

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Billy Jack Pack entitled "A Study of Instructional Support Services and Bureaucracy as Perceived by Teachers in Selected School Districts in Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Education Administration and Supervision.

John T. Lovell

John T. Lovell, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Henry H. Stollar

Earl M. Amner

Jimmy J. Bellon

Accepted for the Council:

Levenson

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
79 b
P324
cop. 2

A STUDY OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES AND
BUREAUCRACY AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS IN
SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TENNESSEE

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Billy Jack Pack
June 1979

1979 JUN 11

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the teachers in the five districts who contributed to this study by their prompt response to the questionnaires. Without their responsible participation this research project would not have been possible.

Further appreciation is extended to the writer's doctoral committee whose suggestions and advice was decided to be most beneficial in making this a most rewarding research experience. A special note of gratitude is due Dr. John T. Lovell who served as a most capable chairman and whose assistance and encouragement contributed greatly to the successful completion of this study.

Finally, a warm expression of thanks is most appropriate to the writer's wife, Peggy, whose unfaltering patience, sacrifice and encouragement throughout the program provided the needed strength and determination. To the writer's children, Jason and Amanda, who did without their father in deference to his intellectual pursuits, goes grateful thanks and a promise to make amends.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of the bureaucracy of school systems and the provision of instructional supervisory support services. Teachers from five school systems in East Tennessee were selected for the study. A district was selected to represent each of the following categories: city school district (less than 25,000 total population), city school district (25,000 to 125,000 total population), city school district (greater than 125,000 total population), county school district (rural), and county school district (urban-suburban).

Based upon the median score of the respondent on Part D of the Supervisors' Instructional Supervision Questionnaire, teachers of each district were classified as "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" or "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services." Respondents' perceptions of the six dimensions of bureaucracy were obtained by using the School Organizational Inventory. Analyses of Variance were made of the responses of the two groups' perceptions of hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, and technical competence. Significant differences in group responses at the .05 level were noted. The Scheffe test was used for the post hoc analysis.

Findings of the study were:

1. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive

instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, and technical competence for District A, District B, District C, and District E.

2. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, and technical competence for District D. There was a significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and those who "did not" regarding division of labor for District D.

3. Among the school districts there was a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, impersonality, and technical competence.

4. Among the school district there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor, presence of rules, and procedural specifications.

5. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality,

and technical competence. Among the school districts there was a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor.

6. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, and impersonality. There was a significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence.

Based upon the findings of this study the conclusions were:

1. The bureaucratic structure of each school system as perceived by the teachers was not a contributing factor to the teachers' perception of instructional supervisory support services.
2. The size of the school system was not a factor in the teachers' perceptions of the dimensions of bureaucracy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem.	4
Purpose of the Study.	5
Basic Assumptions	6
Importance of the Study	7
Delimitations of the Study.	8
Definition of Terms	9
Procedures and Sources of Data.	11
Gathering the Data.	11
Instrumentation	12
School Organizational Inventory	13
Instructional Supervisors Support Services Questionnaire	17
Selecting the Sample Size	20
Selecting the Participants.	20
Letter of Transmittal	22
Administering the Questionnaires.	22
Method of Analysis.	23
Organization of the Study	24
II. A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH	25
The Historical Development of Supervision	25
Summary	29
Instructional Supervision	29
Summary	39
Instructional Supervisory Support Services.	40
Summary	54
Bureaucracy	55
Advantages of Bureaucracy	60
Disadvantages of Bureaucracy.	63
Dysfunctions of Bureaucracy	66
Summary	68
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	70
Introduction.	70
For Each School District Was There a Significant Difference Between the Perceptions Held by Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding the Six Dimensions of Bureaucracy?.	73
District A.	73
District B.	82
District C.	91
District D.	98
District E.	107

CHAPTER	PAGE
Among the School Districts, Was There a Significant Difference in the Perceptions Held by Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding the Six Dimensions of Bureaucracy?	117
Among the School Districts, Was There a Significant Difference in the Perceptions Held by Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding the Six Dimension of Bureaucracy?	126
Was There a Significant Difference Between the Perceptions Held by all the Teachers in the Study Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and all the Teachers in the Study Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding the Six Dimensions of Bureaucracy?	135
IV. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS.	145
Introduction.	145
Summary	145
The Purpose of the Study.	146
Procedures.	147
Determination of Sample Size.	148
Treatment of the Data	148
Findings.	149
Question 1.	149
Question 2.	151
Question 3.	152
Question 4.	153
Conclusions	155
Implications.	155
LIST OF REFERENCES.	157
APPENDIXES.	168
Appendix A. School Organizational Questionnaire.	169
Appendix B. Instructional Supervisory Support Services Questionnaire.	173
Appendix C. Letter of Transmittal.	177
Appendix D. Follow-up Letter	179
VITA.	181

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Number and Percent Returned and Usable of Responses of Teachers in the School Districts From the Sample Sizes For the 1977-78 School Year.	72
II. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Hierarchy of Authority in District A For the 1977-78 School Year.	74
III. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Division of Labor in District A For the 1977-78 School Year.	75
IV. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Presence of Rules in District A For the 1977-78 School Year.	77
V. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Procedural Specifications in District A For the 1977-78 School Year.	78
VI. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Impersonality in District A For the 1977-78 School Year	79
VII. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Technical Competence in District A For the 1977-78 School Year.	81

TABLE	PAGE
VIII. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Hierarchy of Authority in District B For the 1977-78 School Year.	83
IX. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Division of Labor in District B For the 1977-78 School Year.	84
X. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Presence of Rules in District B For the 1977-78 School Year.	86
XI. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Procedural Specifications in District B For the 1977-78 School Year.	87
XII. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Impersonality in District B For the 1977-78 School Year	88
XIII. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Technical Competence in District B For the 1977-78 School Year.	90
XIV. Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Hierarchy of Authority in District C For the 1977-78 School Year.	92

TABLE

PAGE

XV.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Division of Labor in District C For the 1977-78 School Year.	93
XVI.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Presence of Rules in District C For the 1977-78 School Year.	94
XVII.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Procedural Specifications in District C For the 1977-78 School Year.	96
XVIII.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Impersonality in District C For the 1977-78 School Year	97
XIX.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Technical Competence in District C For the 1977-78 School Year.	99
XX.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Hierarchy of Authority in District D For the 1977-78 School Year.	100
XXI.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Division of Labor in District D For the 1977-78 School Year.	102

TABLE

PAGE

XXII.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Presence of Rules in District D For the 1977-78 School Year.	103
XXIII.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Procedural Specifications in District D For the 1977-78 School Year.	105
XXIV.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Impersonality in District D For the 1977-78 School Year	106
XXV.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Technical Competence in District D For the 1977-78 School Year.	108
XXVI.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Hierarchy of Authority in District E For the 1977-78 School Year.	109
XXVII.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Division of Labor in District E For the 1977-78 School Year.	111
XXVIII.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Presence of Rules in District E For the 1977-78 School Year.	112

TABLE

PAGE

XXIX.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Procedural Specifications in District E For the 1977-78 School Year.	114
XXX.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Impersonality in District E For the 1977-78 School Year	115
XXXI.	Differences Between the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Technical Competence in District E For the 1977-78 School Year.	116
XXXII.	Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Hierarchy of Authority For the 1977-78 School Year	118
XXXIII.	Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Division of Labor For the 1977-78 School Year	120
XXXIV.	Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Presence of Rules For the 1977-78 School Year	121
XXXV.	Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Procedural Specifications For the 1977-78 School Year	122
XXXVI.	Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Impersonality For the 1977-78 School Year.	124
XXXVII.	Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Technical Competence For the 1977-78 School Year	125

TABLE	PAGE
XXXVIII. Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Hierarchy of Authority For the 1977-78 School Year . . .	127
XXXIX. Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Division of Labor For the 1977-78 School Year.	129
XL. Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Presence of Rules For the 1977-78 School Year.	130
XLI. Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Procedural Specifications For the 1977-78 School Year. .	132
XLII. Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Impersonality For the 1977-78 School Year.	133
XLIII. Differences Among the School Districts in the Perceptions of Teachers Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Technical Competence For the 1977-78 School Year	134
XLIV. Differences Between the Perceptions of All the Teachers in the Study Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and all the Teachers in the Study Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Hierarchy of Authority For the 1977-78 School Year.	136
XLV. Differences Between the Perceptions of All the Teachers in the Study Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and all the Teachers in the Study Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Division of Labor For the 1977-78 School Year.	138
XLVI. Differences Between the Perceptions of All the Teachers in the Study Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and all the Teachers in the Study Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Presence of Rules For the 1977-78 School Year.	139

TABLE	PAGE
XLVII. Differences Between the Perceptions of All the Teachers in the Study Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and all the Teachers in the Study Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Procedural Specifications For the 1977-78 School Year	141
XLVIII. Differences Between the Perceptions of All the Teachers in the Study Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and all the Teachers in the Study Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Impersonality For the 1977-78 School Year.	142
XLIX. Differences Between the Perceptions of All the Teachers in the Study Who "Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" and all the Teachers in the Study Who "Did Not Usually Receive Instructional Supervisory Support Services" Regarding Technical Competence For the 1977-78 School Year	143

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the decade of the eighties has underscored the necessity for designing new dimensions for the instructional supervisor. The task will necessitate far more definitive functions of the instructional supervisor than has been the case in recent years. The teaching force in this country is now and will continue to be increasingly concerned with the instructional role that will be performed by supervisory personnel as it relates to the free academic pursuit of knowledge in and out of the classroom. Supervisors, who have been in quasi-administrative roles in public schools, are also being confronted with new controls by teachers as to their function in the hierarchial structure of the public school system. In effect, an atmosphere of tenseness is evidenced as a reasonable number of faculty personnel view the supervisor as a person who performs a less helpful task than that demanded by his teaching colleagues.¹

A factor which seems to account for the teachers' negative reactions about supervision is the structure of the organization of the school systems. Two problems for supervisors seem to be caused by the structure of the organization. First, supervision tends to be associated with evaluation even when the supervisor's role or position is defined otherwise. Thus, what appears to take place, regardless of the good intentions of the supervisor, is that teachers

try to put distance between that person and themselves. Most of the time, the distance sought after is social in nature, but sometimes it is actually physical distance including attempts to avoid interaction. At times, this protective distancing effort is initiated in a school through a variety of covert warning systems that teachers employ to let each other know that a supervisor is in the building. The second structural problem is also caused by the definition of the supervisory position and role. The supervisor is removed from the day-to-day action of teaching and from the continual efforts of teachers to cope with conditions in the classroom. The effect of this separation seems to create a mind set in the perceptions of many teachers of "How can that person help me? He or she is too far removed from the real problems to be of any assistance. In order to know what's going on you have to get your hands dirty." The system, it seems, has a built-in distancing mechanism that operates for many teachers relative to their supervisor despite the intentionality of that system to provide help.²

Discussing the organization of school systems, Roald Campbell stated:

Perhaps most people who think about organizations today picture them as structural bureaucracies essentially in Weberian terms. While the man in the street may ascribe many of our ills to bureaucracy, such negative use of the term fails to take account of the ideal characteristics that Weber set forth for the concept. For instance, rules for Weber meant reliability and predictability in the bureaucrat's behavior. He may not have seen that at the same time rules may also account for bureaucratic lack of flexibility and a tendency to turn means into ends. As another instance, hierarchy in an organization obviously does much to clarify responsibilities and relationships.

At the same time, it provides some subordinates with more potential power than they are capable of exercising; hence, organizations must find ways of mediating the influence of some formal officers.³

The rapidly evolving changes in society demand changes in the supervision of instruction in elementary and secondary schools. The directions and forms supervision of instruction should take are persistent questions. There are those who hold that supervisors as such are not needed, for supervision of instruction in narrowly defined forms can readily be delegated to principals and teachers. Others would merely change the words used to think and communicate about supervisors and supervision. Still others seek to blend administrative and supervisory practices into a single undifferentiated function.⁴

Commenting on the future of supervision, Firth and Bishop stated:

An accurate perspective of instructional supervision requires an examination of impending as well as contemporary events. Such a view alleviates the concern for the survival of instructional supervision as unnecessary and inappropriate. Apprehension regarding its significance stems from the tendency to associate instructional supervision with the maintenance of programs soon to be phased out. If instructional supervision is to flourish rather than merely exist, it must be associated with the development of programs soon to be phased in. Often subsumed under different guides, roles, and titles, supervisory missions are in fact increasing. The future will require expanded services from individuals familiar with new skills, tasks, and technologies. Those who can anticipate the emerging opportunities hold the key to success for supervision as a professional endeavor.⁵

Supervision for the improvement of instruction in the future must be seen realistically. The past and emerging realities will not change the essential function of supervision as leadership for the improvement of instruction. The basic tasks supervisors strive to

accomplish will not be essentially altered, for curriculum development, program evaluation, in-service training, public relations, and other tasks will continue to guide the instructional change process.⁶

Sergiovanni observed that:

Supervision is a neglected art in need of revival The evidence is mounting that significant changes in school effectiveness will not come about as a result of increasing salaries of teachers, decreasing class size, introducing new materials, beefing up the academic training or certification credentials of teachers, reducing the work load, introducing clerical assistance, using performance contracts and the like The highly motivated teacher must become a high priority concern of the supervisors.⁷

The findings of Lovell and Phelps regarding the provision of support services by instructional supervisors in Tennessee were:

More than 50 percent of the teachers responded that the services were not usually provided when needed; 70 percent or more indicated a desire for an increase.⁸

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The dysfunction of the instructional supervisor regarding the provision of support services within the bureaucratic structure of school systems was the problem to be investigated by this study. School systems have designed the bureaucratic structure to make maximum use of specialists who possess a high level of expertise. Positions have been created on a functional basis and office holders have been recruited to fill them on the basis of their technical competence to do the work required in those positions. However, teachers report that the quantity and quality of support services provided by instructional supervisors does not meet their psychological and material needs.

School systems have been particularly receptive to the bureaucratic ideology as bureaucratic principles have been incorporated into the organizational practices of the educational enterprise. This traditional organization pattern has served school systems well in many respects. It has provided the means by which reasonable control might be exercised over the behavior of members of the organization and by which the activities of individuals or groups of individuals might be coordinated. However, the present organizational arrangements and practices may have produced serious dysfunctional consequences for the instructional supervisor.

II. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship of the bureaucracy of school systems and the provision of instructional supervisory support services as perceived by the teachers in the selected school districts. Two groups of teachers for each school district were formed by using the median score of the teachers' perceptions of the provision of instructional supervisory support services. Accordingly, the study compared the perceptions of teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the following dimensions of bureaucracy: hierarchy of authority, division of labor, impersonality, presence of rules, procedural specifications, and technical competence.

For this study, the following questions were posed:

1. For each school district was there a significant difference

between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

2. Among the school districts was there a significant difference in the perceptions held by the teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

3. Among the school districts was there a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

4. Was there a significant difference between the perceptions held by all teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

III. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made relative to this study:

1. Bureaucracy is a condition that exists in degrees along the six dimensions studied rather than a present-absent dichotomy.

2. Teachers of the selected school districts were capable of perceiving current instructional supervisory support services.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

If teachers in the public schools of Tennessee are to improve the quality of their instruction to students, instructional supervisors must increase the provision of support services to teachers. The teachers' perceptions of functioning primarily alone, without materials and psychological support from instructional supervisors, must be altered. More support and security of teachers must be arranged to maximize the instructional potential of teachers. School systems in Tennessee must determine the reasons instructional supervisors are not providing the material and psychological support demanded by teachers in order to maximize the potential of teachers.

The educator's interest in bureaucracy is greater than that of the well-informed citizen. The educator devotes his professional life to the strategies and techniques of planning, coordinating, and controlling the affairs of bureaucracy. The professional environment is a bureaucracy, and, to a considerable extent, it is the setting in which he makes decisions, exercises leadership, and in general "behaves" as an educator. To be more effective on the job, the educator must understand and analyze the professional environment--the bureaucracy of school systems.

The description of the provision of support services provided by the instructional supervisors in Tennessee did not attempt to find any reasons for the failure of the supervisor to provide these services. A search of the literature failed to reveal a study which had investigated possible causes of the failure of the supervisor to provide

support services for the teacher; therefore, this study was felt to be important and relevant.

V. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was delimited to teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools of five selected school districts in East Tennessee. A proportionate stratified sampling technique was used to assure a fair representation of each district in the study. To assure a fair representation of teachers of each district, a systematic sampling technique was used. A city school district (less than 25,000 total population), a city school district (25,000 to 125,000 total population), a city school district (greater than 125,000), a county school district (rural), and a county school district (urban-suburban) in East Tennessee were used in this study.

In order to more specifically narrow the exact participants, the following delimitations were observed:

1. For purposes of this study, itinerant, resource, homebound and evening school teachers were not included. It was decided that the responsibilities in these areas would be difficult to compare when considering the regular and instructional program of the school district.
2. For purposes of this study, guidance counselors and librarians were not included as teachers. It was decided that the responsibilities in these areas would be difficult to compare since their duties did not include a regular and daily teaching load in the instructional program of the school district.
3. For purposes of this study, vocational teachers were not included. It was decided that instructional supervisory support

services provided in these areas would be difficult to compare when considering the instructional supervisory support services of the school district.

VI. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Bureaucracy. An organization for administering a formal structure characterized by rules, hierarchy of offices and centralized authority.⁹

2. City school districts (less than 25,000 total population).
Districts which are created by the Tennessee General Assembly at the request of local governmental agencies. These boundaries usually coincide with the boundaries of incorporated towns. For this study these were regarded as "small" districts which receive revenue from the city governing body, as well as a proportionate share of county revenue and state funds designated for the county.¹⁰

3. City school districts (25,000 to 125,000 total population).
Districts which are created by the Tennessee General Assembly at the request of local governmental agencies. Their boundaries usually coincide with the boundaries of incorporated towns. For this study these were regarded as "intermediate" districts which receive revenue from the city governing body, as well as a proportionate share of county revenue and state funds designated for the county.¹¹

4. City school districts (greater than 125,000 total population).
Districts which are created by the Tennessee General Assembly at the request of local governmental agencies. Their boundaries usually coincide with the boundaries of incorporated towns. For this study these were regarded as "metropolitan" districts. These districts

receive revenue from the city governing bodies, as well as a proportionate share of county revenue and state funds designed for the county.¹²

5. County school districts (rural). Districts which are historically identified as the administrative unit for Tennessee public education are described as "minimum foundation school districts," since only a small portion of their revenue comes from local sources.¹³

6. County school districts (urban-suburban). Those highly populated districts in or near which metropolitan centers are located. Although governed directly by the minimum foundation rules and regulations, the local governmental unit usually provides funding substantially above that provided by the state.¹⁴

7. Division of labor. The extent to which work tasks are subdivided by functional specialization decided by the organization.¹⁵

8. Hierarchy of authority. The extent to which the locus of decision making is prestructured by the organization.¹⁶

9. Impersonality. The extent to which both organizational members and outsiders are treated without regard to individual qualities.¹⁷

10. Instructional supervision. Those actions by school personnel which have as their central aim the realization of the school goals by adding new dimensions to the role of the teachers through creative and helpful assistance in the teaching-learning situation.¹⁸

11. Instructional supervisory support services. Individual acts of supervisory support of a school or school system which are instruction-related and are usually found in the tasks areas of evaluation,

curriculum development, inservice education, materials' development, and staffing.¹⁹

12. Perception. The art of linking what is sensed to some past experience to give the sensation meaning.²⁰

13. Presence of rules. The degree to which the behavior of organizational members is subject to organization control.²¹

14. Procedural specifications. The extent to which organizational members must follow organizationally defined techniques in dealing with situations which they encounter.²²

15. Supervisor. A professional staff member who devotes himself/herself primarily to the activities of supervision of instruction. Many titles refer to those who are supervisors. They include: director, consultant, coordinator, specialist, supervisor, and assistant superintendent.²³

16. Supervisory practices. Distinctive endeavors directed toward people, problems, and situations as they are faced in the school.²⁴

17. Teacher. A person employed in an official capacity to guide and direct the learning experiences of pupils in an educational institution.²⁵

18. Technical competence. The extent to which organizationally defined universalistic standards are utilized in the personnel selection and advancement process.²⁶

VII. PROCEDURES AND SOURCES OF DATA

Gathering the Data

The focus of the initial process of gathering data for this study was a review of the related literature with specific reference to

bureaucracy and instructional supervisory support services. The intent was to identify a summary of the theory, research and fundamental concepts which had implications for public schools. With the analysis and application of new knowledge of bureaucracy and instructional supervisory support services, recommended strategies and plans for improvement could be implemented.

The fundamental and significant procedure in gathering data for this educational investigation was the questionnaire method. The use of this type of instrument was decided to be a most economic and time-saving device for collecting information from a professional group in public education. A task was to gather data that would provide current perceptions of instructional supervisory support services being provided as held by teachers. To gather data that would provide current perceptions of bureaucracy of school systems as held by teachers was another task.

Instrumentation

To accomplish the two tasks, two questionnaires were selected to provide the necessary data. The School Organizational Inventory, a revised version of the Organizational Inventory, developed by Balderson in 1974 was selected as the instrument to discover the teachers' perception of the bureaucracy of school systems. Minor revisions were made in the Balderson instrument to make the statements applicable to school systems instead of a school. To discover the teachers' perception of the instructional supervisory support services being provided, Part D of the Supervisors' Instructional Supervision Questionnaire was selected.

School Organizational Inventory

The Organizational Inventory used in the study was originally developed by Richard H. Hall in 1961.²⁷ In constructing the 62 item questionnaire, Hall used six major categories developed from a search of the literature. These categories were: (1) hierarchy of authority, (2) behavior rules for participants, (3) division of labor, (4) procedural specifications, (5) impersonality, and (6) participants being chosen and promoted on technical competence.

Scales were constructed for measurement of each of the six dimensions. The format of the Likert internal-consistency technique was employed together with other techniques. Preliminary items, in the form of descriptive statements related to one of the six dimensions, were collected and edited. The items were placed in preliminary scales on the basis of the "logical" fit of the items. Hall pretested the scales to eliminate irrelevant items, and perhaps even more importantly to eliminate any interdependency among the scales.²⁸

Maximal elimination of interdependency was accomplished by analyzing each scale item of each scale in its relationship to the other five scales. Those items that were discriminating in more than one scale were eliminated from consideration for the final scales. Hall noted that total independence of scales was not achieved. Some scale items had partial relevance in other scales. It appeared to be almost impossible to eliminate all such interdependence since the dimensions under study were in fact parts of the whole, the organization. Nevertheless, there was a high degree of

independence in the scales. According to Hall, any interdependence that existed among the scales would lead to higher, rather than lower, intercorrelations among the dimensions.²⁹

The six scales developed on the basis of these considerations, were comprised of items to which organizational respondents were to respond. The responses were based on a five-point scale designed to indicate how closely each statement corresponded to an accurate description of the organization.

In their final form, the scales were quite brief; five contained ten items each, while the sixth contained twelve items. In spite of their brevity, Hall found all the scales were reliable with the corrected split-half correlation coefficients ranging between .80 and .90.³⁰

Validity of the scales was more difficult for Hall to establish. Inspection led to the conclusion that a high degree of face validity was present. More significantly, the use of external criterion groups indicated that all scales were valid. For each scale, the organizations that scored at both extremes were examined to determine whether the scale scores corresponded with the relevant organizational characteristics. The absence of other measures made such a determination difficult, but observational and interview data indicated a high degree of validity.³¹

The Organizational Inventory developed by Hall was revised by Keith Punch. While it showed up as potentially useful for investigating school bureaucratization, two changes were made before Punch used the instrument. First, Dimension VI (technical competence)

did not differentiate between schools; therefore, the focus was shifted towards technical competence within the schools. Second, wording changes were necessary to assess de facto instead of expected school operation. These changes were planned prior to a thorough analysis of the Organizational Inventory using Mackay's data and those of a study by Robinson. Items were reworded for clarity; scales were tested for internal consistency and items for discriminatory power. As a result, the sixty-two items were reduced to forty-eight.³²

These additional tests further confirmed the rigor of the instrument, but they did not overcome the two objections noted above. Therefore, several new items were devised by Punch for Dimension VI, and others reworded to measure the actual method of operation. A sixty-eight item instrument was administered to forty-eight schools (913 teachers). In view of the extensive analysis of the instrument in its various stages, two tests were used for selecting the forty-eight final items. Analysis of variance was used to determine the power of the items responses to differentiate between schools while clustering within schools. Variances were homogeneous, and all forty-eight items showed F ratios significantly beyond the .05 level, which indicated a high efficiency in discriminating. The six dimensions scores, obtained by summing the appropriate item scores, also differentiated strongly with all F ratios significantly beyond .001 level. Correlation was used to test the internal consistency of scales. Only one item did not correlate most highly with its

own subscale. This showed internal consistency and independence among the scales.³³

Split-half reliabilities for the scales were respectively .83, .24, .59, .64, .56, and .71.³⁴ In five cases these seemed acceptable, remembering that (a) reliability is a function of test length, and (b) the split-half method tends to underestimate.³⁵

The School Organizational Inventory, developed by Punch, was modified by Balderson.³⁶ The focus of the instrument was refined from a general description of the degree to which the organizational structure of schools was bureaucratized to a more direct description of the degree to which the behavior of teachers was bureaucratized. Subscales were formed using corresponding items of the School Organizational Inventory. Wording was altered to apply specifically to teachers. Balderson also divided the instrument into two scales: Bureaucratization of Teacher Behavior and Professionalism of Teacher Behavior.

The Bureaucratization of Teacher Behavior (BTB) contained the following dimensions: hierarchy, rules, specifications, and impersonality. The reliability coefficient of this scale was .83.³⁷

The Professionalism of Teacher Behavior (PTB) contained two dimensions: division of labor and competence. The reliability coefficient was found to be .40.³⁸

One way ANOVA's were used by Balderson to determine the ability of the scales and subscales to discriminate. Only one subscale, hierarchy, was found to have a F value which would not discriminate with $p \leq .02$. The BTB scale had a p value equal to the .02 level. The value of p for the PTB scale was equal to the .0001 level.³⁹

Two minor changes were made in the instrument for this study. The wording was altered to describe the attitudes of teachers regarding the bureaucracy of school systems instead of a school. To force respondents to select an answer on each statement, the response "occasionally true" was omitted.

Instructional Supervisors Support Services Questionnaire

Part D of the Supervisors' Instructional Supervision Questionnaire developed for the study of supervision in Tennessee was used to provide data about supervisory support services.

The roots for the items which constituted the questionnaire originated in the concepts of recognized authorities in supervision relative to what are the tasks and activities of supervisors. Consideration was given to Harris' ten tasks of supervision, as follows:

1. Developing curriculum
2. Organizing for instruction
3. Providing staff
4. Providing facilities
5. Providing materials
6. Arranging for in-service education
7. Orienting new staff members
8. Relating special pupil services
9. Developing public relations
10. Evaluating instruction⁴⁰

Another basis for the questionnaire content was the concept of supervision held by Curtin⁴¹ and Gwynn⁴²; which saw supervision as providing

for teachers any kind of service needed, coordinating system-wide instructional services, and up-grading evaluation. Questionnaire items based on the function of the central office instructional behavior team described by Wiles and Lovell included:

Developing the curriculum design, coordinating the curriculum improvement efforts; stimulating innovations; developing demonstrations of new procedures and practices; keeping informed about new curriculum developments; locating materials for instruction; developing new instructional media; outlining needed research; providing technological and psychological support to individual schools and teachers; studying, analyzing, interpreting, and implementing community expectations of educational programs; communicating curriculum and instructional needs to the superintendent and board; providing a program of professional growth for the staff; evaluating the effectiveness of the educational program; and extending school developed opportunities throughout the community.⁴³

The initial draft of the questionnaire was developed by Dr. Margaret Phelps, Assistant Professor of Education at Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, during her doctoral residence at The University of Tennessee. Through a study of the literature of instructional supervisory practices and her observations of practices of instructional supervisors, a listing of activities normally conducted and services provided was prepared. A class of advanced graduate students in supervision provided suggestions which were incorporated as revisions to the questionnaire.

Members of the Tennessee Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (TASCD) Special Task Force Committee to study supervisory practices in Tennessee also supplied items for the questionnaire. The tentative questionnaire was submitted to the Committee in order to obtain suggestions for its improvement.

Suggestions, too, came from other professional educators in the school districts served by the Committee members. The instrument was altered to reflect the suggested changes.

The teaching staffs of one rural elementary school and one rural high school in West Tennessee, one urban elementary school and one urban junior high school in East Tennessee, and one urban high school in Middle Tennessee comprised the sample of pre-testing of the first revision. Space was provided on the pre-test for comments for improvement of the questionnaire.

An item by item check of responses was conducted of the returns of the pre-test. Evaluation was made of all suggestions, comments, and questions, and blank items were examined to determine if they represented misinterpretations.

For the second revision, necessary wording changes were made to permit construction of an instrument, appropriate for supervisors. Although questionnaires were developed for different groups, the questions would elicit essentially the same information from each group.

A final discussion, review, and revision of the questionnaire were conducted by the Committee, and the forms were approved. The determination was made that the questionnaire then adhered to Good's criteria of validity for a questionnaire, as follows:

1. The questions adhered to the subject.
2. The questions were clear and unambiguous.
3. The questions focused on perceptions that were stable and typical of the target participants.

4. The questions possessed the extractive power so as to assure a large enough proportion to have validity.
5. The suggested responses had a reasonable range of variation.⁴⁴

Selecting the Sample Size

For this study it was concluded that the Chi-square statistic was most appropriate for determining the sample size. According to Nunnery and Kimbrough, an acceptable formula based on the chi-square statistic would be as follows:

$$n = \frac{\chi^2 NO(1-0)}{d^2(N-1) + \chi^2 O(1-0)}$$

Where n = the required sample size

χ^2 = the table value of Chi-square for one degree of freedom and the desired confidence interval.

N = the population size

O = the population proportion it is desired to estimate (.5 was used to give maximum sample size)

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05 where + 5 percent was the error that would be tolerated).

For the purposes of this study, a confidence limit of 95 percent was determined to be significant with the table value of χ^2 being 3.841.⁴⁵

Selecting the Participants

Five school systems in East Tennessee were selected for this study. A district was selected to represent each of the following categories: city school district (less than 25,000 total population),

city school district (25,000 to 125,000 total population), city school district (greater than 125,000 total population), county school district (rural), and county school district (urban-suburban).

A complete roster as listed in the 1977-78 directory of each school district was secured. Included were the names and addresses of the teachers of the five school districts. According to those publications, District A (Small) employed 158 teachers, District B (Intermediate) employed 372 teachers, District C (Metropolitan) employed 1748 teachers, District D (Rural) employed 165 teachers, and District E (Urban-Suburban) employed 1458 teachers for a total population of 3901 teachers.

Using the Krejcie and Morgan sample size table and applying the formula for χ^2 of 3.841 at the 95 percent confidence interval, the needed sample size was determined. The table showed that for a population of 3900 a sample of 350 would be required. Since there were 3901 teachers included in the directories of the school districts, the number 350 was selected for the teachers' sample.

To determine the sample of teachers required from each district, proportionate stratified sampling, the most common and generally the most useful type of stratification, was used. The sample of teachers needed from each district determined by proportionate stratified sampling was: District A--14, District B--33, District C--157, District D--14, and District E--132.

In order to identify the exact participants to equal the indicated sample sizes, the systematic sampling technique was used since systematic selection, instead of true random, is often used for proportionate

sampling. The following steps were carried out with each teacher list:

1. The sample size, as already determined, was divided into the total population to determine the "additional interval" size.
2. A starting number between 0 and 5 was selected.
3. The list of teachers was numbered.
4. The first number between 0 and 5 in the table of random numbers to appear was used as a starting number. An additional interval was added to this number until the designated sample size was reached.

Letter of Transmittal

To help increase the percentage of response, a letter of transmittal was written to accompany the questionnaire. To assure an adequate return, it was agreed that the letter should be brief and should convey certain information and impressions to the respondents. The respondents were given good reasons for completing the questionnaire and returning it. Also, the purpose of the study was explained to assure that the respondents understood its significance.

Administering the Questionnaires

The questionnaires, an accompanying letter of transmittal, and a business reply envelope were mailed to each teacher participating in the study. By using different colors for the questionnaires sent to the teachers of the five school districts, the researcher was able to categorize the returned questionnaires.

To assure a sufficient percentage of responses from the subjects, a follow-up technique was used. All participants were sent cards recalling and reminding them of the questionnaires.

Method of Analysis

The Instructional Supervisory Support Services Questionnaire was used to determine the teachers' perceptions of the provision of support services by the instructional supervisor. Teachers were asked to determine the frequency of the provision of instructional supervisory support services by selecting one of the following responses: always, usually, seldom, or never. Values of four, three, two, and one were assigned to the respective categories and summed to determine a score for each teacher. Using the median of the scores for each district, the following groups of teachers were formed: teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services."

A score on each dimension of bureaucracy for each teacher was determined by using the School Organizational Inventory. Teachers reacted to the 48 statements using the categories of: very frequently or always true, often true, seldom true, and very rarely or never true. Values of four, three, two, and one were assigned to these respective categories. To determine the teacher's score on each dimension, the items of each dimension were summed.

Since the datum for each subject-condition combination was a single-valued number (a "score") along some dimension (the "criterion"), analysis of variance was selected as the method of statistic analysis.⁴⁶

To determine what effects the conditions have on the subjects was another reason for selecting analysis of variance. An alpha value of .05 was decided to be an acceptable level of significance. The Scheffe, a posteriori contrast test, was used to compare all possible pairs of group means and to determine where the difference in the means of any two groups in a subset was not significant at the prescribed level.

VIII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

There are four chapters of this study. The first chapter presents the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, basic assumptions, importance of the study, delimitations of the study, and procedures, sources and treatment of the data. The second chapter is a review of related literature. The third chapter is the presentation of the analysis of the data and findings of the study. The fourth chapter contains the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Data for this chapter were obtained from literature which dealt with studies in the field of supervision, particularly instructional supervisory support services and bureaucracy. Utilized were numerous research studies, books, pamphlets, theses, and periodic literature covering essentially all phases of supervision and bureaucracy. The chapter was organized to include the historical development of supervision in America, instructional supervision, instructional supervisory support services, and bureaucracy.

I. THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SUPERVISION

The purpose of this section was to present a brief historical overview of the development of supervision of instruction. To describe how social and political events have altered the concept of supervision as revealed in the literature was the purpose of this section.

In 1647, the Massachusetts General Court passed one of the most important laws in the educational history of the United States. The law required towns containing fifty or more families to establish schools. A teacher of such a school was to give instruction in reading and writing, and the pay was to come from taxes, contributions from parents, or fees levied on the parents. If there were 100 or more families in the town, a Latin Grammar school was to be established.

This law helped establish the right of the Government's to require the establishment of schools and to control these schools.⁴⁷

During this early period of American education, the concept of supervision was as follows:

The Governor and the Company of Massachusetts Bay showed concern for the affairs of the community by indicating that those people chosen as town officers should give, among other things, some of their time to the parents and the schoolmasters as well as their children. This expectation, insofar as supervisory purposes were concerned, was to give attention to the calling and employment of the children of the community, especially with respect to their ability to read, to develop religiousity, and to obey the laws of the country.⁴⁸

The selectmen of the towns were instructed by the General Courts to secure teachers of certain religious and moral qualities. No specific directions were given concerning inspection or supervision of schools. Local political or religious officers and special committees invested with the authority to visit and to inspect schools marked the beginning of supervisory control of American schools.⁴⁹

In 1709, committees of citizens were appointed to visit and to inspect the plant and equipment and to examine pupil achievement in the public schools of Boston. Frequent and direct inspections were demanded. However, the schoolmaster was to be advised in advance of the impending visit by the Committee, and once there, members were "to consult and advise regarding the progress of teaching and learning in the school."⁵⁰

The concept of supervision by laymen was still the custom in 1835, but lay people were seen as friends of the schoolmaster.

Visits to the school were used to make judgments about the teacher's merit and the pupils' learning. The lay committee was "to give stimulation to the teacher to want to improve teaching practice, so that the learning of students might be greatly improved."⁵¹

In the development of American public education, committees exercised supervision in the form of inspection in order to improve the schools under their jurisdiction. Supervision, a function of administration, was conceived as inspection of schools. It was not until the second quarter of the nineteenth century that the distinction between supervision and administration emerged.⁵²

The first administrative officer to become highly concerned with instructional supervision was the "superintendent of schools." Supervisory duties (inspection) which had been performed by the lay committees were performed by the superintendent. Opposition to the transfer of these functions to the superintendent were voiced by Boards of Education. Thus, the idea of supervision (administrative inspection) carried over into the superintendency.⁵³

Beginning about 1870, a number of new subjects including music, drawing, manual training, and home economics were given a special status in the public schools. Special or regular teachers with the assistance and guidance of an expert, identified as a "supervisor," taught these subjects. These subjects were known as "special subjects" and the new supervisors as "special supervisors."⁵⁴

In the early 1900's, the scientific management concept caused by rapid advances in technology and industrial development was

applied to supervision in the public schools. A description of scientific management applied to education was:

Scientific supervision stems from the idea that the improvement of instruction may be based upon measurable and controllable items. Herein, the respect for truth becomes a chief criterion. Scientific supervision makes of the scientific principle that the solution of problems should be based upon facts. The application of the word "scientific" to education is frequently associated with the spread of objective norms and techniques in the fields of child accounting, school surveys, methods of learning, and the field of tests and measurements in the early part of the twentieth century. Actually, the use of objective norms and techniques is only the beginning of the scientific method. Its ultimate and best purpose is to substitute factual data and unbiased judgment for faulty observation and personal opinion.⁵⁵

Supervision began to emerge as a democratic function with supervisory assignments becoming broader in scope and purpose just beyond the middle of 1900. Reporting on this period in 1972, Arrington stated:

From 1940-1950, the emphases were on democracy as a means and an end in supervision of education.

Since 1950, the supervisor has continued to be involved in research, evaluation of teachers, accreditation activities, interpretation of the educational program to the public, induction and orientation of new teachers, professional growth responsibilities, curriculum development, testing programs, participation with professional organizations, human relations, and group dynamics.

Supervision has been evolving into an activity that establishes all the professional people involved in the teaching and learning activities as professional colleagues who are adequately prepared with common and special talents which can be shared on a professional and voluntary basis to facilitate effective teaching and learning activities.⁵⁶

Writing about supervision in the 1970's, Eye indicated supervision could be defined as "the reformulation of education to fit the rapidly changing society." He saw the emphasis remaining "upon the actualization of the opportunities for both teachers and pupils, as well as

the provision of opportunities for adjustments necessary in a changing society."⁵⁷

Wiles and Lovell reported the continuous progress of supervision through the twentieth century was best characterized by a growing concern for the nature and needs of people in the educational organization. The assumption that human beings in the organization had their own goals, values, feelings, emotions and needs was an important factor in the theory and practice of supervision. These factors affected individual need to behave in ways consistent with organizational needs and goals. However, the needs of the organization and those needs of human beings were not necessarily congruent.⁵⁸

Summary

The literature indicates that the concept of supervision has undergone a gradual yet progressive evolvement over a period of about three centuries. From the concept of supervision being conducted by a committee of citizens, supervision has evolved to being conducted primarily by professional educators. The humanistic approach of supervision developed after periods of the teaching of teachers, efficiency, the scientific approach, and the democratic approach to supervision. Involvement of professional personnel in facilitating and in improving teaching and learning is the focus of supervision in the seventies.

II. INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

The purpose of this section was to present what the literature said relative to supervision and the tasks or function of supervisors.

To present the theories of instructional supervision and ideal tasks of supervisors was the purpose of this section.

An early theorist of supervision, J. Minor Gwynn, stated "the weight of evidence is clearly in favor of supervision and supervisors helping school personnel to improve the teaching-learning situation creatively."⁵⁹ The primary task of the supervisor was to help teachers and school personnel to solve problems that arise or are concerned with a desirable learning situation for children. The main responsibilities of the supervisor were: give individual help to the teacher, to co-ordinate and make more available to all personnel the instructional services of the school, and to act as a resource person for the superintendent and other administrative personnel, as a special agent in training teachers, in-service, and as an interpreter of the school and its program both to school personnel and to the public.⁶⁰

To discharge the major responsibilities, the supervisor was to perform these major tasks:

1. To aid the teacher and the principal in understanding children better.
2. To help the teacher to develop and improve individually and as a co-operating member of the school staff.
3. To assist school personnel in making more interesting and effective use of materials of instruction.
4. To help the teacher improve his methods of teaching.
5. To make the specialized personnel in the system of maximum assistance to the teacher.

6. To assist the teacher in making the best possible appraisal of the student.
7. To stimulate the teacher to evaluate his own planning, work, and progress.
8. To help the teacher achieve poise and a sense of security in his work and in the community.
9. To stimulate faculty groups to plan curriculum improvements and carry them out co-operatively and to assume a major responsibility in co-ordinating this work and in improving teacher education in service.
10. To acquaint the school administration, the teachers, the students, and the public with the work and progress of the school.⁶¹

Due to unsolved theoretical problems about teaching, Mosher and Purpel adopted an operational definition of supervision. The writers saw supervision as teaching teachers how to teach (which involves working with teachers as people) and as professional leadership in reformulating public education--more specifically its curriculum, its teaching and its forms. The supervisor was a teacher of teachers, concerned with the content, method and effects of classroom teaching. Validity of the specific teaching objectives, the problems posed by materials and the depth of the teachers' and students' understanding of the curriculum were considerations of the supervisor. Decisions on what should be taught and who should teach it under what circumstances were a major responsibility of the supervisor. The crucial task of supervision was to conceive and develop the full range of conditions under which people can be taught and/or learn.⁶²

Lucio and McNeil believed that "supervision is itself a distributive function which holders of various positions discharge in different ways."⁶³ The expected behavior of supervisors, regardless of their position in the school system, exhibited a common dimension. The determination of ends to be sought, the design of procedures for effecting the ends, and the assessment of results were the common elements of supervision.

As an instructional specialist assigned to promote the improvement of teaching and the curriculum, the supervisor (consultant, resource person) was especially concerned with the discovery and use of instructional aids, materials, teaching guides, methods of teaching, and resource units. The supervisor was generally responsible for six kinds of duties:

1. Planning. Individually and in groups, he helps to develop policies and programs in his field.
2. Administration. He makes decision, coordinates the work of others, and issues necessary directions.
3. Supervision. Through conferences and consultations, he seeks to improve the quality of instruction.
4. Curriculum development. He participates directly in the formulations of objectives, selection of school experiences, preparation of teaching guides, and selection of instructional aids.
5. Demonstration teaching. He gives and arranges for classroom demonstrations of teaching methods, use of aids, and other direct help to classroom teachers.

6. Research. Through systematic surveys, experiments, and studies, he explores current conditions and recommends changes in practice.⁶⁴

Unruh and Turner described supervision in terms of process, of function, and of educational leadership. Supervision as a social process was a means of stimulating, nurturing, and appraising the professional growth of teachers.⁶⁵ The central element of supervision was people. Concern for professional growth was the prime purpose of supervision. Operational strategy of supervision called for identifying interests, talents, capacities, and skills of teachers, organizing the personnel in ways to maximize these traits, and mobilizing the resultant power for the improvement of instruction and learning.⁶⁶

Supervision, along with all other aspects of the educational system, has as its ultimate goal the improvement of learning for all those who take part in educational programs was stated by Swearingen. The focus of supervision was upon the improvement of instruction. Supervision was conceived with the continuous redefinition of goals, with the wider realization of the human dynamic for learning and for cooperative effort, and with the nurturing of a creative approach to the problems of teaching and learning.⁶⁷

The term "supervisor" had both a general and a specific meaning. Broadly, it referred to all persons responsible for instructional leadership. Persons who devoted all their time and energy directly to improvement of instruction was the specific meaning of the term.⁶⁸

Cultural, philosophical, psychological, social, sociological, and professional bases determined the educational needs of today. The functions of supervisors were summarized as eight major continuing functions: (1) coordination of efforts, (2) provision of leadership, (3) extension of experience, (4) stimulation of creative effort, (5) contributions to a body of professional knowledge, (6) facilitation and evaluation of change, (7) analysis of learning situations, and (8) integration of goals.⁶⁸

Certain activities which were vital to the daily life of the school was used so often. They were regarded as recurring procedures in supervision. A large portion of supervisory time and attention was devoted to the procedures. Four such procedures were: research; selection, production and utilization of materials; evaluation, accreditation, and testing programs; and interpreting the program to the public.⁶⁹

Melchior defined function as "a specific work accomplished, or, the accomplished." As applied to supervision, it meant an activity or work rightfully belonging to and expected of the supervisor and co-workers. The operation by which supervisors and teachers together study the child, the curriculum, and many other objects and process was a major technical responsibility or a major duty. The functions, long established in the field of supervision were: preliminary study or inspection, research, teaching or training, guidance and evaluation.⁷⁰

Improvement of professional procedures reflected in the development of the student was seen as the value of supervision by Marks,

Stoops and Stoops. An activity which was primarily concerned with the improvement of instruction in the classroom was an activity within the scope of supervision. Since a school system is designed for the ultimate purpose of stimulating learning and growth, those items which primarily, and rather directly, condition learning and growth involved supervision.⁷¹

Oliva perceived supervision as a service to teachers individually and in groups which offered teachers assistance in instruction. Those persons who have improvement of curriculum and instruction as their primary task were supervisors. Domains (task areas) in which the supervisor worked with teachers were: (1) instructional development (planning for instruction, presenting instruction, evaluating instruction, and classroom management), (2) curriculum development (developing and evaluating curriculum), and (3) teacher development (self-evaluation, cooperative work, and in-service development).⁷²

Williams viewed supervision as the fulfillment of any task that leads to the shared development of an improved instructional program. Supervision was characterized as a type of activity in which functional assistance and encouragement were key characteristics. Essential to a planned program of supervisory help were partnership of ideas, planning, and creativity.⁷³

The basic function of the supervisor was to broaden the role of the teacher. By providing creative and helpful assistance whenever requested, the supervisor added new dimensions to the teacher's role. Thus, the role of the supervisor was primarily supportive of the classroom teacher.⁷⁴

Sergiovanni and Starratt described supervision as "attitudes, efforts, and behaviors on the part of one who is dependent upon and works through others in order to achieve school goals."⁷⁵ Departing from the traditional view of supervision, the authors added to the instructional emphasis responsibility for all school goals which are achieved through or dependent upon the human organization of the school. Supervision was viewed as a process rather than as an unique function of role. To facilitate the emergence of instructional leadership throughout the professional staff was the aim of supervision.

Supervision, one of the essential functions for the operation of schools, was conceptualized by Harris as a set of reasonably distinctive endeavors within the context of the school operation.⁷⁶ Certain distinguishing characteristics were required to categorize endeavors as supervisory. Instructional supervision was seen as one part of the total operation geared to producing certain outcomes.

Instruction-relatedness and pupil-relatedness were regarded as major dimensions for analyzing the operation of schools and for distinguishing instruction supervision from other endeavors. Supervision, highly instruction-related, but only remotely pupil-related endeavors were distinguished from teaching by their indirect impact on pupil learning. Supervision provided highly instruction-related support services to the teaching function.⁷⁷

Harris stated:

Supervision of instruction is what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching process employed to promote pupil learning. Supervision is a major function

of the school operation, not a task or a specific job or a set of techniques. Supervision of instruction is directed toward both maintaining and improving the teaching-learning processes of the school.⁷⁸

Based upon the sequence in which the tasks were employed to facilitate teaching, the ten tasks of supervision were categorized as preliminary, operational, and developmental. Developing curriculum, providing facilities, and providing staff were preliminary tasks. Operational tasks were organizing for instruction, orienting staff, providing materials, relating services, and developing public relations. The final tasks of evaluation and in-service education were developmental.

The real core of a program of supervisory services (evaluation, curriculum development, in-service education, materials' development, and staffing) were the operational fabric of a well-balanced program of supervision.⁷⁹

Wiles and Lovell viewed instructional supervision as an open behavior sub-system of the educational organization which is in interaction with the other sub-systems of the educational organization. The instructional supervisory behavior system was behavior officially designated by the organization which has the purpose of influencing the "teacher behavior sub-system" in such a way as to facilitate the achievement of the teacher-pupil systems.⁸⁰ This was achieved either by effect on the teacher or by directly influencing the teacher-pupil system. Instructional supervisory behavior was "an additional behavior system formally provided by the organization for the purpose of interacting with the teacher behavior system in such a way as to maintain, change, and improve the provision and

actualization of learning opportunities for students."⁸¹ Specific functions of instructional supervisory behavior were: goal development, program development, control and coordination, motivation, problem solving, professional development, and evaluation of educational outcomes.⁸²

Commenting on the tasks of supervisors, Wiles and Lovell stated:

They are expeditors. They help establish communication between persons who have similar problems and resource people who can help. They stimulate staff members to look at the extent to which ideas and resources are being shared, and the degree to which persons are encouraged and supported as they try new ideas. They make it easier to carry out the agreements that emerge from evaluation sessions. They listen to individuals discuss their problems and recommend other resources that may help in the search for solutions. They bring to individual teachers, whose confidence they possess, appropriate suggestions and materials. They sense, as far as they are able, the feelings that teachers have about the system and its policies, and they recommend that the administration examine irritations among staff members. They provide expertness in group operation, and provide the type of meeting place and structure that facilitate communication. They are, above all, concerned with helping people to accept each other, because they know that when individuals value each other, they will grow through their interaction together and will provide a better emotional climate for pupil growth.⁸³

Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak advocated the systems approach to instructional supervision. The organization for supervision was considered within the context of the total curriculum and instruction system. The major part of the system was the educational process that occurred within the schools called the implementation subsystem. The administrators who managed the curriculum and instruction system constituted the coordination or management subsystem. The supporting personnel who assist teachers in the improvement of instruction constituted the supervisory subsystem.⁸⁴

The supervisory subsystem of the total curriculum and instruction system represented what has been referred to in the past as supervision. Citing the need for differentiated roles in supervision, the authors concluded that supervision involved three basic functions--curriculum design, providing advice when needed, and working with instructional staff on problems related to the improvement of instruction.⁸⁵ Therefore, the supervisory system was conceptualized as having three components which specialized in the performance of these functions. Curriculum design, consultation, and facilitating were designated as the three components.

The curriculum-design component was staffed by specialists capable of designing instructional systems and producing various types of instructional materials. Included in the staff of the consultation component was subject-matter, instructional media; and evaluation specialists which provided advice throughout the system and were responsible for in-service teacher education programs. The facilitating component, staffed by teaching consultants who were assigned to instructional units or buildings, worked directly with the instructional staff.⁸⁶

Summary

The literature indicated that the primary focus of supervision was the improvement of instruction. Although supervision was defined in many different ways, pupil growth and progress through the improvement of classroom instruction was the recurring theme. Whether conceived as a process or system, supervision was related to working with the teacher to improve the instructional process.

Tasks of the supervisor were derived from the definitions of supervision. The task of the supervisor was to provide those services to the teacher which would improve the teaching-learning situation. The services provided by the supervisor were considered to be supportive. By providing the support services to the teacher, the supervisor was able to contribute to the improvement of instruction.

III. INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES

The purpose of this section was to determine what the literature said relative to the supervisor's role in instructional supervisory support services, the types of such services being provided, and their value to recipients. To determine how instructional supervisory support services were viewed by teachers, principals, and supervisors was a purpose of this section of the study.

In 1945, Antell⁸⁷ asked 200 teachers in New York to evaluate 25 common supervisory practices. He reported teachers favoring "supervisory practices which gave them the widest latitude to participate in curriculum improvement, which make available to them sources of information and which give them genuine assistance." "Teachers desired help in everyday tasks" and "did not care for inspectorial supervision."⁸⁸

Over 300 teachers in the Middle West were asked by Replogle⁸⁹ to express themselves in respect to the areas in which help was most desired. There was general agreement that teachers wanted help in areas which focused on the improvement of classroom instruction.

Teachers wanted "to receive help in solving their own problems rather than being told the answers, to be helped by someone who can make them feel secure and wanted, and one who is sympathetic and sensitive to human values."⁹⁰

In the mid-fifties, existing and desired supervisory services in the public schools of Indianapolis, Indiana, were studied by Palmer.⁹¹ Teachers, principals, and consultants wanted "more teacher opportunities for inter-school visitation, and more demonstration lessons before individual classrooms." Palmer concluded that "the program of supervisory services should be adapted to teacher needs."⁹²

Practices of the supervisor in the public schools of Ohio were studied by Heil⁹³ and King⁹⁴ (1957). Heil sent questionnaires to county superintendents, executive heads, supervisors, and elementary teachers in 25 selected Ohio counties "to determine, appraise, and report supervisory practices." A greater number of administrative, supervisory, and teaching personnel "mentioned the positive help that supervisors and supervisory programs had given within the past year than stated that the program was not worthwhile." Heil stated "the supervisory program produced definite improvement in instruction during the year."⁹⁵ Using the same professional groups, King investigated the extent of agreement between actual and ideal practices of supervision. King found agreement in the following areas: instructional policy-making, classroom visitation, conference following visitation, determination and improvement of teaching method, evaluation of the school program and of teaching personnel, developing

curriculum guides and courses of study, orientation of teachers, participating in community activities, and planning for work in the local districts and buildings.⁹⁶

Two years later, in 1959, Elgin⁹⁷ sought to determine the nature and status of instructional supervision in the elementary schools of Louisiana. Some of the significant findings revealed in the study were: (1) A large majority of instructional supervisors were actively engaged in in-service activities involving teachers and themselves, (2) Of the 47 supervisory functions, 11 were not helpful and only 26 were "helpful in improving instruction," (3) Thirteen of the highest ranked functions performed by the respondents were performed most frequently or regularly by educators across the nation as revealed in an earlier study.

Also in 1959, Miller⁹⁸ asked Pennsylvania teachers to evaluate the effect of 16 supervisory practices upon 10 professional problems of teachers over a period of six years. Sixteen supervisory activities were selected from an extensive list of 67 practices identified in the literature. Miller's findings indicated "each of the selected supervisory activities affected 72 percent or more of the teachers in at least one area of professional problems." "Also, he found 85 percent or more of the teachers believed they were being helped by one or more of the supervisory activities." In conclusion, Miller stated "one of the most effective supervisory activities to be the securing and guided use of instructional materials" and "effective supervision must remain closed to the teacher and his problems in the teaching-learning situation."⁹⁹

Guss¹⁰⁰ reported in 1961 the results of a three-year study of the functions, duties being performed, and contributions of supervisors by the Indiana Association for Curriculum Development. Professional and non-professional groups in the state defined supervision and listed functions, duties, and most important and least important contributions of supervisors. Her findings revealed the following:

Functions of Supervision. Develop curriculum to meet common needs. Help teachers achieve the most effective learning environment. Improve instruction. Inspire teachers. Render expert advice concerning methods and materials. Serve as consultant or coordinator.

Duties Being Performed by Supervisors. This representative sample of professional and lay persons concerned with supervision believed them to be performing these duties: compiling library and audio-visual materials; giving professional advice and assistance to teachers; improving the curriculum; taking care of paper work; testing and evaluating.

Most Important Contributions. Helping teachers, especially new ones, to improve classroom instruction. Holding individual conferences with teachers. Providing teacher guidance and improving morale. Serving as a leader in curriculum development.

Least Important Contributions. Creating unnatural situations in classrooms. Evaluating teachers (check-up, inspection). Performing clerical jobs (ordering, counting, delivering). Writing reports and keeping records.

Supervision Defined. A process of: improving instruction by working with teachers, directing curriculum; cooperating in providing

a wholesome learning environment for children; critically evaluating and directing education; overseeing, checking, comparing, and helping.¹⁰¹

Reported in 1962 were studies by Burgess,¹⁰² Hall,¹⁰³ and Puckett,¹⁰⁴ all with implications for instructional supervision. The services performed by instructional supervisors in the public schools of Alabama in relation to the services supervisors believed they should perform was the purpose of the study by Burgess. He found "19 of the 46 services were performed differently from the way these services should be performed" and only "23 were performed to the same extent it was believed they should be performed."¹⁰⁵

A random sample of 222 teachers, nine supervisors, 108 principals and assistant principals in the public schools of Mobile, Alabama, participated in Hall's study. Seventy percent of the teachers were generally satisfied with the supervisory services. Supervision should be a cooperative effort between the principal and supervisor was the opinion of 70 percent of the participants in the study. Hall also discovered that three-fourths of the participants felt that supervision should not be limited to teacher requests.¹⁰⁶

In a study of three North Central Association accredited school systems, Puckett found the primary function of the supervisor was the coordination of the instructional program. The lowest rated function was demonstration teaching. Rated most important were the following specific functions:

. . .keeping teachers informed with regard to new school policies, improved methods of teaching, and new ideas related to teaching; helping orient teachers new to the system; and helping select textbooks and other instructional materials.¹⁰⁷

The studies of Cain¹⁰⁸ and Wallace¹⁰⁹ in 1964 were concerned with supervisory practices and functions. In Cain's study, supervisors, principals, and teachers were to describe and to analyze concepts of the actual functions of general elementary supervisors and to compare them to the "ideal functions" of elementary school supervisors, as defined by the same group. Using a questionnaire, data were obtained from 61 supervisors, 57 principals, and 61 teachers in selected public schools of Missouri. Although administrative and clerical functions were not considered highly desirable, elementary school supervisors were generally perceived as performing them. Morale and professional growth, highly desirable functions, were performed by elementary school supervisors.¹¹⁰

Principals, supervisors, and teachers of the Waterbury (Connecticut) Schools were asked by Wallace to determine "what constitutes effective supervisory practices." The number of supervisory activities considered "satisfactory" by the supervisors were more than double those judged "satisfactory" by the teachers and one-third greater than the number judged "satisfactory" by the principals. The area of supervision considered less effective by principals and teachers was related to curriculum development.¹¹¹

In 1966, secondary school teachers of South Carolina were asked by Colbert¹¹² to identify effective types of supervisory behavior. An effective supervisory behavior was demonstrated when the supervisor:

1. Assisted teachers in developing and understanding of teaching technique, demonstrated new methods, offered constructive criticism, and held conferences on methods following classroom visits;

2. Assisted in obtaining materials, equipment, and other aids directed toward improvement in the quality of instruction;

3. Gave specific advice, was unobtrusive during classroom visits, and assisted teachers in the evaluation of various aspects of their teaching;

4. Demonstrated high-level human relations through showing sincerity, serious consideration of teachers' problems, compliments, through showing a willingness to help, and through inspiring teachers to improve their performance.

5. Assisted teachers with discipline problems by taking over serious problems, supporting teacher-made decisions and promoting a deeper understanding of the principles underlying discipline problems;

6. Assisted in enriching and improving the curriculum.¹¹³

In 1969, Ross¹¹⁴ studied the activities of public school supervisors in North Carolina and reported the percentage of their typical work week that supervisors estimated they spent in various categories of supervisory activities. Data collected from 36 directors of instruction, 67 general supervisors, 52 supervisors of elementary instruction, 20 supervisors of secondary education and 152 special area supervisors revealed:

Supervisors reported spending the largest percentages of their time assisting individual teachers, in curriculum development, in instructional organization, and in coordination, respectively. Much less time was spent in activities related to other categories of supervisory duties. Although all the respondents were members of the same educational organization for supervisors,

there was little uniformity in titles, positions, or specific duties performed. Even groups of supervisors categorized according to title, differences were often great.¹¹⁵

Ross concluded:

Evidence of this study suggests that the supervisor who spends the major portion of his work week visiting individual teachers classrooms, conferring with individual teachers, doing demonstration teaching, and evaluating the performance of classroom teachers may exist in textbooks on supervision, but he seldom exists in the public school systems in North Carolina.¹¹⁶

Carman synthesized the research findings on the general supervisor's role and responsibilities in 1970. From the 99 usable studies, Carman found:

The principle purpose of supervision is the coordination of effort to improve instruction. Major factors involved in this goal include the provision of leadership, the creation of a productive environment, curriculum development, and in-service education.¹¹⁷

Coordinating in-service education and workshops, fostering improvement in human relations, and providing consultative help and instructional services were the most often reported responsibilities of the general supervisor.

The most helpful supervisory practices as perceived by local school personnel were: developing curricula, providing special materials and resources, and giving practical assistance to specific problems. Accordingly, activities involving curriculum and instruction received the highest priority in use of supervisory time.

Responses of 1,044 elementary teachers and 52 principals were used by Carlton¹¹⁸ (1971) to develop the following ranking of activities of the actual role of supervisors: (1) assistance in development of programs for federal funding; (2) routine administrative

duties; (3) participation in the formulation of policy; (4) participation in in-service education programs and workshops; and (5) assisting textbook selection committees.

Bradshaw¹¹⁹ (1971) found that "Georgia supervisors were frequently engaged in activities which they believe should receive priority" based upon a correlation coefficient of $+0.69$ between supervisors' perceptions of ideal supervisory behavior and reported actual supervisory behavior. Also, he found that "generalists and specialists most frequently engage in activities pertaining to the collection, selection, utilization, dissemination, and/or evaluation of materials and media".

Smith¹²⁰ sought to determine and evaluate the normal duties and responsibilities in terms of their essentiality to the function of school supervision by supervisors of selected rural West Virginia school districts in 1971. Thirty-four supervisors ranked 58 normal supervisory duties on performance, involvement, and essentiality of the function. He found that more than 50 percent of the supervisors performed 44 of the 58 questionnaire duties. More than 75 percent of the supervisors believed that 34 of the duties were essential and of major importance. Program planning, instruction, resources, and evaluation were considered most important by 68 percent of the respondents. The least important duties were in administration.¹²¹

Hutchinson¹²² investigated the practices associated with science supervision in the public high schools of the parish and city school systems in Louisiana in 1973. Participants for the study were science supervisors and general supervisors of school systems

which did not employ a science supervisor. The supervisory function considered most important was classroom visitation and supervision of instruction.¹²³

Identification of the major tasks of instructional supervisors in open-concept schools and comparison of the tasks of instructional supervisors in traditional schools was the purpose of the 1973 study by Wolters.¹²⁴ Using the 1961 study of the Texas Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, ten major tasks of instructional supervision were used to examine the supervisory tasks of 1973. Both groups rated the following as major tasks: (1) Curriculum Development, (2) Organizing for Instruction, (3) Selection and Use of Textbooks and Materials, (4) In-service Education, (5) Counseling Teachers, (6) Evaluation, and (7) Communication. Since both groups related tasks different from tasks reported in the 1961 study and less emphasis given to the task areas of special services, staffing, and designing facilities, a changing role for instructional supervisors was a conclusion of Wolters.

Maddox,¹²⁵ in 1974, sought to identify desirable behaviors for instructional supervisors using the responses of college professors, principals, instructional supervisors, and classroom teachers of Alabama. Of the 48 supervisory behaviors, the following were rated of major importance or of moderate importance by at least 95 percent of all participants:

Instructional Improvement

1. Keeping teachers informed with regard to improved methods and new ideas related to teaching.

2. Assisting teachers in securing various instructional materials and services (visual aids, resource materials, resource people).

3. Conferring with groups of teachers on common problems.

4. Conferring with individual teachers on instructional problems.

Curriculum Development

5. Setting up and working with curriculum committees.

6. Supervising development of curriculum guides and courses of study.

7. Providing assistance for teachers for development of curriculum materials.

8. Securing consultant assistance in curriculum development.

Administrative and Personnel Behaviors

9. Participating in the development of policy relating directly to instruction.

Evaluation Behaviors

10. Provides opportunities for teachers to prepare evaluations and give suggestions for improvement of supervision.

In a study of supervision in Georgia in 1974, Lentini¹²⁶ proposed these questions: "1. What are the critical behaviors of supervision? 2. What are the critical requirements derived from perceived behavior reports of Georgia public school supervisors?" A questionnaire to gather data on effective and ineffective behaviors was sent to all Georgia public school supervisors. Using the critical incident technique, 457 effective and 261 ineffective behaviors were identified. Leadership ranked first in the number of requirements and first in the numbers of behaviors. Ranking second in the number of behaviors

reported and third in the requirements was Professional Growth Activities. Ranked second in critical requirements and third in behaviors was Administration. Resources ranked fourth in number of behaviors and fifth in number of requirements. Curriculum Development and Improvement ranked fifth in critical behaviors and fourth in number of requirements.

Comprehensive check lists of tasks of supervisors of instruction found in current literature were devised by Frances Ferguson¹²⁷ for her study of the practices of elementary supervisors of instruction (K-8) in the state of Louisiana during the 1974-75 school year. Tasks were categorized as directly, possibly, or indirectly related to the improvement of instruction, and those having little or no relation. Items in each of the three check lists were matched for comparative purposes. Findings from the 137 supervisors of instruction, 79 principals, and 144 teachers were: (1) Persons who functioned in a supervisory capacity under titles other than supervisor reported more school visits and more scheduled classroom observations made per year than either general or specific supervisors. General supervisors reported more unscheduled classroom observations made per year than either specific or other supervisors; (2) Supervisors agreed on relative importance of future roles of supervisors of instruction: long-range planning, directing teacher in-service, assisting teachers, and evaluating programs (most important); evaluating teachers, monitoring programs, and directing pilot programs (least important); (3) Supervisors indicated that they consistently performed tasks directly related to the improvement of instruction involving close teacher-

principal contacts; sharing ideas; listening; assisting; offering suggestions, recommendations; supplying resource persons; materials; planning cooperatively; stimulating creativity; conducting workshops; acting as liaison persons; (4) Overall, in considering supervisors' tasks performance, higher consensus existed between supervisors and principals than between supervisors and teachers.¹²⁸

In 1975, Evans¹²⁹ attempted to determine whether significant disagreement as to certain supervision task expectations existed between elementary teachers and supervisors in Virginia. Evans found that "supervisors rated organizing for instruction and evaluating instruction tasks as the most important"; however, teachers rated "curriculum development and providing materials as the most important tasks." Also, he found no significant difference in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor expressed by general and special area supervisors.

In 1977, Holder¹³⁰ conducted a task analysis of selected leadership personnel responsible for instructional supervision and/or curriculum development in local school systems of Georgia. Questionnaires were mailed to 675 instructional supervisors and/or curriculum leaders in Georgia local school systems. Duties and responsibilities of instructional supervisors and/or curriculum leaders presented in the literature during the ten year period, 1967-77 were determined. Data from the study and a similar 1967 study, The Role of the Curriculum Worker, in Georgia, were compared "in order that changes in supervisory tasks over the decade, 1967-1977, might be identified." Findings and conclusions, presently primarily under six areas of work utilized throughout the study, were:

1. Program Planning, Instruction, Resources, and Evaluation.

The emphasis maintained on tasks in this area of work in Georgia and the high priority placed on these items in the literature suggest that professional leaders continue to have major responsibilities in this area of the field.

2. In-Service, Workshop, and Teacher Education. The expectation that instructional supervisors are not teachers, but are brokers for staff development activities which are done on a cooperative basis, leads to the conclusion that professional leaders must involve teachers on a more collegial basis in addressing staff development needs.

3. Administration and Personnel. The increase in emphasis on tasks of administration and personnel which has occurred in Georgia, is not in keeping with national emphasis on these tasks within the literature during the past 10 years (1967-1977). It seems that administrators may be encouraging instructional leaders to perform duties outside of their primary role.

4. Studies, Demonstration, and Research. Less emphasis was placed on tasks in this area of work while an increased emphasis in other parts of the nation is indicated by the literature.

5. School-Community Relations. The decreased emphasis on these tasks in Georgia by professional leaders is not in keeping with the increase of responsibility in this area mentioned by the literature during the past 10 years. It would appear that professional leaders may be involved in other tasks, particularly administrative, to the neglect of school-community relations tasks.

6. Conferences, Professional Meetings, and Organizations.

Although respondents indicated that generous travel allotments existed, participation in tasks of this area decreased from 1967 to 1977, but were still in keeping with infrequent mention or emphasis of this area within the literature.¹³¹

Summarizing, Holder stated:

It is likely that professional leaders in Georgia perceive their time as being limited due to increased non-supervisory duties and lack of additional personnel with whom responsibilities may be shared.¹³²

Summary

The literature indicated that a discrepancy existed between the supervisors, principals, and teachers regarding the provision of support services. Supervisors and principals were more in agreement as to the services that should be provided or were being provided. Disagreement existed between teachers and supervisors as to what services were most important. Services such as in-service education, securing materials, curriculum development were viewed by all groups as services provided by instructional supervisors. Also indicated in the literature was a change in the emphasis of the provision of supervisory support services.

Supervisory support services should assist teachers in improving instruction; however, the needs of the teachers must be met. Supervisors who remain close to the teaching-learning situation are perceived by teachers as the most effective. A matter of disagreement, revealed in the literature, was whether teacher evaluation should be

classified as a support service. How much of the supervisor's time, if any, should be devoted to administrative tasks was also an area of disagreement.

IV. BUREAUCRACY

The purpose of this section was to examine the bases of the bureaucratic model, the dimensions of the organization that were characteristically cited as bureaucratic attributes. To present some of the advantages, disadvantages, and dysfunctions of bureaucracy as determined by the literature was also a purpose of this section.

Max Weber, in his formulative work on bureaucracy, described bureaucratic organizations from the dimensional perspective. He listed a series of organizational attributes, which when present, constituted the bureaucratic form of organization. The most important of these characteristics were:

1. Organizational tasks are distributed among the various positions as official duties. Implied is a clear-cut division of labor among positions which makes possible a high degree of specialization. Specialization, in turn, promotes expertness among the personnel by narrowing the range of duties of jobs and by enabling the organization to hire employees on the basis of their technical qualifications.

2. The positions or officers are organized into a hierarchical authority structure. In the usual case this hierarchy takes on the shape of a pyramid wherein each official is responsible to the

superior above him in the pyramid for his subordinates' decisions and actions as well as his own, and wherein each official has authority over the officials under him. The scope of authority of supervisors over subordinates is clearly circumscribed.

3. A formally established system of rules and regulations governs official decisions and actions. In principle, the operations in such administrative organizations involve the application of these general regulations to particular cases. The regulations ensure the uniformity of operations and, together with the authority structure, make possible the coordination of the various activities. They also provide for continuity in operations regardless of changes of personnel, thus promoting a stability lacking in many other types of groups and collectivities, such as social movements.

4. There is a specialized administrative staff whose task it is to maintain the organization and, in particular, the lines of communication in it. The lowest level of this administrative apparatus consists of the clerical staff responsible for keeping the written records and files of the organization, in which all official decisions and actions are embodied. Whereas the "production" staff contributes directly to the achievement of the organization's objectives, whether this involves producing cars, collecting taxes, fighting wars, or curing patients, the administrative staff contributes to goal achievement only indirectly by keeping the organization itself going.

5. Officials are expected to assume an impersonal orientation in their contacts with clients and with other officials. Clients are

to be treated as cases, the officials being expected to disregard all personal considerations and to maintain complete emotional detachment, and subordinates are to be treated in a similarly impersonal fashion. The social distance between hierarchical levels and that between officials and their clients is intended to foster such formality. Impersonal detachment is designed to prevent the personal feelings of officials from distorting their rational judgment in carrying out their duties.

6. Employment by the organization constitutes a career for officials. Typically an official is a full-time employee and looks forward to a lifelong career in the agency. Employment is based on the technical qualifications of the candidate rather than on political, family, or other connections. Usually such qualifications are tested by examination or by certificates that demonstrate the candidate's educational attainment - college degrees, for example. Such educational qualifications create a certain amount of class homogeneity among officials, since relatively few persons of working-class origin have college degrees, although their number is increasing. Officials are appointed to positions, not elected, and thus are dependent on superiors in the organization rather than on a body of constituents. After a trial period, officials gain tenure of position and are protected against arbitrary dismissal. Renumeration is in the form of a salary, and pensions are provided after retirement. Career advancements are according to seniority or to achievement, or both.¹³³

Berger's observations grow out of his study of Egyptian bureaucracy in which he concluded that there was an inadequacy of existing

theory. His examination led to the identification of three dimensions of bureaucratic behavior that accompanied corresponding structural features of bureaucratic organization. The three behavioral components were designated as (1) rationality and universalism, (2) hierarchy, and (3) discretion. The other three component parts were identified as (1) skill, (2) self-protection, and (3) service.¹³⁴

Dahl and Lindblom viewed bureaucracy as "an organization marked by certain structural features that cannot be readily called whether desirable or undesirable per se." Arriving at a neutral concept of bureaucracy, the authors used the following characteristics in describing bureaucracy: (1) conscious adoption of means to ends, (2) hierarchies, (3) prescribed and limited discretion, (4) specialization of skill and function, and (5) separation of ownership.¹³⁵

According to Blau, bureaucracy was a "type of organization designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals."¹³⁶ Basic characteristics of bureaucratic organizations were specialization, a hierarchy of authority, a system of rules, and impersonality. As the result of studies of actual conduct in organizations as contrasted with formal expectations, Blau reconceived bureaucracy in terms of its purpose. He, then, defined bureaucracy "as organization that maximizes efficiency in administration, whatever its formal characteristics, or as an institutionalized method of organizing social conduct in the interest of administrative efficiency."¹³⁷

Morstein Marx used the definition of bureaucracy as applied to organizational structure. It referred to a type of structure manned by trained personnel who were grouped in specific command relationships.

Included as unmistakable characteristics of this type of organization were hierarchy, jurisdiction, specialization, professional training, fixed compensation, and permanence. Hierarchy was the most important since it signified the scheme of interlocking superior-subordinate relationships.¹³⁸

Five characteristics of a bureaucracy developed by Presthus were:

1. Fixed and official jurisdictional areas, regularly ordered by rules, policies, regulations, and by-laws.
2. Principles of hierarchy and levels of graded authority that ensure a firmly ordered system of super- and subordination in which those in higher offices supervise those in lower ones.
3. Administration based upon written documents.
4. Administration run by full-time, trained officials.
5. Administration planned according to stable and comprehensive general policies.¹³⁹

Carl Friedrich identified six primary criteria of bureaucracies throughout the Western world as: (1) the differentiation of functions; (2) qualification for office; (3) centralization and intergration of control and supervision; (4) objectivity; (5) precision and consistency or continuity; and (6) discretion. The first three of these aspects were organizational, and the latter three were behavioral.¹⁴⁰

Dimock assumed that certain elements of bureaucracy were necessary for administrative efficiency and vitality.¹⁴¹ Bureaucracy was the ordering of institutional management to secure the advantages of the system. Bureaucracy as form of organization exhibited the characteristics of hierarchy and authority, specialization and professionalization,

rules and fixed procedures. Impersonality was not viewed by Dimock as being indispensable for efficiency.¹⁴²

Katz and Danet, as sociologists, viewed bureaucracy as goal-oriented organizations based on a clearly defined division of labor whereby each job in the organizational chart was spelled out in detail. The chain of command was carefully specified. People were assigned jobs on the basis of their objective qualifications to fulfill them. Individuals were expected to feel loyal to the organization and to be motivated to advance through the ranks.¹⁴³

Pugh, Hickson, Hinings and Turner developed six primary dimensions of organizational structure from the review of literature. Specialization was concerned with the division of labor within the organization, the distribution of official duties among a number of positions. A basic aspect of organizational structure, standardization of procedures, meant an event that had regularity of occurrence, was legitimized by the organization, and there were rules or definitions that covered all circumstance and were applied invariably. Formalization denoted the extent to which rules, procedures, instructions, and communications were written. Centralization had to do with the locus of authority to make decisions affecting the organization. Configuration was the shape of the role structure. Traditionalism was the extent to which an organization was standardized by customs or by rules.¹⁴⁴

Advantages of Bureaucracy

An advantage of bureaucracy, stated by Weber, was the optimum possibility for carrying through the principle of specializing

administrative functions according to purely objective considerations. Individual performances were allocated to functionaries who had specialized training and who by constant practice learned more and more. The "objective" discharge of business primarily meant a discharge of business according to calculable rules and "without regard for persons."¹⁴⁵

Precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and material and personal costs were raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic administration according to Weber.¹⁴⁶ When compared to collegiate, honorific, and avocational forms of administration, bureaucracy was superior on all these points. Bureaucratic work was more precise and cheaper than honorific services as far as complicated tasks were conceived.

Mornstein Marx stressed the advantage of hierarchy. Through the scheme of interlocking relationships organizations were held together and acted as a single, cohesive body. Responsibility for direction from the top was not overextended since ever order was reinforced by the way it secured attention on successively lower levels of control. Confusion was reduced since each person within the organization knew precisely from whom he got orders and to whom he was to pass them.¹⁴⁷

Anderson found that bureaucratic rules appeared to mediate authority conflict, making the imposition of hierarchical authority more tolerable to professionals. By structuring relationships between superiors and subordinates and community to professionals what was expected of them, rules impersonalized the exercise of authority and

reduced anxiety among members of the organization. Rules were particularly necessary in education due to the lack of accepted performance measures, the difficulty in effectively supervising instruction, and the varying degrees of professional competence among teachers.¹⁴⁸

Four advantages, stated by Owens, were:

1. Bureaucracy is efficient. It provides administrative services to large members of clients systematically and uniformly. The staff--consisting of trained specialists--proceeds with little lost time and motion.

2. Bureaucracy is predictable. Rules are written and explicit. The hierarchical status of roles and their authority are clear.

3. Bureaucracy is impersonal. Rules and procedures are applied on the basis of predetermined criteria, and hence, in an unbiased and fair way.

4. Bureaucracy is fast. Uniform rules are impartially applied to process thousands of cases quickly. Specialists collaborate on important problems to solve them without delay.¹⁴⁹

Charles Perrow stated:

After fifteen years of studying complex organizations, I have come to two conclusions that run counter to much of the organizational literature. The first is that the sins generally attributed to bureaucracy are either not sins at all or are consequences of the failure to bureaucratize sufficiently. In this respect, I will defend bureaucracy as the dominant principle of organization in our large, complex organizations. The second conclusion I have reached is that the extensive preoccupation with reforming, "humanizing", and decentralizing bureaucracies, while salutary, has served to obscure from organizational theorists the true nature of bureaucracy and has diverted us from assessing its impact upon society. The impact upon society in general is incalculably more important than the impact upon the members of a particular organization.¹⁵⁰

The best thing about bureaucracy, according to Dimock, was orderly analysis leading to orderly procedure. Emphasis of logic, uniformity, and symmetry created balance. Order was based on rational arrangements, priorities, logical distributions of functions, and clear categories.¹⁵¹

Disadvantages of Bureaucracy

Max Weber condemned the apparatus he helped to immortalize. Although he felt that bureaucracy was inescapable, he also thought it would strangle the spirit of capitalism. In a debate on bureaucracy, he said:

It is horrible to think that the world could one day be filled with nothing but those little cogs, little men clinging to little jobs and striving towards bigger ones--a state of affairs which is to be seen once more, as in the Egyptian records, playing an ever-increasing part in the spirit of our present administrative system, and especially of its offspring, the students. This passion for bureaucracy . . . is enough to drive one to despair. It is as if in politics . . . we were deliberately to become men who need "order" and nothing but order, who become nervous and cowardly if for one moment this order wavers, and helpless if they are torn away from their total incorporation in it. That the world should know no men but these: it is such an evolution that we are already caught up in, and the great question is therefore not how we can promote and hasten it, but what can be oppose to this machinery in order to keep a portion of mankind free from this parcelling-out of the soul from this supreme mastery of the bureaucratic way of life.¹⁵²

The conventional criticisms of bureaucracy fell into two categories according to Perrow. First, they were said to be inflexible, inefficient, and, in a time of rapid change, uncreative and unresponsive. Bureaucracies which stifled the spontaneity, freedom, and self-realization of their employees was the second criticism.¹⁵³

Some of the more serious faults of bureaucracy stated by Owens were:

1. Bureaucracy encourages overconformity, including "group think."
2. In time, bureaucracy modifies the very personality of bureaucrats such that they become the drab, colorless, routinized "organization men."
3. Innovative ideas wilt from the distortion and long delays which result from communications overloading as attempts are made to transmit ideas through the hierarchical layers of the organization.
4. Bureaucracy does not take into account the presence of informal organizations, including the primary groups to which role-incumbents belong.¹⁵⁴

Arnstine, commenting on bureaucracy and freedom in schools stated that the bureaucratic form of organization was inappropriate since educational aims were not stated in clear and precise behavioral terms. Another limitation of bureaucracy was that it limited the freedom of school personnel, parents, and pupils. The hierarchy of control had the effect of creating increased amounts of apathy, passivity, and ineffectiveness. The social disintegration and alienation of teachers and pupils in bureaucratically organized schools was another disadvantage.¹⁵⁵

According to Cody, supervision, process mechanisms, and bureaucratic rules were valuable and necessary ways of ensuring that school organizations and their staff members were accountable to their clients. However, none of them was sufficient, and each was accompanied

by constraints on the teachers that prevented them from doing an effective job. Existing bureaucratic systems were in conflict with the procedural autonomy and flexibility needed by teachers to meet the varied needs of students.¹⁵⁶

Bureaucracy was criticized for its theoretical confusions and contradictions, for moral and ethical reasons, on practical grounds such as its inefficiency, for its methodological weaknesses, and for containing too many implicit values or for containing too few. Bennis stated the following criticisms of bureaucracy:

1. Bureaucracy does not adequately allow for personal growth and the development of mature personalities.
2. It develops conformity and "group think."
3. It does not take into account the "informal organization" and the emergent and anticipated problems.
4. Its systems of control and authority are hopelessly outdated.
5. It has no adequate juridical process.
6. It does not possess adequate means for resolving differences and conflicts among ranks and, most particularly, among functional groups.
7. Communication (and innovative ideas) are thwarted or distorted because of hierarchical divisions.
8. The full human resources of bureaucracy are not being utilized because of mistrust, fear of reprisals, etc.
9. It cannot assimilate the influx of new technology or scientists entering the organization.

10. It will modify the personality structure such that man will become and reflect the dull, gray, conditioned "organizational man."¹⁵⁷

Dysfunctions of Bureaucracy

Without denying Weber's essential proposition that bureaucracies were more efficient (with respect to the goals of the formal hierarchy) than were alternative forms of organization, important dysfunctional consequences of bureaucratic organization were suggested by Merton, Selznick, and Gouldner. They hypothesized that the unintended consequences of treating individuals as machines actually encouraged a continued use of the "machine" model.¹⁵⁸

The general structure of the systems of all three writers was remarkably similar. Some form of organization or organizational procedure designed to control the activities of the organizational members was used as the basic independent variable. The procedures were based primarily on what had been called the "machine" model of human behavior. Anticipated consequences by organizational leaders and unanticipated consequences were shown to occur. These unanticipated consequences reinforced the tendency to use the control device.¹⁵⁹

Merton described organizational and client reaction to an emphasis on reliability of behavior. The intended results of reliability through rules was uniform and programmed decision making. There was a decrease in the search for alternatives to problems and a more rigid behavior on the part of the supervisors. The supervisor was provided with a potent weapon which permitted escape from accountability for his actions. The unanticipated consequences of the reliability emphasis

were described as (1) increased visibility of power and authority which supervisors had by virtue of position; (2) increased levels of dissatisfaction and frustration by clients; (3) resistance, complaints, militancy and conspiracy by clients resulted from this dissatisfaction and frustration; (4) a felt need by supervisors for more protection from client hostility; which (5) resulted in an increase in control.¹⁶⁰

Gouldner's model portrayed the inherent dangers in relying on universal-general-impersonal rules. It suggested that as supervisors attempted to decrease power visibility and interpersonal tension, in order to obtain satisfaction and compliance in teachers, through the use of general rules, opposite results were obtained. To regulate the behavior of a few through the use of rules which apply to all, minimum organizational expectations were announced and legitimized. Any reduction in performance received an organization response in the form of close supervision. Increased power visibility and interpersonal tension increased with close supervision. This tended to decrease the legitimacy of supervision and decrease satisfaction.¹⁶¹

Selznick emphasized the delegation of authority. An increase in delegation of authority resulted from the demand for control made by the top hierarchy. The amount of training in specialized competencies was increased. Bifurcation of interests was also stimulated by the specialized training that delegation produced. Bifurcation within the organization resulted in an increased conflict among organizational subunits. As a consequence, the content of decisions made within the organization depended increasingly upon considerations of internal

strategy. The increase in the difference between organizational goals and achievement resulted in an increase in delegation.¹⁶²

This effect on daily decisions was accentuated by two other mechanisms in Selznick's system. With each subunit seeking success by fitting its policy into the official doctrine of the large organization, internalization of subgoals by participants increased.

The necessity for making decisions depended primarily on the operational criteria of the organization. Precedents tended to become habitual responses to the situations. Operationality of organizational goals was the extent to which it was possible to observe and test how well the goals were being achieved.¹⁶³

Summary

The literature indicated that the concept of bureaucracy, as proposed by Weber, has been accepted by most writers. The major dimensions of bureaucracy were hierarchy of authority, division of labor, technical competence, rules, procedural specifications, and impersonality. Some authors proposed the idea that Weber had not fully dealt with the human element.

Major advantages of bureaucracy as revealed in the literature were efficiency, predictability, impersonality, and speed. Efficiency stemmed from the highly rational nature in which officials functioned on the basis of technical knowledge. Factual, objective standards of judgment and of performance were used by superiors.

Bureaucracy was criticized for its theoretical confusions and contradictions. Bureaucracies were said to be inefficient and inflexible. Modification of the personality and overconformity were also

disadvantages. Another problem caused by bureaucracy was the lack of attention given to the informal organization.

Merton, Selznick, and Goulder showed how that certain procedures of bureaucracy caused dysfunction. Although the authors used the basic model of bureaucracy, they showed how that the model produced both anticipated consequences and unanticipated consequences. Resulting from the unanticipated consequences was more reliance upon the "machine" model.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I. INTRODUCTION

Data analyzed in this chapter were collected by use of the questionnaires, School Organizational Inventory and Instructional Supervisory Support Services Questionnaire. To elicit information from the teachers of the five school districts regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy, the School Organizational Inventory was used. The Instructional Supervisory Support Services Questionnaire was used to elicit information from the teachers of the five school districts regarding the provision of support services by the instructional supervisor. Services of The University of Tennessee Computer Center were utilized to keypunch the data on cards. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (S.P.S.S.), subprogram ONEWAY, was utilized for the analysis of variance. Data were presented in tabular form and organized to answer the questions posed in the purpose of this study as follows:

1. For each school district was there a significant difference between the perceptions held by the teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

2. Among the school districts was there a significant difference in the perceptions held by the teachers who "usually receive

instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

3. Among the school districts was there a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

4. Was there a significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

Table I shows the number and percent of returned and usable responses of the teachers in the five school districts. Questionnaires were mailed to 350 teachers of which 14 were sent to District A, 33 were sent to District B, 157 were sent to District C, 14 were sent to District D, and 132 were sent to District E. The number returned from District A was 14 (100 percent), from District B was 30 (91 percent), from District C was 87 (55 percent), from District D was 14 (100 percent), and from District E was 80 (61 percent) for a total number returned of 225 or 64 percent. The total number of responses deleted was nine of which two were from District B, four from District C, and three were from District E. Fourteen returns (100 percent) were usable from both District A and District D. Eighty-five percent or 28 usable returns were received from District B. Usable returns from District C were 83 or 53 percent. Fifty-eight percent or 77 returns were usable from District E. Total usable returns were 216 or 62 percent.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENT RETURNED AND USABLE OF RESPONSES OF
TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS FROM THE SAMPLE SIZES
FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

	SAMPLE SIZE	NUMBER RETURNED	PERCENT RETURNED	NUMBER DELETED	NUMBER USABLE	PERCENT USABLE
District A	14	14	100	0	14	100
District B	33	30	91	2*	28	85
District C	157	87	55	4*	83	53
District D	14	14	100	0	14	100
District E	132	80	61	3*	77	58
T O T A L	350	225	64	9*	216	62

*Did not follow instructions on the questionnaires.

- II. FOR EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT WAS THERE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS HELD BY TEACHERS WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING THE SIX DIMENSIONS OF BUREAUCRACY?

District A

Table II shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between the teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and the teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority in District A. The sum of squares was 0.1501 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 206.7083, and the mean squares was 17.2257 with 12 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 206.8584 with 13 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.009, which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table III reports the results of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor in District A. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 0.7224, and the mean squares was 0.7224 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within groups was 44.2083, and the mean squares was 3.6840 with 12 degrees of freedom. With 13 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 44.9307. The "F" ratio was 0.196 which was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE II

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY
 IN DISTRICT A
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.1501	0.1501	1	0.009
Within groups	206.7083	17.2257	12	
T O T A L	206.8584		13	

TABLE III

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 DIVISION OF LABOR
 IN DISTRICT A
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.7224	0.7224	1	0.196
Within groups	44.2083	3.6840	12	
T O T A L	44.9307		13	

Table IV contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules in District A. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 0.0088, and the mean squares was 0.0088. The sum of squares for the within groups was 109.2083, and the mean squares was 9.1007 with 12 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 109.2171 with 13 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.001, which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table V shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications in District A. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 2.6250, and the mean squares was 2.6250. The sum of squares for the within groups was 147.3750, and the mean squares was 12.2812 with 12 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 150.0000 with 13 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.214, which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table VI contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and

TABLE IV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PRESENCE OF RULES
 IN DISTRICT A
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.0088	0.0088	1	0.001
Within groups	109.2083	9.1007	12	
T O T A L	109.2171		13	

TABLE V

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PROCEDURAL SPECIFICATIONS
 IN DISTRICT A
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	2.6250	2.6250	1	0.214
Within groups	147.3750	12.2812	12	
T O T A L	150.0000		13	

TABLE VI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 IMPERSONALITY
 IN DISTRICT A
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.0567	0.0567	1	0.011
Within groups	62.8750	5.2396	12	
T O T A L	62.9317		13	

teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality in District A. The sum of squares of the between groups was 0.0567, and the mean squares was 0.0567 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 62.8750, and the mean squares was 5.2396 with 12 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 62.9317 with 13 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.011, which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table VII reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence in District A. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 6.4839, and the mean squares was 6.4839 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within groups was 70.3750, and the mean squares was 5.8646 with 12 degrees of freedom. With 13 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 76.8589. The "F" ratio was 1.106, which was not significant at the .05 level.

Tables II-VII, pages 74-81, compared the perceptions of the two groups of teachers in District A regarding their perceptions of the six dimensions of bureaucracy. In District A, a small city school district, the teacher's perceptions of the six dimensions were similar irregardless of their perceptions of the provision of instructional supervisory support services. Teachers especially seemed to perceive hierarchy of authority, presence of rules, and impersonality with

TABLE VII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 TECHNICAL COMPETENCE
 IN DISTRICT A
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	6.4839	6.4839	1	1.106
Within groups	70.3750	5.8646	12	
T O T A L	76.8589		13	

only minor differences. However, the two groups differed, although not significantly, in their perceptions of technical competence.

District B

Table VIII contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority in District B. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 36.5758, and the mean squares was 36.5758. The sum of squares for the within groups was 601.2850, and the mean squares was 23.1263 with 26 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 637.8608 with 27 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 1.582 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table IX shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor in District B. The sum of squares for the between groups was 4.3214, and the mean squares was 4.3214 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 158.6427, and the mean squares was 6.1016 with 26 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 162.9641 with 27 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.708, which was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE VIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY
 IN DISTRICT B
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	36.5758	36.5758	1	1.582
Within groups	601.2850	23.1263	26	
T O T A L	637.8608		27	

TABLE IX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 DIVISION OF LABOR
 IN DISTRICT B
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	4.3214	4.3214	1	0.708
Within groups	158.6427	6.1016	26	
T O T A L	162.9641		27	

Table X reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules in District B. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 17.2808, and the mean squares was 17.2808 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within groups was 280.7142, and the mean squares was 10.7967 with 26 degrees of freedom. With 27 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 297.9950. The "F" ratio of 1.601 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XI shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teacher who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications in District B. The sum of squares for the between groups was 6.0401, and the mean squares was 6.0401 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 364.6427, and the mean squares was 14.0247 with 26 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 370.6828 with 27 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.431 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XII contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality in District B. With 1

TABLE X

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PRESENCE OF RULES
 IN DISTRICT B
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	17.2808	17.2808	1	1.601
Within groups	280.7142	10.7967	26	
T O T A L	297.9950		27	

TABLE XI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PROCEDURAL SPECIFICATIONS
 IN DISTRICT B
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	6.0401	6.0401	1	0.431
Within groups	364.6427	14.0247	26	
T O T A L	370.6828		27	

TABLE XII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 IMPERSONALITY
 IN DISTRICT B
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	12.8929	12.8929	1	1.865
Within groups	179.7856	6.9148	26	
T O T A L	192.6785		27	

degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 12.8929, and the mean squares was 12.8929. The sum of squares for the within groups was 179.7856, and the mean squares was 6.9148 with 26 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 192.6785 with 27 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 1.865, which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XIII reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence in District B. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 22.3213, and the mean squares was 22.3213 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within groups was 198.6427, and the mean squares was 7.6401 with 26 degrees of freedom. With 27 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 220.9640. The "F" ratio of 2.922 was not significant at the .05 level.

Presented in Tables VIII-XIII, pages 83-90, was the comparison of the perceptions of the two groups of teachers in District B. Teachers in District B, a medium-sized city school district, seemed to have a definite hierarchy as evidenced by the results in Table VIII, page 83. The importance of the competence of the personnel was shown in Table XIII, page 90. Although the school district was not very large, some degree of impersonality existed. Of special interest was the low "F" ratio for division of labor and procedural specifications, since there seemed to be a very distinct hierarchy of authority.

TABLE XIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 TECHNICAL COMPETENCE
 IN DISTRICT B
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	22.3213	22.3213	1	2.922
Within groups	198.6427	7.6401	26	
T O T A L	220.9640		27	

District C

Table XIV shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority in District C. The sum of squares for the between groups was 29.1295, and the mean squares was 29.1295 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 1247.1387, and the mean squares was 15.3968 with 81 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 1276.2682 with 82 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 1.892 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XV contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor in District C. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 15.5912, and the mean squares was 15.5912. The sum of squares for the within groups was 466.3554, and the mean squares was 5.7578 with 81 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 481.9466 with 82 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 2.708 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XVI reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and

TABLE XIV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY
 IN DISTRICT C
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	29.1295	29.1295	1	1.892
Within groups	1247.1387	15.3968	81	
T O T A L	1276.2682		82	

TABLE XV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 DIVISION OF LABOR
 IN DISTRICT C
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	15.5912	15.5912	1	2.708
Within groups	466.3554	5.7578	81	
T O T A L	481.9466		82	

TABLE XVI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PRESENCE OF RULES
 IN DISTRICT C
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	17.4440	17.4440	1	1.424
Within groups	992.3589	12.2513	81	
T O T A L	1009.8029		82	

teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules in District C. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 17.4440, and the mean squares was 17.4440 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within groups was 992.3589, and the mean squares was 12.2513 with 81 degrees of freedom. With 82 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 1009.8029. The "F" ratio was 1.424 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XVII shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications in District C. The sum of squares of the between groups was 9.8679, and the mean squares was 9.8679 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 604.0192, and the mean squares was 7.4570 with 81 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 613.8871 with 82 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 1.323 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XVIII reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality in District C. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 6.2760, and the mean squares was 6.2760 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within

TABLE XVII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PROCEDURAL SPECIFICATIONS
 IN DISTRICT C
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	9.8679	9.8679	1	1.323
Within groups	604.0192	7.4570	81	
T O T A L	613.8871		82	

TABLE XVIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 IMPERSONALITY
 IN DISTRICT C
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	6.2760	6.2760	1	0.851
Within groups	597.2546	7.3735	81	
T O T A L	603.5306		82	

groups was 597.2546, and the mean squares was 7.3735 with 81 degrees of freedom. With 82 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 603.5306. The "F" ratio of 0.851 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XIX contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence in District C. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 9.0632, and the mean squares was 9.0632. The sum of squares for the within groups was 615.1785, and the mean squares was 7.5948 with 81 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 624.2417 with 82 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 1.193 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Comparison of the perceptions of the two groups of teachers in District C were presented in Tables XIV-XIX, pages 92-99. The differences in the perceptions of the teachers were more great for District C, a large city school district. The teachers' perceptions of hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, and technical competence were greater than the other city districts. Although a very large district, the teachers' perceptions of impersonality was not very important.

District D

Table XX shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually

TABLE XIX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 TECHNICAL COMPETENCE
 IN DISTRICT C
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	9.0632	9.0632	1	1.193
Within groups	615.1785	7.5948	81	
T O T A L	624.2417		82	

TABLE XX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY
 IN DISTRICT D
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	4.5714	4.5714	1	1.272
Within groups	43.1428	3.5952	12	
T O T A L	47.7142		13	

receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority in District D. The sum of squares of the between groups was 4.5714, and the mean squares was 4.5714 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 43.1428, and the mean squares was 3.5952 with 12 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 47.7142 with 13 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 1.272 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXI reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor in District D. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 23.1446, and the mean squares was 23.1446 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within groups was 45.7142, and the mean squares was 3.8095 with 12 degrees of freedom. With 13 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 68.8588. The "F" ratio of 6.075 was significant at the .05 level.

Table XXII contains the results of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules in District D. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 4.5691, and the mean squares was 4.5691. The sum of squares for

TABLE XXI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 DIVISION OF LABOR
 IN DISTRICT D
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	23.1446	23.1446	1	6.075*
Within groups	45.7142	3.8095	12	
T O T A L	68.8588		13	

*Significant at the .05 Level.

TABLE XXII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PRESENCE OF RULES
 IN DISTRICT D
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	4.5691	4.5691	1	0.306
Within groups	179.4285	14.9524	12	
T O T A L	183.9976		13	

the within groups was 179.4285, and the mean squares was 14.9524 with 12 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 183.9976 with 13 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.306 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXIII shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications in District D. The sum of squares for the between groups was 0.6407, and the mean squares was 0.6407 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 90.2857, and the mean squares was 7.5238 with 12 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 90.9264 with 13 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 0.085 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXIV contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality in District D. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 0.0714, and the mean squares was 0.0714. The sum of squares for the within groups was 64.2857, and the mean squares was 5.3571 with 12 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 64.3571 with 13 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.013 which was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PROCEDURAL SPECIFICATIONS
 IN DISTRICT D
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.6407	0.6407	1	0.085
Within groups	90.2857	7.5238	12	
T O T A L	90.9264		13	

TABLE XXIV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 IMPERSONALITY
 IN DISTRICT D
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.0714	0.0714	1	0.013
Within groups	64.2857	5.3571	12	
T O T A L	64.3571		13	

Table XXV reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence in District D. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 0.6428, and the mean squares was 0.6428 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within groups was 95.7142, and the mean squares was 7.9762 with 12 degrees of freedom. With 13 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 96.3570. The "F" ratio was 0.081 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Tables XX-XXV, pages 100-108, showed the comparison of the perceptions of the teachers in District D, a rural school district. Teachers in this school district felt that a well defined division of labor existed in the district. Although not as pronounced was the evidence that a hierarchy of authority existed within the school district. Everyone seemed to be treated the same as evidenced by the results shown in Table XXIV, page 106.

District E

Table XXVI shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority in District E. The sum of squares for the between groups was 6.6379, and the mean

TABLE XXV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 TECHNICAL COMPETENCE
 IN DISTRICT D
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.6428	0.6428	1	0.081
Within groups	95.7142	7.9762	12	
T O T A L	96.3570		13	

TABLE XXVI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY
 IN DISTRICT E
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	6.6379	6.6379	1	0.463
Within groups	1075.4253	14.3390	75	
T O T A L	1082.0632		76	

squares was 6.6379 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 1075.4253, and the mean squares was 14.3390 with 75 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 1082.0632 with 76 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.463 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXVII reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor in District E. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares was 3.7124, and the mean squares was 3.7124 for the between groups. The sum of squares for the within groups was 380.6494, and the mean squares was 5.0753 with 75 degrees of freedom. With 76 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 384.3618. The "F" ratio was 0.731 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXVIII contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules in District E. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 6.3154, and the mean squares was 6.3154. The sum of squares for the within groups was 671.6443, and the mean squares was 8.9553 with 75 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 677.9597 with 76 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.705 which was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXVII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING

DIVISION OF LABOR
 IN DISTRICT E
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	3.7124	3.7124	1	0.731
Within groups	380.6494	5.0753	75	
T O T A L	384.3618		76	

TABLE XXVIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PRESENCE OF RULES
 IN DISTRICT E
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	6.3154	6.3154	1	0.705
Within groups	671.6443	8.9553	75	
T O T A L	677.9597		76	

Table XXIX shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications in District E. Between groups the sum of squares was 9.3478, and the mean squares was 9.3478 with 1 degree of freedom. The sum of squares for within groups was 573.4529, and the mean squares was 7.6460 with 75 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 582.8007 with 76 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 1.223 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXX reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality in District E. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 0.1938, and the mean squares was 0.1938. The sum of squares for the within groups was 365.2647 which resulted in a mean squares of 4.8702 with 75 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 365.4585 with 76 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.040, which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXXI contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory

TABLE XXIX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PROCEDURAL SPECIFICATIONS
 IN DISTRICT E
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	9.3478	9.3478	1	1.223
Within groups	573.4529	7.6460	75	
T O T A L	582.8007		76	

TABLE XXX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 IMPERSONALITY
 IN DISTRICT E
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.1938	0.1938	1	0.040
Within groups	365.2647	4.8702	75	
T O T A L	365.4585		76	

TABLE XXXI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO
 "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT
 SERVICES" AND TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 TECHNICAL COMPETENCE
 IN DISTRICT E
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	17.4247	17.4247	1	2.481
Within groups	526.6542	7.0221	75	
T O T A L	544.0789		76	

support services" regarding technical competence in District E. The sum of squares of the between groups was 17.4247, and the mean squares was 17.4247 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 526.6542, and the mean squares was 7.0221 with 75 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 544.0789 with 76 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 2.481 which was not significant at the .05 level.

The results of the comparison of the perceptions of the two groups of teachers in District E, an urban-suburban school district, were shown in Tables XXVI-XXXI, pages 109-116. Although District E was about the same size as District C, the comparison of the two groups yielded different and contrasting views. Regardless of the teacher's perceptions of the provision of support services, the two groups seemed to have the same perception of hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, and impersonality. A strong difference of opinion regarding procedural specifications and technical competence was revealed in Table XXIX, page 114, and Table XXXI, page 116.

III. AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS, WAS THERE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE PERCEPTIONS HELD BY TEACHERS WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING THE SIX DIMENSIONS OF BUREAUCRACY?

Table XXXII contains the results of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among districts of the teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority. With 4 degrees of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 163.7604, and the mean

TABLE XXXII

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	163.7604	40.9401	4	3.410*
Within groups	1212.6883	12.0068	101	
T O T A L	1376.4487		105	

*Significant at the .05 Level.

squares was 40.9401. The sum of squares of the within groups was 1212.6883, and the mean squares was 12.0068 with 101 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 1376.4487 with 105 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 3.410 was significant at the .05 level. The Scheffe tested showed that District B was significantly different from District C.

Table XXXIII contains the results of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the school districts of teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor. For the between groups, the sum of squares was 10.8366, and the sum of squares was 2.7091 with 4 degrees of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 630.7690, and the mean squares was 6.2452 with 101 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 641.6056 with 105 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 0.434 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXXIV shows the results of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the school districts of teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules. The sum of squares for the between groups was 5.8787 resulting in a mean squares of 1.4697 with 4 degrees of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 987.8563, and the mean squares was 9.7808 with 101 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 993.7350 with 105 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 0.150 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXXV reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the districts of

TABLE XXXIII

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 DIVISION OF LABOR
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	10.8366	2.7091	4	0.434
Within groups	630.7690	6.2452	101	
T O T A L	641.6056		105	

TABLE XXXIV

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PRESENCE OF RULES
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	5.8787	1.4697	4	0.150
Within groups	987.8563	9.7808	101	
T O T A L	993.7350		105	

TABLE XXXV

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PROCEDURAL SPECIFICATIONS
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	32.8125	8.2031	4	0.893
Within groups	927.4674	9.1828	101	
T O T A L	960.2799		105	

teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications. The sum of squares of between groups was 32.8125 which resulted in a mean squares of 8.2031 with 4 degrees of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 927.4674, and the mean squares was 9.1828 with 101 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 960.2799 with 105 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.893 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXXVI contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the school districts of teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality. The sum of squares for the between groups was 103.2101 which resulted in a mean squares of 25.8025 with 4 degrees of freedom. The sum of squares for the within groups was 606.9063, and the mean squares was 6.0090 with 101 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 710.1164 with 105 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 4.294 which was significant at the .05 level. The Scheffe test showed that District B was significantly different from District C and District D.

Table XXXVII shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the districts of teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence. Between groups, the sum of squares was 131.9862, and the mean squares was 32.9966 with 4 degrees of freedom. With 101 degrees of freedom, the sum of squares

TABLE XXXVI

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 IMPERSONALITY
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	103.2101	25.8025	4	4.294*
Within groups	606.9063	6.0090	101	
T O T A L	710.1164		105	

*Significant at the .05 Level.

TABLE XXXVII

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 TECHNICAL COMPETENCE
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	131.9862	32.9966	4	5.221*
Within groups	638.3535	6.3203	101	
T O T A L	770.3397		105	

*Significant at the .05 Level.

for the within groups was 638.3535, and the mean squares was 6.3203. The total sum of squares was 770.3397 with 105 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 5.221 was significant at the .05 level. The Scheffe test showed that District C and District D were significantly different from District B.

Tables XXXII-XXXVII, pages 118-125, presented the comparison of teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services." Teachers of the medium-sized city school district were more aware of the hierarchy than teachers in the large city school district. Impersonality existed to a greater degree in the medium-sized city school district than in the large city school district or the rural school district. Teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" in District C and D perceived personnel of their school districts to be more competent than did the teachers of District B.

IV. AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS, WAS THERE A
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE
PERCEPTIONS HELD BY TEACHERS
WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY
SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
THE SIX DIMENSIONS OF
BUREAUCRACY?

Table XXXVIII reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the districts of teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority. The sum of squares of between groups was 92.2715 which resulted in a mean squares of

TABLE XXXVIII

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	92.2715	23.0679	4	1.235
Within groups	1961.0117	18.6763	105	
T O T A L	2053.2832		109	

23.0679 with 4 degrees of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 1961.0117 and the mean squares was 18.6763 with 105 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 2053.2832 with 109 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 1.235 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XXXIX contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among school districts of teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor. The sum of squares for the between groups was 93.0146 which resulted in a mean squares of 23.2536 with 4 degrees of freedom. The sum of squares for the within groups was 464.8011, and the mean squares was 4.4267 with 105 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 557.8157 with 109 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 5.253 which was significant at the .05 level. The Scheffe tested showed that District D was significantly different from District B, District C, and District E.

Table XL shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the districts of teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules. Between groups, the sum of squares was 93.2501, and the mean squares was 23.3125 with 4 degrees of freedom. With 105 degrees of freedom, the sum of squares for the within groups was 1245.4978, and the mean squares was 11.8619. The total sum of squares was 1338.7479 with 109 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 1.965 was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXXIX

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 DIVISION OF LABOR
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	93.0146	23.2536	4	5.253*
Within groups	464.8011	4.4267	105	
T O T A L	557.8157		109	

*Significant at the .05 Level.

TABLE XL

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PRESENCE OF RULES
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	93.2501	23.3125	4	1.965
Within groups	1245.4978	11.8619	105	
T O T A L	1338.7479		109	

Table XLI reports the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the districts of teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications. The sum of squares of between groups was 32.6558 which resulted in a mean squares of 8.1639 with 4 degrees of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 852.3080, and the mean squares was 8.1172 with 105 degrees of freedom. With 109 degrees of freedom, the total sum of squares was 884.9638. The "F" ratio of 1.006 was not significant.

Table XLII contains the results of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among school districts of teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality. The sum of squares for the between groups was 30.2139 which resulted in a mean squares of 7.5535 with 4 degrees of freedom. The sum of squares for the within groups was 662.5593, and the mean squares was 6.3101 with 105 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 692.7732 with 109 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 1.197 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XLIII shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores among the districts of teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence. Between groups, the sum of squares was 50.1477, and the mean squares was 12.5369 with 4 degrees of freedom. With 105 degrees of freedom, the sum of squares for the within groups was 868.2111, and the mean squares was 8.2687.

TABLE XLI

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PROCEDURAL SPECIFICATIONS
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	32.6558	8.1639	4	1.006
Within groups	852.3080	8.1172	105	
T O T A L	884.9638		109	

TABLE XLII

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 IMPERSONALITY
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	30.2139	7.5535	4	1.197
Within groups	662.5593	6.3101	105	
T O T A L	692.7732		109	

TABLE XLIII

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
 PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 TECHNICAL COMPETENCE
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	50.1477	12.5369	4	1.516
Within groups	868.2111	8.2687	105	
T O T A L	918.3588		109	

The total sum of squares was 918.3588 with 109 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 1.516 was found and is not significant at the .05 level.

The comparison of the perceptions of teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" was shown in Tables XXXVIII-XLIII, pages 127-134. Teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" seemed to have the same perceptions of five of the six dimensions regardless of the district. A more clearly defined division of labor existed in District D than in District B, District C and District E. Teachers in the rural district were more aware of their jobs and other personnel's jobs than in the urban-suburban school district, the urban school district, or the medium-sized city school district.

V. WAS THERE A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS HELD BY ALL THE TEACHERS IN THE STUDY WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" AND ALL THE TEACHERS IN THE STUDY WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING THE SIX DIMENSIONS OF BUREAUCRACY?

Table XLIV contains the results of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between all the teachers in the study who "receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority. The sum of squares for the between groups was 56.8857 which resulted in a mean squares of 56.8857 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups,

TABLE XLIV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF ALL THE TEACHERS
 IN THE STUDY WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" AND ALL THE
 TEACHERS IN THE STUDY WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITY
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	56.8857	56.8857	1	3.549
Within groups	3429.7153	16.0267	214	
T O T A L	3486.6010		215	

the sum of squares was 3429.7153, and the mean squares was 16.0267 with 214 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 3486.6010 with 215 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 3.549 was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XLV shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor. The sum of squares of the between groups was 11.0137, and the mean squares was 11.0137 with 1 degree of freedom. For the within groups, the sum of squares was 1199.3975, and the mean squares was 5.6047 with 214 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 1210.4112 with 215 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 1.965 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XLVI presents the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules. The sum of squares of the between groups was 0.0102 which resulted in a mean squares of 0.0102 with 1 degree of freedom. The sum of squares of the within groups was 2332.4792, and the mean squares was 10.8994 with 214 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 2332.4894 with 215 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.001 which was not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XLV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF ALL THE TEACHERS
 IN THE STUDY WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" AND ALL THE
 TEACHERS IN THE STUDY WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 DIVISION OF LABOR
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	11.0137	11.0137	1	1.965
Within groups	1199.3975	5.6047	214	
T O T A L	1210.4112		215	

TABLE XLVI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF ALL THE TEACHERS
 IN THE STUDY WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" AND ALL THE
 TEACHERS IN THE STUDY WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PRESENCE OF RULES
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.0102	0.0102	1	0.001
Within groups	2332.4792	10.8994	214	
T O T A L	2332.4894		215	

Table XLVII shows the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications. The sum of squares of the between groups was 26.6802, and the mean squares was 26.6802 with 1 degree of freedom. For the within groups, the sum of squares was 1845.2083, and the mean squares was 8.6225 with 214 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 1871.8885 with 215 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 3.094 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XLVIII contains the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for significant differences in the scores between all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality. With 1 degree of freedom, the sum of squares for the between groups was 0.0916, and the mean squares was 0.0916. The sum of squares for the within groups was 1402.8689 which resulted in a mean squares of 6.5555 with 214 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 1402.9605 with 215 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio was 0.014 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Table XLIX presents the result of a one-way analysis of variance which tested for differences in the scores between all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support

TABLE XLVII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF ALL THE TEACHERS
 IN THE STUDY WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" AND ALL THE
 TEACHERS IN THE STUDY WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 PROCEDURAL SPECIFICATIONS
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	26.6802	26.6802	1	3.094
Within groups	1845.2083	8.6225	214	
T O T A L	1871.8885		215	

TABLE XLVIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF ALL THE TEACHERS
 IN THE STUDY WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
 SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" AND ALL THE
 TEACHERS IN THE STUDY WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
 IMPERSONALITY
 FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	0.0916	0.0916	1	
Within groups	1402.8689	6.5555	214	0.014
T O T A L	1402.9605		215	

TABLE XLIX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF ALL THE TEACHERS
IN THE STUDY WHO "USUALLY RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONAL
SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" AND ALL THE
TEACHERS IN THE STUDY WHO "DID NOT USUALLY RECEIVE
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES" REGARDING
TECHNICAL COMPETENCE
FOR THE 1977-78 SCHOOL YEAR

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F Ratio
Between groups	41.7678	41.7678	1	5.293*
Within groups	1688.6851	7.8911	214	
T O T A L	1730.4529		215	

*Significant at the .05 Level.

services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence. The sum of squares for the between groups was 41.7678, and the mean squares was 41.7678 with 1 degree of freedom. Within groups, the sum of squares was 1688.6851, and the mean squares was 7.8911 with 214 degrees of freedom. The total sum of squares was 1730.4529 with 215 degrees of freedom. The "F" ratio of 5.293 was significant at the .05 level.

Comparison of the perceptions of the two groups of teachers regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy was presented in Tables XLIV-XLIX, pages 136-143. Teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" believed that technical competence was the most important factor as shown in Table XLIX, page 143. Presence of rules was not a factor in the teachers perceptions as evidenced by the low "F" ratio (.001) shown in Table XLVI, page 139.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter was to summarize the present study and to report its findings. Major conclusions reached as a result of the findings were drawn. The final section listed some implications arising from the study.

II. SUMMARY

The dysfunction of the instructional supervisor regarding the provision of instructional supervisory support services within the bureaucratic structure of school systems was the problem studied in this study. School systems have been particularly receptive to the bureaucratic ideology as bureaucratic principles have been incorporated into the organizational practices of the educational enterprise. School systems have designed the bureaucratic structure to make maximum use of specialists, who possess a high level of expertise such as instructional supervisors. Positions have been created on a functional basis and office holders have been recruited to fill them on the basis of their technical competence to do the work required in those positions. However, the present organizational arrangements and practices may have produced serious dysfunctional consequences for the instructional supervisor.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of the bureaucracy of school systems and the provision of instructional supervisory support services as perceived by the teachers in the selected school districts. Two groups of teachers for each school district were formed by using the median score of the teachers' perceptions of the provision of instructional supervisory support services. Accordingly, the study compared the perceptions of teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the following dimensions of bureaucracy: hierarchy of authority, division of labor, impersonality, presence of rules, procedural specifications, and technical competence.

The study answered the following questions:

1. For each school district was there a significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

2. Among the school districts was there a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

3. Among the school districts was there a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive

instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

4. Was there a significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

Procedures

The process of gathering data for this study was directly related to a review of the literature pertaining to bureaucracy and instructional supervision particularly instructional supervisory support services. The development of certain theories and concepts from current research provided information to formulate questions to meet specific objectives.

For this study two questionnaires (see Appendixes, pages 169-176) were selected as a means of gathering the data. The questionnaires were used since they could provide a cross-section picture and yield current perceptions of teachers in the five school districts relative to bureaucracy and the provision of instructional supervisory support services. Two advantages of the questionnaire method of data collection, economy of time and resources, were instrumental in its selection for this study. Validity of the questionnaires had been established in prior studies.

A systematic sampling technique was used to determine the teachers who were asked to respond to the questionnaires. Each selected

participant was mailed the questionnaires, letter of transmittal, and a return, stamped envelope. A letter, reminding respondents of the questionnaires, was used as a follow-up and was sent to all participants.

Determination of Sample Size

The directory of each school system for 1977-78 was used to get a complete roster of the names and addresses of the teachers in the five selected school districts. According to those publications, 3901 elementary and secondary teachers were employed in the five school systems during the 1977-78 school year.

For determining the sample size, the Chi-square statistic was decided to be a most appropriate procedure. A sample of 350 was determined by applying the formula for χ^2 of 3.841 at the 95 percent confidence level and using the special table developed by Krejcie and Morgan.

Since the population was separated into nonoverlapping groups, proportionate stratified sampling was used to determine the sample size for each school district. The sample sizes for the five school systems were: 14 from District A, 33 from District B, 157 from District C, 14 from District D, and 132 from District E.

Treatment of the Data

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), sub-program ONEWAY, was used to analyze the data. Respondents were grouped according to whether the respondent "usually received instructional supervisory support services" or the respondent "did not

usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and scores on the six dimensions of bureaucracy were obtained for each respondent. Analyses of variance were made of the responses by the two groups of teachers of their perceptions of hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, and technical competence. Significant difference in group responses at the .05 level was noted. The Scheffe test was used for the post hoc analysis.

Analyzing and comparing the processed data revealed the major findings of the study. Areas of agreement and differences in the perceptions of the two groups were noted. Based on the major findings of the study, conclusions were reached. These conclusions permitted implications to be drawn for the improvement of instructional supervisory support services in the schools of the five districts. Also, conclusions were drawn for the improvement of the bureaucratic structure of the school systems.

III. FINDINGS

Findings related to the four questions which pervaded the study are discussed in numerical order.

Question 1

For each school district was there a significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

District A. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory services" regarding hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, and technical competence.

District B. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers "who usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, and technical competence.

District C. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, and technical competence.

District D. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality, and technical competence. There was a significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" (17.5714) and teachers who "did not

usually receive instructional supervisory support services" (15.0000) regarding division of labor.

District E. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority, division of labor, presence of rules, procedural specifications, impersonality and technical competence.

Question 2

Among the school districts was there a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

Hierarchy of authority. Among the school districts there was a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority. District B (18.7857) was significantly different from District C (22.2195).

Division of labor. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor.

Presence of rules. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory services" regarding presence of rules.

Procedural specifications. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications.

Impersonality. Among the school districts there was a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality. District B (16.2143) was significantly different from District C (19.0732) and District D (19.2857).

Technical competence. Among the school districts there was a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence. District C (18.7561) and District D (18.0000) were significantly different from District B (21.8571).

Question 3

Among the school districts was there a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

Hierarchy of authority. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority.

Division of labor. Among the school districts there was a significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually

receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor. District D (15.0000) was significantly different from District B (19.3571), District C (18.4524), and District E (18.3077).

Presence of rules. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules.

Procedural specifications. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications.

Impersonality. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality.

Technical competence. Among the school districts there was no significant difference in the perceptions held by teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence.

Question 4

Was there a significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding the six dimensions of bureaucracy?

Hierarchy of authority. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding hierarchy of authority.

Division of labor. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding division of labor.

Presence of rules. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding presence of rules.

Procedural specifications. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding procedural specifications.

Impersonality. There was no significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding impersonality.

Technical competence. There was a significant difference between the perceptions held by all the teachers in the study who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" and all the teachers in the study who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" regarding technical competence. Teachers who "did not usually receive instructional supervisory support services" (18.8182) differed significantly from teachers who "usually receive instructional supervisory support services" (19.6981).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study present evidence to suggest certain logical conclusions. Based on the survey of the literature and the data of the sample in this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. the bureaucratic structure of each school district as perceived by the teachers was not a contributing factor to the teachers' perception of instructional supervisory support services.
2. the size of the school system was not a factor in the teachers' perceptions of the six dimensions of bureaucracy.

V. IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions drawn from the data in this study have several implications for practitioners in instructional supervision, and for school systems interested in the improvement of instructional supervision in the public schools. There are also implications for further research with respect to bureaucracy and the practice of supervision.

1. Technical competence of the supervisor should be a major factor in the employment of an instructional supervisor.

2. A technical competent supervisor is a major factor in the provision of instructional supervisory support services.

Further research arising from this study were:

1. An in-depth study using more systems of each category should be undertaken.

2. A study should investigate the relationship of other variables such as age of teachers, years of experience, years in system, grade level, and sex to the teachers' perceptions of bureaucracy.

3. A study should investigate the instructional supervisors' perceptions of the six dimensions of bureaucracy.

4. A study should investigate the technical competence of instructional supervisors.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Stanley W. Williams, New Dimensions of Supervision (Scranton, Pennsylvania: Intent Educational Publishers, 1972), p. 3.
2. Arthur Blumberg, "Supervision: What Is and What Might Be." Theory Into Practice, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 284-285.
3. Roald Campbell, "A History of Administrative Thought," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 2.
4. Ben M. Harris, "Altering the Thrust of Supervision Through Creative Leadership," Educational Leadership, Vol. 34, May 1977, p. 567.
5. Leslee J. Bishop and Gerald R. Firth, "New Conceptions of Supervision," Educational Leadership, Vol. 34, May 1977, p. 572.
6. Ben M. Harris and Leonard A. Valverde, "Supervisors and Educational Change," Theory Into Practice, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 270.
7. Thomas J. Sergiovanni, editor. Professional Supervision for Professional Teachers (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975), pp. 1-7.
8. Supervision in Tennessee, (Tennessee Association for Curriculum Development and Supervision, 1976), p. 157.
9. Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 74.
10. Clifford L. Hendrix, Jr., "A Study of Supervisory Practices with Reference to Classroom Observations and Conferences as Perceived by Teachers, Principals and Supervisors in Tennessee," Ed.D. Dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1976, p. 10.
11. Hendrix, p. 11.
12. Hendrix, p. 11
13. Hendrix, p. 12.
14. Hendrix, p. 12.
15. Richard H. Hall, "Professionalizational and Bureaucratization," American Sociological Review, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1968, p. 95.
16. Hall, "Professionalization," p. 95.

17. Hall, "Professionalization," p. 95.
18. Ben M. Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 75.
19. Harris, Supervisory Behavior, p. 12.
20. Deobold B. Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1973), p. 40.
21. Hall, "Professionalization," p. 95.
22. Hall, "Professionalization," p. 95.
23. Harris, Supervisory Behavior, p. 545.
24. Harris, Supervisory Behavior, p. 16.
25. Good, Dictionary of Education, p. 410.
26. Hall, "Professionalization," p. 95.
27. Richard H. Hall, "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relation to Other Organizational Characteristics," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1961.
28. Richard H. Hall, "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 69, No. 1, p. 32.
29. Hall, "Concept of Bureaucracy," p. 35.
30. Hall, "Concept of Bureaucracy," p. 35.
31. Hall, "Concept of Bureaucracy," p. 35.
32. Keith F. Punch, "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools: Towards Redefinition and Measurement," Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 5, No. 2, p. 48.
33. Punch, p. 49.
34. Punch, p. 49.
35. J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, Fourth Edition, 1956), p. 458 cited in Punch, p. 49.
36. James H. Balderson, The Bureaucratization of Teacher Behavior Scale and the Measurement of School Organizational Structure, April, 1977, ED 129841, p. 4.

37. Balderson, p. 5.
38. Balderson, p. 6.
39. Balderson, p. 7.
40. Harris, Supervisory Behavior, pp. 11-12.
41. James Curtin, Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), pp. 10-11.
42. J. Minor Gwynn, Theory and Practice of Supervision (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1961), pp. 27-31.
43. John T. Lovell and Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 170.
44. Carter V. Good, Introduction to Educational Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Publishing Company, 1963), pp. 282.
45. Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Politics, Polls, and School Elections (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971), p. 72.
46. Wayne T. Lee, Experimental Design and Analysis (San Francisco, California: V. H. Freeman and Company, 1975), p. 7.
47. James Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), pp. 7-8.
48. Glen G. Eye, "Supervisory Skills: The Evolution of the Art," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 69 (Summer, 1975) p. 14.
49. William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 4.
50. A. S. Barr, William H. Burton, and Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision Principles and Practices in the Improvement of Instruction (New York: Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1938), p. 6.
51. Glen G. Eye, Tanore A. Netzer, and Robert D. Krey, Supervision of Instruction (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971), p. 24.
52. Fred C. Ayer, Fundamentals of Instructional Supervision (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1954), p. 11.
53. Barr, Burton, and Brueckner, p. 4.

54. Ayer, pp. 9-10.
55. Ayer, p. 25.
56. Alfred A. Arrington, "A Historical Analysis of the Development of Supervision in the Public Schools of the United States from 1870-1970 " (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1972), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 33, No. 6, p. 2628.
57. Eye, "Supervisory Skills," p. 15.
58. Lovell and Wiles, pp. 35-36.
59. Gwynn, p. 25.
60. Gwynn, p. 27.
61. Gwynn, pp. 27-31.
62. Ralph L. Mosher and David Purpel, Supervision The Reluctant Profession (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1972) pp. 63-66.
63. Lucio and McNeil, p. 46.
64. Lucio and McNeil, p. 24.
65. Adolph Unruh and Harold E. Turner, Supervision for Change and Innovation (Boston, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1970), p. 17.
66. Unruh and Turner, p. 26.
67. Mildred E. Swearingen, Supervision of Instruction: Foundations and Dimensions (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1962), p. 1.
68. Swearingen, p. 6.
69. Swearingen, p. 42.
70. Swearingen, p. 150.
71. William T. Melchior, Instructional Supervision: A Guide to Modern Practice (Boston, Mass.: Heath, 1950), p. 6.
72. Marks, Stoops and King-Stoops, pp. 2-17.
73. Peter F. Oliva, Supervision For Today's Schools (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1976), pp. 7-14.

74. Williams, p. 24.
75. Williams, p. 75.
76. Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 3.
77. Harris, Supervisory Behavior, p. 3.
78. Harris, Supervisory Behavior, p. 6.
79. Harris, Supervisory Behavior, pp. 10-11.
80. Harris, Supervisory Behavior, pp. 12-13.
81. Lovell and Wiles, p. 12.
82. Lovell and Wiles, p. 6.
83. Lovell and Wiles, p. 8.
84. Lovell and Wiles, pp. 19-20.
85. Kathryn V. Feyereisen, A. John Fiorino, Arlene T. Nowak, Supervision and Curriculum Renewal: A Systems Approach (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 96.
86. Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak, p. 105.
87. Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak, p. 110.
88. Henry Antell, "Teachers Appraise Supervision," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 38 (April 1945), pp. 606-611.
89. Antell, p. 611.
90. Vernon L. Repley, "What Help do Teachers Want?" Educational Leadership, Vol. 7 (April, 1950), pp. 445-448.
91. Repley, p. 448.
92. Wayne R. Palmer, "A Study of Existing and Desired Supervisory Services in the Indianapolis Public Schools," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1954), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 357-358.
93. Palmer, p. 358.

94. Floyd F. Heil, "A Study of Supervisory Practices at the Elementary Level in County School Districts in Ohio," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1957), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28, No. 4, p. 2039.
95. Martha L. King, "Concepts of the Role of the Supervisor in Ohio County School Districts," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1958), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28, No. 4, p. 2041.
96. Heil, p. 2039.
97. King, p. 2041.
98. William R. Elgin, "Study of Instructional Supervisions in Louisiana's Public Schools," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1959), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 20, No. 1, p. 934.
99. Darwin W. Miller, "Teachers' Appraisals of Selected Supervisory Practices," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 20, No. 7, p. 3157.
100. Miller, p. 3157.
101. Carolyn Guss, "How is Supervision Perceived?", Educational Leadership, Vol. 19, November, 1961, pp. 99-102.
102. Guss, p. 102.
103. Clifford V. Burgess, "A Descriptive Investigation of Instructional Supervision in Alabama," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1962), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 23, No. 9, p. 3184.
104. Matthew H. Hall, "A Study of the Perceptions of Supervisory Program in the Mobile (Alabama) Public Schools," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1962), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 23, No. 11, pp. 4186-4187.
105. Daniel W. Puckett, "The Status and Function of the General School Supervision," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 23, No. 7, January 1963, p. 3758.
106. Burgess, p. 3184.
107. Hall, "Perceptions Regarding Supervisory Program," p. 4187.
108. Puckett, p. 2758.

109. Gerald G. Cain, "An Analysis of the Functions of General Elementary School Supervisors in the Public Schools of Missouri," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1964), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 25, No. 9, p. 5671.
110. Michael F. Wallace, "An Investigation of Supervisory Practices in the Waterburg Public Elementary Public Schools," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1964), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 26, No. 1, p. 842.
111. Cain, p. 5671.
112. Wallace, p. 842.
113. James E. Colbert, "A Study of Effective and Ineffective Supervisory Behavior," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 27, No. 7, January 1967, p. 2306.
114. Colbert, p. 2306.
115. Grace S. Ross, "A Description of Activities of North Carolina Supervisors as Self-Reported," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1968), Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 29, No. 7, p. 2449.
116. Ross, p. 2449.
117. Ross, p. 2449.
118. Beatrice D. Carman, "Rules and Responsibilities in General Supervision of Instruction: A Synthesis of Research Findings," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1970), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 31, No. 9, pp. 4406-4407.
119. Cecil G. Carlton, "The Rule of Instructional Supervisions as Perceived by Teachers and Principals in Selected Florida Elementary Schools," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1970), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 31, No. 9, p. 4406.
120. Randolph S. Bradshaw, "A Study of the Role of the Local Level Supervisor of Instruction in Georgia," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1970), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 31, No. 11, p. 5689.
121. Gary Smith, "An Evaluation Study of School Supervisors in Selected Rural School Districts in West Virginia," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, American University, 1971), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 32, No. 3, p. 1243.

122. Smith, p. 1243.
123. Jesse Hutchinson, Jr., "A Study of Science Supervision in the Public High Schools of Louisiana," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1973), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 34, pp. 1565-1566.
124. Hutchinson, p. 4911.
125. Joyce Wolters, "A Descriptive Study of the Instructional Supervisor's Major Tasks in an Open Concept School," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1973), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 1565-1566.
126. Joe W. Maddox, "The Perceptions of Selected Alabama Educators Toward Desirable Behaviors for Instructional Supervisors," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Alabama, 1974), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 35, No. 11, p. 6987.
127. Harris K. Lentini, "Critical Requirements Derived from Frequency Data Reported by Georgia Public School Supervisors of Perceived Effective and Ineffective Behaviors," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, 1974), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 35, No. 8, pp. 4866-4867.
128. Frances Ferguson, "A Study of Practices of Elementary School Supervisors (K-8) in the State of Louisiana as Perceived by Supervisors, Principals, and Teachers," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1976), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 37, No. 6, p. 3292.
129. Ferguson, p. 3292.
130. Robert L. Evans, Jr., "Task Expectations for the Elementary Teachers and Supervisors," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1975), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 36, No. 8, pp. 4901-4902.
131. Caroline Holder, "Task Analysis of Selected Leadership Personnel Responsible for Instructional Supervision and/or Curriculum Development in Local School Systems of Georgia," (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation University of Georgia, 1977), Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 38, No. 8, p. 4546.
132. Holder, p. 4546.
133. Holder, p. 4546.
134. Max Weber, Essays in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 196-204 and The Theory of Social and Economic Organization (Glencoe: Free Press, 1947), pp. 329-336.

135. Morroe Burger, "Bureaucracy East and West," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 518-529.
136. Robert A. Dahl and Charles E. Lindblom, Politics, Economics and Welfare (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1953), pp. 234-236.
137. Peter M. Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society (New York: Random House, Inc., 1956), p. 14.
138. Blau, p. 60.
139. Fritz Morstein Marx, The Administrative State (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 22.
140. Robert Presthus, The Organizational Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962), p. 5.
141. Carl J. Friedrich, Constitutional Government and Democracy (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1975), p. 58.
142. Marshall E. Dimock, Administrative Vitality (New York: Harper Brothers, 1959), p. 265.
143. Dimock, p. 265.
144. Brenda Danet and Eliha Katz, Bureaucracy and the Public (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973), p. 4.
145. D. S. Pugh, D. J. Hickson, C. R. Henings, and C. Turner, Administrative Science Quarterly, April 1959, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 72-81.
146. Oscar Grusky and George Miller, editors, Max Weber, "Bureaucracy, The Sociology of Organizations," (New York: The Free Press, 1970), p. 113.
147. Grusky and Miller, p. 12.
148. Max, p. 22.
149. James C. Anderson, Bureaucracy in Education, (Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins Press, 1968), p. 11.
150. Carl Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 60.
151. Charles Perrow, Complex Organizations (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1972), p. 6.
152. Dimock, p. 265.

153. Reinharadt Bendix, Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960), pp. 455-456.
154. Perrow, p. 6.
155. Owens, p. 57.
156. Donald Arnstine, "Freedom and Bureaucracy in Schools," in Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling, Vernon F. Hauleride, editor, (Washington, D.C.: Association for Curriculum Development and Supervision, 1971), pp. 13-17.
157. Wilmer S. Cody, "The Administrator Looks at His Practice," in Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling, Vernon F. Hauleride, editor, (Washington, D.C.: Association for Curriculum Development and Supervision, 1971), p. 102.
158. Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 6.
159. J. G. March and H. A. Simon, "The Dysfunctions of Bureaucracy," Organization Theory, D. S. Pugh, editor, (New York: Penguin Books, 1971), p. 31.
160. March and Simon, p. 31.
161. March and Simon, pp. 31-35.
162. March and Simon, pp. 37-40.
163. March and Simon, p. 36.
164. March and Simon, pp. 36-37.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS:

READ each item carefully. THINK about how well the statement describes teachers in your school system. DECIDE to what extent the condition is true for teachers in your school system. DRAW a circle around one of the four letters to show your answer.

- A = Very Frequently or Always True
- B = Often True
- C = Seldom True
- D = Very Rarely or Never True

- A B C D 1. Promotions or favorable evaluations are not based on personal preferences of their superiors but on objective evaluations of their teaching capabilities.
- A B C D 2. No matter how special a person's problem appears to be, he/she is treated the same way as anyone else.
- A B C D 3. Discipline problems are referred to a specific person within the school.
- A B C D 4. Are assigned teaching duties without regard for their training or qualifications.
- A B C D 5. Attend staff meetings which proceed in a friendly and informal manner.
- A B C D 6. Do a lot of paper work which could be done by central office staff.
- A B C D 7. Refer even small matters to someone higher up for a final answer.
- A B C D 8. Use the same uniform methods and procedures in their classroom/area work.
- A B C D 9. System has standard punishments for standard offenses, regardless of the individual involved.
- A B C D 10. Little action is taken until decisions are approved.
- A B C D 11. Periodically evaluated for competence in their work area.
- A B C D 12. Work within specific subject areas of a departmentalized instructional program.

- A B C D 13. Do not leave their classes during class periods unless they have permission.
- A B C D 14. Go to the same person for an answer whenever they have a problem with their work.
- A B C D 15. System keeps a record of the staff member's performance.
- A B C D 16. Know nothing will be said to them if they get to school just before class time or leave right after dismissal.
- A B C D 17. Have formal and informal relationships with each other.
- A B C D 18. Cannot get necessary supplies without permission from the principal, vice-principal, or some other designated person.
- A B C D 19. Are supposed to get approval for decisions they make.
- A B C D 20. Strictly follow the rules stating when to arrive or depart the building.
- A B C D 21. Perceive promotions or favorable evaluations based on how well they are liked.
- A B C D 22. Required to sponsor extra-curricular activities for which they have no suitable background.
- A B C D 23. Are strictly regulated in terms of time for informal get-togethers during the school day.
- A B C D 24. Are bothered by "red tape" in getting their work done.
- A B C D 25. Receive help from the custodial staff in setting up audio-visual equipment.
- A B C D 26. Engage in social get-togethers sponsored by the system.
- A B C D 27. Do almost as they please in classroom/work area.
- A B C D 28. Treated within the rules of the system, no matter how serious a problem a teacher may have.
- A B C D 29. Haven't much of a chance for a promotion or favorable evaluation unless they are "in" with the administration.
- A B C D 30. Follow strict operating procedure at all times.
- A B C D 31. Who want to make their own decision quickly become discouraged.

- A B C D 32. Follow a set of rules and regulations.
- A B C D 33. Prepare their own stencils for classroom use.
- A B C D 34. Feel it is important to go through proper channels.
- A B C D 35. Follow orders from their superiors in the system unquestioningly.
- A B C D 36. Follow standard procedures in dealing with most situations which arise.
- A B C D 37. Make their own decisions without checking with anyone else.
- A B C D 38. Are careful not to violate the rules.
- A B C D 39. Follow clearly specified procedures for doing their work.
- A B C D 40. Know that teachers are hired, selected, or not transferred simply because they have attractive personalities.
- A B C D 41. Ask someone higher up before they do almost anything.
- A B C D 42. Are aware of rules regarding their behavior in and around the school.
- A B C D 43. Feel they are their own boss in most matters related to their work.
- A B C D 44. Are involved in a variety of tasks and responsibilities from day to day.
- A B C D 45. Experiment with procedures for teaching and other school work.
- A B C D 46. Have fun socializing together during school time.
- A B C D 47. Have other staff members in this system, as their closest friends.
- A B C D 48. Work in a system that leaves how things are done in the classroom up to the individual teacher.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORY SUPPORT SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS:

Listed below are 21 services provided by instructional supervisors. The following items have been identified as ideal services that should be provided by an instructional supervisor for the support of the classroom teacher. Respond to the following items with that person in mind who is designated your instructional supervisor. An instructional supervisor is one whose primary role is to help the classroom teacher improve his/her instruction. Other titles that may be the same are instructional consultant, coordinator, and specialist. Check the appropriate box to indicate your feelings toward the 21 listed services.

Did you receive the service when needed?				
Always	Usually	Seldom	Never	
				1. Providing instructional materials
				2. Involving teachers in system-wide instructional programs.
				3. Assisting in developing effective disciplinary techniques.
				4. Planning in-service activities.
				5. Evaluating teachers.
				6. Providing teaching demonstrations.
				7. Consulting with teachers on instructional problems.

Did you receive the service when needed?				
Always	Usually	Seldom	Never	
				8. Dispensing information.
				9. Serving as two-way communications link with the central office.
				10. Helping describe and analyze instructional processes.
				11. Helping define instructional objectives.
				12. Helping select appropriate instructional activities.
				13. Helping choose methods for evaluating student progress.
				14. Informing teachers of professional growth activities.
				15. Aiding in development of curricula.
				16. Conducting or directing research.
				17. Facilitating good human relations within school and community.
				18. Acting as change agent.
				19. Providing psychological support.

Did you receive the service when needed?				
Always	Usually	Seldom	Never	
				20. Suggesting new ideas and approaches for instruction.
				21. Assisting in classroom organization and arrangement.

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

3700 Sutherland Avenue
Apartment F-9
Knoxville, Tennessee 37919

Dear Colleague:

I am asking that you participate in my doctoral research study which is designed to investigate the perceptions held by teachers in regard to instructional support services and the organization of school systems.

Questionnaires are being mailed to a random sample of three hundred sixty-one (361) teachers in five school districts in East Tennessee. To protect the anonymity of all respondents, the questionnaires will not be coded to individual respondents or districts; therefore, completed questionnaires returned will not be identifiable.

The completed questionnaires will remain confidential and will be available only to myself and the chairperson of my doctoral research committee. The presentation and analysis of data collected will be reported in my doctoral dissertation, and completed questionnaires will not be retained beyond this reporting.

This study is intended to contribute to the improvement of instructional supervision. After responding completely, fold the questionnaire so that the return address on the reverse side is exposed, seal by either stapling or taping closed, and place in a mailbox as postage is prepaid. Please return within two weeks.

Your cooperation in this study will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Billy J. Pack
Graduate Student (UTK)

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

3700 Sutherland Avenue
Apartment F-9
Knoxville, Tennessee 37919

Dear Colleague,

Recently, I asked you to participate in my doctoral research which was designed to investigate the perceptions held by teachers in regard to instructional support services and the organization of school systems. I would like to thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this study by completing the questionnaires. If you have not returned the questionnaires, would you please take about ten minutes and complete them and return them to me.

Thank you,

Bill J. Pack
Graduate Student (UTK)

VITA

Billy Jack Pack, first child of William L. and Arvie Fuson Pack, was born on 20 May, 1939, in Smithville, Tennessee. He received his elementary education in Manchester, Tennessee Schools and his secondary education was in Coffee County Schools. He entered Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, in 1958 and graduated in May 1962 with a Bachelor of Science degree, majoring in Mathematics.

After having taught for a year in both Alabama and Georgia, he returned to Manchester, Tennessee where he taught mathematics in the Manchester City Schools. During his tenure in the Manchester City Schools, he served as the chairman of the Mathematic Department of Westwood Junior High for five years.

Upon completion of Master of Education degree in 1976 at Middle Tennessee State University, with a major in educational administration and supervision, he entered the doctoral program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. He was admitted to candidacy for the Doctor of Education Degree in February 1978. During his residency, he served as a Graduate Research Assistant in School Planning Laboratory and as a Graduate Assistant for the Tennessee Association of School Business Officials.