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Introduction

...the principal is an integral part of the dynamic process of education where the forces of administration meet the problems and ideas of teachers, pupils, parents, and community organizations. He operates in a framework where face-to-face relationships are typical practice and where he has to prove himself and vindicate his ideas as an educator. He cannot assume a position of indecision, procrastination, or lack of action. The principal, to a greater extent than any other administrator must assume responsibility in an active program under careful and sometimes critical scrutiny of teachers, pupils, and lay citizens. The success or failure of the school program in the individual school depends largely upon him (Burrup, 1962, p. 13).

Payne (as cited by Jacobson and Reeves, 1941) adds to the significance of the foregoing statement as he writes: "The success of a school program depends more upon the principal than any other person in the entire school program (v.p.)."

The role of the principal as a vital cog in administrative machinery is not a matter of controversy, but rather, is an established fact.

Principalship is not only important in the process of public school education; it is a vital leadership entity in the seminaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
Importance of the Study

The expansion of the seminary program is continuing at such an accelerated rate that more responsibility for the administration of local programs has been delegated to the principal. The emerging role of the principal is one that will necessarily require more attention in the future.

Limited formal study of the seminary principal's role has been attempted in the past. There now exists a need for a detailed analysis of seminary principalship. An investigation of this type would be the first step toward developing criteria for the selection of principals and the eventual establishment of a training in the administration of seminaries.

For these reasons, it is believed that this study will be valuable to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and other institutions sponsoring programs of released-time religious instruction.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to determine the perceptions of teachers, principals and coordinators in the L. D. S. Sem-
inaries along the Wasatch Front of Utah as they relate to (a) the role of the seminary principal and (b) the actual performance of seminary principals.

The answers to the following questions were also sought:

1. Will the cumulative ratings of the respondents' perception of the seminary principal's role differ significantly with their cumulative ratings of the principals' actual performance?

2. Will affiliation with a seminary district significantly influence the respondents' perceptions of the seminary principal's role or their ratings of the principals' actual performance?

Definition of Terms

Some of the specific terms defined for use in this study are:

*Released-time seminaries* refers to organized programs of religious instruction maintained by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in facilities adjacent to public schools to which a student may be released by parental permission during regularly scheduled school hours.

*Instructional supervision* as used in this study refers
to those activities of the principal that assist in the development of a more effective teaching-learning situation.

Administrative-clerical tasks are those activities of the principal that are concerned with the general keeping of records, preparation of reports, preparation of a budget, administration of finances, and management of the physical plant.

Leadership will refer to the ability of the principal to motivate faculty members to contribute to the establishment and attainment of group goals.

Human relations alludes to the ability of the principal to develop relationships with others based on mutual trust, friendliness, respect, and warmth (Yauch, 1957, pp. 90-91).

Guidance and counseling adverted to in this study will comprise those activities of the seminary faculty which aid students in achieving personal adjustment and in the attainment of socially acceptable goals particularly as they relate to religious values.

Ideal ratings will be used in this study to identify the respondents' perceptions of the role of the seminary prin-
principal as registered on the questionnaire rating scales.

**Actual ratings** will refer to the respondents' evaluations of the principals' actual performance as registered on the questionnaire rating scales.

**Occupational categories** is used to refer to the three occupational identities that were sampled in this study; i.e., teachers, principals, and coordinators.

**Review of Related Research**

The material presented in this section will include items relative to principalship in the public schools and the seminaries. The role of the principals as an educational leader has certain universal implications that are appropriate in a variety of situations; therefore it is felt that a discussion of public school principalship is germane to this study.

**Public School Principalship**

**Diversity**

Wide diversity from district to district, exists relative to the functional responsibilities of principals. Hencley and McCleary (1965) note some of the more obvious evidences of
this as:

... the manner in which different principals spend their time; the salience principals attach to their particular tasks and duties; the expectations held for principal participation in educational policy making and leadership; the definitions of the principal's responsibilities for improvement of teaching-learning opportunities; and in the scope of the principal's responsibilities for structuring educational programs, for effecting staff improvement, for fostering student development and for the development of effective school management process (p. 73).

The lack of standardization can most likely be attributed to the great differences in administrative settings. Hencley and McCleary (1965, p. 74) further point out some of the environmental conditions affecting individuals school districts. Among those are these: (1) the size of the school; (2) the number and the competence of personnel serving the district; (3) the varying traditions and operating procedures; and (4) the organizational concepts that underlie the district's operations.

In addition to the variances that exist among districts relative to administrative conditions and practices, another important component of the standardization problem must be recognized. The school administrator's role has been
defined at least four different ways during the last twenty years.

Miller (1960) enumerates these as:

1. The inclusive type. This requires the school executive to assume responsibility for all tasks and duties for which administration and administrators may be accountable.

2. Exclusive or restrictive type. This type seeks to separate administration from policy making and stresses the organizational maintenance function of the administrator.

3. Standardized or division of labor type. This highlights the administrator's role in impersonalizing and standardizing administrative procedures through the development of job descriptions, the structuring of bureaucratic working patterns, and the formalization of organizational work flow procedures.

4. The integrative or relational type. This type directs attention to the administrator's role in the development, management and decision making with reference to (a) educational goals, (b) operations, and (c) interactions and adjustments within the organization and between organization and environment (pp. 60-61).

Lack of uniformity from district to district makes the task of standardizing evaluation criteria difficult. Burrup (1962, p. 368) and other authorities in the field of educational administration acknowledge this problem openly and agree that the most adequate attempt at achieving this task may be embodied
in the *Evaluative Criteria* as approved by the General Committee, Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards. Burrup suggests that these criteria applied by the principal himself and by others with particular emphasis on such areas as administration, supervision, and student activities.

**Leadership**

The man who assumes the role of principal deserves initial consideration as some of the important constituent properties of principalship are examined.

There has been much research conducted on the man who occupies the leadership role. The answer to a common question is sought: i.e., what distinguishing factors separate the leader from the followers? Ovard (1966, pp. 5-7) summarizes the research in this area briefly as evolving in three different stages:

1. The search for universal traits.
2. The shift to leadership typology, biography, motivation, and behavior.
3. The leader studied as part of the group process.

*Trait versus perceptual leadership.* Bird (1940) surveyed
the studies based on isolating specific traits indicative of successful leadership. He discovered 79 traits that were identified in different studies. Only 5 percent of these were common to four or more of these investigations.

Combs and Snygg (1959) indicate that the trait approach as it relates to helping people achieve desired behavior "... often fails because it is exclusively concerned with what people do (p. 294)." They further argue that behavior is only "... a symptom of expression of dynamic factors within the individual that produce a unique way of behaving (p. 294)". They add that teaching or exhorting people by telling them how to act is ineffective. The significant ingredients producing behavior (whether it is interpreted as leadership behavior or administrative behavior) are (1) individual need and (2) the state of the person's perceptual field at the moment of behaving.

The perceptual approach seems to lend support to some recent attempts to define leadership by studying the ways through which leaders evolve in the group process, (Gouldner in Kemp, 1964).

Gouldner (1964, p. 205) lists the inadequacies of the trait approach:
1. There is no establishment by trait theorists as to which of the traits are most important and which are the least important.

2. Some of the traits mentioned in a single list are not mutually exclusive.

3. No discrimination is made between traits facilitating ascent to leadership and those enabling it to be maintained.

4. Questions are raised concerning the organization of behavior, range of recurring behavior, patterns manifest by individuals.

5. The study of personalities of leaders, as of any other group of individuals, in terms of traits involves certain debatable assumptions regarding the nature of personality (p. 205).

Gibb (1947) summarizes the most recent feelings toward leadership formation as he writes: "There is no one leadership type of personality. Leadership resides not exclusively in the individual but in his functional relationship with other members of his group (p. 231)."

Research points out some important factors that affect the
immersion of the leader in a group as he relates to the other members.

Competence. Competence is one of the important factors dictating the acceptance or rejection of an individual as a leader. It has been shown in research projects that group members will often support a person with a reputation of competence as the leader although they have not directly observed his success. Haiman (1948) demonstrated this when he produced a change in attitude in students with the use of a recording.

Levenger (1959) demonstrated the same principle when he experimented with dyads who were involved in the planning of a model town.

To transfer this principle of competence to the school situation as it involves the principal's acceptance as a leader, Yauch (1957) is quoted as follows:

Recent research in the field of administration reveals that the successful leader is a combination of two primary abilities: the ability to organize the conditions which make it possible for a group to achieve its own purposes and the ability to develop a relationship with others based on mutual trust, friendliness, respect, and warmth (pp. 90-91).

The competence of a person accorded the leadership role
in a group must reveal itself in his ability to be flexible in his approach to problems. Although the leader may have some preferred method of behavior, the situation itself may demand that he function differently under various circumstances: e.g., in some situations he lacks the administrative freedom to engage in more than limited use of democratic procedure.

Studies further indicate that competence as recognized by one panel of authorities would include the ability on the part of the principal to employ "... a creative approach to matters of educational concern." Clark (as cited in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1960) further expands the meaning of this in his study wherein he tested nine critical areas of administrative behavior and found that the effective administrators "... used very systematic procedures which solved problems satisfactorily and relieved them of time-consuming, repetitive functions (p. 1251)."

Judging group opinion. The leader of a group has also been identified in studies of groups as a person who has superior ability compared to the non-leaders and isolates in a group when it comes to judging group opinion on familiar and relevant
issues (Cohowdery and Newcombe, 1952, pp. 51-57).

Cohowdery and Newcombe concluded: "It is possible that leaders are accorded the leader status because they are superior in their ability in evaluating group opinion."

They then add:

Leadership ability may be adapted to a wide range of membership characters. But leaders of particular groups seem to be chosen because their potentialities have been developed in particular directions, as called for by the differentiated interests of the group members (p. 57).

This would necessarily mean that an individual may gain the leadership role in one group because he possesses the abilities called for by the other group members. In a different group or in the same group under other circumstances where the needs are different, he may not be accorded leader status because he does not have the abilities to fit the needs of the group.

Communication. Communication is a critical function in a group. Leavett (1951) found in one study of groups:

1. Communication patterns affected the behavior of the groups.

2. The major behavior differences attributable
to communication were differences in accuracy, total activity, satisfaction of group members, emerging of a leader and organization of a group.

3. Positions which individuals occupied in a communication pattern affected their behavior while occupying those positions.

4. The characteristic of communication patterns that most clearly correlated with behavioral differences was centrality.

5. Where one position is low in centrality relative to the other members of the group, that position will be a follower position, dependent on the leader, accepting his dictates, falling into a role that allows little opportunity for prestige, activity or self-expression.

6. It is tentatively suggested that centrality affects behavior via the limits that it imposes on independence of action, relative to other members of the group, in turn, held to be the primary determinant of the definition of who shall take the primary leadership role, total satisfaction with one's lot and other specific behaviors (pp. 38-50).

Clark (as cited in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1960, p. 1251) found that effective principals had more contact with teachers and students and in general had higher frequency of behavior categorized as communicating and showing consideration than did ineffective principals.

With respect to their principals, teachers in one study expect:
... the principal to be sympathetic. Teachers expect him to support them 100% on everything they do in response to requests from the principal. They want principals to listen to problems -- whether they are personal or professional and they want to be sure that the principal is committed to working for the best working conditions that can be provided (Cooke 1966, p. 68).

Teachers desire not only to have their principals communicate in a way that is clear and demonstrate professional competency with regard to educational matters, but they desire to have their leader communicate empathy and understanding toward them personally.

In establishing a meaningful relationship with those who come to him, the principal must communicate a positive regard for the individual, his feelings and experiences. The underlying tone for his relationships with others must be that of genuineness that denotes there is a congruence in each relationship (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967, pp. 28-29).

**Motivation.** Motivation of those with whom he works is a significant index of success in principalship. Miller (1962, pp. 422-423) suggests that motivation is not a direct function of salary alone, but rather, the establishment of a feeling of
well being allowing the faculty and staff to share in management and finally, the ability to direct people in such a way so that they achieve their goals. These are all things that initiate action on the part of group members to contribute to the success of a school program.

Encouraging people to responsible innovation is a very practical method of determining the degree to which a leader can motivate his fellow workers. According to a study reported in the NASSP Bulletin (October, 1965), the principal who wishes to encourage innovation in his school would do well to behave in such a way that:

1. He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the members.
2. He anticipates problems and plans for them.
3. He argues persuasively for his point of view.
4. Things turn out as he predicts.
5. He keeps the group working together as a team.
6. He looks after the personal welfare of group members.
7. He makes accurate decisions.
8. He is friendly and approachable.

9. He represents the group to outsiders.

10. He speaks from a strong inner conviction.

11. He can reduce a madhouse to system and order.

12. His word carries weight with his superiors.

13. He does not become anxious when he cannot find out what is coming next.

14. He is clearly recognized as the leader of the group.

15. He is willing to allow the members freedom of action (Jacobs, 1965, p. 16).

Some of the behavior types mentioned in the foregoing paragraph relate to the principal's ability to react with other people adequately. These bear emphasis. They are: (5) the ability to correlate the group's activities in a team effort; (6) concern for the welfare of others; (8) friendliness and approachability; (12) respect by superiors for his judgment and ability; and (15) willingness to allow members of his group to exercise freedom in their actions.

It is fair to assume that these actions on the part of a principal contribute to the establishment of a working environment
where security and well being lessen the threat of failure and create an atmosphere where innovation is encouraged without fear of retaliation.

Relationships with others. In further casting light on those factors that are valuable in improving relationships between the principal and his co-workers, it is interesting to cast a glance in passing at some of the factors which supervisors and teachers in one study cited as critical requirements of the principal. Cooper (as cited in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1960) enumerates these as:

1. Development of student potential and student needs.

2. Apperceptive guidance of the community in a cooperative venture.

3. Coordination of group effort and advancement of harmonious relationships.

4. Conformity to professional standards of conduct and principles of leadership (p. 1246).

This study points out that not only do supervisors and teachers expect that a principal will place the development of student potential and the meeting of student needs as the target of the school program, but they suggest that the goals are best attained
under the leadership of a man who can enlist the support of the community as a whole and coordinate the efforts of all concerned through harmonious relationships. They add that they feel the most effective way to achieve this end is by the principal conducting himself in a professional manner.

Lipham (1960), in his study of effective versus ineffective principals, indicates that the effective principal is characterized as one who:

1. Has high social ability.

2. Is able to associate successfully with others in the solution of problems.

3. Feels that he has attained his initial position as a principal because of his ability to relate well to others.

4. Finds that helping teachers with problems is his greatest source of job satisfaction (pp. 1-4).

The significant point here to be underlined is that not only did the effective principals in the foregoing study feel that their ability to relate to other people was a key element in their selection as a principal, but they recognized it as a primary index of success and the one item contributing the most to job satisfaction.
Leadership Acts

Principalship may also be analyzed by considering the actual acts of leadership essential to the accomplishment of the tasks assigned the principal. Ovard (1966, pp. 30-35) suggests that some of the more pertinent of these are:

1. Planning
2. Initiating
3. Managing
4. Delegating
5. Coordinating
6. Decision making
7. Evaluating
8. Communicating

All of the items mentioned above are acts that leaders are required to perform as a part of their role whether they be leaders of schools, businesses or public works. They will serve as a format for the discussion of leadership acts that follow.

Planning. It is evident all men occupying leadership capacities must face a number of problems in achieving their goals. It is a matter of necessity that the leader facilitate the
operating of his organization by adopting certain planning measures that will meet the needs of common situations before they arise. The military leader has his Standard Operating Procedures as a reference for guidance, and the educator establishes a set of plans and policies to accomplish a like purpose in the performance of his tasks.

Initiating. Initiating or commencing action in any organization has equal importance with the planning phase of leadership function. The leader must in some way enlist the interest, cooperation and dedication of those with whom he works in order that goals be achieved. There are a variety of means whereby this can be accomplished. It would appear that means of motivating people today as compared with those utilized in the 1920's are quite different. The difference is attributed to the people who are being supervised according to James Thompson who is quoted by Ovard (1968) as stating:

'Good supervision' of the 1920 variety in America was rooted in a firm paternalism in which fear-inspired discipline had a large role. The same supervisory behavior today is 'bad supervision.' Why? In part, I think, because the individuals being supervised today have more education, are better organized, and place higher value on human dignity (p. 58).
Eikenberry (1951) agrees with Thompson and further illuminates some of the factors involved in the school situation:

It is rather widely admitted that one of the failures of the school administrator of a generation or two ago was the dogmatic manner in which most problems were solved — the autocracy, as it were, of the high school principal's group. This dictatorship type of administration revealed a lack of knowledge of, and belief in, the intelligent research into the psychological growth processes of both the faculty and the student body. During recent years, we have come to a much better understanding and appreciation of the democratic processes. Principals are discovering that, through democratic processes we may have many methods of attack upon administrative problems with a number of solutions, rather than a limited single answer to questions and difficulties that arise (p. 27).

Teacher motivation is a product of many things. Miller (1962) suggests that the feeling of belonging and an actual sharing in the management of the school are valuable contributors. He adds that teachers are particularly motivated when they are included in the formulating of policies and programs which directly affect their behavior.

Chase (1951) makes clear that one of the items that increased staff satisfaction was the extent in which the teachers were allowed to participate in the formulation of:
1. Curriculum changes.

2. Policies governing grouping, promotion, and control of pupils.

3. Salary schedules (pp. 127-132).

**Management.** Management deals with the routines and procedures that grow out of experience and planning. This aspect of the principal's role is one that can occupy a large amount of his time. It would appear that the fact that many administrators have used the management facet of their job as that part to which they give primary emphasis.

The time expenditures of principals are interesting to study because they indicate the degree of importance principals place on management tasks. The administrative-clerical tasks and the supervision of instruction are the two areas of the principal's management task that seem to most frequently come into conflict with each other.

Whatcott (1965) describes the problem simply as one where supervising principals in elementary schools consistently express the belief that they should be spending more time on supervisory tasks than they are now, but in reality the national
trend for this group indicates that they are actually decreasing
the time spent rather than increasing it. Her study of 48 Utah
supervising principals in the elementary schools revealed that:

1. Utah principals are generally typical of the nation-
al average in actual allotment of time and desired allot-
ment of time in each of seven main role areas.

2. Utah principals spend an average of 25 percent
more time on administrative-clerical duties than on super-
vision and expressed a desire to spend 15 percent less on
the administrative-clerical role than on supervision.

3. The three rationale most commonly selected to
explain this apportionment of time were: excessive admin-
istrative-clerical demands, district pressure for admin-
istrative-clerical work and preference for 20 percent more
administrative-clerical work than supervision.

4. Positive correlation significant at the 1 percent
level of confidence was found between desire to spend time
in the role areas of administration, clerical work and
supervision and the time actually spent on these role
areas (pp. 63-64).

It would appear from the results of the study conducted by
Whatcott that the principal's time expenditures are a direct pro-
duct of his basic desires. If he desires to spend more time in
supervision than in the clerical tasks, or visa versa, he will
actually perform that way.

Delegating. It is obvious that the principal must delegate
part of his duties so that he can accomplish all the tasks for
which he is responsible. The choice of tasks to be delegated
is largely governed by their nature. Ovard (1966, p. 32) places the principal's tasks into three large categories: (1) duties that are mandatory, (2) duties that are discretionary, and (3) duties that can be delegated.

Tead (1959, p. 31) indicates that proper delegation should include some method of regular review and some means of follow up. He also adds that delegation should be explicit and as generous as possible.

**Coordinating.** Coordinating is a very vital function of leadership. For the principal it means correlating the activities, programs, and efforts of the school enterprise. It builds the feeling of order and lends to the students and faculty alike the air of importance that each needs if he is to feel that his program is important. Tead (1959) enlarges on this as he states:

Coordination is the effort to insure a smooth interplay of the functions and forces of all the different component parts of an organization to the end that its purposes will be realized with a minimum of friction and a maximum of collaborative effectiveness (p. 36).

**Decision making.** The value and effectiveness of the democratic process as it relates to the motivation of the staff of a school in the initiatory process of principalship
has already been discussed. It was suggested that where the
teachers or staff of a school are able to aid in the making of
decisions that affect them directly they feel motivated and
involved. Parallel studies in industry reveal the same result:
e.g., a study of performance appraisal at the General Electric
Company (Mahar and Coddington, 1965) concluded: "Experi-
ments showed that men who worked under high participation
levels performed best on goals that they set for themselves
(pp. 128-129)." Harris (1963, p. 11) further indicates that
leadership which operates on a democratic basis is more
effective in initiating changes in individuals than were more
authoritative methods.

Before a problem is considered by the group as a whole,
it is necessary for the leader to consider these important
factors:

1. Time. Must the decision be made immediately?

2. The type of people involved. Do they have the
necessary knowledge at hand to make the decision and
have they had much experience in group techniques?

3. The ways the results will affect the people
involved. Will it result in the dismissal of one of
them?

At this point it is obvious that there are some decisions that cannot be made by any one except the principal himself. The foregoing conditions of the situation itself will aid the principal in deciding whether he must make the ruling or whether others may share in the process. As in the delegation of all his duties, the principal must assume there are some things which are mandatory, others which are discretionary and others which may be readily delegated.

Ovard (1966, p. 33) indicates that regardless of the method used in arriving at a decision there are two important factors influencing decision making: (1) values and (2) knowledge and understanding. He further points out that the principal must know his own value system and have some conviction of what is in the best interest of the school, faculty, students, and community.

Evaluation. Evaluation is a vital aspect of any school program. There are many aspects of the total school program that have need to be evaluated. Burrup (1962, pp. 364-368) suggests that the principal's performance be evaluated by (1)
the administration, (2) the faculty and (3) by the principal himself. Gardner (1964) reveals that if a man desires to continually re-vitalize his life that he does not leave an exploration of his own potentialities to chance. "It is something that he pursues systematically, or at least avidly, to the end of his days (p. 11)."

The discovery of talent is only one side, he continues, the other side is self-knowledge. A daily self-appraisal and seeking the evaluations of others enables a leader to arrive at a state of being where he not only has a better picture of what he can become but also he is able to determine the quality of his performance.

The principal is an evaluator of others. He must continually measure the effectiveness of the teaching-learning situation, the curriculum, school plant, administrative processes, supply and transportation systems and many other aspects of the total school program. He must welcome the opportunity to have evaluative teams, whether they be from the district office or from accrediting associations, enter his school and assess its progress. He must be open to the comments from community leaders and others who reflect the community's opinion of the
educational enterprise. All of these go together to aid him and his staff in the planning of new programs approaching the solutions to school problems, in general improving the entire school effort.

Communication. The value of communication has already been discussed as it applies to the leadership role in a group situation. Needless to say, communication is a primary success factor in principalship. Whether it be within the staff itself, between the principal and the students, or the school and the community, communication cannot be disregarded without serious consequence. It is significant to the coordination of all school programs and equally important in all the other leadership functions already cited in this study: i.e., delegating, decision making, planning, initiating, managing, and evaluating. Without effective communication the school could not successfully operate.

Tasks. The final phase of this investigation of research related to public school principalship is to approach from the standpoint of the tasks contained within the role itself.

Hencley and McCleary (1965) quote the findings of a study
conducted by the Southern States Cooperative Program as they refer to the tasks of administration. They list the following as task areas.

1. Instruction and curriculum development.
2. Pupil personnel.
3. Community-school relationship.
4. Staff personnel.
5. School plant.
7. School finance and business management (pp. 10-11).

This list matches the one included in Burrup's Modern High School Administration. He also quotes the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration and adds one more area of consideration -- school transportation.

Burrup (1962) cites an actual outline of general duties of secondary school principals as prepared by the school personnel of Shoreline, Washington. This will give a general outline of the actual duties with which secondary school principals are typically charged.

A. General Administrative Responsibilities
1. To have general supervision of all areas in the school.

2. To make final decisions regarding matters of school policy and practice.

3. To make or confirm all teaching and activity assignments.

4. To interpret policies set up by the school board to building personnel and to students.

5. To serve on district committees as requested by the superintendent.

6. To represent the high school level in district, county, state athletic associations and in principal's associations.

7. To serve on state and local professional committees.

8. To develop a working philosophy for the high school.

9. To exercise leadership in developing and evaluating the curriculum program of the school.

10. To establish and promote a research program to assist in evaluation of the entire school program.

11. To keep the school board informed, through the superintendent's office, of the total school program, including co-curricular activities.

B. Responsibilities in Relation to Personnel

1. To participate in selection and retention of all staff personnel.
2. To assign, supervise, and evaluate building personnel.

3. To encourage all staff members to participate in the administration of the educational program.

4. To practice guidance and leadership of staff in matters of morale.

5. To assume leadership of the principal's cabinet.

6. To plan, lead faculty meetings.

7. To act as a liaison person between building personnel and the district.

8. To orient new staff members, substitute teachers, and cadets.

9. To promote professional growth of teachers.

10. To maintain a file of pertinent factual records of personnel.

11. To visit classrooms frequently for classroom observation.

12. To establish a professional library.

13. To report to the superintendent, professional progress of staff members and to evaluate their work.

C. Responsibilities in Relation to Students

1. To assume responsibility for welfare of students.

2. To supervise student registration.
3. To certify students for graduation.

4. To assume general responsibility for the graduation program.

5. To provide for adequate reports to parents on progress of the students.

6. To assume responsibility for conferences and decisions in relation to probations and suspensions of students in regard to their academic standards.

7. To establish adequate communications with students.

8. To conduct case conferences.

D. Building Administration

1. To prepare the schedule of classes.

2. To coordinate plans for building alterations and additions.

3. To coordinate activities of departments, areas, and groups to promote efficiency and harmony.

E. Responsibilities in Regard to Public Relations

1. To guide and lead building personnel in public relations activities.

2. To publicize and interpret school policy and practice.

3. To serve as liaison between visitors to the building and school personnel.
4. to pass on the accuracy and effect of releases to the press, (pp. 20-21).

**Seminary Principalship**

The principalship in the Latter-day Saint Seminaries was developed largely by accretion and not according to any predetermined plan (Jones, 1956, p. 105). A brief historical overview of the evolution of the role of the principal in the seminaries will aid in better understanding the present status of principals in the seminary system of the L. D. S. Church. Such a sketch is provided as a background for the discussion of seminary principalship.

**Principalship, 1919-1928.** During the period of 1919 to 1928, the term "principal" and "teacher" were used synonymously in the seminaries and there was no salary differential between the two positions, according to Adam S. Bennion, who served as the Superintendent of Church Schools during that period (as cited by Jones, 1956, p. 97).

There was no attempt to outline the administrative duties of those who served as principals in the seminaries and no
handbook of instructions was issued during this period (Jones, 1956).

Principalship, 1935-1953. An interview with Franklin L. West, who served as the Church Commissioner of Education from 1935 to 1953, shows the following development in seminary principalship during that period:

1. The Administrative Code published in 1944 was the only official statement of a principal's duties prepared during his administration.

2. A salary schedule was set up which provided for some additional compensation for principals depending on the number of teachers serving under them.

3. Objective criteria were set up and principals in larger seminaries were granted one additional free period each day during which they were expected to take care of administrative work.

4. A teacher's handbook was published in 1949 which gave some instructions to principals regarding the administration of seminaries.

5. The orientation of principals was accomplished largely at summer conventions. Supervisors in their regular visits to seminaries were expected to instruct principals in their administrative duties.

6. During this period, seminary principals were "teaching principals". Three men, however, served in positions which required that they devote their full time to administration and supervision. One man
served for a period of time in the Hawaiian Islands, where his time was devoted to the supervision of an elementary week-day religious education program. In 1950, principals were appointed in the Phoenix and Los Angeles areas who devoted their full time to the administration and supervision of early morning seminary classes (Jones, 1956).

Principalship, 1953 to the present. The past 17 years has seen the development of many new seminaries within Utah and the surrounding states where released-time religion classes are taught. A significant part of this growth has been the development of programs adjacent to junior high schools and in special service areas such as the State Industrial Schools in Utah and in Idaho; the State Hospital at Provo, Utah; and the Utah State Training School at American Fork.

The addition of these programs as well as the demand for additional seminaries to keep pace with the development of new secondary schools throughout Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming has brought about tremendous growth in the released-time program of the Department of Seminaries and Institutes.

In 1970, there were over 30 seminaries where the faculty
ranged from 5 men to 13. The need for faculties to function as an educational unit somewhat like their counterparts in the public schools has arrived. The function and role of the Principal becomes one of significant consequence to the success or failure of the local seminary program.

In 1967, two seminary districts (Davis and Ogden) began experimenting with a secretarial assistance program. While student secretaries had been used in past years and subsidized by the Department of Seminaries and Institutes in seminaries where there were large faculties (five teachers or more), this experimental program authorized the use of professionally qualified secretaries in large seminaries for four hours of each school day.

It is advantageous to refer to the duties outlined for principals assigned to L. D. S. seminaries. The chart in the appendix, pages 101 to 104 will reveal the evolvement of the principal's duties as assigned by the Department of Seminaries and Institutes from 1944 to 1965. The data cited in the chart were extracted from the Administrative

There has been a gradual increase in the duties since the first list was given as recorded in the Administrative Code. The principal differences that exist in the original list and those appearing in later seminary handbooks are in the area of establishing more responsibility for the supervision and orientation of teachers. This was initially done through the requirement to hold regular meetings for the improvement of teachers on a district level and later evolved to include reciprocal visits to classrooms and the development of professional meetings on a local seminary level.

The principal's duties have not changed greatly over the years except to give the principal greater latitude within the areas of responsibility as outlined by the Department of Seminaries and Institutes.

Jones (1956) made a study of seminary principalship wherein he set out to determine:

1. The duties required of seminary principals.

2. The extent to which these specific duties were being recognized and performed.
3. The relative importance attached to each of these duties by the principals who performed them (p. 12).

A questionnaire was developed on the basis of the research Jones made of interviews and printed materials dealing with seminary principalship. This was sent to 154 persons listed as seminary principals on the 1964-65 roster of the Church Department of Education. One hundred fourteen were included in the study he conducted.

His findings are summarized as follows (Jones, 1956):

1. The principalship in the Latter-day Saint seminaries has developed by accretion and not according to any predetermined plan.

2. There is no single source from which a seminary principal can find a complete and authoritative statement of duties he is expected to perform.

3. The full-time teaching load of some seminary principals added to their administrative duties was unreasonably heavy and seriously impairs his effectiveness both as a teacher and as an administrator.

4. Clerical duties are requiring more of the principal's time than any other non-teaching duties.

5. There is a marked lack of uniformity and a great deal of uncertainty among seminary principals as to their understanding of duties they are expected to perform.
6. The following administrative practices seem to be carried out in accordance with education practices:

   a. budgeting and accounting procedures.
   
   b. monies are handled in a manner that insures that they are accounted for.
   
   c. guidance services are being provided.
   
   d. accurate and complete scholastic and attendance records are maintained.

7. Comparatively few of the principles of organization and administration which the jury of experts agree would benefit the administration of the seminary system are being fully applied in its administration today.

8. Greater stress, it would seem should be given to bringing the seminary administration up to the level of acceptable educational standards in the following areas:

   a. recognition of the seminary principal as the key officer in seminary administration.
   
   b. delegation of the improvement of curriculum methods as one of the important supervisory responsibilities of principals.
   
   c. provision of the services of special supervisors to seminary principals to exercise supervisory leadership and not administrative authority in their work with seminaries.
   
   d. provision of sufficient clerical assistance so that the principal can be relieved of excessive routine clerical duties and be freed to devote his time to administrative, supervisory, and teaching responsibilities.
e. reservation of the title of "seminary principal" to those persons whose training and status are approximately equal to that title in public schools.

f. provision of a separate salary schedule for principals which takes into consideration the additional educational training and added responsibilities carried.

g. employment of seminary principals for a longer period than teachers in order to give them time to make advance preparation for the fall opening of seminaries and to make out necessary reports at the close of the seminary in the spring.

h. designation of the seminary principal as the executive officer of the stake or district board of education.

i. delegation to the seminary principal of the responsibility for making purchases involving stake or district board of education funds (pp. 314-318).

Since the completion of Jones' study many of the above situations have been taken under consideration and there have been solutions to many of these problems. The duties of the seminary principal are outlined in the Manual of Instructions: Released-Time Seminaries and these are periodically revised to some extent. The brief resume of these duties reported in Appendix A indicates that limited change has
occurred in the past 21 years.

Some of the changes that have been made would include:

1. The clerical duties of principals have not lessened, however, the teaching load has been reduced in the larger seminaries to accommodate the situation.

2. A small allowance has been awarded men who assume the position of principal in the seminaries that is proportionate to the number of men he is to supervise.

While these changes have occurred some conditions remain unadjusted. Among these are:

1. No particular means other than that used to assess the performance of teachers is used to determine the effectiveness of seminary principals unless it occurs on the district level where coordinators may have devised their own evaluative methods.

2. The professional training and preparation of seminary principals appears to be varied and no standardization of criteria has been officially published for the selection of principals.

The improvement of curriculum methods has been made an official function of the Director of Seminary Curriculum who is a part of the Administrative Staff of the Department of Seminaries and Institutes. The Director has consistently
utilized various curriculum committees composed of teachers to upgrade and revitalize lesson materials. Principals are given opportunity to serve as members of these committees and in addition, they are invited to send any materials or ideas to the Director they feel will contribute to the improvement or development of the curriculum.

**Studies of Principal and Teacher Evaluation of Principalship**

A review of the literature indicates no studies where there has been a comparison of teacher, principal, or coordinator attitudes toward the role of seminary principalship. Indeed, the literature is equally void of similar studies in the public schools; however, Gentry and Kenny (1966) report a study done in 60 elementary schools in Georgia, where principals and teachers rated principal performance. The Principal's Profile, developed under a Kellogg Foundation grant by Smith and Sprowles, was used as the evaluative instrument. The three operational areas into which the Profile is divided are (1) carrying out the role of democratic leadership; (b) working effectively with school personnel; and (c) working effectively with the community and its organizations. The three operational
areas were divided into 299 administrative actions and practices.

The results of the study were:

1. Overall, the teachers and principals differed significantly in their evaluation of principal's performance on 22 of the 46 administrative practices included in the study.

2. The principals saw their performance as more satisfactory than did their teachers on 18 of 22 administrative practices on which the ratings of the two groups differed significantly.

3. Teachers gave principals a higher rating on the actuating function than on functions of planning, organizing, and evaluating (p. 67).

Based on this relatively small amount of evidence in the literature, the hypotheses used in this study of seminary principalship will be stated in the null form.

Hypotheses and Questions to be Investigated

The hypotheses tested in the study were:

1. There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers, principals, or coordinator as they relate to the role of the seminary principal.

2. There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers, principals, or coordinators as they relate to the
actual performance of seminary principals.

3. There will be no significant difference between the cumulative ideal ratings and the cumulative actual ratings of the respondents in this study.

4. There will be no significant differences in the cumulative ratings of the five seminary districts sampled in this study.

Method

Subjects

The subjects in this study consisted of teachers, principals, and coordinators of L. D. S. Seminaries along the Wasatch Front of Utah. The selection of subjects was further delimited to those associated with seminaries where there were three teachers or more in addition to the principal during the 1966-67 school year.

One hundred and forty-eight seminary personnel were initially sent questionnaires. Of these, thirty-one were teaching principals; one hundred and seventeen were teachers; and six were supervising coordinators of the six districts involved.
Instrument

An instrument was prepared by the researcher (appendix) consisting of items gleaned from a research of the literature dealing with principalship in the public schools. The questionnaire was designed to sample the following areas of principalship:

1. Techniques of instructional supervision.
2. Administrative-clerical procedures.
3. Leadership behavior.
4. Methods of supervising counseling services.

The design of the instrument used in this study was suggested by a technique developed by Osgood (1952) and Osgood and Suci (1955) which is referred to in the literature as the "semantic differential technique". It is appropriate at this point to describe it and indicate why it was used in this study.

It is not uncommon to note difficulty in measuring abstract ideas semantically. For example, what may mean one thing to one person may mean something entirely different to a second person. A third observer may make an entirely different
evaluation of the same phenomenon experienced by the first two individuals. In an attempt to handle this problem, Osgood, et. al. (1957) developed the concept of semantic meaning. Rugraff (1964) describes it briefly as:

They began by postulating a semantic space, a region of some unknown dimensionality. Each semantic scale, a pair of polar (opposite in meaning) adjectives, was assumed to be a straight line which passes through the origin of the semantic space. Several of the same type of scales represent a multi-dimensional space. The greater the number of scales, the more representative the sample, the better will be the definition of the space. When a subject compares a concept ("actual you" or "what you would like to be") with a series of scales (polar adjectives), each judgement is a selection from a given set of alternatives and serves in localizing the concept as a point in a semantic space (pp. 35-36).

The direction of a point in the semantic space will correspond to the reactions elicited by the sight of the words at either poles of the scale and the distance from the origin or midpoint of a scale will correspond to the intensity of the reactions.

This technique has been successfully used in researching problems dealing with the relationships between self and ideal-self concepts by Jorgensen (1963) and Rugraff (1964).

It was felt that the concept of principalship was one that
could be explored using the semantic differential technique since it would allow the respondents to qualitatively and quantitatively identify their perceptions of the role of a principal in terms of what they felt characterized the "ideal" principal and the seminary he would administer. In like manner, the same rating scales could be altered slightly and used by the subjects in the study to evaluate the actual performance of seminary principals, who were already active in that role.

The rating scales were constructed in such a manner so as to present the respondent with a pair of polar (opposite in meaning or nature) alternatives. The alternatives represented a sampling of different types of behavior, administrative practices, supervisory techniques, and descriptive adjectives. The pairs of alternatives were separated by a five point scale so that the respondents could indicate the direction of their agreement as well as the intensity of their choice.

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first section requested that the subjects respond to 60 rating scales presented to them in terms of the way they felt the "ideal" principal would behave and the seminary they perceived he would
administer. The second set of 60 rating scales were used by the participants in the study to evaluate the performance of the principal with whom they were associated. Principals were instructed to make a self-evaluation. The sections were clearly marked; the first section was printed on pink paper and the second section was printed on green paper to indicate the difference to those marking the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was originally given to a group of 20 individuals for criticism. Among these were teachers, principals and a coordinator. The Administrator of Seminaries and Institutes of Religion, as well as the Director of Research for the Seminaries and Institutes and members of the researcher's advisory committee also reviewed it. After several excellent suggestions, the questionnaire was revised to increase the clarity of the items on the different scales.

Procedure

The questionnaires were delivered to the individual seminaries in the spring of 1967 and after one week he returned to gather them.

As the questionnaires were gathered, they were identified by seminaries and districts. No attempt was made to identify
individual respondents other than as members of their seminary faculties and according to their seminary districts. The total population of those sampled represented seminary personnel associated with various scio-economic areas. This was done in order to gain a sample that was representative of the total seminary system where teaching principals supervise seminaries as delimited by this study.

The responses on the scales were scored manually using a scale from one to five. The first space on the extreme left of each scale was designated as a "one"; the second space as a "two"; the third as a "three" and so on up to five. The attempt here was merely to identify the location of responses along the scales and not to reflect correctness or incorrectness. This also facilitated arriving at a numerical mean for each scale and aided in the comparison of responses in the statistical analysis of the data.

The data were transferred from IBM form 553's upon which the subjects' responses were recorded to IBM form DD-5081's to facilitate analysis by the IBM 360 computer located at the Brigham Young University.

To accommodate a balance in the three major occupational
groupings (teachers, principals, and coordinators) for statistical reasons, five districts were randomly selected from those reporting, and within each district, four seminaries were randomly chosen to represent these districts. Again a balance was achieved for statistical reasons with respect to the number of teachers in each seminary; a maximum of four were randomly selected to represent each seminary. The mean of each rating scale was determined for the teachers in each seminary in order that there would not be a statistical imbalance when teachers were compared with the principals and coordinators. The total number of subjects whose responses were compared and reported in this study is 20 principals, 76 teachers, and 5 district coordinators.

Originally, each of the questionnaire items had been identified in one of the following categories: leadership, instructional supervision, administrative-clerical tasks, or supervision of counseling services. An arithmetic sum of the responses in each of the above named categories was made resulting in a composite score for leadership, instructional supervision, administrative-clerical tasks, and supervision of counseling for each of the respondents in the study.
The results of the questionnaires were subjected to an analysis of variance using the program ANOVAR from the Brigham Young University Computer Library to determine if there were significant differences when the mean responses the teachers, principals, and coordinators were compared on each item of the questionnaire. Comparisons were also made between the ideal and actual responses within each of the groups (teachers, coordinators, and principals); between the responses in the various districts sampled; and between the cumulative ratings of ideal principalship and actual principal performance. The following model was utilized in analyzing the data:

\[
\lambda + A(I) + B(U) + C(K) + AC(IK) + BC(IJK) + D(L) + AD(IL) + BD(IJL) + CD(KL) + ACD(IKL) + BCD(IJKL)
\]

"A" was used to represent the seminary districts sampled; "B" represents the seminaries within those districts; "C" represents the ideal-actual evaluations; and "D" represents the occupational identities (teachers, principals, and coordinators) within the study.

In instances where it was determined that there were significant differences in the means of the factors noted above at \( P < .05 \) level of confidence, the Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test was used to identify the sources of these differences.
Results

The results of the study will be reported as they related to the four areas of principalship investigated: i.e., leadership, instructional supervision, administrative-clerical tasks, and supervision of counseling activities.

Leadership

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers, coordinators, or principals. As they related to the leadership role of the seminary principal, Table 1 (p. 54) indicates an F ratio of .5464 when a comparison of the means tested by an analysis of variance. This is not statistically significant; therefore, hypothesis 1 was not rejected as it related to the leadership ratings of the subjects in the study.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be no significant differences in the perceptions of teachers, coordinators or principals as they relate to the actual performance of seminary principals. An analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .5464 which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence (see Table 1) and hypothesis 2 was not rejected relative to the leadership role.
Table 1
Analysis of Variance of the Leadership Role of Seminary Principalship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District (A)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.6791</td>
<td>1.5584</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 1) Seminaries (B)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.5361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-Actual (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6750</td>
<td>0.0265</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts X Ideal-Actual (AC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.8624</td>
<td>0.9393</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 2) Seminaries X Districts (BC)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.4027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings of Occupational Categories (D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>488.6583</td>
<td>14.2385</td>
<td>P&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District X Ratings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.1791</td>
<td>0.9959</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 3) Seminaries X Ratings of Occupational Categories (BD)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.3194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (CD)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2249</td>
<td>0.2034</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District X Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (ACD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3500</td>
<td>0.5464</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 4) Seminaries X Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (BCD)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.7694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to note at this point that there were significant differences at the .005 level of confidence when the cumulative ratings (Ideal plus actual ratings) of the three occupational groups were compared. The Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test was utilized to determine the source of this difference. Table 2 contains the results of that inquiry.

Table 2
Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test
of Means of Occupational Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Categories</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Coordinators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>75.799</td>
<td>6.950**</td>
<td>4.125**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>71.674</td>
<td>2.825*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>68.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level  
**Significant at .01 level

Principals differed with both coordinators and teachers at the .01 level and teachers also differed in their leadership evaluations with coordinators at the .05 level of significance on leadership items.
Hypothesis 3 stated that there would be no significant difference between the cumulative ideal ratings and the cumulative actual ratings of the respondents on the questionnaire items relating to leadership. Table 1 indicates that an analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .0265 when the ideal and actual ratings were compared. This was not statistically significant, consequently hypothesis 3 was not rejected.

The fourth hypothesis set forth was that there would be no significant differences in the cumulative ratings of the five seminary districts sampled in the study. Table 1 discloses an F ratio of 1.5584 when the ratings were compared. This was not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore, hypothesis 4 was not rejected.

**Supervision**

Table 3 (p. 58) presents the results of an analysis of variance made on those questionnaire items related to instructional supervision.

The analysis of variance performed on the data indicate that there is a significant difference in the ratings of the three occupational categories at the .005 level. The Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test was employed to locate the source of this difference. Table 4 reflects that there are no significant differences in the ideal ratings of teachers, coordinators, or principals.
### Table 3

Analysis of Variance for the Instructional Supervisional Role of Seminary Principalship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District (A)</td>
<td>6.3833</td>
<td>0.2878</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 1) Seminaries (B)</td>
<td>22.1749</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-Actual (C)</td>
<td>785.4083</td>
<td>79.1786</td>
<td>P &lt; .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts X Ideal-Actual (AC)</td>
<td>20.0750</td>
<td>2.0238</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 2) Seminaries X Districts (BC)</td>
<td>9.194</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings of Occupational Categories (D)</td>
<td>12.6583</td>
<td>0.4903</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District X Ratings of Occupational Categories (AD)</td>
<td>36.1895</td>
<td>1.4017</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 3) Seminaries X Ratings of Occupational Categories (BD)</td>
<td>25.8166</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (CD)</td>
<td>105.4083</td>
<td>7.9888</td>
<td>P &lt; .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District X Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (ACD)</td>
<td>3.9187</td>
<td>0.2970</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 4) Seminaries X Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (BCD)</td>
<td>13.1944</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Newman-Keuls

Sequential Range Test of Means of Occupational Categories as they relate to Ideal and Actual Ratings for Instructional Supervisory Role of Seminary Principalship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings of Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Actual Teacher Means</th>
<th>Actual Coordinator Ratings</th>
<th>Actual Principal Ratings</th>
<th>Ideal Coordinator Ratings</th>
<th>Ideal Principal Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>53.049</td>
<td>7.400**</td>
<td>6.799**</td>
<td>3.350*</td>
<td>1.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Coordinator Ratings</td>
<td>52.799</td>
<td>7.150**</td>
<td>6.549**</td>
<td>3.100*</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Principal Ratings</td>
<td>51.099</td>
<td>5.450**</td>
<td>4.849**</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Principal Ratings</td>
<td>49.699</td>
<td>4.050**</td>
<td>3.449**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Coordinator Ratings</td>
<td>46.250</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Teacher Ratings</td>
<td>45.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no significant differences in the ideal perceptions of the three occupational categories as they rated the instructional supervision items on the questionnaire. On
the basis of the findings reported above, hypothesis 1 was not rejected as it related to instructional supervision aspect of the seminary principal's role.

It was proposed in hypothesis 2 that there would be no significant difference in the ratings of teachers, coordinators, or principals as they evaluated the actual performance of the seminary principals. With respect to instructional supervision, the findings reported in Table 4 indicate that the self-evaluations of principals differed significantly with the actual performance ratings of both teachers and coordinators at the .01 level. When the ratings of teachers and coordinators were compared, there was no significant difference. Hypothesis 2 was rejected on the basis of the lack of agreement that existed between principals and teachers and between principals and coordinators.

When the ideal ratings were compared with the actual ratings of all of the subjects as set forth in the third hypothesis, a significant difference at the .005 level of confidence existed (see Table 3). Due to this difference, hypothesis 3 was rejected with respect to instructional supervision.

The final hypothesis tested with respect to supervision was to test if there were significant differences in the ratings of the five seminary districts studied in the research project. Table 3 reports
a F ratio of .2878 when the district ratings of supervisory practices were tested which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. There was no statistical evidence to reject hypothesis 4; therefore, it was retained.

**Administrative-clerical Tasks**

When the perceptions of teachers, coordinators, and principals were compared with reference to the administrative-clerical tasks associated with the role of the principal, no significant difference was found to exist. Table 5 (p. 61) gives an F ratio of 1.9261 as the result of an analysis of variance which tested these means. The F ratio was not statistically significant at the .05 level; therefore, hypotheses 1 and 2 were not rejected as they related to the administrative-clerical tasks of principalship.

It is important to recognize, however, that the cumulative ratings (ideal plus actual ratings) of the three occupational categories do differ significantly as the .025 level of confidence. A Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test was used to identify the sources of this difference. Note in Table 6 (p. 62) that there are significant differences in the mean rating of the coordinators as compared with both the mean ratings of the principals and the teachers at the .05 level. It is also notable that teachers do not differ significantly with the principals in their overall administrative-clerical ratings.
Table 5

Analysis of Variance for the Administrative-Clerical Tasks
Associated with Seminary Principalship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District (A)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.1583</td>
<td>1.8316</td>
<td>P&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 1) Seminaries (B)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.1194</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-Actual (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>667.4083</td>
<td>46.6809</td>
<td>P&lt; .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts X Ideal-Actual (AC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.8250</td>
<td>2.8554</td>
<td>P&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 2) Seminaries X Districts (BC)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.2772</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings of Occupational Categories (D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139.0333</td>
<td>4.8089</td>
<td>P&lt; .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District X Ratings of Occupational Categories (AD)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.9111</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 3) Seminaries X Ratings of Occupational Categories (BD)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.9111</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (CD)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.0333</td>
<td>1.9261</td>
<td>P&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District X Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (ACD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.5125</td>
<td>3.0171</td>
<td>P&lt; .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 4) Seminaries X Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (BCD)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.4388</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Newman-Keuls Analysis of Group Means as they relate to the Cumulative Ratings of Teacher, Coordinator, and Principal Perception of the Administrative-Clerical Tasks of Seminary Principalship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>54.824</td>
<td>3.449*</td>
<td>2.949*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>51.875</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>51.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

Table 5 records a significant difference at the .005 level between the cumulative ideal ratings of respondents and their cumulative actual ratings. This difference made it necessary to reject hypothesis 3 relative to the administrative-clerical tasks examined in the study.

It was postulated in hypothesis 4 that there would be no differences in the cumulative ratings of the seminary districts investigated. Upon examination by an analysis of variance, it
was determined the differences in the responses of the districts as a whole were not statistically significant at the .05 level, therefore, hypothesis 4 was not rejected as it related to administrative-clerical tasks of principalship.

Counseling

The data collected and analyzed during the study with reference to the supervision of counseling services within the seminary are reported in Table 7.

Hypothesis 1 assumed no significant difference would exist in the way teachers, coordinators, or principals would perceive the principal's role. When hypothesis was tested by analysis of variance, an F ratio of 2.4159 was obtained. This was not statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore hypothesis 1 was not rejected as it related to counseling services.

Hypothesis 2 set forth that the actual ratings of the three occupa-identities in the study would not differ significantly as they related to the principals' performance. Table 7 indicates that there were no significant differences in these actual ratings; therefore, hypothesis 2 was not rejected as it applied to the supervision of counseling services.
### Table 7

**Analysis of Variance for the Supervision of Counseling Services within the Seminaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District (A)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.7291</td>
<td>6.3358</td>
<td>P&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 1) Seminaries (B)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1138</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-Actual (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.0083</td>
<td>19.7203</td>
<td>P&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts X Ideal-Actual (AC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6541</td>
<td>1.3904</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 2) Seminaries X Districts (BC)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3472</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings of Occupational Categories (D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>263.0083</td>
<td>43.9772</td>
<td>P&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District X Ratings of Occupational Categories (AD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.7791</td>
<td>1.9695</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 3) Seminaries X Ratings of Occupational Categories (BD)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.9805</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (CD)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3083</td>
<td>2.4159</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District X Ideal-Actual Ratings of Occupational Categories (ACD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1416</td>
<td>1.4298</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error 4) Seminaries X Ideal-Actual X Ratings of Occupational Categories (BCD)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.1972</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                      | 119  |
An analysis of variance did indicate a significant difference, however, when the cumulative ratings (ideal plus actual ratings) of the occupational categories were compared. The difference was significant at the .005 level. A Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test was used to determine the source of the difference. Table 8 indicates that the coordinator ratings differed significantly at the .01 level with both principal ratings and those of the teachers. In addition to these differences, teachers ratings also differ significantly from those of the principals at the .01 level.

Table 8

Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test of Means of Occupational Categories as they relate to the Cumulative Ratings of Counseling Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>9.424</td>
<td>5.025**</td>
<td>1.625**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>7.799</td>
<td>3.400**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level
It was postulated in hypothesis 3 that there would be no significant difference in the cumulative ideal ratings of all the respondents as they were compared with their cumulative ratings of principals' actual performance. Table 7 indicates an F ratio of 19.7203 when the means were tested which is significant at the .005 level. Due to these findings, hypothesis 3 was rejected as it related to the supervision of counseling services.

Hypothesis 4 set forth that there would be no differences in the cumulative ratings of the seminary districts sampled. With reference to the supervision of counseling services, Table 7 reports an F ratio of 6.3358 when the means were tested. This was found to be significant at the .005 level of confidence; consequently, hypothesis 4 was rejected. Further investigation of this difference revealed the source to be differences between district 3 and the other districts included in the study. Table 9 reports the differences between district 3 and districts 2 and 5 to be significant at the .01 level, while the differences between district 3 and districts 1 and 4 are significant at the .05 level of confidence.
Table 9

Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test of the Means of the Cumulative Ratings of the Five Seminary Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>8.125</td>
<td>2.375**</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>7.708</td>
<td>1.958**</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>7.416</td>
<td>1.666*</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>7.041</td>
<td>1.291*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>5.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

Summary of Results

It is beneficial to restate the hypotheses tested in the study and then summarize the data as they relate to these hypotheses.

It was postulated that:

1. There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers, coordinators, or principals as they relate to the role of the seminary principal.
2. There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers, coordinators, or principals as they relate to the actual performance of seminary principals.

3. There will be no significant difference between the cumulative ideal ratings and the cumulative actual ratings of the respondents in the study.

4. There will be no significant differences in the cumulative ratings of the five seminary districts sampled in the study.

Hypothesis 1 was not rejected as it related to leadership, instructional supervision, administrative-clerical, tasks, or supervision of counseling services aspects of the seminary principal's role.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected with regard to the instructional supervisory activities of principals rated, but there were no grounds for rejecting it as it related to the leadership, administrative-clerical, or supervision of counseling services in the seminaries investigated.

Hypothesis 3 was rejected as it related to administrative-clerical tasks, instructional supervision, and supervision of counseling services. It was not rejected as it related to the leadership function of principalship.
Hypothesis 4 was not rejected as it related to (1) leadership, (2) instructional supervision, or (3) administrative-clerical tasks, but there was a statistical basis for rejecting it at the .005 level with reference to the supervision of counseling services. Further investigation revealed that the difference was between one of the five seminary districts and the remaining four which reflects general unity with the exception of one district.

Discussion

This study was delimited to four areas of seminary principalship. Four hypotheses were formulated to be tested in each of these areas. The results of the statistical analyses have been reported in the previous section.

While conducting a descriptive research study, the researcher often has the opportunity to experience certain feelings and form opinions that cannot necessarily be substantiated by the objective evidence. It was felt that the addition of these subjective observations would add clarity to the empirical findings. With this in mind, it was decided that the following discussion of the results is appropriate.
Leadership

Statistical analysis of the subjects responses reveal no significant differences in their perceptions of the seminary principal's role or the actual performance of principals as perceived by the three occupational categories or due to affiliation to a seminary district. In addition, no significant difference was found to exist between the cumulative ideal ratings as they were compared with the cumulative actual ratings.

It would appear that there is agreement among the seminary personnel sampled relative to the leadership role expectations and leader performance. The lack of diversity could be attributed to several causes. Among the possible explanations are: (1) the criteria used in initially selecting seminary teachers; (2) the process of natural selection that occurs during the first ten years of seminary service; (3) priesthood training in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; (4) the effect of pooling the results of multiple ratings which results in an over generalization of the data results; and (5) inadequacies within the instrument itself that may affect the findings. Each of these will be discussed in turn.
Criteria for the selection of seminary teachers. The qualifications for seminary teachers have not varied greatly over the years. They are best illustrated in the words of Joseph F. Merrill in his letter to the Superintendent of Church Schools as he requests the employment of a teacher to open the first seminary. The following is an excerpt from that letter:

... It is the desire of the Presidency of the Stake to have a strong young man who is properly qualified to do the work in a most satisfactory manner. By young we do not mean a teacher young in years, but a man who is young in his feelings, who loves young people, who delights in their company, who can sympathize strongly with them and who can exercise a great influence over them. We want a man who can enjoy student sports and activities as well as one who is a good teacher. We want a man who is a thorough student, one who will not teach in a perfunctory way but who will enliven his instruction with a strong, winning personality and give evidence of thorough understanding of and scholarship in the things he teaches. It is desired that this school be thoroughly successful and a teacher is wanted who is a leader and who will be universally regarded as the inferior to no teacher in the High School... (as cited in Jones, 1956, pp. 92-93)

The criteria used in the selection of seminary personnel place emphasis on competency and leadership. This suggests that those sampled in the study are individuals whose selection
on the basis of these criteria would tend to affect their perception of leadership.

**Natural selection.** A second factor to consider relative to leadership in the seminaries is that of the natural selection that takes place due to the continual turnover in personnel. Actual statistics from the Department of Seminaries and Institutes indicate a high rate of men leaving the program prior to their tenth year of teaching. A survey of seminary personnel employed during the 1969-70 school year reveals that approximately 57 percent of those under contract had taught five years or less. About 80 percent of those working in the seminaries during that school year had taught ten years or less.

These statistics become meaningful when it is realized that those who are eliminated from the seminary program by natural selection do not become eligible for principalships. More important, selection could affect the program significantly by eliminating those whose perceptions of leadership differ significantly with the norms of the group. While this argument is based on conjecture, it does have possible merit and would invite investigation.
Priesthood training. Priesthood training within the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints not only offers exposure to a fundamental concepts of leadership developed in a theological framework, but also offers many opportunities to gain leadership experience. It is difficult to determine the influence priesthood training has had on the idealistic perceptions seminary personnel hold of leadership or how it might affect their actual performance in a leadership role. A formal study of the correlation of leader behavior and priesthood training is suggested for further researchers.

Statistical generalization. The statistical analyses in the study were based on the pooled ratings of several items on the questionnaire dealing with leadership. The apparent unity among respondent could be a result of an over generalization of the responses. It could very well be that there is diversity among the ratings of individual items on the questionnaire when they are considered separately. A random investigation of individual items on the questionnaire revealed that there were significant differences in several instances with reference to individual items as tested by all four hypotheses.
Instrument. Finally, the construction of the questionnaire items themselves may be a variable influencing the results obtained. While the questionnaire was presented to several individuals for judgement of its content, other means of determining validity and reliability were not utilized. This alone makes the results somewhat suspect.

Supervision

Those items grouped under the heading of instructional supervision were tested with the four hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 was not rejected indicating that there were no statistically different perceptions of ideal principalship held by teachers, coordinators, or principals.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected due to the significant differences in the principals' ratings of their own performance as compared to ratings of coordinators and teachers of principals' actual performance. This indicates that while principals perceive their supervision of instruction to be ideally correct, coordinators would not agree with the way they rate themselves. It is also important to note that the
idealized perceptions of teachers and coordinators differ significantly with their ratings of principals' performance as instructional supervisors.

The disagreement of the three occupational categories becomes more significant when the cumulative ratings of all respondents are compared. Hypothesis 3 was rejected on the basis of a significant difference between the ideal and actual cumulative ratings. This could be interpreted as a basic disagreement between what teachers and coordinators perceive should be happening in the seminaries relative to instructional supervision and how the principal is actually functioning as an instructional supervisor.

The fact that districts do not vary significantly in their ratings of instructional supervision could indicate lack of inter-district diversity, but again this could be a product of statistical over generalization. An attempt should be made to determine if there is inter-district unity on supervision of instruction or not.
Administrative-clerical

The administrative-clerical tasks that are a part of the principal's role were represented by several items on the questionnaire. The hypotheses were all tested with respect to the subjects' reaction to them.

Hypothesis 1 was not rejected. This would appear to indicate agreement among teachers, coordinators, and principals with respect to their ideal perceptions of administrative and clerical duties of seminary principalship.

When the perceptions of the three groups with regard to the principals' actual performance was tested, there were no significant differences. Consequently, hypothesis 2 was not rejected.

There are various possible explanations for these results. First, the instructions outlined by the Department of Seminaries and Institutes since 1944 in the Administrative Code have dealt heavily with administrative and clerical matters in detail. This may have satisfactorily standardized these administrative procedures. The fact that hypothesis 4 was not rejected indicating no differences among seminary districts on administrative-clerical matters would seem to support this
assumption.

A second factor needs to be introduced into the discussion of the administrative-clerical results. Agreement on administrative-clerical tasks could very well be a product of pooling of the items dealing with administrative and clerical matters resulting in an over generalization. Statistically this could have no differences whereas, in reality there may very well be significant differences when individual questionnaire items are inspected.

Hypothesis 4 was rejected indicating that differences between the cumulative ideal and actual ratings were significant.

Counseling

Supervision of counseling services was represented by three items on the questionnaire.

No significant differences in teacher, coordinator, or principal perception of the principals role as it relates to the supervision or counseling services was found. Hence hypothesis 1 was not rejected.
No significant difference in the perception of teachers, coordinators or principals was found relative to the actual performance of seminary principals; therefore, hypothesis 2 was not rejected.

The lack of differences at a statistically significant level may be due to at least two causes. First, the nature of the items on the questionnaire may be restrictive and tend to elicit only one type of response. Secondly, it is possible that there is genuine agreement on the items due to the emphasis given counseling in the seminary system. The latter reason seems to have some validity since one of the objectives of the seminary program is facilitating behavioral change toward acceptance of the tenets of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Students frequently seek the counsel of their seminary teacher and the facilities of the seminaries are so arranged that each faculty member has a private office for conference purposes. The physical arrangements may provide for an environment conducive to counseling situations as a result of the curricular approach to seminary objectives while at the same time tend to cause teachers, coordinators, and principals to perceive counseling to occur under similar circumstances.
Hypothesis 3 when tested revealed significant differences between the ideal and actual ratings of the subjects as they were considered cumulatively. This leads to rejection of hypothesis 3.

The basis for this difference is difficult to determine, but coupled with the fact that there was a significant difference noted in the ratings of district 3 as opposed to the other four seminary districts. It might be concluded that the difference is isolated to this inter-district difference between the one district and the remaining four.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

Purpose. The study was designed to determine the perception of teachers, coordinators, and principals in the L. D. S. Seminaries along the Wasatch Front of Utah as they relate to (a) the role of the seminary principal and (b) the actual performance of seminary principals.

The answers to the following questions were also sought:

1. Will the cumulative ratings of the respondents' perception of the seminary principal's role differ significantly
with their cumulative ratings of the principals' actual performance?

2. Will affiliation with a seminary district significantly influence the respondents' perception of the seminary principal's role or the ratings of the principals' actual performance?

**Delimitation.** The study was delimited to an investigation of four areas of seminary principalship: (1) leadership, (2) instructional supervision, (3) administrative-clerical tasks and (4) supervision of counseling services.

**Hypotheses.** Four hypotheses were formulated to be tested in each of the areas of principalship noted above. They were:

1. There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers, principals, or coordinators as they relate to the role of the seminary principal.

2. There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers, coordinators, or principals as they relate to the actual performance of seminary principalship.

3. There will be no significant difference between the cumulative ideal ratings and the cumulative actual ratings of the respondents in the study.
4. There will be no significant differences in the cumulative ratings, of the five seminary districts sampled in this study.

Findings. The findings of the study are as follows:

1. The differences tested by hypothesis 1 were not significant at the .05 level; therefore, hypothesis 1 was not rejected as it related to the leadership role of seminary principals.

2. The perceptions of teachers, coordinators, or principals of principals' actual performance did not differ significantly at the .05 level; consequently, hypothesis 2 was not rejected with respect to leadership as exercised by the seminary principals sampled.

3. When the cumulative ratings of leadership were compared, the difference between the ideal and the actual responses was not significant at the .05 level, this hypothesis 3 was not rejected on the basis of this evidence.

4. The differences in leadership ratings as tested by hypothesis 4 were not significant at the .05 level which does not justify the rejection of hypothesis 4.

5. It was determined that the differences in the perceptions of teachers, coordinators, or principals did not differ significantly as they related to the instructional supervisory role of seminary
principalship. Hypothesis 1 was not rejected as it related to instructional supervision.

6. The actual ratings of the three occupational categories sampled in the study yielded a significant difference at the .01 level when the principals' evaluations were compared with both the teacher and coordinator ratings of instructional supervision. This led to the rejection of hypothesis 2 relative to instructional supervision.

7. The differences between the ideal and actual cumulative ratings was significant at the .005 level for instructional supervision; hypothesis 3 was rejected.

8. The ratings of seminary districts did not differ significantly at the .05 level when instructional supervision was tested by an analysis of variance. Hypothesis 4 was therefore not rejected.

9. The administrative-clerical aspect of principalship as perceived by teachers, coordinators, and principals revealed no significant differences at the .05 level when compared. As a result, hypothesis 1 was not rejected as it related to idealized perception of administrative-clerical tasks.

10. The actual ratings of the three occupational groups as
they evaluated the principals' administrative-clerical performance did not differ at the .05 level of significance, hence, hypothesis 2 was not rejected as it was applied to the administrative-clerical performance of the principals in the study.

11. The cumulative ratings of all subjects differed significantly at the .005 level when the ideal and actual ratings of administrative-clerical tasks were compared which resulted in the rejection of hypothesis 3.

12. A comparison of the ratings of all seminary districts surveyed in the study reflects no differences that are statistically significant when the administrative-clerical tasks are examined. Hypothesis 4 was not rejected.

13. Perception of the supervision of counseling services as it related to the ideal role of the seminary principal was tested by hypothesis 1. No significant differences were found to exist in the perceptions held by the three occupational identities sampled in the study, hence, hypothesis 1 was not rejected.

14. The perceptions of teachers, coordinators, and principals regarding the supervision of counseling by the principals were not significantly different when tested by an analysis of variance and the Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Test.
Hypothesis 2 was not rejected as it referred to the performance of principals as supervisors of counseling activities.

15. Hypothesis 3 was rejected at $P < .005$ due to the differences in the ideal-actual ratings of all respondents regarding supervision of counseling.

16. The cumulative ratings of the five seminary districts manifested a significant difference in the way they perceived the supervision of counseling. The difference was significant at $P < .005$. On the basis of this finding, hypothesis 4 was rejected relative to supervision of counseling.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings or results of this study:

1. It is concluded from the results that the perceptions of teachers, coordinators, and principals in L. D. S. Seminaries along the Wasatch Front of Utah do not significantly differ at $P < .05$ level of confidence as they relate to the leadership, instructional supervisory, administrative-clerical, or counseling supervisory aspects of the seminary principal's role.

2. It is concluded from the findings that the perceptions of teachers, coordinators, and principals in L. D. S. Seminaries
along the Wasatch Front of Utah do not differ significantly at $P < .05$ relative to the leadership, administrative-clerical, and counseling supervisory performance of seminary principals; but the perceptions of the occupational groups do differ at $P < .01$ as they relate to performance of principals as instructional supervisors.

3. It is concluded from the findings that the cumulative ratings of the respondents' perception of seminary principal's leadership role do not differ significantly with their cumulative ratings of the principals' actual leadership performance at $P < .05$; however, the subjects' cumulative ratings relative to their perception of the seminary principal's instructional supervisory role, administrative-clerical role, and counseling supervisory role differ significantly at $P < .05$ when compared with their evaluation of principals' performance in those same areas.

4. It is concluded from the results that affiliation with a seminary district had no influence on the respondents' perception of the seminary principal's role or principal's
performance as they related to leadership, administrative-clerical tasks, or instructional supervision; but a significant difference was found in the district ratings of seminary principalship and principals' performance as it related to supervision of counseling at the \( P < .01 \) level.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made as a result of this study:

1. The Administrator of Seminaries and Institutes should take definite steps toward defining the role of a seminary principal, particularly as it relates to instructional supervision.

2. Studies of the broader aspects of seminary principalship are needed which would include: (a) the public relations aspect of the principal's role; (b) the lines of communication within the seminary faculty; (c) the relationship of the seminary principal with the student body; and (d) the principal's role in the development of curriculum.

3. An instrument needs to be developed to evaluate seminary
principalship which would have constructive, content, predictive, and concurrent validity as well as reliability.

4. Criteria for the selection of seminary principals should be researched and formulated.

5. It is recommended that the Administrator of Seminaries & Institutes establish a training course for men entering seminary principalship.
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APPENDIXES
Appendix A
A Resume of the

Duties of a Seminary Principal

1944-1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Responsibility:</th>
<th>1944</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1959</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative-clerical Tasks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. develop a class schedule and adjust teaching loads.</td>
<td>p. 24</td>
<td>p. 12</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>p. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. supervision of finances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. supervise the expenditures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. maintain financial records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. hold weekly business meetings.</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Responsibility:</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. make extra-curricular assignments to teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 36</td>
<td>p. 15, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. maintain a file of a. policy letters b. memorandums c. handbooks course manuals</td>
<td>&quot;...keep adequate files.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;...keep records of students.&quot;</td>
<td>p. 36</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. prepare agenda for district board meetings.</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td>p. 8</td>
<td>p. 24</td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>p. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. attend all meetings, conventions, and summer schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 36</td>
<td>pp. 15, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. maintain a history of the seminary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. carry out an effective program of religious education as outlined by the Department of Seminaries and Institutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 23, 25</td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>pp. 14, 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Responsibility:</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. direct and supervise the care of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. grounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. equipment and furnishings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. district board of education.</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td>p. 8</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>pp. 7, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. public high schools.</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td>pp. 11-14</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>pp. 14, 32-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. institutes of religion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. community.</td>
<td>pp. 9, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of responsibility:</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. provide a proper atmosphere for student counseling and guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;...direct a program of student guidance.&quot; p. 48</td>
<td>p. 26</td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. supervise social activities.</td>
<td>p. 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 26</td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. build a seminary library.</td>
<td>p. 24</td>
<td>p. 18</td>
<td>p. 26</td>
<td>p. 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. classroom visits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. weekly professional meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 24, 26</td>
<td>p. 35</td>
<td>p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. orientation of new teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 26</td>
<td>p. 36</td>
<td>p. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. most important function is that of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
This questionnaire is a part of a research study on seminary principalship. There are three sections; please complete all items in each section.

Your responses to the items will be kept confidential. It is important that you complete every item. Respond using your best judgement; there is no right or wrong answer. Do not return to items once you have responded to them; your FIRST impression is desired.

A pilot study conducted earlier revealed that it requires from 25 to 20 minutes to complete the entire questionnaire.

Please proceed to section I.

SECTION I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Write the number of your choice in the box to the left of each item.

Item 1 YOUR PRESENT SEMINARY DISTRICT

☐ 1. Northern Utah  
☐ 2. Ogden  
☐ 3. Salt Lake Valley North  
☐ 4. Salt Lake Valley South  
☐ 5. Salt Lake City  
☐ 6. Utah Valley  
☐ 7. Other

Item 2 YOUR PRESENT SEMINARY ASSIGNMENT

☐ 1. Teacher  
☐ 2. Coordinator  
☐ 3. Principal

SECTION II. YOUR IMPRESSION OF THE IDEAL SEMINARY PRINCIPAL.

This section contains a number of descriptive scales on
which we would like you to describe the ideal seminary principal and the seminary he would administer. In marking the scales, please make your judgements on the basis of what these things mean to you. You are to rate the way you would like the ideal principal to behave on each of the scales in order. Here is how you are to use the scales:

If you feel that the way you perceive the ideal role of a seminary principal is most closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your mark as follows:

Sample 1  The ideal principal should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dominate those around him.</th>
<th>be submissive toward those around him.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dominate those around him.</th>
<th>be submissive toward those around him.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel that the way you perceive the ideal role of the seminary principal is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not neutral), you should place your mark as follows:

Sample 2  The ideal principal should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dominate those around him.</th>
<th>be submissive toward those around him.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dominate those around him.</th>
<th>be submissive toward those around him.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you feel that you perceive the ideal role of the seminary principal in a way that is neutral on the scale; i.e., both sides of the scale are equally associated with the concept, then mark the middle space on the scale:

Sample 3  The ideal principal should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dominate those around him.</th>
<th>be submissive toward those around him.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Place your marks in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries.

| : | : | X | : | : |

2. NEVER put more than one mark on a single scale.
3. DO NOT read ahead in the questionnaire before responding to the items.
4. DO NOT go back to items after you have completed them; your FIRST impression is desired.

There are 60 items in this section. The experience of those involved in the pilot study indicates that it takes approximately 15 minutes to complete this section.

Please proceed to item 1 below.

* * * * * * * * *

Item 1  In his relationship with others, the principal:

should always recognize the worth of the individual

cannot always recognize the worth of the individual.
Item 2  As an administrator, the principal's behavior should be governed primarily by:

the inspiration of the Spirit

correct principles of leadership and administration as determined by research.

Item 3  The principal should:

operate in a completely unstructured setting.

always be structured or consistent in his expectations of others.

Item 4  The principal should:

delegate all tasks in the seminary to faculty members.

do everything himself and only delegate work when he must.

Item 5  When conflicting administrative matters arise, the principal should always show greatest loyalty to:

those who are superior to him in administrative authority.

the members of his faculty.
Item 6 The matter of greatest importance to a good principal is:

individual expression.

Item 7 The ideal principal:

never recognizes individual accomplishment unless it is called to his attention.

always recognizes the accomplishments of those around him.

Item 8 In his assignments to faculty members, the principal should:

always outline the exact method of doing them down to the finest details.

allow freedom in carrying out assignments even though he must often chance clarity.

Item 9 The ideal principal is best described as:

never exerting pressure on those around him.

always exerting pressure on those around him.
Item 10  The good principal:

should always be serious. be serious.

Item 11  The principal should see his most important task as that of:

never risking anything that would thwart a smooth and efficient running operation.

developing strong individuals and fulfilling their needs.

Item 12  The principal's treatment of those with whom he works should be:

related to their ability. impartial regardless of personal abilities.

Item 13  The good principal budgets his time with emphasis on the:

administrative duties. supervision and improvement of instruction.

Item 14  Deliberate and conscientious budgeting of personal time is:

insignificant of the success of a principal. extremely vital to the success or failure of a principal.
Item 15  Neatness in personal appearance is:

extremely vital to the success or failure of a principal. ______:_____:_____:_____:____:

Item 16  The principal should approach teacher's problems:

objectively and without personal involvement.

_____:_____:_____:_____:____:

Item 17  With respect to new teachers, a principal should:

take it for granted that they know virtually nothing and must be helpful continually:

_____:_____:_____:_____:____:

Item 18  Professional growth of faculty members will:

be greatly encouraged by the principal's personal attitude toward professional growth.

_____:_____:_____:_____:____:

not be encouraged or limited by the principal's attitude toward professional growth.
Item 19  The principal should observe classroom teaching as frequently as needed, but a minimum during the year of:

never if the teacher is judged to be competent by the principal.

Item 20  The teacher should:

always be informed prior to classroom observations by the principal.

Item 21  The principal's personal standards of classroom instruction and concept of teacher behavior:

should not be revealed to the teachers prior to classroom observations. should always be revealed to teachers prior to any classroom observations by the principal.
Item 22  Principals should take notes:

during every classroom visit as they observe teachers instruct. ______:______:______:______:______

after classroom visits if at all, but only when there is something significant.

Item 23  Principal's notes concerning classroom visits should consist of only:

objective statements of what happened in the classroom. ______:______:______:______:______

subjective statements concerning the classroom situation and the teacher.

Item 24  Contents of rating sheets used during classroom observations should:

never be revealed to teachers prior to classroom visits. ______:______:______:______:______

always be revealed to teachers prior to classroom visits.

Item 25  Principal-teacher conferences after classroom observations should follow:

only when there is something of real importance to discuss. ______:______:______:______:______

every visit regardless of what occurred during the classroom visit.
Item 26  Opportunities to visit other seminaries and other teachers should:

not be afforded teachers.

be encouraged and aided by a program that both schedules time for teachers to make visits and offers guidance as to which teachers to observe.

Item 27  The best means of improving instruction is:

when the responsibility for improvement is left totally to the individual teachers; no in-service program exists.

a regularly scheduled program of in-service training which includes occasional workshops, group planning, and seminars.

Item 28  The principal should:

be alert to the need of continually keeping the teaching aids updated in the seminary.

not be so converted to the use or value of teaching-aids that he updates them.
Item 29  Instruction in the use of teaching aids:

is neither practical nor necessary in the seminary.

Item 30  Faculty meetings:

should be scheduled regularly even if there is no pressing business.

Item 31  Faculty meetings are best when:

they are totally unstructured.

Item 32  The solutions to problems and the formulation of policies in the seminary:

are always decided by the principal.
Item 33  The faculty members should:

be informed by the principal about everything that goes on whether in the seminary itself or elsewhere if it affects the seminary in any way.

Item 34  The principal should be:

aware of everyone's problems regardless of their nature.

Item 35  The principal should make himself available to hear teacher's problems whether personal or of a professional nature on a very limited basis.

Item 36  A professional library (including secular or academic as well as religious references):

should be existent in every seminary.

be informed about as little as possible by the principal outside of those things that directly affect them.

aware of only those problems that would seriously impair the smooth operation of the seminary.

limitless basis.

is of no great significance to the success or failure of a seminary.
Item 37  The ideal seminary principal is best described as a:

spiritual leader. educational leader.

Item 38  Equalization of the student-load of each teacher should be:

left entirely to the high school administration.

Item 39  The principal should:

assume control of student activities and never delegate the responsibility.

Item 40  The principal should:

insure that a great amount of continual effort is exerted to maintain highly accurate student achievement records.

allow the student officers to function in an unstructured situation under the sponsorship of a faculty member.

recognize the fact that student achievement records are used so infrequently that any great time expenditure in maintaining them would be
denying proper emphasis to more critical needs of the seminary.

Item 41  An inspection of the seminary property:

should only occur when and where there is a need suspected. should be systematic and occur periodically.

Item 42  Inspections should:

include health and safety hazards as major factors. be made with primary emphasis on general building maintenance and health and safety as secondary considerations.

Item 43  Economy of the plant operation (cost lights, heat, etc.):

should be a matter of definite and periodic investigation. should not really be of concern or investigation unless, of course, a need arises.
Item 44  Repairs are a matter of urgency:

only when there is a safety or health hazzard involved.  even if they don't constitute a health or safety hazzard.

Item 45  The appearance of the building:

should always be spotless unless there are legitimate circumstances that limit the situation.  can be marginal or even questionable without greatly affecting the operation of the seminary.

Item 46  The interior decorating, furnishings and design of seminaries:

are really insignificant when it comes to mode or style; the important thing is that they are clean.

Item 47  The library facilities should be:

well-organized and circulation of books controlled by some system of accounting.  organized in a very informal manner and circulation of the books made the responsibility of the teachers.
Item 48  
Organization and accounting of audiovisual and other teaching aids are:
never really necessary.

very necessary and should facilitate their wide and equal use.

Item 49  
Relative to the preparation and submission of reports concerning the seminary, the principal should:
be sensitive to absolute accuracy and promptness.

not really be overly concerned about the accuracy or the promptness in submitting them if there are more pressing matters.

Item 50  
Pupil attendance, to include tardiness, should:
never be of primary concern to the seminary principal; the public school administrators should assume that responsibility.

be of such great concern to the seminary principal that there is some policy formulated and enforced by him.
Item 51  Control of materials and supplies:

is completely unrealistic and unnecessary in a seminary. __________:________:________:________:

Item 52  Inventories of seminary property are:

necessary and should be made at least 4 times a year. __________:________:________:________:

Item 53  Budgeting and requesting money:

are very important and should always allow participation of the faculty in the formulation of the budgetary request. __________:________:________:________:

Item 54  Seminary finances should:

be controlled by a highly accurate system of accounting of money received and paid. __________:________:________:________:

be accounted for by some system but not so rigidly controlled that individual teacher receipt books are periodically audited.
Item 55. The responsibility for the accounting of seminary finances should:

be delegated to a faculty member but always remain under the personal supervision of the principal, be totally assumed by a faculty member, thus relieving the principal of a responsibility that would inhibit his supervision of other areas of the program.

Item 56. Principals in seminaries where there are five teachers or more should:

teach some classes, but not more than three; not teach at all but be free to do administrative and supervisory functions totally.

Item 57. With respect to the use of seminary funds as temporary loans to faculty members who have legitimate needs, the principal:

should never consider them available for this kind of a purpose regardless of the circumstances; should allow the circumstances to be the ruling factor in his decision.
Item 58  The Principal:

should be aware
that facilities are
needed where
teachers can
counsel students.

should not see
counseling as a
seminary respon-
sibility; there-
fore it is un-
necessary to
provide a place
where teachers
can counsel
students.

Item 59  The Principal should:

stress some means
of acquiring the
basic skills of
effective
counseling.

not stress the
need of acquir-
ing the basic
skills of
effective
counseling.

Item 60  Student counseling by seminary
teachers should be recognized
as important by the principal
to the degree that:

he makes deliberate
allowances in teacher's
class schedules for
counseling purposes.

he sees no
necessity in
making delibe-
rate time
allowances in
teacher's class
 schedules for
counseling.
SECTION III. YOUR EVALUATION OF YOUR OWN SEMINARY PRINCIPAL

This section contains a number of descriptive scales on which we would like you to describe your seminary principal and the seminary he administers. In marking the scales, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. You are to rate your principal's performance on each of the scales in order. Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the way you perceive the behavior or performance of your principal is closely related to one or the other end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

Sample 1     My Principal:

dominates those around him,                       is submissive toward those around him.

X:________:________:________:________

OR

dominates those around him,                       is submissive toward those around him.

:________:________:________:X:________

If you feel that the way you perceive the behavior or performance of your principal is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not neutral), you should place your check-mark as follows:

Sample 2     My Principal:

dominates those around him.                       is submissive toward those around him.

:________:X:________:________:________


OR

dominates those around him. is submissive toward those around him.

_____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____

If you feel that you perceive the behavior or performance of your seminary principal in a way that is neutral on the scale; i.e. both sides of the scale are equally associated with the concept, then mark the middle space on the scale:

dominates those around him. is submissive toward those around him.

_____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____

IMPORTANT:

1. Place your marks in the middle of the spaces; not on the boundaries.

_____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____

2. NEVER put more than one mark on a single scale.
3. DO NOT read ahead in the questionnaire before responding to the items.
4. DO NOT go back to items you have completed; your FIRST impression is desired.

There are 60 items in this section. The experience of those involved in the pilot study indicates that it takes approximately 15 minutes to complete this section.

Please proceed to item 1 below.

*** * *** *

Item 1 In his relationships with others, my principal:

always recognizes does not
the worth of the recognize the
individual. worth of the

Item 2  As an administrator, my principal feels that his behavior is best governed by:

the inspiration of the Spirit. correct principles of leadership and administration as determined by research.

---

Item 3  My Principal:

operates in a completely unstructured setting. is always structured or consistent in his expectations of others.

---

Item 4  My Principal:

delegates all tasks in the seminary to faculty members. does everything himself and only delegates work to others when he must.

---

Item 5  When conflicting administrative matters arise, the principal always shows greatest loyalty to:

those who are superior to him in administrative authority. members of his faculty.

---

Item 6  The matter of greatest importance to my principal is:

individual expression. conformity to the group or the accepted standards.
Item 7  

My Principal:

never recognizes
individual accomplishments unless it is called
to his attention.

always recognizes the
accomplishments of those around
him even when they are small
and insignificant.

Item 8  

In his assignments to faculty
members, my principal:

always outlines the
exact method of
carrying them out
to the finest detail

allows so much
freedom in
carrying out assignments
that he must
often change
clarity.

Item 9  

My principal is best described as:

never exerting
pressure on those
around him.

always exerting
pressure on
those around
him.

Item 10 

My Principal:

is always
serious.

is seldom
serious.
Item 11 My principal sees his most important task as that of:

never risking anything that would thwart a smooth and efficient running operating.

developing strong individuals and fulfilling their needs.

Item 12 My principal's treatment of those with whom he works is:

related to their ability.

impartial regardless of personal abilities.

Item 13 My principal budgets his time with emphasis on the:

administrative duties.

supervision and improvement of instruction.

Item 14 My Principal:

deliberately and conscientiously budgets his personal time.

makes no apparent attempt to budget his personal time.

Item 15 My Principal:

is always neat in personal appearance.

obviously feels that neatness in personal appearance is not a factor determining success; he frequently is careless in personal appearance.
Item 16  My principal approaches teacher's problems:

objectively and without any personal involvement.

Item 17  With respect to new teachers, my principal:

takes it for granted that they know nothing and must be helped continually.

Item 18  Professional growth of the faculty members:

is greatly encouraged by the principal's personal attitude toward professional growth.

Item 19  My principal visits classrooms as frequently as needed, but a minimum during the year of:

never if the teacher is judged to be competent by the principal.


Item 20  As teachers, we are:
always informed  never informed
prior to classroom  prior to classroom visits by
observations by my  my principal.
principal. 

Item 21  My principal's personal standards
of classroom instruction and concept
of teacher behavior:

are never revealed  are always re-
to the teachers prior vealed to teach-
to classroom ers prior to any
observations. classroom visits
by my principal.

Item 22  My principal takes notes:
during every class-
room visit as he  after classroom
observes the teacher visits if at all,
instruct. but only when

there is some-
thing

significant.

Item 23  My principal's notes concerning
classroom observation:

consist only of  consist only of
objective statements subjective
of what happened in statements con-
the classroom. cerning the

classroom
situation and

the teacher.
Item 24  Contents of rating sheets used during classroom observations are:

never revealed to teachers prior to classroom visits.

always revealed to teachers prior to classroom observations.

Item 25  Principal-teacher conferences after classroom visits should follow:

only when there is something of real importance to discuss.

every visit regardless of what occurred during the classroom visit.

Item 26  Opportunities to visit other seminaries and other teachers:

are never afforded me or any of the other teachers.

are encouraged and aided by a program that schedules time for teachers to make visits and offers guidance as to which teachers to observe.
Item 27  Improvement of instruction is:

left up to the independent efforts of the individual teachers; there is no system of in-service training in my seminary.

Item 28  My principal is:

alert to the need of continually keeping the teaching aids up-dated in the seminary.

Item 29  Instruction in the use of teaching aids:

is never a matter of consideration or effort in my seminary.

is evidenced by an organized program in my seminary devoted to promoting their correct use.
Item 30  Faculty meetings:

are held only when  are scheduled regularly even
there are pressing  if there is no
matters at hand and  pressing
they can not be  business,
handled any other
way.

Item 31  Faculty meetings are:

highly structured  are as un-
by my principal.  structured as

possible.

Item 32  The solutions to problems and the
formulation of policies in the
seminary are:

always decided by  always decided
the principal.  by the entire

faculty with the
principal's
opinion equal to
any other faculty
members.

Item 33  The faculty members:

are always informed  are informed by
by my principal about  my principal
everything that goes  about as little
on whether in the  as possible out-
seminary itself or  side of those
elsewhere if it  things that
daffects the seminary  directly affect
in any way.

them.
Item 34  My principal is:

aware of everyone's problems regardless of their nature.

aware of only those problems that would seriously impair the smooth operation of the seminary.

Item 35  My principal makes himself available to hear teacher's problems whether of a personal or professional nature on a:

very limited basis.

limitless basis.

Item 36  A professional library (including secular or academic as well as religious references):

is existent in my seminary.

is not existent in my seminary.

Item 37  My seminary principal is best described as a:

spiritual leader.

educational leader.

Item 38  Equalization of the student-load of each teacher:

is left entirely to the public school administration.

is of great concern to my seminary principal; he assumes responsibility to utilize his teachers as he sees best.
Item 39  My Principal:

assumes personal control of student activities and never delegates the responsibility.

Item 40  My Principal:

Insures that a great amount of continual effort is exerted to maintain highly accurate student achievement records.

Item 41  An inspection of our seminary property:

occurs only when and where a need is suspected.
Item 42 Inspections:

include health and safety hazards as major factors, are made with the primary emphasis on general building maintenance; health and safety are secondary.

---

Item 43 Economy of plant operation:

is a matter of definite periodic investigation, is never really of concern or investigation, unless, of course, a need arises.

---

Item 44 Repairs are a matter of urgency:

only when a safety or health hazard is involved, even if they don't constitute a health or safety hazard.

---

Item 45 The appearance of our building:

is always spotless unless there are legitimate circumstances that limit the situation, is often marginal or even questionable.
Item 46  The interior decorating, furnishings, and design of my seminary is:

out-moded and out of style, but clean.

clean and modern and has been updated.

Item 47  Our library facilities are:

well organized and the circulation of books is controlled by a system of accounting.

organized on a very informal level; circulation of the books is the responsibility of the teachers.

Item 48  Organization and accounting of audio-visual and other teaching aids:

is non-existent in my seminary.

in my seminary facilitates their use.

Item 49  Relative to the preparation and submission of reports concerning my seminary, my principal is:

sensitive to absolute accuracy and promptness.

never overly concerned about either accuracy or promptness, particularly if there are more pressing matters.
Item 50  Pupil attendance, to include tardiness, is:

not of primary concern to my seminary principal.

of such great concern that my principal has formulated a policy relative to attendance and enforces it.

Item 51  Control of materials and supplies:

is non-existent in my seminary.

is very precise and tight in my seminary.

Item 52  Inventories of seminary property are:

made at least 4 times a year.

never conducted.

Item 53  Budgeting and requesting money:

are very important and my principal always allows our faculty to participate in formulating our budgetary request.

are done by my principal who later informs our faculty what has been requested.
Item 54  Our seminary finances are:
controlled by a highly
accurate system of
accounting of money
received and paid.

accounted for by
some system but
not so rigidly
that individual
teacher's
receipt books
are periodically
audited.

Item 55  Seminary finances are:
delegated to a faculty
member but remain
under the personal
supervision of the
principal.

assumed in
total by a
faculty member
thus the prin-
cipal is freed
of that respons-
ability to do
other duties.

Item 56  My seminary principal:
teaches some
classes but
not more than
three.

does not teach
at least three
classes but is
of the opinion
that seminary
principals should
be free to do
administrative
duties totally.
Item 57  With respect to seminary funds as temporary loans to faculty members who have legitimate needs:

loans are never made under any circumstances.

my principal may allow teachers to borrow if there are good reasons.

Item 58  My principal:

is aware that facilities are needed where teachers can counsel students;

such a place is available in my seminary.

my principal does not see counseling as a seminary responsibility and sees no need to provide a place for it.

Item 59  The importance of counseling students as a seminary responsibility:

is not evidenced by some positive effort on the part of my principal to promote either individual or group study of counseling principles and techniques.

is evidenced by a positive effort on the part of my principal to teach better counseling techniques or acquaint teacher with counseling principles either through personal study or as a part of our in-service training program.
Item 60  
Student counseling by seminary teachers is recognized as important by my principal to the degree that:

he makes deliberate allowances in teacher's schedules to insure that teachers are available to students when they desire counseling.

he sees no necessity in making deliberate allowances in teaching schedules for student counseling.