


1970

## A Study of the Reading Background and Current Program Practices in Reading Used by Elementary Principals in Washington's Second Class School Districts

Kenneth William Anderson  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Anderson, Kenneth William, "A Study of the Reading Background and Current Program Practices in Reading Used by Elementary Principals in Washington's Second Class School Districts" (1970). *All Master's Theses*. 1269.

<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1269>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@cwu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

A STUDY  
OF THE READING BACKGROUND AND CURRENT PROGRAM PRACTICES  
IN READING  
USED BY ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS  
IN WASHINGTON'S SECOND CLASS SCHOOL DISTRICTS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington State College

---

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

---

By  
Kenneth William Anderson

April, 1970

LD  
5771.31

A49

SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

STANDARD TIME

028.326.3

Library  
Central Washington  
State College  
Ellensburg, Washington

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

William Gaskell, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

J. Wesley Crum

---

Alan R. Bergstrom

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to thank Dr. William Gaskell for his assistance in serving as chairman of the committee for this thesis. To Dr. J. Wesley Crum and Dr. Alan Bergstrom, appreciation is also given for serving on the committee. Their guidance and assistance is appreciated greatly.

A special thank you to Linda and Kimmie for their help in compiling results of questionnaires and for patience shown in this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED ..	1
THE PROBLEM .....	2
Statement of the problem .....	2
Importance of the study .....	2
Limitations .....	3
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED .....	4
Elementary principal .....	4
Elementary teacher .....	4
Elementary school .....	4
Second class district .....	4
PROCEDURE USED .....	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	6
THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL .....	6
FACTORS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP .....	9
LEADERSHIP IN READING INSTRUCTION .....	13
III. RESULTS OF THE STUDY .....	17
TECHNIQUE USED .....	18
EFFECT OF TIME AS A FACTOR .....	24
READING COURSE WORK AS A FACTOR .....	24

PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE AS A FACTOR .....	34
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	42
SUMMARY .....	42
CONCLUSIONS .....	42
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	44
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	46
APPENDIX .....	49

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Year of Graduation from College .....	19
II. Year Granted Principal's Credential .....	21
III. Number of Years at Present School .....	23
IV. Number of Reading Courses as Undergraduate ...	26
V. Reading Courses in Preparation for Principal's Degree .....	28
VI. Reading Courses Since Principal's Credential..	29
VII. Teaching Years Experience at the Elementary Level .....	31
VIII. Taught Reading as Separate Subject During Teaching Days .....	33
IX. Attends Workshops or In-Service Meetings Dealing with Reading Instruction .....	35
X. Reads Current Materials Dealing with Methods and Materials of Reading Instruction .....	37
XI. Worked on/or with Committees in Area of Reading Curriculum .....	40
XII. Becomes Familiar with Available Textbook Programs .....	41



## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Today, as never before, the elementary school administrator is being called upon to provide instructional leadership within the building he directs. Since reading must be recognized as the most important task of the elementary school, it would seem that this is a subject area in which the elementary principal must be capable of providing leadership if he is in reality going to be an instructional leader (22:255). As the field of reading involves such an immense variety, both in scope and detail, it is unrealistic to expect an elementary principal to be an expert or to know completely the intricacies of reading instruction. Because of this overwhelming obstacle, it is quite possible that many elementary principals are at a loss as to what to do to improve reading instruction within their own situation (32:V intro). While the building principal may not need to be a reading specialist, (22:51) it does seem reasonable, that the elementary principal should possess enough skill and understanding of reading instruction so that he is able to give effective direction and leadership to the members of his staff. This leadership may fall into actions he may take as a coordinator, a supervisor, or a promoter of the reading program.

## THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. Elementary principals who take their jobs seriously must certainly provide the best assistance possible to those instructing in reading within their buildings. Principals, while expressing a desire to work in curriculum, often spend little time in curriculum work in comparison to other administrative duties.

If elementary principals want to serve as instructional leaders and if the leadership provided will lead to more sound reading programs, shouldn't more be done to make it possible for such leadership to take place? There likely is a variety of individual reasons why so few elementary principals are active in directing reading instruction. Since many superintendents and district curriculum leaders have expressed the desire that the principal assume this role, it is not likely that demands from the school district interfere with the principal assuming this role. The purpose of this study is to determine the degree to which the training and backgrounds possessed by elementary principals affect their actions as leaders of reading instruction with their buildings.

Importance of the study. If training and experience enhance the effectiveness of the elementary principal (as he functions instructionally) then more time should be

devoted to the training of elementary school principals in instructional areas. A primary task of the elementary school has long been recognized as that of providing primary learnings which will serve as a foundation on which to build later educational experiences. Many elementary principals, upon assuming an administrative position, have had a minimum of training and/or experience with elementary reading instruction. Despite this fact, there is a strong movement to have elementary principals become more active as curriculum leaders at the elementary level. If training and background can be shown to have an influence on the success of the principal's assumption of this role, as curriculum leader then colleges and universities training future administrators should develop programs which would provide greater training in curriculum areas such as reading.

Limitations. One of the limiting factors of this study is the questionnaire method in gathering responses. Since the questionnaire calls for some personal evaluations and evaluations of administrators by teachers, factors other than those investigated may influence the responses. Personal factors or situations may be particularly influential since the study was conducted in many schools with a small number of faculty members. The study is limited to second class school districts in Washington State.

Because the field of reading is so complex, the development of a questionnaire which includes the major

areas of reading instruction and program practices so that an evaluation can be made is difficult.

#### DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Elementary principal. Elementary principal is defined as any person holding a position of prime responsibility in a school housing all or any of the grades 1-6.

Elementary teacher. Elementary teacher is defined as any instructor presently teaching in grades 1-6, in which part of the instructional day involves the teaching of reading as a separate subject area.

Elementary school. Elementary school for the purpose of this study will mean any school which instructs students in any of the grades 1-6.

Second class district. Second class district is defined as any district in the State of Washington maintaining a fully accredited high school or containing a city of the third class or a town, or an area of one square mile having a population of at least 300 shall be a school district of the second class. Districts over 10,000 population or at the discretion of the county superintendent may be called first class.

#### PROCEDURE USED

To gather the data for the study, a questionnaire was sent to one hundred forty elementary school principals

from selected schools in Washington's Second Class Districts. Schools were selected from an alphabetized list with the author selecting a random group of schools on the list. Each principal was asked to respond to questions regarding his training and background in the field of elementary education and reading instruction. No attempt was made to ask the principal to evaluate his own procedures, methods, or effectiveness. A second questionnaire was also mailed to the principal, and he was instructed to give it to a teacher currently teaching reading. In the second questionnaire, the teachers in the respective schools were asked to rate the principal on several key areas of the reading program. The data drawn from the two questionnaires was then compared in an attempt to identify any correlations between the reading background and training of the principals and how they direct the reading programs in their buildings as seen through the eyes of their teaching staffs.

The second chapter includes background on the elementary principalship and how it has developed to its present status, a discussion of what effect training and background may have on an individual's ability to perform a task, and a review of the role a principal should fulfill as a leader of reading instruction.

Chapter III presents the results of the study and an interpretation of the data gathered. Chapter IV presents a summary of some conclusions and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL

The elementary school principal has been a part of the elementary school itself almost since its creation as a separate segment of the educational program. As far back as 1850, "head teachers", "headmasters" or "principal teachers" were serving as the leaders of elementary school buildings. The role of these "principals" was hardly as complex as it now is and involved largely teaching duties and certain clerical or disciplinary matters.

As the elementary schools became larger and more diversified, the role of the elementary school principal changed. Less time was spent in actual teaching duties as he became more of a manager of the school. He became the recognized leader of the school building and served as an intermediary between the higher administration or board of education and teachers. He was also the central link between the teaching staff and the public.

The trend in growth and development of society in general, and in the public schools in particular, has brought about a change in the elementary principalship from one of limited clerical duties to a complex, many-sided, job with increasing demands by both central administration

and the general public. A noticeable change is the growing demand that the principal provide instructional leadership for his teaching staff.

Much of the impetus for the changing role to include more instructional leadership is the result of the efforts of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, organized in 1921 (18:4). Through the efforts of this group and later other associated groups, the elementary principalship became more and more that of coordinator and instructional leaders. The trend has continued. The question of how the role of educational leader should be carried out continues to receive attention. Hicks and Jameson believe that the role of instructional leader is the most important one that the principal assumes (22:62).

After the crisis of the Russian space program in the 1950s and its impact on the American educational system during the 1960s, the elementary principal's role as an instructional leader became a more difficult task. The public schools took a large portion of the blame for the failure of the United States to beat the Russians into space. As a result, the public schools became the focus of efforts to remedy the situation. In order to solve the problem, many new methods, materials, facilities, and training procedures were introduced into the elementary schools. As an instructional leader, the elementary principal faced the problem of trying to keep abreast of the changes in an ever expanding curriculum (11:55). The school principal was looked

to for leadership during the resulting confusion in the elementary schools; but, in many cases, the movement had caught him as unprepared as the members of his staff.

Many attempts have been made to assist principals in performing their duties. Colleges and universities have updated and upgraded the programs for training principals in hopes of preparing them more adequately to meet the requirements of the job. Governmental agencies at all levels have provided assistance in financing learning opportunities to help overcome the demands of the principalship. Professional organizations have become more active in attempts to improve the quality of leadership in the elementary schools. States, and local school districts have raised the standards for the elementary principalship, and have increased the services available. The trend continues to develop as attempts are made to keep the principal abreast of the rapidly changing elementary school. However, much of the responsibility for personal growth lies with the individual himself (26:31).

Today, the principal's superiors attempt evaluation of his efforts largely on the basis of the successfulness of the instructional program within his building. Teachers look to the principal for assistance in a variety of instructional problems and to provide coordination among the members of the staff and for the program. Better trained teachers have required that better trained principals be selected to work with them (29:7). In 1970, the elemen-



tary principal finds himself more or less accepted as the educational leader of the elementary school. How well the principal is meeting these demands varies from individual to individual.

Serving the needs of teachers under unique building situations may not always call for the same methods or techniques on the part of the administrator. Mickelson and Hansen believe that the variety in school make-up makes it difficult to generalize about the role of the principal. (25:21). Although particulars are more variable, some common ground is found in general procedural practice. It is upon common factors in educational leadership that attention has been focused.

#### FACTORS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Most authors talk of the role of the principal as a coordinator. Mickelson and Hansen, again, indicate that this is to be done by setting up and maintaining a good educational climate (25:20), leading to greater teacher efficiency and better student progress.

The principal who creates or develops a good educational atmosphere probably possesses certain skills and abilities or operates under certain methods which make the proper atmosphere possible. Spain states that in order to increase the chances of such a school situation, the administrator should: (1) develop staff moral, (2) formulate policies cooperatively, (3) create harmony and problem

resolution, (4) foster professional cooperative growth, (5) encourage personal professional growth, (6) balance work and rest, (7) develop leaders in staff, (8) help staff to utilize the proper techniques, (9) encourage experimentation (30: 94-96).

Lowe found in a study of Indiana teachers that they were able to work most harmoniously when the administrator provided for most of the following: (1) participation in professional organizations, (2) committee work, (3) classroom visitations, (4) help in administration and scoring of tests, (5) individual conferences, (6) recognition of good work (26:187).

Burton and Brueckner indicate that the supervisor of the elementary school must develop a unified effort and a pleasant environment, an atmosphere of acceptance, opportunities to work effectively as a faculty group, personnel procedures, and program changes based on honest evaluation (51:191).

Attempts to isolate the variables in determining the effectiveness of the principal as a building leader continue. The results of such study may provide answers that will serve to increase the ability of administrators to exert the leadership needed in today's schools.

Efforts to relate background and previous experience upon the effectiveness of leadership ability is a difficult task because of the variables which may influence any human act. Will it be possible to isolate those experi-

ential activities which may influence behavior or ability?  
How can the effects of situational influences be measured?  
What can be done to outline the acts which provide the most  
valuable leadership assistance?

Most experts agree that incorporation of training into the overall personality is necessary before the training will serve a purpose. Knowledge is important in competence, but not until it is integrated or made a part of the pattern of behavior (17:14). Training and background are, then, but an integrated part of the overall aspect of human behavior or ability. Past learnings and experiences affect leadership behavior, but how and to what extent is difficult to determine reliably. Attempts to measure the effect of past experience is further complicated by problems of controlling extraneous variables.

Sanford summarizes the problem of measuring successful leadership traits when he states:

- (1) There are either no leadership traits in general or they cannot be described by familiar or common sense terms.
- (2) In a specific situation, leaders have certain traits that set them apart from followers, but what traits set what leaders apart from what followers will vary from situation to situation (19:82-83).

The problem of measuring the effect of background on leadership ability is complicated also by the variety of conditions under which leadership may take place. Despite the difficulties involved, attempts have been made to isolate and relate some factors involving ability to lead

to prior training and experience. As Halpin states:

"Training methods and techniques can be evaluated for comparing relative effectiveness". (19:82-83).

Few studies have been made to substantiate the relationship between training and background and the success of a person in a leadership position. Research shows no reliable correlation between possession of specialized knowledge and success in an administrative position (7:408). In summarizing the inability to measure in a reliable manner knowledge and its effect on administrative success, Campbell and Gregg stated that "In the absence of tests of knowledge that are valid in predicting administrative effectiveness, it would appear that evidence of appropriate educational experiences and superior ability to learn would constitute an adequate substitute" (7:408-9).

Although there seems to be some disagreement as to the amount or type of training necessary for successful leadership, most experts agree that it is important. Studies have shown that successful business and educational leaders have a greater breadth of knowledge about their field than those who are not as successful (7:409). This seems to indicate that a more complete educational background might give greater assurance of success.

In a study of New York teachers, it was found that greater training in subject matter areas resulted in a higher rating of teacher effectiveness by school administrators (6:95). The relationship here is only in that par-

ticular instruction area where training was greater and not necessarily in other nonrelated instructional areas. In the same study, it was found that the number of years experience in a field or instructional area also resulted in an upward trend in effectiveness rating (6:98). This may indicate that the amount of time spent at a particular task provides greater chance for success at that task. Further results from the same New York study indicate that teachers with advanced degrees were rated more effective than their counterparts with baccalaureate degrees (6:98-99). Calabria, in summarizing the study, suggests that mastery of subject matter within a given field has a direct relationship to effectiveness in that job (6:100).

If the above is true of teachers in instructional ability, might not the same logic apply to the administrator in providing leadership? Could not greater mastery in certain aspects of the job lead to greater success in that particular aspect? The training and educational experience of the administrator may bear some very direct relationships on his success in dealing with the intricacies involved in the position.

#### LEADERSHIP IN READING INSTRUCTION

In accepting the challenge of the elementary principalship, an individual will deal with a variety of curricular and instructional media. One such area of curricular and instructional concern is the area of reading. Reading instruction has been given much importance as a

task of the elementary school. The importance of reading instruction has implications for the elementary principal, therefore, as well. An overriding concern of every elementary supervisor should be the quality of reading instruction in his building (11:55).

Strang believes that the most important assistance to the teacher should come from a supervisor who is well-prepared to give teachers direction and provide appropriate material (32:6). An elementary principal should have enough background in the reading field to be able to evaluate effectively new methods and materials and to keep successful programs functioning efficiently (8:47).

"Historically, elementary principals have been chosen from upper and middle grade faculties where they received only minimal training in the foundations of reading instruction" (27:127). Are current training programs providing training thought necessary for principals to function most successfully as leaders of reading instruction? According to Morrison, current programs which teach and train elementary principals are not doing an adequate job (27:125).

Some experts believe that the improvement of reading instruction will be somewhat dependent upon upgrading training programs to include more focus on reading instruction methods, materials, and problems. If the principal does not know about the subject matter area such as reading, how will he be able to work effectively with his teachers

and students to improve instruction (22:50)?

In studies conducted in schools where principals had little reading instruction background, the methods used were found to be inferior to those where the building principals were well trained in reading instruction (27:128). Reading training and background seem to increase the ability of the principal to deal with problems related to instruction in the reading area.

While it may not be necessary for the building principal to be an expert in the field of reading, he would possess enough knowledge of the field to be able to:

- (1) select competent consultants and the best teachers available,
- (2) organize the reading program for the best instruction in an atmosphere conducive to learning for all students,
- (3) help the faculty to grow through study groups, workshops, faculty meetings, and individual and group conferences.

The performance of these acts will increase the ability of the teachers to teach and students to learn (32:3).

Other opinions vary somewhat as to how best to conduct the business of providing guidance in reading instruction and what is necessary to best carry it out. J. E. Devine, in a Master's thesis, discusses what elementary principals should do to develop a sound reading program within his building. Among the factors given attention are the following: (1) develop a philosophy with his teachers, (2) in-service meetings held regularly, (3)

cooperative selection of material, (4) good rapport should be developed, (5) the variety of reading approaches and instructional methods should be investigated (14 :4-5).

Ladd sees the principal working in the area of teacher competency and preparation, readiness skills, pupil-personnel problems, materials selection, and in-service programs (23:216).

If training does have an effect upon the ability of principals to work with teachers effectively, what is necessary to provide for the training desired? The answer to this question seems difficult to find as are the variables of human interaction difficult to measure scientifically. Despite such difficulties, attempts to provide the answers continue.



## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

#### TECHNIQUE USED

To conduct a study of the effect of training and background on the ability of the elementary principal, one hundred forty questionnaires were mailed to principals in Second Class Districts in the State of Washington. Of the one hundred forty that were mailed, ninety-three duplicate completed forms were returned. In order to obtain a duplicate form, the author needed a form completed by the principal, as well as an evaluation completed by a member of his instructional staff. All of the ninety-three duplicate copies were not completely filled out. The result is that the number of responses varies from question to question, and the author has recorded on the tables in this chapter the number of individuals being evaluated on each question.

Each principal was asked to respond to twelve questions which dealt with some aspect of his training or background. These twelve questions form the basis of the tables that follow in this chapter. Principals were also asked to present the second part of the questionnaire to a member of the staff instructing in the field of reading. Separate envelopes were enclosed so that the results of

both responses could be kept completely confidential. Teachers were asked to rate principals on certain aspects of his role as it relates to reading instruction. The evaluation was completed on a scale of ten numbers ranging from one through ten. The lower the number, the lower the rating given; the higher the number, the higher the rating. For example, a rating of two would be lower than a rating of three.

The usable questionnaires were then grouped according to the responses of the principals, and the numerical rating by the teachers was totaled and the average of all the principals in a particular group was computed. These averages are listed on the tables under each principals group or category and across from each question upon which they were evaluated. The purpose of presenting the material in this manner is to make any trends in results of the data clearly evident on the tables. It must be remembered that the results shown here reflect only trends and are not statistically reliable.

#### EFFECT OF TIME AS A FACTOR

In an attempt to evaluate the effect of time since formal degrees were issued from college upon the ability of the principal to provide leadership in areas of reading instruction, evaluations were categorized in Table I according to when degree was received. The principals were placed into four groups: (1) those who graduated before

TABLE I  
Year of Graduation from College

	1939--		1940-9		1950-9		1960-8	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	13	6.54	26	6.40	39	5.35	11	5.56
Shows knowledge of problems	13	7.62	27	7.50	38	5.96	11	6.50
Makes regular observations	12	4.25	28	3.51	38	3.64	10	3.14
Works with staff develop program	13	7.23	28	6.45	37	5.50	11	5.50
Provides in-service opportunity	13	6.62	28	7.02	39	5.98	11	5.53
Provides appropriate material	13	8.54	28	8.87	40	8.55	11	9.42
Assists set up evaluation system	13	6.32	27	5.67	40	6.08	11	6.14
Attuned to student attitudes	13	7.23	28	6.89	39	6.94	11	7.86
Assists in setting up philosophy	13	6.92	28	6.26	39	6.02	11	5.11
Maintains good staff morale	13	7.92	28	8.02	40	7.71	11	9.03
Encourages suggestions	13	7.77	28	7.04	40	7.47	11	8.84
Assists interpreting tests	12	6.08	26	5.73	37	5.35	11	6.94
Uses evaluation plan program	13	6.69	28	5.97	36	5.53	11	6.19
Has commitment to reading	13	7.85	28	7.80	40	7.61	11	8.33

1940, (2) those who graduated during the 1940s, (3) those who graduated during the 1950s, and (4) those who graduated during the 1960s.

The results of Table I show that there seems to be no overall trend in the ability of the principals to provide assistance in reading instruction and the length of time since graduation. All principals were rated lowest in ability to make regular observations in classrooms to help teachers with reading instruction. The highest ratings are in the area of providing appropriate material, encouraging suggestions, and maintaining good staff morale. Those who were graduated from college prior to 1950 were rated higher than more recent graduates in ability to work with staff to develop programs. Earlier graduates also rated higher in ability to make helpful suggestions, knowledge of reading problems, providing in-service opportunities, and assisting in setting up a philosophy of reading. Those who graduated more recently were rated slightly higher on being committed to a better reading program, encouraging suggestions, maintaining morale within staff, and providing appropriate material.

Table II shows a comparison of the year individuals were granted the principal's credential and the rating they were given in the same areas of leadership in reading instruction dealt with in Table I.

Three individuals indicated they received their credentials before 1940. These three people showed a

TABLE II  
Year Granted Principal's Credential

	1939--		1940-9		1950-9		1960-9	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	3	8.33	9	6.33	36	6.08	32	6.00
Shows knowledge of problems	3	9.00	9	7.44	36	7.33	31	7.22
Makes regular observations	3	5.67	9	4.78	35	3.49	32	3.34
Works with staff develop program	3	9.67	9	6.89	36	6.17	32	5.91
Provides in-service opportunity	3	9.67	9	6.67	36	6.83	32	6.09
Provides appropriate material	3	9.67	9	8.44	36	8.44	32	8.91
Assists set up evaluation system	3	8.67	9	5.89	35	5.50	32	5.69
Attuned to student attitudes	3	9.00	9	7.22	36	6.97	32	7.10
Assists in setting up philosophy	3	8.67	9	6.44	36	6.25	31	6.12
Maintains good staff morale	3	9.00	9	8.11	36	8.25	32	7.81
Encourages suggestions	3	9.00	9	7.67	36	7.86	32	7.81
Assists interpreting tests	3	7.33	9	6.00	34	5.41	32	5.47
Uses evaluation plan program		9.33	9	6.22	35	5.31	32	5.77
Has commitment to reading		9.67	9	7.56	36	7.67	32	7.72

consistently higher rating in all areas than did any of the other groups. Because of the low number in the group, however, this may not be significant. Other ratings show little difference between the year credentials were granted and ability to work in reading instruction areas. Again, the trend seems to be that principals who were granted credentials more recently rated slightly lower than those who have held the credential for a greater number of years. There are several exceptions and the trend is slight to insignificant. The overall evaluation shows much the same trend as in Table I; principals collectively were rated lowest in making regular observations and highest in providing material, maintaining morale, and encouraging suggestions.

In Table III, the principals are divided into groups according to the number of years spent in their current assignments. The intent was to see if there was any correlation between the length of time spent in a particular building situation and the ability of the administrator to provide leadership in reading instruction.

The trend as shown in Table III is for principals with a greater number of years in service at a particular building to be rated slightly higher than other principals. Areas of greatest differences appear to be: working with staff, setting up an evaluation system, assisting in setting up a philosophy, and assisting in interpreting tests. The greatest difference seems to occur between those who have

TABLE III  
Number of Years at Present School

	5 or less		6-14		15 or more	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	36	5.58	27	6.44	22	6.09
Shows knowledge of problems	35	6.88	27	7.54	22	7.50
Makes regular observations	36	3.03	27	4.07	21	3.77
Works with staff develop program	36	5.33	27	6.52	22	6.82
Provides in-service opportunity	36	6.17	27	6.44	22	7.27
Provides appropriate material	36	8.69	27	8.67	22	8.64
Assists set up evaluation system	36	4.81	27	6.15	22	6.09
Attuned to student attitudes	36	6.61	27	7.30	22	7.23
Assists in setting up philosophy	36	5.23	27	6.78	22	6.73
Maintains good staff morale	36	7.56	27	8.22	22	8.22
Encourages suggestions	36	7.75	26	8.00	22	7.32
Assists interpreting tests	35	5.11	26	6.85	21	5.05
Uses evaluation to plan program	35	5.14	27	6.41	21	5.85
Has commitment to reading	36	7.33	27	8.41	22	7.68

been in a school, as principal, for five or less years and those who have served six to fourteen years in a particular school. The increase is not as great between the six to fourteen year group and principals who have served fifteen or more years and in some cases even results in a decline in the rating. One influence here may be that over a period of years, personal factors may have a stronger influence.

#### READING COURSE WORK AS A FACTOR

Table IV is more specific in relating training to leadership in reading instruction. The principals are grouped into four groups according to the number of reading courses they have taken as an undergraduate. The groups are comprised of (1) those who have taken no reading courses as an undergraduate, (2) those who have taken one, (3) those who have taken two, and (4) those who have taken three or more.

The results indicate no consistent trend in performance according to this variable. Differences between the groups are slight and reflect little in the way of significant influences. Principals who indicated that they had taken three or more reading courses as undergraduates show a very slight upward trend over members of the other three groups. However, those who indicated they had had no reading courses while an undergraduate were in several instances given higher ratings than their counterparts who had taken one or two reading courses. It seems that one



would have a difficult time making a case for undergraduate reading as a positive influence on an administrator's ability to work in reading instructional areas based on the results here.

In an attempt to isolate some effects of reading courses on ability to work in reading instruction, the writer further divided the responding principals into groups according to the number of reading courses taken during preparation for the principal's credential. Those who had taken no courses in reading during this time were placed in one group, those who had taken one such course were placed in another, a third group was made up of those who had taken two courses during this time, and the last group was made up of those who had taken three or more. The results of this grouping on rating standards are shown in Table V.

A wider variation on ability rating is evidenced here than in Table IV. Those principals who indicated that they had taken two courses in reading during the preparation period for the principal's credential show an overall much higher rating than do those who had none. The difference does not seem to be as great between principals who took one reading course during graduate work and those who had none and in some cases the principals with one reading course rated slightly lower. Also of interest is the trend between those principals who had taken two courses during the preparation period and those who indicated they had taken three or more. The figures show a general decline in rated ability of principals in nearly all areas from

TABLE IV  
Number of Reading Courses as Undergraduate

	None		1.		2.		3 or more	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	17	6.24	17	5.88	25	5.40	23	6.43
Shows knowledge of problems	17	7.18	17	7.24	24	6.92	22	7.73
Makes regular observations	17	3.24	17	4.06	25	3.16	23	3.64
Works with staff develop program	17	6.47	17	5.82	25	5.40	23	6.65
Provides in-service opportunity	17	6.35	17	6.65	25	5.97	23	7.13
Provides appropriate material	17	8.29	17	8.88	25	8.48	23	8.87
Assists set up evaluation system	17	6.41	17	4.59	25	5.00	23	6.17
Attuned to student attitudes	17	6.76	17	7.47	25	6.96	23	7.09
Assists in setting up philosophy	17	6.25	17	5.82	25	5.64	23	6.43
Maintains good staff morale	17	7.82	17	8.47	25	7.24	23	8.26
Encourages suggestions	17	7.59	17	7.59	25	7.48	23	8.13
Assists interpreting tests	16	5.88	17	5.59	25	4.64	22	6.72
Uses evaluation to plan program	16	6.06	17	5.53	25	4.84	23	6.45
Has commitment to reading	17	7.77	17	8.35	25	7.36	23	7.96

those who had taken two classes and those who had taken three or more.

In further examining reading course work as an influence on instructional leadership ability in the reading program, principals were grouped according to the number of reading courses taken since the issuance of the principal's credential. Principals were divided into three groups: (1) those who had taken no reading courses since principal's credential, (2) those who had taken one course since the credential, (3) those who had taken two or more courses since attaining the credential. Results of this grouping are presented in Table VI.

As in Table V, the results seem to show a direct influence between the number of courses taken, particularly in the case of those who have taken none, and the rated ability of the principals in dealing with reading instruction. Although differences are not as great as in Table V, the overall trend seems to be the same. The greatest numerical differences seem to result between the group with no course work since the degree and the group with one course since the degree, with the more favorable ratings going to the latter group. Also not present in the results of Table VI is the general drop in efficiency rating of the final group (two or more courses) that was evident in Table V with the same method of grouping. A comparison of these two groups with more course work reveals an inconsistent variation of rating averages from one to the other.

TABLE V  
Reading Courses in Preparation for Principal's Degree

	None		1.		2.		3 or more	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	25	5.40	27	5.67	18	7.61	15	5.96
Shows knowledge of problems	23	6.95	27	6.89	18	8.28	15	7.30
Makes regular observations	25	2.64	27	3.07	17	5.35	15	3.79
Works with staff develop program	25	4.68	27	6.22	18	8.06	15	5.69
Provides in-service opportunity	25	6.04	27	6.14	28	7.72	15	6.30
Provides appropriate material	25	8.24	27	8.92	18	8.89	15	8.80
Assists set up evaluation system	25	4.44	27	5.52	18	7.45	15	6.08
Attuned to student attitudes	25	6.56	27	6.44	18	8.22	15	7.51
Assists in setting up philosophy	25	4.96	27	5.54	18	8.39	15	6.14
Maintains good staff morale	25	7.52	27	8.04	18	8.78	14	7.98
Encourages suggestions	25	7.38	27	7.56	18	8.78	14	7.76
Assists interpreting tests	22	5.09	27	5.44	17	7.41	14	5.52
Uses evaluation to plan program	24	4.83	27	5.65	18	7.83	14	5.38
Has commitment to reading	25	7.60	27	7.30	18	8.61	14	7.76

TABLE VI  
Reading Courses Since Principal's Credential

	None		1.		2 or more	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	39	5.36	25	6.76	15	6.73
Shows knowledge of problems	38	7.13	25	7.32	15	8.06
Makes regular observations	39	3.00	25	4.76	15	3.29
Works with staff develop program	39	5.08	25	7.24	15	7.07
Provides in-service opportunity	39	5.82	25	6.88	15	8.06
Provides appropriate material	39	8.26	25	8.72	15	8.80
Assists set up evaluation system	39	5.10	25	6.40	15	5.93
Attuned to student attitudes	39	7.12	25	6.88	15	7.20
Assists in setting up philosophy	39	5.55	25	6.60	15	7.27
Maintains good staff morale	39	7.74	25	8.00	15	8.40
Encourages suggestions	39	7.51	25	8.12	15	7.93
Assists interpreting tests	39	4.97	24	6.20	14	5.27
Uses evaluation to plan program	38	5.07	24	6.29	15	6.13
Has commitment to reading	39	7.38	25	8.00	15	8.40

The writer felt that the number of years spent teaching at the elementary school or level might also have some effect upon the ability of a principal to guide reading instruction. Therefore, principals who responded to the questionnaire were grouped according to the number of years teaching experience they had at the elementary level. The result was that three groups were formed for the basis of comparing the influence of teaching experience. One group was made up of principals with none to four years experience. Another group consisted of those with five through ten years experience, and the final group was made up of those principals with more than ten years teaching experience at the elementary level. The results of grouping according to this criteria are found in Table VII.

According to these results, the influence of years of teaching experience at the elementary level does not influence the ability of the principal to serve in the areas of reading instruction investigated here, as greatly as was the case in number of reading courses taken. In fact, it seems that teachers believe the influence of teaching years experience upon a principal's leadership abilities bears little relationship to his teaching years of experience at the elementary school level. The data show that there is no overall trend which in any way reflects a connection between teaching years of experience and a higher rating. The experience may be valuable as an experience; yet the amount of the teaching experience does

TABLE VII  
Teaching Years Experience at the Elementary Level

	0-4		5-10		More than 10	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	23	5.83	32	5.73	28	6.43
Shows knowledge of problems	23	6.91	32	7.13	27	7.85
Makes regular observations	23	3.70	32	3.13	28	4.15
Works with staff develop program	23	6.43	32	5.61	28	6.32
Provides in-service opportunity	23	7.04	32	6.00	28	6.71
Provides appropriate material	23	8.74	32	8.73	28	8.54
Assists set up evaluation system	23	6.09	32	5.21	28	5.61
Attuned to student attitudes	23	7.00	32	6.88	28	7.07
Assists in setting up philosophy	23	6.38	32	5.73	28	6.64
Maintains good staff morale	23	8.52	32	7.58	28	7.89
Encourages suggestions	23	8.09	32	7.64	28	7.48
Assists interpreting tests	23	5.78	30	5.44	26	5.92
Uses evaluation to plan program	22	6.23	32	5.64	27	5.52
Has commitment to reading	23	8.00	32	7.39	28	8.11

not seem to relate to effectiveness.

The degree of past experience in teaching reading was used as the basis for providing a further look at ability rating data. In Table VIII, the principals are divided into three groups according to the degree they indicated they had been involved in teaching of reading while they were members of a regular teaching staff. Principals were asked to rate themselves on a ten point scale which would indicate the degree of experience of teaching reading they possessed. The scale on which they rated themselves was arranged in the same manner as the scale the teachers used to evaluate the principal. Those responding were asked to circle one number in a sequence of one through ten, which indicated the extent of their reading-teaching experience. Numbers one through three corresponded to a rating of seldom; numbers four through seven corresponded to a rating of sometimes; and numbers eight through ten reflected a rating of often.

As shown by Table VIII, the greatest number of principals indicated that they had often taught reading as a separate subject during their teaching days. The results seem to show a slight general increase in rating for those principals in the group who had often taught reading during teaching experience. The amount of influence seems to be slight, with greatest increase in rating being in the areas of observing teachers in reading and interpreting reading test results, favoring the principal with more reading-



TABLE VIII  
 Taught Reading as Separate Subject During Teaching Days

	Seldom		Sometimes		Often	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	10	6.50	16	6.13	59	5.86
Shows knowledge of problems	10	7.30	16	7.06	57	7.37
Makes regular observations	9	2.10	16	3.75	59	3.69
Works with staff develop program	10	5.40	16	6.68	59	6.08
Provides in-service opportunity	10	6.30	16	6.75	59	6.53
Provides appropriate material	10	8.60	16	8.31	59	8.75
Assists set up evaluation system	10	4.70	16	5.50	59	5.80
Attuned to student attitudes	10	8.00	16	6.19	59	7.05
Assists in setting up philosophy	10	6.00	16	6.05	58	6.16
Maintains good staff morale	10	8.00	16	7.44	59	8.10
Encourages suggestions	10	7.60	16	7.31	59	7.88
Assists interpreting tests	10	4.30	16	5.06	56	6.05
Uses evaluation to plan program	10	5.60	16	5.50	57	5.79
Has commitment to reading	10	7.30	16	7.44	59	7.95

teaching experience. Despite the fact that the results here show little relationship between experience as a reading teacher and effectiveness as a principal in dealing with instructional problems, the data does not indicate that such teaching experience is unimportant.

#### PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE AS A FACTOR

In an effort to assess the influence of personal educative devices on the administrator's leadership ability in reading, principals were placed into three groups in the same manner described in Table VIII. With this information, the principals were rated on the basis of the extent they had been active in in-service meetings and/or workshops. The results of such grouping and rating is shown in Table IX.

The results show a definite trend upward that favors principals who indicated they often involved themselves in in-service or workshop activities. The degree of difference between the rating accorded those with little activity and those who were often involved varied but always reflects a higher rating for those attending in-service meetings. In every instance, the rating given the group who were involved often was higher than those who indicated that they seldom took part in in-service or workshop activity. The difference between the group who indicated that they "sometimes" attended such meetings and the "often" attending group was not as great as between the "seldom" and

TABLE IX  
Attends Workshops or In-Service Meetings  
Dealing with Reading Instruction

	Seldom		Sometimes		Often	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	12	5.00	44	5.91	29	6.50
Shows knowledge of problems	12	6.42	43	7.49	29	7.31
Makes regular observations	12	2.42	43	3.49	29	4.14
Works with staff develop program	12	4.25	44	6.27	29	6.59
Provides in-service opportunity	12	4.83	44	6.68	29	7.03
Provides appropriate material	12	8.50	44	8.64	29	8.79
Assists set up evaluation system	12	4.00	44	5.61	29	6.28
Attuned to student attitudes	12	6.67	44	6.77	29	7.48
Assists in setting up philosophy	12	3.75	44	6.25	28	6.89
Maintains good staff morale	12	7.58	44	8.05	29	8.00
Encourages suggestions	12	7.00	44	7.75	29	8.03
Assists interpreting tests	12	3.92	42	5.50	28	6.61
Uses evaluation to plan program	12	3.75	43	5.70	28	6.57
Has commitment to reading	12	6.08	44	7.82	29	8.41

"sometimes" groups. It would seem that attendance at such meetings bears a relationship to the ability of the elementary administrator in dealing with reading instruction.

The influence of professional reading in the field of reading instruction and its effect upon the principal's role as a leader in reading instruction is the next area under examination. As in Table VIII and IX, principals were divided into three groups and were then checked to see how they were rated by the teachers.

Because so few principals indicated that they "seldom" read professional material in the field of reading, it is difficult to get a clear picture of how great the influence might be. The general trend, again, shows those principals in the "often" group were given higher ratings than those in the other two groups. The number of persons in the group who often read current material dealing with reading instruction was much greater than in either of the two remaining groups. The data here seems to suggest that a positive effect results from wide professional reading in the area of reading instruction and the ability to administer the reading program.

The effect of committee work in the reading field was another variable that was investigated in this study. Procedures followed in grouping and rating were as described in the previous tables. A better balance in the number of respondents in each group makes the results here seem more meaningful than in Table X.

TABLE X  
 Reads Current Materials Dealing with Methods  
 and Materials of Reading Instruction

	Seldom		Sometimes		Often	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	2	5.50	21	5.29	62	6.24
Shows knowledge of problems	2	5.50	19	7.26	62	7.37
Makes regular observations	2	2.50	21	3.00	62	3.79
Works with staff develop program	2	5.50	21	4.43	62	6.35
Provides in-service opportunity	2	2.50	21	5.95	62	6.87
Provides appropriate material	2	8.50	21	8.81	62	8.63
Assists set up evaluation system	2	4.50	21	4.90	62	5.81
Attuned to student attitudes	2	6.00	21	7.00	62	7.03
Assists in setting up philosophy	2	3.00	21	5.38	61	6.15
Maintains good staff morale	2	7.00	21	7.33	62	7.89
Encourages suggestions	2	6.50	21	6.62	62	8.16
Assists interpreting tests	2	4.50	20	4.45	60	6.08
Uses evaluation to plan program	2	4.50	21	4.95	60	6.02
Has commitment to reading	2	4.50	21	7.00	62	8.00

The same general trend as evidenced in the past two tables is also found here. In every area in which they were rated, the principals who indicated they "often" worked on committees dealing with reading instruction were rated higher than those who said they "seldom" worked on the same types of committees. Unlike before, Table XI shows that the greatest differences were indicated between the "sometimes" and "often" groups rather than between the "seldom" and "sometimes" groups. The data in this and other past tables that have dealt with personal habits of self education might also indicate the interest in reading instruction that some principals possess relates in a positive way to ability to lead reading teachers and programs.

In Table XII, principals are grouped according to the extent they involve themselves in studying textbook programs currently available to the schools. Since most school districts make some use of reading textbooks and many rely on them a great deal, the influence of this variable on reading leadership ability was investigated.

As in many of the past tables, Table XII reveals a majority of the principals in one group. The results then are somewhat affected by small numbers of respondents in the "seldom" headed group. The trend shown by the evidence here is not as conclusive as in several of the past tables. Principals who are "often" involved in evaluating and familiarizing themselves with textbook programs are rated slightly higher in some areas than those in the

other two groups. This is not consistent, however, and the influence of this aspect of a principal's background seems to be as significant as others reviewed.

TABLE XI  
Worked on/or with Committees in Area of Reading Curriculum

	Seldom N Mean	Sometimes N Mean	Often N Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	13 5.31	37 5.70	35 6.54
Shows knowledge of problems	13 6.85	35 7.20	35 7.57
Makes regular observations	13 2.85	37 3.32	35 3.94
Works with staff develop program	13 5.54	37 5.08	35 7.17
Provides in-service opportunity	13 6.15	37 6.19	35 7.06
Provides appropriate material	13 8.77	37 8.97	35 8.83
Assists set up evaluation system	13 4.85	37 4.73	35 6.83
Attuned to student attitudes	13 6.15	37 6.86	35 7.46
Assists in setting up philosophy	13 5.08	37 5.30	34 7.41
Maintains good staff morale	13 6.46	37 7.32	35 8.34
Encourages suggestions	13 6.77	37 7.57	35 8.29
Assists interpreting tests	13 5.23	35 4.89	34 6.59
Uses evaluation to plan program	13 4.69	37 4.92	33 7.00
Has commitment to reading	13 6.46	37 6.86	35 8.60



TABLE XII  
Becomes Familiar with Available Textbook Programs

	Seldom		Sometimes		Often	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Makes helpful suggestions	5	5.80	21	5.00	59	6.36
Shows knowledge of problems	5	8.20	21	6.71	57	7.44
Makes regular observations	5	2.80	21	3.42	58	3.66
Works with staff develop program	5	4.00	21	5.61	59	6.41
Provides in-service opportunity	5	6.80	21	6.47	59	6.53
Provides appropriate material	5	9.60	21	8.90	59	8.51
Assists set up evaluation system	5	4.20	21	5.00	59	5.94
Attuned to student attitudes	5	8.80	21	7.00	59	6.83
Assists in setting up philosophy	5	4.20	21	5.95	59	6.34
Maintains good staff morale	5	8.40	21	7.61	59	8.05
Encourages suggestions	5	7.40	21	7.95	59	7.64
Assists interpreting tests	5	5.20	19	5.25	57	5.82
Uses evaluation to plan program	5	5.20	20	5.30	58	5.90
Has commitment to reading	5	7.20	21	8.04	59	7.90

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY

This study has investigated the effect of training and background on the ability of the elementary principal to provide leadership in reading instruction. The principals selected for this study have come from second class districts in Washington State. Evaluations were made by one member of the teaching staff from each principal's building.

Principals were evaluated in a variety of leadership areas including: working with staff, classroom supervision, subjective knowledge, professional services, and pupil relations. Ability to provide leadership in these areas was related to prior experience in elementary teaching, course work in the reading field, experience as an elementary principal, and independent professional growth in the reading field. The relationships between prior experience and leadership ability in reading were then presented in a series of tables. These tables reflected the extent and degree to which the experience factor was found to have in the specific leadership areas.

### CONCLUSIONS

The data suggests that elementary principals in

Washington's Second Class Districts were rated lowest by their teachers in the ability to make regular classroom visits for instructional improvement: as in all leadership variables examined, the ability to make observations was often influenced by certain aspects in the principals' background, but observing in the classroom received consistently low ratings throughout. Other leadership abilities which received a lower rating by the teachers included: principal providing assistance in setting up an evaluation system in reading, principal using test results to plan a better program for the students, principal providing assistance in interpreting test results, and principals providing helpful suggestions in matters of reading instruction.

The results also show that teachers felt principals provided the best leadership in areas such as maintaining good staff morale through appreciation of good teaching practices. There may be some question as to how the principal can be aware of good instructional practices if he does not often visit the classroom. Other leadership factors receiving a high rating were the ability to provide appropriate material for reading instruction and demonstrating a firm commitment to good reading instruction.

In most instances, the effect of years of service as an elementary principal or as a principal in a particular school was not significant and often inconsistent in developing a pattern. Reading course work seemed to more greatly influence leadership in all areas particularly

those reading courses taken during the principal's preparation work or since the granting of the principal's credential. The greatest influence on the principal's leadership ability, according to the data, is reflected in the personal professional growth experienced by the principals. Attendance at workshops or in-service meetings, professional reading in reading instruction areas, work with committees, and familiarity with textbook programs, reveal a greater significance and overall trend in influence than any of the other experiences on which the principals were rated.

It seems safe to assume that, while course work and experience have an effect upon leadership ability in reading instruction, the greatest determining factor is the willingness on the part of the principal to make himself more knowledgeable about reading and how it is best taught. Why some principals involve themselves in professional growth more than others is a question that remains unanswered.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended by the writer that more study be done to examine more closely some of the factors which influence professional growth on an individual basis. If the elementary principalship is to serve a purpose, the individuals must be professional leaders and in order to be leaders, they must be active and up-to-date.

Institutions of higher learning should provide stimulation for future growth when training elementary principals and provide opportunities for learning experience while serving as a principal. While reading training is an important part of the principal's needs, it is not the only need which the college and universities might serve.

The public school system also should provide aid in assisting the elementary principal to grow professionally in the field of reading and other areas. Visitation opportunities incorporating a variety of schools should be made available and encouraged. Reports on latest developments and ideas in reading instruction should be distributed to all principals. The public schools could provide the principal with books and periodicals which deal with reading and instruction, on a regular basis. If money is available, the principal should have the opportunity to return to school with at least a part of his experience paid for.

If principals prove to be ineffective after all attempts have been made to increase his leadership ability, it is recommended that his position in education be shifted. He may be able to fill a position in some other capacity, but if he is not providing leadership in reading instruction and other instructional areas, he is not an elementary principal.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barbe, Walter B., Educators Guide to Instruction, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969.
2. Bassone, Richard M., "The Principal's Role in the Reading Program," Elementary English, 40:277-79, March, 1963.
3. Betts, Emmett A., Foundations of Reading Instruction, New York: The MacMillan Co., 1947.
4. Bond, Guy L., & Bond, Eva, Teaching the Child to Read, New York: The MacMillan Co., 1946.
5. Burton, William Henry, & Brueckner, Leo J., Supervision: A Social Process, Appleton-Century Crofts, New York, 1955.
6. Calabria, Frank M., "Characteristics of Effective Teachers", Educational Research Bulletin, Vol. XXXIX, No. 4, April 13, 1960.
7. Campbell, F. Roald, & Gregg, Russell T., Administrative Behavior in Education, Harper Bros., New York, 1957.
8. Clymer, Theodore, "Approaches to Reading Instruction", The National Elementary Principal, XLV, November, 1965.
9. Coladarci, Arthur P., "Administrative Success Criteria", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XXXVII, No. 7, April, 1956.
10. Cooper, John E., Elementary School Principalship, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, 1967.
11. Curtin, James & Gilbertson, Stanley, "The Principal and the Instruction Program", The National Elementary Principal, 45:53-55, Sept., 1965.
12. Cutts, Warren G., Modern Reading Instruction, Washington, D.C., The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.
13. DeCarlo, Mary Rossini, & Cleland, Donald L., "A Reading In-Service Education Program for Teachers", The Reading Teacher, Vol. 22, No. 2, Nov., 1968, p. 163.

14. Devine, James Edward, A Study of What an Elementary Principal Should Know About the First Grade Reading Program, Thesis presented to C.W.S.C., 1968.
15. Durkin, Delores, "What School Administrators Should Know About Early Reading Program", Nations Schools, Vol. 81, No. 3, March, 1968, pp. 126-132.
16. Enochs, James B., "Elementary School Administrators Evaluate Themselves", Elementary School Journal, Sept., 1950, pp. 15-21.
17. Graffe, Orin B., & Street, Alvin M., Improving Competence in Educational Administration, Harper & Bros., N. Y., 1956.
18. Gross, Neal and Herriott, Robert E., Staff Leadership in Public Schools, A Sociological Inquiry", John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: N. Y., 1966.
19. Halpin, Andrew, Theory and Research in Administration, The MacMillan Co., N. Y., 1966.
20. Harris, Albert J., "Key Factors in a Successful Reading Program", Elementary English, Jan., 1969, p. 69.
21. Harris, Ben M., Supervisory Behavior in Education, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1964.
22. Hicks, William K., & Jameson, Marshall C., The Elementary School Principal at Work, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1957.
23. Ladd, Margaret Rhoads, The Relation of Social, Economic, and Personal Characteristics to Reading Ability, Published with approval of Professor Arthur I. Gates, sponsor, New York City, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933.
24. McCracken, Glenn, The Right to Learn, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1959.
25. Mickelson, Peter Palmer & Hansen, Kenneth H., Elementary School Administration, McGraw Hill, New York, 1957.
26. Misner, Paul J., Schneider, Frederick W., Keith, Lowell G., Elementary School Administration, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, 1963.

27. Morrison, Coleman, "The Role of the School Principal," Combining Research Results and Good Practice, Mildred Dawson, Editor, Vol. II, Part 2, Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Convention, International Reading Association, 1966-1967, pp. 125-131.
28. Olsen, Hans C., "Criteria for Selecting Materials to Teach Reading--Elementary", Conference Proceedings--International Reading Association, J. Allen Figurel, Ed., Indiana University N.W. Congress, Vol. 12, part 1, Proceedings of 12th Annual, Neward, Delaware, 1968.
29. Pharis, William L., "In-Service Education of Elementary School Principals", Washington Dept. of Elementary Principals, National Education Association, 1966.
30. Spain, Charles, Drummond, Harold D., & Goodlad, John I., Educational Leadership and the Elementary School Principal, Rinehart, N. Y., 1956.
31. Stoops, Emery & Marks, James R., Elementary School Supervision--Processes and Trends, Allyn and Bacon, 1965.
32. Strang, Ruth & Lindquist, Donald M., The Administrator and the Improvement of Reading, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1960.



March 16, 1969

Dear Principal:

The following is a questionnaire designed to sample the **type** of training and background you have experienced in the reading field. This study is being conducted for the writing of a thesis.

Since all information gathered is to be considered collectively and confidentially, your most direct responses are requested. Of course, the success of such a study is dependent upon the completions of this questionnaire and its return to me. I appreciate your cooperation and am enclosing the necessary materials.

In addition, enclosed is an envelope addressed to one of your teachers. I would appreciate it if you would distribute it to a member of your staff currently instructing in the reading area (1-6).

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ken W. Anderson  
Graduate Student  
Central Washington State College  
3216 J. St.  
Washougal, Washington 98671

Enclosures

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond briefly to the following:

1. Year of graduation from college \_\_\_\_\_
2. Year granted principal's credential \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of years at present school \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of reading courses taken while an undergraduate \_\_\_\_\_
5. Number of reading courses taken during graduate work in preparation for principal's credential \_\_\_\_\_
6. Number of reading courses taken since issuance of principal's credential \_\_\_\_\_
7. Number of teaching years experience at elementary level \_\_\_\_\_

Please circle the one number which best indicates the degree to which you feel you have been active in the areas mentioned below:

8. I have taught reading as a separate subject during my teaching days ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
9. I attend workshops or in-service meetings which deal with reading instruction ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
10. I read current reports and/or articles which deal with methods and materials of reading instruction . 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
11. I have worked on/or with committees or study groups in the area of reading curriculum ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
12. I familiarize myself with the various programs now available to the public schools through textbook publishers .. 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)

March 16, 1969

Dear Teacher:

The following is a questionnaire designed to sample your principal's role in the reading program in your school. This study is being conducted for the writing of a thesis.

Since all information gathered is to be considered collectively and confidentially, your most direct responses are requested. Of course, the success of such a study is dependent upon the completion of this questionnaire and its return to me. I appreciate your cooperation and am enclosing the necessary materials.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ken W. Anderson  
Graduate Student  
Central Washington State College  
3216 J. St.  
Washougal, Washington 98671

Enclosure

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond briefly to the following:

1. Year of graduation from college \_\_\_\_\_
2. Grade level now teaching \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of years in present building \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of years taught at elementary level \_\_\_\_\_
5. Number of years taught under present principal \_\_\_\_\_
6. Degree of education (B.A., M.A., 5th year, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

Please circle the one number which best indicates the degree to which you feel your principal has been active in the areas mentioned below:

7. My principal makes helpful suggestions  
in matters dealing with reading curriculum ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
8. My principal shows good knowledge of the  
problems teachers encounter in teaching reading ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
9. My principal makes regular observations  
in my classroom to help assist me with reading instruction ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
10. My principal has worked with me and with  
other staff members in developing our current reading program ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
11. My principal has provided opportunities  
for in-service growth in methods and materials for reading instruction ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
12. My principal has provided (within limits  
of budget) the appropriate materials needed for the teaching of reading ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
13. My principal has worked with me and  
other staff members to set up an evaluation system to measure students' growth in reading ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)
14. My principal is attuned to the attitudes  
of my students regarding our current reading program ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(often) (sometimes) (seldom)

15. My principal has worked with me and other staff members to develop a working philosophy of reading instruction for our building ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (often) (sometimes) (seldom)
16. My principal maintains good staff morale by being appreciative of good reading instruction ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (often) (sometimes) (seldom)
17. My principal encourages suggestions on ways of strengthening the current reading program ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (often) (sometimes) (seldom)
18. My principal provides assistance to me and other staff members in interpreting reading test results ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (often) (sometimes) (seldom)
19. My principal works with me and other staff members in using test results to plan a better program for the students.... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (often) (sometimes) (seldom)
20. My principal demonstrates that he has a firm commitment to better reading instruction ..... 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 (often) (sometimes) (seldom)