.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Region Location of Principal's School/ Community Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| Region 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Region 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| Region 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Region 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| Region 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Region 7 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Region 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 4 | 19 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 7 Level of Significance = 0.0678
Chi-Square = 13.181

The $\chi^2$ was 13.181 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. However the results show that principals in Regions 1 and 7 were more positive toward community involvement in school affairs.

Table 4-30 analyzes the principal's attitude toward community involvement in school affairs based on his amount of education.

The $\chi^2$ was 3.7681 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4-30.

TABLE 4-30.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principal's Amount of Education/Community Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Bachelors | | | | | |
| *Bachelors + 30 | | | | | |
| Masters | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Masters + 30 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 21 |
| Masters + 60 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| Doctorate | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 50 |

*No principals in this group.

Degrees of Freedom = 3 Level of Significance = 0.2876
Chi-Square = 3.7681

Table 4-31 shows principal's attitude toward community involvement based on his amount of teaching experience.

The $\chi^2$ was 3.2531 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Table 4-31 summarizes the results.

Table 4-32 shows prinicpal's attitudes toward sharing decision-making roles and responsibilities with community based on his amount of administrative experience.

The $\chi^2$ was 10.554 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Table 4-32 shows that principals with less administrative experience were more positive toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with the community.

TABLE 4-31.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Principal's Teaching Experience/Community Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-6 years | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 7-10 years | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 11-16 years | 5 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 24 |
| 17-20 years | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Above 21 years | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 4 Level of Significance = 0.5164
Chi-Square = 3.2531

TABLE 4-32.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Amount of Principal's Administrative Experience/ Community Involvement

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-6 years | 7 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| 7-10 years | 7 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 22 |
| 11-16 years | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| Above 17 years | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 9 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 2 | 21 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 3 Level of Significance = 0.0144
Chi-Square = 10.554

Table 4-33 shows the attitude of the principal toward community involvement based on level of principal's school.

**TABLE 4-33.--Analysis of Contingency Table for Level of Principal's School/Community Involvement**

| Group | Strongly Approve | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Middle of Road | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 6 | 12 | 0 | 19 | 37 |
| Junior High | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Senior High | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Total Frequencies | 14 | 13 | 1 | 22 | 50 |

Degrees of Freedom = 2 Level of Significance = 0.0157
Chi-Square = 8.3077

The $\chi^2$ was 8.3077 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Results show junior high principals were more positive toward sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with community while elementary principals were more negative toward community involvement.

Tables 4-26 through 4-33 analyzed principals' attitudes toward community involvement in school affairs.

## Findings

Based on this study the findings are:

1. Principals having over ten years of administrative experience showed significantly less support toward involvement of parents in school affairs than those with ten years or less experience.

2. A similar relationship was found between approval of student involvement and the length of administrative service.

3. Junior high and senior high school principals showed a significantly higher percentage of support for student involvement than principals on the elementary level.

4. Black principals approved of community involvement to a significantly greater extent than white principals.

5. Support of community involvement was definitely greater among principals having 10 years or less experience than those having over 10 years experience.

6. Junior high and senior high school principals were more agreeable to community involvement than those at the elementary level.

A summary of the eight hypotheses follows:

Hypothesis 1. Principal's group perceptions between elementary and secondary levels will differ on their own decision making roles and responsibilities.

According to the results of the analyzed data elementary principals were less positive toward sharing responsibilities and decision making on (1) overall score (items 1-30). Significance level of $\chi^2$ on the overall score was 0.051 which was just beyond 0.05 level of significance. (2) Elementary principal's attitude was less positive toward permitting student participation in school affairs. Twelve of the 37 elementary principals strongly disapproved of permitting student participation. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.0431 which was significant at the 0.05 level.

(3) Elementary principals were less positive toward permitting community participation in school affairs. Twelve elementary respondents of 37 strongly disapproved of community participation. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.0157 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Six junior high school principals of nine strongly approved of community participation in school matters. (4) There was a trend among elementary principals to be less positive toward permitting parent participation in school matters. Thirteen elementary principals of 37 strongly disapproved with parent participation in school matters. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.0579 which was just beyond 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 2. Principals' perceptions will differ on the basis of age.

According to the results of the analyzed data, the overall score (Items 1-30), showed no difference in the total attitude of the principals based on age. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.2402 which was not significant at the 0.05 level. Neither was age a factor in the attitude of the principal toward permitting involvement of parents, teachers, students or community in school affairs.

Hypothesis 3. Principals' perceptions will differ on the basis of race.

According to the results of the analyzed data, the major difference was in terms of the principals' attitude toward permitting community participation. White principals were more negative. The significance of $\chi^2$ was 0.0446

which was significant at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis 4. Principals perceptions will differ on the basis of sex.

According to the results of the analyzed data on the overall score (Items 1-30), seven female principals responded out of 50. Two of seven or 29% strongly approved, one or 14% strongly disapproved and four or 57% were middle of the road regarding parents, students, teachers and community participation in school matters.

Hypothesis 5. Principals perceptions in different socio-economic locations will differ.

According to the results of the analyzed data the overall score (Items 1-30), showed no difference in the principals' attitude towards permitting participation of parents, teachers, students or community in school affairs based on the socio-economic location of the schools. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was not sifnificant at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis 6. Principals perceptions with more years of teaching experience will differ with those of less teaching experience.

According to the results of the analyzed data, the overall score (Items 1-30), showed no difference in the principals' attitude toward permitting participation of parents, students, teachers, or community in school affairs based on the amount of principals' teaching experience. The significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.5505 which was not significant at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis 7. Principals' perceptions with more years of administrative experience will differ with those of less administrative experience.

According to the results of the analyzed data, the overall score (Items 1-30) showed a highly significant difference in terms of the total attitude among the principals. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.0200 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Principals with less administrative experience were more positive toward permitting participation of parents, students and community persons. Sifnificance level of $\chi^2$ in relacion to parents was 0.0469 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Significance level of $\chi^2$ in relation to students was 0.0248 which was significant at the 0.05 level. Significance level of $\chi^2$ in relation to community was 0.0144 which was significant at the 0.05 level. No significant difference showed in results in terms of teacher participation. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.2876 which was not significant at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis 8. Principals' perceptions who hold degrees beyond Master's will differ with those who have only the master's degree.

According to the results of the analyzed data, the overall score (Items 1-30) showed no difference in the principals' attitude toward permitting participation of parents, teachers, students or community in school affairs based on the amount of education principals have. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.9408 which was not significant at the 0.05 level.

School Regions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

According to the results of the analyzed data, the overall score (Items 1-30) showed some difference among regions in attitude toward parents participation in school affairs. Regions 3 and 4 were more negative. Region 8 more positive. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.0539 which was just beyond the level of significance. Regions 1 and 7 were more positive toward permitting student participation. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.0625 which was close but not significant at the 0.05 level. However, it does indicate trend. Region 7 was more positive toward community participation. Six Region 7 principals of eight or 75% strongly approved community participation. None of Region 7 principals strongly disapproved. Significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.0678 which was not significant at the 0.05 level.

## Summary

The questionnaire was used to gather data for this study. Elementary, junior high and senior high school principals of Detroit, Michigan Public Schools were selected to participate in the study. Out of 108 questionnaires sent out 50 usable forms were returned by the cut off date, May 29, 1974.

Respondents were asked to answer thirty items on the questionnaire. The eight hypotheses statements were based on race, age, socio-economic level of school, sex, amount

of education, amount of teaching experience, amount of administrative experience and level of school (elementary, junior high, senior high). The principals' attitude based on region location was also analyzed.

The thirty items on the questionnaire were grouped into four categories: attitudes toward parents, teachers, students and community participation in school matters. The principals' attitude regarding partners in the educational social system was determined by adding scores on questions dealing with each category. These scores were ranked and tests were made comparing the top 27% to the bottom 27%.

Items on the questionnaire were asked in order to obtain the respondents' opinion on problem areas of partners' participation in defining accountability in the educational social system. The Chi-square analysis was used on all categories in the study and on the overall score (overall score is sum of responses to questions 1-30 on the questionnarie).

Results indicated that 27% of respondents strongly approved, 27% strongly disapproved, 46% were middle of the road who apparently did not wish to commit themselves toward parents, teachers, students and community participation in school matters.

Chapter IV presented and analyzed data in this study. Chapter V presents summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

# CHAPTER FIVE

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Summary

The problems of this investigation are: (1) To examine the perceptions of urban school principals within a social system model of accountability as defined by Talmage and Monroe (1972). These writers believe that accountability is derived from the agreement of perceived goals among those groups participating in a school/community social system. (2) To ascertain how the urban school principals perceive themselves in the decision making process within the accountability framework. (3) To ascertain how the urban school principals' perceptions of decision making roles and responsibilities of other partners, such as, teachers, students, parents and community persons in the educational social system can define accountability. Particularly since the term accountability is synonymous with sharing decisions and responsibilities among the principals and the other partners involved in the educational process.

It should be pointed out that through negotiation among the groups within the education social system, areas of responsibility which each group is willing to

to assume are delineated. This delineation process is such a vital part of the accountability framework that until responsibility is fixed through mutually agreed perception of the concerned groups accountability cannot be made operational. As Wildavsky emphatically states:

> No plan for accountability can succeed unless all the major participants in the educational process--parents, teachers, students, principals, superintendents and board members--see something in it for themselves.[1]

As the participatory base in school decision making is broadened, the model of accountability is viewed more as a social system and less as a product management model, however, is largely based on theory and commentory derived from social psychology. Each actor in such a social system brings his own perceived expectations of responsibility and decision making both in regard to his own role and that of the other actors. The identifiable participants who hold varying degrees of power and who have varying channels for voicing their needs, include the school personnel, the students, parents (who express individual concerns relative to their own children), and the community (who may voice concerns beyond the local level relative to the school/community relationships). This concept of accountability within a social system is concerned with cooperative relationships, a broad base of decision making input, and reciprocal responsibilities. It is assumed that perceptions of

goals, objectives and responsibilities differ. Therefore, all participants in the educational social system need to bring their perceptions of perceived roles and responsibilities in line with the perceptions of the other participants in order to gain agreements on role responsibilities. Assuming that differences in perceived roles and responsibilities can be reconciled, then through mutual consent accountability roles can more easily be worked out among the concerned parties.

Based on the analysis of the data reported from the principals responses used in this study, the following general conclusions are stated:

1) The data reported identified a number of variables within elementary, junior high and senior high Detroit Public School principals which affect their perceptions on concerns closely related to accountability.
2) Within these principal groups, 23 out of 50 took a status quo position which showed that principals choose not to commit themselves on concerns closely related to accountability.
3) The perceptions of principals with less administrative experience showed highly significant difference in terms of being more positive in their attitude towards overall, parents, students, and community in concerns related to accountability.

4) Principals' perceptions did not differ in relation twoards teachers having input into school matters. Again, results show that principals become non-committal when voicing their opinions on the decision making role of the teacher. The Significance level of $\chi^2$ for categories relating to teachers was not significant in any area. Based on the principals' race the significance level of $\chi^2$ was 0.3019; age, 0.8415; socio-economic level of school, 0.3317; region location, 0.5588; amount of education, 0.9408; teaching experience, 0.5505; administrative experience, 0.2870; and level of school, 0.1540. This poses the problem of how teachers can be held accountable for decisions in which they have had no participation and involvement.

The most striking results gained from this study are as follows: (1) principals tend to be cautious on concerns closely related to accountability, (2) disagreement is shown among principals' attitude twoard sharing decision making roles and responsibilities with parents, students and community persons, (3) agreement is shown among principals to be non-committal in regards to teacher participation in school matters.

Generalizable results of this study indicate that principals choose not to take a stand on the decision making role of the teacher in school affairs.

## Recommendations

Based upon a review of the literature and personal observation, the following recommendations are made.

(1) If principals expect to offer the vital leadership that the accountability plans are demanding, they must change their non-committal attitudes and offer dynamic leadership based on the democratic principles which involve the voices of all constituents.

(2) Principals should include teachers in decision making which deals with vital concerns of the daily classroom problems.

(3) Principals should realize that issues must be faced and not avoided until a crises erupts.

(4) Principals should realize that dynamic leadership acts rather than reacts to problems.

(5) In-service training should be instituted among principals and teachers.

(6) Goals and recommendations should be cooperatively worked out with the principal and other partners in the educational social system before implementation.

(7) Principals should recognize the accelerative rate of change within the community so as to deal with the non-static nature of issues.

(8) Principals should liberate themselves from traditional rigid molds of behavior which causes static leadership by listening critically to the voices of their partners.

## Suggested Areas for Further Study

Based upon findings and conclusions of this study the following areas warrant further study:

1. Further study is needed to probe administrative tenure.

2. Further study is needed in order to find out why principals having over ten years of administrative experience show less support toward involvement of parents, students and interested community persons.

3. Further study is needed in order to find out why black principals approved of community involvement to a significantly greater extent than white principals.

4. Further study is needed in order to find out why junior high and senior high school principals were more agreeable to community involvement than those at the elementary level.

Further study of the above mentioned findings could give school leaders a basis for working out accountability relationships within a school social system.

## NOTE TO CHAPTER FIVE

[1]Aaron Wildavsky, "A Program of Accountability for Elementary Schools," op. cit., p. 215.

# APPENDIX A

## PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL/COMMUNITY ACCOUNTABILITY QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTERS

2919 Glynn Ct.
Detroit, Michigan 48206
May 6, 1974

Dear Principal:

I am asking your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire. I am a doctoral candidate in the Ph.D. Program at The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan and this questionnaire is a very important part of my dissertation.

Please return the questionnaire unsigned in the enclosed envelope at your earliest convenience.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Naomi Ross

(Mrs.) Naomi Ross

## PART I

### Perceptions of School/Community Accountability

Please indicate whether you strongly approve, approve, disapprove, or strongly disapprove with the following statements by circling the appropriate response.

### Evaluation Concerns

1. Teachers should be consulted on the procedures used to evaluate their instruction.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

2. Principals should be consulted on the procedures used to evaluate their leadership ability.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

3. Parents should be allowed to observe the instruction of the teachers.

   strongly approve approve disapprove stronglt disapprove

4. Students should be allowed to participate in the evaluation of their cognitive and affective domain.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

5. Principals should perform in such a way in the improvement of instruction that a favorable rating would be given them by their teaching staff.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

### Instruction Concerns

6. The more a principal utilizes the community's human and ethnic mores in the instructional program, the greater the relevance of the instructional program.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

7. Teachers should be expected to justify to a parent the grades given to the parent's child.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Perceptions of School/Community Accountability

8. A cooperative relationship between the principal and the community will improve the behavior of the children in the instructional process.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

9. Local community members have much to add to the school's instructional program in their artifacts.

   strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

10. The cooperation of the teachers is related to the attitude of the principal in improving the instructional program.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Curriculum Concerns

11. The local community's participation in helping to plan the curriculum will not lead to the lowering of academic standards.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

12. Parents should be members of the school's curriculum committee.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

13. Principals and teachers should be required to consult with students before initiating curriculum changes.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

14. Principals and teachers should be required to consult with parents before initiating curriculum changes.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

15. Students should be members of the school's curriculum committee.

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Personnel Matters

16. Parents should be included on the interviewing committee on hiring new personnel (Principal, teachers, and other staff).

    strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Perceptions of School/Community Accountability

17. The principal should not be expected to cover up the teacher's weaknesses from local community attack.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

18. The local community should be consulted on decisions concerning transferring a teacher.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

19. Teachers should have a role in hiring the new school personnel (principal, teachers and other staff members).

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

20. Principals and teachers should be held responsible to the student regarding learning outcomes.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Academic Standards

21. Pupils are responsible for their own academic achievement.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

22. The principal should be expected to improve the academic achievement of students whether the community is academically oriented or not.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

23. The pupils should help determine the nature of an academic assignment.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

24. People who do not have children attending a given school should be permitted to advise and make recommendations in curriculum and personnel/hiring matters.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

25. Pupils should expect the teacher to take responsibility for the pupil's success in the classroom.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## Perceptions of School/Community Accountability

### Behavior Standards

26. The more parents participate in helping set standards of pupil's behavior, the less discipline problems around school.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

27. Teachers should be expected to improve the attitudes of their students toward learning even though parents may not cooperate.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

28. Most people which serve as teacher aides can be depended on to keep pupil personnel records confidential.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

29. Parents should be held responsible for the discipline of their children in school.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

30. Teachers should not protect the principal from local community criticism.

strongly approve approve disapprove strongly disapprove

## PART II

## DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Directions: Please circle the appropriate answer.

(This part of the questionnaire asks questions about your background and experiences)

I.D. (Do not write anything here)_____

1. School; Elementary, Junior High, Senior High

Region: I II III IV V VI VII VIII

2. Age (last birthday):
   under 26
   26 to 35
   36 to 45
   46 to 55
   over 56

## Demographic Information

3. Sex/4. Race:

white male
white female
black male
black female
other male
other female

5. What is your highest academic degree?

Bachelors
Bachelors + 30
Masters
Masters + 30
Masters + 60
Doctorate
Other_____

6. How many years of full time teaching experience in Detroit, Michigan have you had prior to becoming principal?

1-3 years
4-6 years
7-10 years
11-16 years
17-20 years
21-30 years
over 31 years

7. How many years have you been an administrator in Detroit, Michigan?

1-3 years
4-6 years
7-10 years
11-16 years
17-20 years
21-30 years
over 31 years

8. Socio-Economic Level of Community

High Income Area
Medium Income Area
Low Income Area

SUBJECT: Approved Research Study Research Study No. 74025

FROM : Robert S. Lankton, Divisional Director
Research and Development Department, Detroit Public Schools

TO : _____, Principal, _____School

DATE : May 3, 1974

The research study identified below has been reviewed and approved by the Research and Development Department subject to authorization to conduct the study by the Region Superintendent and the principal, in accordance with the statement of policy in the Administrative Handbook and the Guidelines of October 26, 1970, p. 17. Participation by individuals or by schools in this project is entirely voluntary.

If you desire further information, please call Dr. Ferdinand Galante of the Research Department, 931-2930, Stevenson Building, Room 300.

Name of research worker

Mrs. Naomi Ross, Mathematics teacher, Region V M.S. on leave, and doctoral candidate, University of Michigan

Title of project

An Analysis of Urban School Principals' Perceptions of Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities in Defining Accountability

Purpose

To ascertain how the urban school principals' perception of decision making roles and responsibilities of other partners in the educational social system can define accountability.

Schools and principals to be involved

Principals of the following schools:

Region 1

| Elementary | | Jr. High | Sr. High |
|---|---|---|---|
| Balch | Foster | Hutchins | Northeastern |
| Campau | Hancock | Jefferson | |
| Couzens | Lincoln | Pelham M.S. | |
| Doty | Myrtle | | |
| Ferry Annex | Parke Annex | | |

Region 2

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bennett | Jamieson | Munger | Southwestern |
| Biddle | McGraw | Webber | |
| Columbian | Newberry | | |
| Craft | Sampson | | |
| Hanneman | Woodward | | |

## Region 3

| Elementary | | Jr. High | Sr. High |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ann Arbor Trail | Leslie | Noble | Cody |
| Coolidge | McFarlane | Ruddiman | |
| Courtis | McKerrow | | |
| Ford M.S. | Parkman | | |
| Keidan | Ruthruff | | |

## Region 4

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cadillac | Holcomb | Cerveny | Henry Ford |
| Cerveny | King | Mettetal | |
| Edison | Ludington M. S. | Winship | |
| Emerson | Newton | | |
| Harding | Winship | | |

## Region 5

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Brady | MacDowell | Hampton | Central |
| Clinton | Pasteur | Longfellow | |
| Custer | Roosevelt | | |
| Hampton | Turner | | |
| Higginbotham | Vernor | | |

## Region 6

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cooper | Law M. S. | Nolan | Osborn |
| Davison | Marshall | Richard | |
| Fleming | Mason | | |
| Greenfield Park | Trombly | | |
| Homes, A. L. | Van Zile | | |

## Region 7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carleton | Marquette | Jackson | Denby |
| Columbus | McGregor | Goodale | |
| Goodale | Robinson | Joy | |
| Krolik | Stellwagen | | |
| Macomb | Damon Keith | | |

## Region 8

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bell | Jones | Barbour | King, M. L |
| Carstens | Lingeman | Foch | Southeastern |
| Chrysler | Monteith | | |
| Guyton | Rose | | |
| Hove | Scripps | | |

**Procedures**

1. The researcher requests the cooperation of the principals in the schools listed above in responding to a short (30 item) unsigned questionnaire. Approximate time to complete the instrument is fifteen minutes.

   A cover letter is included with each questionnaire wherein the researcher explains the purpose of the study and gives explanatory details.

2. A copy of the questionnaire accompanies this approval request for the region superintendents' review.

3. Principals are requested to return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped and self-addressed envelope.

4. The researcher will supply the Research Department and the region superintendents with an abstract or summary of findings upon completion of the study.

**Principal's action**

Please complete the two attached reply slips: send the PINK slip to your Region Superintendent; return the WHITE slip to the Research Department.

cc: Committee
Region Superintendents 1 through 8 (to principals)
Mrs. Naomi Ross, researcher

# APPENDIX B

## COMPOSITE HISTOGRAM TABLE OF OBSERVED FREQUENCY

COMPOSITE HISTOGRAM TABLE
OF OBSERVED FREQUENCY

| Question Number | Strongly Approve | Approve | Disapprove | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 30 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| 2 | 32 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| 3 | 21 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 50 |
| 4 | 12 | 24 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 50 |
| 5 | 15 | 19 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 50 |
| 6 | 13 | 28 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 50 |
| 7 | 36 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 50 |
| 8 | 22 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 50 |
| 9 | 11 | 32 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 50 |
| 10 | 24 | 19 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 50 |
| 11 | 12 | 31 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 50 |
| 12 | 15 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 50 |
| 13 | 4 | 15 | 25 | 4 | 2 | 50 |
| 14 | 11 | 25 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 50 |
| 15 | 7 | 24 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 50 |
| 16 | 11 | 21 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 50 |
| 17 | 15 | 20 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 50 |
| 18 | 1 | 9 | 29 | 11 | 0 | 50 |
| 19 | 7 | 19 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 50 |
| 20 | 3 | 23 | 16 | 6 | 2 | 50 |
| 21 | 8 | 24 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 50 |
| 22 | 12 | 26 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 50 |
| 23 | 4 | 32 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 50 |
| 24 | 3 | 16 | 17 | 11 | 3 | 50 |
| 25 | 6 | 13 | 22 | 5 | 4 | 50 |
| 26 | 23 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 50 |
| 27 | 14 | 27 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 50 |
| 28 | 1 | 21 | 19 | 6 | 3 | 50 |
| 29 | 16 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 50 |
| 30 | 6 | 20 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 50 |

# APPENDIX C

## COMPOSITE PERCENTAGE TABLE

COMPOSITE PERCENTAGE TABLE

| Question Number | Strongly Approve | Approve | Disapprove | Strongly Disapprove | No Response | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100% |
| 2 | 64.0 | 34.0 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 100% |
| 3 | 42.9 | 53.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1 | 100% |
| 4 | 26.0 | 52.2 | 19.6 | 2.2 | 4 | 100% |
| 5 | 33.3 | 42.2 | 13.3 | 11.2 | 5 | 100% |
| 6 | 26.5 | 57.2 | 16.3 | 0 | 1 | 100% |
| 7 | 73.5 | 24.5 | 2.0 | 0 | 1 | 100% |
| 8 | 44.9 | 49.0 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 1 | 100% |
| 9 | 23.9 | 69.6 | 4.3 | 2.2 | 4 | 100% |
| 10 | 48.0 | 38.0 | 12.0 | 2.0 | 0 | 100% |
| 11 | 25.0 | 64.6 | 6.2 | 4.2 | 2 | 100% |
| 12 | 30.0 | 66.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0 | 100% |
| 13 | 8.3 | 31.3 | 52.1 | 8.3 | 2 | 100% |
| 14 | 22.4 | 51.0 | 20.4 | 6.2 | 1 | 100% |
| 15 | 15.2 | 52.2 | 23.9 | 8.7 | 4 | 100% |
| 16 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 26.0 | 10.0 | 0 | 100% |
| 17 | 30.0 | 40.0 | 26.0 | 4.0 | 0 | 100% |
| 18 | 2.0 | 18.0 | 58.0 | 22.0 | 0 | 100% |
| 19 | 14.0 | 38.0 | 36.0 | 12.0 | 0 | 100% |
| 20 | 6.3 | 47.9 | 33.3 | 12.5 | 2 | 100% |
| 21 | 16.7 | 50.0 | 27.0 | 6.3 | 2 | 100% |
| 22 | 25.0 | 54.2 | 12.5 | 8.3 | 2 | 100% |
| 23 | 8.7 | 69.6 | 19.6 | 2.1 | 4 | 100% |
| 24 | 6.4 | 34.0 | 36.2 | 23.4 | 3 | 100% |
| 25 | 13.0 | 28.3 | 47.8 | 10.9 | 4 | 100% |
| 26 | 47.9 | 43.8 | 6.3 | 2.0 | 2 | 100% |
| 27 | 28.6 | 55.1 | 10.2 | 6.1 | 1 | 100% |
| 28 | 2.1 | 44.7 | 40.4 | 12.8 | 3 | 100% |
| 29 | 34.0 | 59.6 | 6.4 | 0 | 3 | 100% |
| 30 | 14.0 | 46.5 | 27.9 | 11.6 | 7 | 100% |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books


Cremins, L. A. The Genius of American Education. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1966.

Glines, Don E. "Planning and Effecting Needed Change in Individual School." Designing Education of the Future. Edited by Edgor L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan. New York: Citation Press, 1970.

Goldman, Samuel, "The Question of Relevancy." Preparing Educators to Meet Emerging Needs. Edited by Edgar L. Morphet and David L. Jesser. New York: Citation Press, 1969.

Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.

Good, Carter V. and Scates, Douglas. Methods of Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Hall, Stanley, Founders of Modern Psychology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1924.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University, 1948.

Lessinger, Leon. Every Kid a Winner, Accountability in Education. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.

McKean, Richard. Efficiency in Government Through Systems Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.


### Newspaper Articles


Cohen W. Innovator. Newsletter published by The University of Michigan, School of Education, March 11, 1971.

Porter, John. "A School's Responsibility for Results." New York Times, March 28, 1971.

Trumbull, W. "A School's Responsibility for Results." New York Times, March 28, 1971.

## Articles in Periodicals

Barro, S. "An Approach to Developing Accountability Measures for the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, No. 4, December, 1970.

Bloom, Benjamin. "Learning for Mastery." Evaluative Comments. Published by UCLA, May, 1968.

Briner, Conrad, "Administrators and Accountability." Theory Into Practice. College of Education, The Ohio State University, October 1969.

Drucker, Peter F. "Decision-Making and the Effective Executive." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Vol. 52, No. 328, May 1968.

Dyer, Henry S. "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City." Phi Delta Kappan. 52 (1970).

Elam, S. "The Chameleon's Dish." Phi Delta Kappan. March, 1971.

Hilston, Charles R. "The Principalship." National Association of Secondary School Principals. Washington, D.C., 1970.

Lessinger, Leon. "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 52, December, 1970.

Morris, John E. "Accountability: Watchword for the 70's." The Clearing House. Vol. 45, February, 1971.

Nicholson, Everett W. "Principals in the Accountability Syndrome." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. 57, No. 362, May 1972.

Sherman, H. "Accountability Not New." Phi Delta Kappan. December, 1970.

Wildavsky, Aaron. "A Program of Accountability for Elementary School." Phi Delta Kappan. December, 1970.

## Unpublished

Estes N. and Waldrip, D. "Their Lives and Our Careers: Accountability as a Fair Trade in Education." Proceedings of the Conference in Educational Testing Service on Educational Accountability, Washington, D.C., March, 1971.

## Public Documents

Coleman, J. Equality of Educational Opportunities. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1966.