DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 681 EA 006 132

AUTHOR Sloan, Harold; Loomer, Bradley M.
TITLE Status of Twenty-Six Innovative Education Practices in Iowa Elementary Schools.
INSTITUTION Iowa Association of Elementary School Principals, Des Moines.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; Computer Assisted Instruction; Differentiated Staffs; Drug Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; *Educational Practice; Elementary Schools; Individualized Instruction; Learning Laboratories; Nongraded System; Open Plan Schools; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Programed Instruction; Tables (Data); Teaching Machines; Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS Iowa; *Learning Packages

ABSTRACT

This study represents an attempt to identify the status of change in Iowa elementary schools. In addition to providing current data reflecting the prevalence of 26 selected educational practices, this study report includes data concerning the adoption process, proposers, influencers, degree of staff involvement, preservice and inservice training activities, and degree of teacher change required. However, school districts desiring to use any of the practices cited are urged to study the data relative to the specific practice and to solicit additional information from practice sources. (Pages 31 through 36 Appendix A-may reproduce poorly.)
(Author/MLF)

STATUS OF TWENTY-SIX INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES IN IOWA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

By

Harold Sloan
and
Br 'ley M. Loomer

Iowa Association of Elementary School Principals

1973

PREFACE

This study represents an attempt to identify the status of change in Iowa elementary schools. It is intended to provide current data reflecting the prevalence of twenty-six selected educational practices. Included also are data concerning the adoption process, proposers, influencers, degree of staff involvement, pre-service activities, in-service activities and degree of teacher change required.

Those school districts anticipating the use of any one of the twenty-six selected practices are urged to study assiduously the data relative to the specific practice. The infusion process of specific educational practices into elementary schools is no simple task. Schools can learn from each other. Administrators who are desirous of additional information concerning schools included within this study are urged to contact the authors. Special thanks to Margaret Loomer for typing this study.

Bradley M. Loomer
Chairman
Research Committee
Iowa Association of
Elementary School Principals
Professor
University of Iowa

Harold Sloan
Principal
Harding Elementary School
Mason City Public Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

> In a society like ours academic patterns change more slowly than any others. In my lifetime, in England, they have crystallised rather than loosened. I used to think it would be about as hard to change, say, the Oxford and Cambridge scholarship examination as to conduct a major revolution. I now believe that I was overoptimistic (Snow, 1961, p. 186).

Snow's pessimistic comment on the ability of English educational institutions to make changes might well have been made about the ability of America's public schools to instigate change only a few years ago. While some experts suggest that schools in America are still woefully lacking in needed changes, and others report their belief that schools are not capable of initiating adequate change, it is apparent that many feel that the theme of change has had considerable impact upon the schools. Garrison (1968) stated: "There has not been a time in the history of American education when there was as much interest as there is now in innovation and change (p. 432)."

Innovation and change appear to be key words in education today. Within the past decade an increasing number of articles in professional periodicals have discussed the various aspects of change. Conferences and conventions have continually developed the theme of change. Scores of books have been published which have helped develop interest in instigating change in the schools. It is apparent that the concept of change is a common element in a vast amount of material that is being presented today.

Buchan (1971, P. 298) noted that the impetus for change has come from many sources: the government, teachers, parents, students, scholars from the various disciplines, community pressure groups, and critics of education. In short, nearly everyone has added to the cry for change in education.

Faber and Shearron (1970, p. 7) have suggested that changing societal forces have also helped create a demand for the schools to change. Technological advances, which have caused a re-evaluation of the use of manpower, the rise of metropolitanism, racial desegregation, teacher militancy, and emphasis on education of the disadvantaged are all societal pressures which have acted on the schools and created a demand for change.

Hearn (1971) explained the increasing emphasis on change when he stated that mass access to public education has helped accelerate the pace of change. As more and more literate people emerge from the schools, more and more of them have ideas about who and what should be changed."...Possibly what we need are more effective methods of channeling and arbitrating the energies of this multitude of change agents (p. 358)."

In response to these various forces, schools have been instigating change at an accelerated rate. A recent survey of instructional practices in Iowa schools gives some indication of the increasing number of changes that are occurring in Iowa schools. (ISEA, 1971)

In 1969 the Iowa State Education Association asked superintendents to indicate which of twenty-three innovative practices and specialized course offerings were present in their districts. In 1971 a follow-up study was conducted to determine the status of these same practices. The results showed

that nineteen of the twenty-three practices showed an increase in the number and percentage of schools using them.

The 1971 study also included questions about twenty additional practices than did the 1969 study. While the results of the study, reported only in table form, did not indicate such, the inclusion of the additional twenty items might suggest that these additional innovative practices had gained enough prominence since the 1969 study to warrant their inclusion in the 1971 survey.

Rogers (1965), in discussing implications for research concerning educational innovations, commented:

> Perhaps one implication of the present paper for educational research is that there is not enough of it. . . . I would argue that in conjunction with research to develop educational innovations, we need study on how these new ideas spread and are adopted. (p.60).

Miles (1964) also emphasized the need for further research regarding educational innovation when he listed classes of important questions that need further clarification through research. One class of questions posed by Miles asked, "What sort of persons or groups characteristically serve as advocates of innovation (pp. 40-42)?"

This study concerned itself with certain aspects of the adoption process in elementary schools in Iowa.

Statement of the Problem

The purposes of this study were twofold: 1) to determine the prevalence of selected practices and programs in the elementary schools in Iowa, and 2) to investigate principals' perceptions of certain aspects of the adoption process involved with these practices and programs.

Significance of the Study

In a recent doctoral study at the University of Iowa, Thomas Marx (1970) investigated educational innovation and the adoption process in secondary schools of Iowa. This present study investigated certain aspects of the adoption process in elementary schools in Iowa. This study, together with the study by Marx, should help provide a more complete analysis of the adoption process in Iowa's public schools.

Limitations

The following limitations of this study should be noted:

1) The responses obtained from the principals on the questionnaire could not be validated.
2) Only those principals who responded to the questionnaire became factors in the final outcome of the study. It was not possible to find out how those who failed to respond to the questionnaire might have affected the final results.
3. No attempt was made to investigate the quality of the programs within the buildings and only limited information was gathered to learn how

extensively the practices were used in the buildings. Also, the degree to which the programs were developed in the buildings was not ascertained.

Chapter II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purposes of this study were: 1) to determine the prevalence of selected programs and practices in the elementary schools of Iowa, and 2) to investigate principals' perceptions of certain aspects of the adoption process involved with these practices and programs.

This chapter presents the procedure used for selection of the practices to be investigated. The development of the survey instruments, the selection of participants, the collection of data, and the procedure used for analysis of the data are discussed for each of the three parts of the study.

Selection of Practices

The development of the list of practices and programs to be investigated was the first task undertaken in this study. A review of the literature related to innovative practices in elementary education resulted in the selection of twenty-six programs or practices that this study would investigate. Each practice was briefly defined in an attempt to avoid confusion or misunderstanding by the respondent in determining the existence of the specified program in a building.

The definitions were developed following a search of the related literature. In most instances it was difficult to find uniform definitions of the practices and programs being investigated. The left the writers with task of choosing a definition that seemed most logical and appropriate. When one source did not yield an adequate defintion, two or more sources were used in arriving at the definition selected.

The definitions were then examined by the authors and by a number of graduate students in elementary education. Modifications were made in some of the definitions as a result of these examinations. The twenty-six practices investigated were:

1. TUTORIAL PROGRAM - An organized program in which one child, acting as a teacher, works with another child as a tutor. The tutor may give direct instruction or reinforce previously learned material.
2. TEAM TEACHING - A type of instructional organization in which two or more teachers assume joint responsibility for all or a significant part of the planning, instruction, and evaluation of a group of students.
3. PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAM - The use of paid non-degree persons for assisting teachers with non-instructional tasks.
4. VOLUNTEER AIDES - An organized program using volunteer helpers for assisting teachers with non-instructional tasks.

5. UNSTRUCTURED TIME - A regularly scheduled period of time that is not planned by the teacher, but is left for the student to utilize as he desires (within broad guidelines established by the school).
6. INDEPENDENT STUDY - A procedure which allows students the opportunity and the time to pursue a learning activity that has been proposed or elected by the individual student. It should not be confused with teacher initiated projects, uniform homework, or seatwork.
7. COMPUTER ASSISTED/MANAGED INSTRUCTION - A form of instruction which uses the capabilities of a computer. The student may react directly with the computer during the learning process or the computer may be used to direct instruction or moniter the learning progress of a child.
8. PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION - Learning materials designed so that the student proceeeds in small sequential steps, responds to the material presented, and is informed immediately whether or not the response selected is correct.
9. MULTIAGE OR MULTIGRADE GROUPING - A form of school organization where children of different chronological and grade levels are deliberately grouped together for instructional purposes.
10. MINORITY CULTURES - A course of study designed for the purpose of helping children obtain a better understanding and appreciation of minority culture groups.
11. LEARNING PACKAGES OR LEARNING CONTRACTS - Activities developed and designed in such a manner that a child may proceed through the learning activity independently.
12. DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING - A staffing pattern which formally places teachers at various levels of reponsibility according to defined roles or tasks. Teachers are placed in these roles according to their particular talents and strengths. Remuneration varies according to the role assignment.
13. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES - The objectives for the major portion of one course or curricular area are written in terms of behavior that can be specified and measured.
14. SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES - A program where children with specific learning disabilities are diagnosed and an appropriate instructional program formulated.
15. TEACHING MACHINE - A mechanical device which presents an educational program designed to teach a student through a controlled learning sequence.
16. MICRO TEACHING - An organized and continuing program that makes use of videotaping as an in-service tool for the improvement of instruction. Lessons taught by a teacher are video-taped to allow the teacher an opportunity to observe himself and make a self evaluation of the lesson taught.
17. DIAL ACCESS - An audio-visual technique that allows students to select audio and/or video recordings from a centralized source by dialing predetermined codes.
18. INTEREST CENTERS - Areas, established by the teacher, where students may go, individually or in small groups, to work when time allows.
19. NONGRADED ORGANIZATION - An arrangement in which the usual grade labels are removed from some or all classes. It is an organizational approach which seeks to implement the idea of continuous pupil progress.
20. ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE - A program which provides the services of a certified elementary counselor on a full- or part-time basis.

21. DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM - A course of study designed to acquaint children with the topic of drugs, their use and abuse.
22. OPEN SPACE SCHOOL - A building constructed in such a manner that the instructional program takes place in a large open area (s). Provisions may or may not be available for dividing the large open area into several small areas.
23. FAMILY LIFE OR SEX EDUCATION - A course of study that focuses on human sexuality as it applies to an individual's total adjustment to his family and society.
24. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION - The major portion of at least one curricular area is organized in such a manner that each child is allowed to move at his own pace through a learning program designed to meet the interests, needs, and abilities of the child.
25. A PROCESS APPROACH TO SCIENCE - A science program where the primary emphasis is on developing the same processes that scientists employ in scientific inquiry.
26. CAREER EDUCATION - A program designed to help students develop positive attitudes toward work and recognize the important role work plays in individual life styles.

Prevalence of Selected Practices in Iowa's Elementary Schools

The first part of the study was designed to ascertain the prevalence of the twenty-six practices and programs in Iowa's elementary schools. A questionnaire was developed to obtain the desired data (See Appendix A).

The instrument was brief and direct. It consisted of a listing of the twenty-six practices and programs under investigation and their definitions.

Each respondent was asked to indicate whether or not the listed practices and programs were present in his elementary building. For those practices marked as present, the respondent was asked: 1) to indicate how many years the practice had been in effect in his building, and 2) to indicate the grade levels that were involved with the practice or program.

In an attempt to determine the status of these practices and programs on a statewide basis, it was decided that the questionnaire be sent to the elementary principals in each of the elementary schools in the state of Iowa. The names of the elementary principals in Iowa's elementary schools were obtained from the State Department of Public Instruction. Those individuals who served as principals in more than one building received more than one questionnaire to complete.

The questionnaires were mailed to the principals on April 12, 1972. One thousand two hundred sixty questionnaires were sent to nine hundred sixty individual principals.

As the questionnaires were returned, they were recorded on a form constructed by the writers for tabulating purposes.

On April 26, 1972, two weeks after the instruments had been mailed, a deadline was established for selecting the population for Part II of the study.

Questionnaires received after this date were recorded and tabulated, but were not used as a part of the population for Part II of the study. On the April 26th deadline 705 questionnaires had been received from 645 principals. This return represented 56.0 per cent of the elementary buildings in the state and 67.2 per cent of the state's elementary principals.

The final number of questionnaires received was 791. This represented 62.8 per cent of the elementary buildings in the state. The final tabulation showed 696 or 72.5 per cent of the state's elementary principals had responded to the first questionnaire.

The data for Part I of the study were reported as numbers and percentages of schools reporting the existence of the twenty-six programs and practices investigated.

Principals' Perceptions of the Adoption Process

The second part of this study was designed to learn more about principals' perceptions of the adoption of the twenty-six practices and programs under investigation. A second questionnaire was constructed for this part of the study. The second instrument investigated six sources as to their importance in proposing programs and for the degree of influence these six sources had on the decision to adopt the programs in a building.

The sources investigated for proposing the changes and influencing the adoption of the programs or practices were:

1. Superintendent
2. Other Central Office Staff
3. Board of Education
4. Building Principal
5. Teacher (s)
6. Citizens
7. Unknown

The degree of influence each of these six sources had on the adoption of the specific programs was measured as:

1. Much
2. Some
3. Little
4. None
5. Unknown

The second questionnaire was also constructed to gain added information about other factors related to the adoption process of each program. The information obtained included: 1) how extensively the staff was involved with the program, 2) how receptive the staff had been to the program, 3) how much change had been required of staff members as a result of the program, 4) how much preservice training the staff had received before the program was initiated, and 5) how much inservice training the staff had received following the initiation of the program.

It was decided that the sample for Part II of the study would be chosen from the principals who had responded to the first questionnaire before the established April 26, 1972, deadline.

Two hundred twenty-five of the 645 principals who had responded to the first questionnaire before April 26, 1972, were selected through the table of random numbers.

An analysis of the programs in the two hundred twenty-five schools chosen to be involved in the second part of the study revealed that information concerning the adoption of less prominent programs would not have been ascertained through the random sampling procedure.

None of the three schools having indicated the presence of Computer Assisted/Managed Instruction were among the randomly selected schools. To learn something about the adoption of this program all three schools having Computer Assisted/Managed Instruction were added to the randomly selected schools.

Only seven of twenty schools indicating the presence of Dial Access were included among the two hundred twenty-five randomly selected schools. Three more schools having Dial Access were selected to be included in Part II of the study. The questionnaires were mailed on April 29, 1972.

On May 12, 1972, eighty-two follow-up letters were sent to principals who had not responded to the second questionnaire.

A total of one hundred seventy-four questionnaires were returned. This was 75.3 per cent of the total number of principals involved with this part of the study.

The responses on each questionnaire were key punched onto IBM cards for processing by The University of Iowa Computer Center. A program was devised to report the collected data in a percentage format. Percentages were tabulated for each practice to indicate the degree of involvement each of the six sources investigated had in both proposing the program or practice and in influencing its adoption. Percentages were also tabulated on the responses to the five questions asked about each practice.

Chapter III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purposes of this study were: 1) to determine the prevalence of selected programs and practices in the elementary schools of Iowa, and 2) to investigate principals' perceptions of certain aspects of the adoption process involved with these practices and programs.

This chapter has been divided into two sections for presentation of the two purposes stated.

Prevalence of Selected Practices in Iowa Elementary Schools

Table 1 reports the prevalence of the twenty-six programs and practices under investigation as view by principals in Iowa's elementary schools. The percentages in Table 1 are based on 791 returned questionnaires.

Interest centers and paraprofessional programs appeared to be the two most common practices of the twenty-six investigated. Interest centers were reported in 75.3 per cent of the schools, while 71.6 per cent reported the existence of paraprofessional programs.

Table 1

Prevalence of Twenty-Six Selected Practices
In Iowa Elementary Schools
(N = 791)

Practices	Number of Schools Reporting Practices	Percentage of Schools Reporting Practices
Interest Centers	596	75.3
Paraprofessional Program	566	71.6
Drug Abuse Program	448	56.6
Individualized Instruction	436	55.1
Specific Learning Disabilities	399	50.4
Programmed Instruction	390	49.3
Tutorial Program	390	49.3
Process Science	372	47.0
Learning Packages	346	43.7
Volunteer Aides	340	43.0
Behavioral Objectives	290	36.7
Team Teaching	290	36.7
Family Life or Sex Education	227	28.7
Independent Study	213	26.9
Unstructured Time	212	26.8
Elementary Guidance	196	24.8
Teaching Machines	189	23.9
Multiage Grouping	179	22.6
Minority Cultures	161	20.4
Nongraded Organization	135	17.1
Career Education	134	16.9
Micro Teaching	117	14.8
Differentiated Staffing	86	10.9
Open Space School	69	8.7
Dial Access	20	2.5
Computer Assisted Instruction	5	.6

Eight programs or practices: tutorial programs, volunteer aides, programmed instruction, learning packages, specific learning disabilities, drug abuse, individualized instruction, and process science, were reported in approximately half of the schools. The actual percentages ranged from 43 per cent for volunteer aides to 56.6 per cent for drug abuse programs.

Both team teaching and the use of behavioral objectives were reported in 36.7 per cent of the schools.

Between 20 and 30 per cent of the respondents indicated the existence of unstructured time, independent study, multiage grouping, minority cultures, teaching machines, elementary guidance, and family life programs in their buildings. The actual percentages of schools reporting these practices ranged from 20.4 per cent for minority cultures to 28.7 per cent for family life programs.

Less than 20 per cent of the schools reported the use of computer assisted instruction, differentiated staffing, micro teaching, dial access, nongraded organization, open space schools, and career education. Two of these seven programs, computer assisted instruction and dial access, were found in less than three per cent of the reporting schools.

Principals' Perceptions of the Adoption Process

This section concerns itself with principals' perceptions of: 1) the importance of six sources as program proposers, 2) the degree of influence these six sources exerted on the decision to adopt the program, and 3) five other factors related to the adoption process.

For analysis and presentation purposes the twenty-six practices included in the study were categorized as follows: 1) organizational practices, 2)curricular-type programs, 3) practices related to personnel, 4) instructional practices, 5) materials related to instruction, and 6) "other", a category that includes two practices that did not appear to logically belong in the first five categories.

The following data were derived from 174 returned questionnaires which had been designed to gether the desired information.

Organizational Practices

Table 2 reports principals' perceptions of the roles played by six sources in proposing four organizational practices (See Appendix B).

Principals saw themselves in an important position as proposers of the organizational practices investigated. Approximately half of the respondents marked themselves as the original proposers of each practice.

Superintendents were also viewed as important proposers. The superintendents received their highest rating as the proposers of open space schools. They received their lowest rating as the original proposers of team teaching.

Together, principals and superintendents were viewed as the proposers of multiage grouping by 73.5 per cent of the respondents. Approximately 60 per cent named either themselves or superintendents as the original proposers of the other three practices. Seventy-one per cent reported themselves or teachers as first proposing team teaching.

Slightly over ten per cent of the principals reported that central office personnel first proposed the use of the non-graded organization. This was the only practice of the four where over 10 per cent of the respondents indicated the central office staff as program proposers.

The board of education and citizens were not named as having proposed any of the four organizational practices.

Nearly one-third of the principals reported the original proposal for open space schools to be a team effort, involving two or more sources. Approximately 10 per cent reported a team effort in proposing the other three practices.

Principals' perceptions of the degrees of influence of six sources on the adoption of four organizational practices are presented in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Elementary principals viewed themselves as most influential of the six sources in the adoption of these four practices. The percentages of principals reporting themselves as having "much" influence ranged from 75 per cent for open space schools and the nongraded organization to slightly over 79 per cent for multiage grouping and team teaching.

Teachers were also viewed as being influential in the adoption of the four practices. Fifty per cent or more of the principals rated teachers as having "much" influence in the adoption of the practices. The actual percentages ranged from 50 per cent for open space schools to 55.9 per cent for multiage grouping. With each of these practices from 25 to 32.1 per cent of the respondents reported the teachers to have "some" influence in the adoption process.

The influence of the superintendent seemed to vary from practice to practice. The percentages of principals reporting "much" influence on the part of the superintendent ranged from 14.5 per cent for team teaching to 56.3 per cent for open space schools. With open space schools 87.6 per cent of the principals reported the superintendent to have either "much" or "some" influence, while with multiage grouping the responses were divided almost equally among the four choices.

The influence exhibited by the central office staff also varied. Central office personnel appeared to have most influence in the adoption of open space schools, with 50 per cent indicating either "much" or "some" influence. They appeared least influential with multiage grouping.

The board of education was reported to have most influence in the decision to adopt open space schools. With this practice 31.3 per cent of the principals reported the board to have "much" influence. They appeared to have least influence in the adoption of multiage grouping.

Citizens appeared to have a minor impact on the decision to adopt any of the four practices in this category. The principals gave citizens their highest ranking with the non-graded organization and open space schools, where 21.4 per cent and 25 per cent of the principals, respectively, reported citizens to have "some" influence on the decision to adopt the two practices.

Table 7 describes the extensiveness of teacher involvement with four organizational practices.

The nongraded organization appeared to be the most highly implemented practice, with over 80 per cent of the principals reporting either "all" teachers or "most" teachers involved with the practice.

Approximately 55 per cent of the principals reported either "all" or "most" of the teachers in their buildings were involved with multiage grouping.

In half of the buildings open space teaching areas were reported to involve "all" or "most" of the teachers. The remaining 50 per cent were divided equally between the responses of "some" and "few" teachers involved.

Team teaching appeared to be the least widely implemented of the four organizational practices, with approximately 60 per cent of the principals reporting either "some" or "few" teachers involved. Nearly one-fourth indicated that only "few" teachers were involved.

Table 8 reports that the organization practices: team teaching, multiage grouping, nongraded organization, and open space schools, were viewed as either "very well received" or "well received" by 71.0 per cent, 67.6 per cent, 60.7 per cent, and 75.1 per cent, respectively, of the responding principals.

The percentage of principals marking "fairly well received" ranged from 18.8 per cent for open space schools to 39.3 per cent for nongraded organizations.

With the exception of open space schools, less than 3 per cent of the respondents marked "not well received" to describe teacher receptivity to the practices. About 6 per cent marked "not well received" to describe open space schools.

Principals' perceptions of the change required of teachers as a result of the four organizational practices are presented in Table 9.

With three of the four practices approximately 90 per cent of the respondents indicated that either "much" or "some" change was required of teachers upon practice implementation. With open space schools all of the respondents gave these same two responses in reference to change required. The actual percentages ranged from 50 per cent for multiage grouping to 75 per cent for open space schools.

Table 10 presents the preservice preparation provided for the four organizational practices.

In each of the four practices more than half of the respondents reported the preservice training provided to be at least "adequate". The percentages of principals marking either "highly adequate" or "adequate" for the four programs ranged from 55.9 per cent for multiage grouping to 67.9 per cent for nongraded organization. The percentages marking "highly adequate" ranged from 8.7 per cent for team teaching to 14.3 per cent for nongraded organizations.

The largest percentage of negative responses toward preservice training was evident with open space schools, where 18.8 per cent of the respondents reported the training provided to be "totally inadequate". This rating was over 11 percentage points higher than the closest completely negative response, that of 7.1 per cent for the nongraded organization.

Table 11 reports that 50 per cent or more of the principals indicated at least "adequate" inservice training was provided for each of the organizational practices included in this category. The percentages marking either "highly adequate" or "adequate" ranged from 50 per cent for multiage grouping to 68.7 per cent for open space schools.

Over 14 per cent of the principals reported the inservice program for the nongraded organization to be "highly adequate". This rating was over twice as large as the next largest percentage, that of 6.2 per cent indicating "Highly adequate" inservice for open space schools.

While a majority of the respondents reported the inservice programs for open space schools to be "adequate", 12.5 per cent reported "totally inadequate" training for this practice. This percentage was nearly three times as large as the next largest rating that indicated "totally inadequate" inservice training, that 4.3 per cent for team teaching.

Curricular-type Programs

Table 12 describes how principals perceived six sources as proposers of curricular-type programs (See Appendix C).

The principals surveyed viewed teachers as important in proposing four programs: minority cultures, drug abuse, family life, and process science. Ratings ranged from 20 per cent for family life to 27.3 per cent for process science. Career education was the only program in which teachers did not appear to function as program proposers. Only 3.8 per cent of the respondents name teachers as first proposing such programs. This figure was far smaller than the numbers and per cents of principals who saw teachers as proposers of the other four programs.

Principals consistently ranked their schools' central office staff as important proposers of these programs. They received their highest rating as proposers of career education, 26.9 per cent, and their lowest rating as proposers of drug abuse programs, 17 per cent.

Together, central office personnel and teachers were viewed as proposers of minority cultures and process science programs by approximately 50 per cent of the responding principals. Central office personnel and superintendents were named as the original proposers of career education programs by a combined total of 46.1 per cent, while approximately 30 per cent named the two sources as original proposers of drug abuse and family life programs.

Principals rated themselves and their superintendents less often as proposers of these programs. The greatest difference between these two sources was found with process science, where principals named themselves as the original proposers nearly five times as often.

Citizens and boards of education were not seen in important positions as proposers of curricular-type programs. Family life was the only program in which more than 10 per cent of the principals named citizens as original proposers. In none of the five programs was the board viewed as a proposer by even 5 per cent of the respondents.

Approximately 10 per cent of the responding principals indicated a team effort in proposing all five curricular-type programs.

Tables 13 through 17 show that with each of the five programs the largest percentage of principals saw either themselves or teachers as the most influential in the adoption of the five curricular-type programs.

Teachers were rated as having "much" influence in the adoption of minority cultures, drug abuse, and process science by 47.1 per cent, 41.5 per cent, and 47.7 per cent of the principals, respectively. Principals viewed themselves as having greatest importance in the adoption of career education and family life courses, with 38.5 per cent and 46.7 per cent, respectively, rating their influence as "much".

Central office personnel showed consistent ratings in their influence of the adoption process. The percentages of principals who marked the central office staff as having "much" influence ranged from 23.5 per cent for minority cultures to 34.6 per cent for career education.

Principals viewed the superintendent as having lesser importance in the adoption of the five programs. Superintendents received their highest ratings with drug abuse and family life courses, where 29.8 per cent and 28.9 per cent of the principals rated them as having "much" influence. They received their lowest ratings with process science and minority cultures, where 28.4 per cent and 38.2 per cent viewed them as having "little" or "no" influence.

Citizens were reported as having "much" influence in the adoption of drug abuse and family life programs by approximately 20 per cent of the respondents. With the other three programs, they were viewed as having minor importance in the decision to adopt the programs.

Of the six sources, the board of education was viewed as having least influence in the adoption process. For none of the five programs did more than 11.5 per cent of the respondents report the board to have "much" influence, while approximately one-third to one-half viewed the board as having "little" or "no" influence in the adoption of the five programs.

Table 18 summarizes data related to the extent of teacher participation with the five curricular-type programs.

The degree of staff involvement with the five programs studied appeared to be quite similar. Approximately half of the principals marked "some" or "few" to indicate the degree of staff involvement with all five programs. In four of the programs: minority cultures, drug abuse, family life, and career education, approximately 20 per cent indicated that only "few" teachers were involved.

Of the five programs, career education was the only program in which more than one-third of the respondents indicated involvement by "all" staff members. In each of the other four programs just over one-fifth of the principals noted that "all" teachers were involved.

Teacher receptiveness to five curricular-type programs is reported in Table 19.

Approximately 60 per cent of the principals indicated that four of the programs: drug abuse, family life, career education, and process science, were either "very well received" or "well received" by teachers. With minority cultures, however, slightly less than one-third used these same two responses to report teacher receptivity. Only 5.9 per cent indicated that minority cultures programs were "very well received", while about 15 per cent used this response to describe the remaining four programs.

Approximately 60 per cent of the principals indicated that four of the programs: drug abuse, family life, career education, and process science, were either "very well received" or "well received" by teachers. With minority cultures, however, slightly less than one-third used these same two responses to report teacher receptivity. Only 5.9 per cent indicated that minority cultures programs were "very well received", while about 15 per cent used this response to describe the remaining four programs.

Approximately one-third of the respondents reported that four of the five programs were only "fairly well received" by their teachers, while nearly 60 per cent gave this same response for minority cultures.

The respondents marked "not well received" or "poorly received" to describe teacher receptiveness less than 10 per cent of the time.

Principals' perceptions of the change required of teachers as a result of five curricular-type programs are recorded in Table 20.

Process science was reported as requiring more change on the part of teachers than the four other programs. Nearly 95 per cent of the principals indicated that either "much" or "some" change was required on the part of teachers as a result of program adoption in process science. Approximately half reported that process science required "much" change by teachers.

Approximately 60 per cent of the principals reported that minority cultures, drug abuse, family life, and career education programs required either "much" or "some" change on the part of teachers. The actual percentages ranged from 53.2 per cent for drug abuse to 64.4 per cent for family life programs.

With the exception of process science, about 40 per cent indicated "little" or "no" change was required of teachers as a result of program adoption. Only 5.6 per cent gave these same two responses to indicate the change required of teachers as a result of the adoption of process science programs.

Table 21 reports preservice training provided prior to implementation of the five curricular-type programs.

Highest ratings in this category were received by family life courses, where two-thirds of the respondents reported at least "adequate" preparation provided. With minority cultures, career education, and process science courses of study, 50 per cent or more of the respondents described the preservice training offered as at least "adequate". With drug abuse, 45.8 per cent indicated their preservice offerings to be at least "adequate". "Highly adequate" preservice training was indicated by less than 5 per cent for minority cultures, drug abuse, and career education. Approximately 10 per cent marked this same response for the other two programs.

Over one-fourth of the principals reported that "totally inadequate" preservice preparation had been provided for minority cultures courses of study. This rating was nearly 15 percentage points higher than the closest totally negative rating, that of 10.6 per cent for drug abuse programs.

With each of the programs large percentages of principals marked "some,

but inadequate" preservice preparation had been provided. The actual percentages indicating this response ranged from 23.5 per cent for minority cultures to 41.5 per cent for drug abuse.

Table 22 reports the inservice training provided after implementation of the five curricular-type programs.

Principals seemed to view inservice training for curricular-type programs in their buildings much as they viewed the preservice training provided. Family life inservice programs received at least 'adequate" ratings by 60 per cent of the respondents, which was the highest rating given to any of the five programs. "Highly adequate" inservice training was indicated by 8 per cent or less for the five programs.

Lowest ratings went to drug abuse and minority culture programs, where at least half of the respondents found their inservice to be inadequate. Less than half of the principals selected either of the two negative responses to describe the inservice programs for family life, career education, and process science.

One-fifth of the principals used "totally inadequate" to be describe the inservice training provided after implementation of minority cultures programs. Career education followed with 15.4 per cent indicating the inservice offered to be "totally inadequate" for this curricular-type program.

Practices Related to Personnel

Table 23 indicates how the responding principals perceived six sources as proposers of practices related to personnel. In each of the four practices included in this category, approximately one-third of the principals saw themselves as program proposers. These ratings were considerably higher than those received by any of the other five sources (See Appendix D).

Approximately half of the respondents named either themselves or their superintendents as first proposing paraprofessional programs, differentiated staffing, and elementary guidance. When teachers were added, these three sources accounted for two-thirds of the original proposals for paraprofessional programs. Either superintendents or central office personnel were named by nearly one-third of the principals as proposers of paraprofessional and elementary guidance programs.

Citizens were named as first proposing volunteer aides by 15.8 per cent of the respondents. With this exception, citizens did not exhibit any importance as proposers of the programs related to personnel.

Boards of education failed to receive any status as proposers of these practices.

The numbers and percentages of principals indicating a team effort varied from practice to practice. Ratings ranged from 10.2 per cent for paraprofessional programs to 25 per cent for differentiated staffing.

Tables 24, 25, 26, and 27 show that principals viewed themselves as the most

influential of the six sources in the adoption of the four practices related to personnel. The percentages indicating that principals had "much" influence in the adoption of the practices ranged from 61 per cent for elementary guidance to 75 per cent for differentiated staffing.

Principals also saw teachers as influential in the adoption of the four practices. Except for elementary guidance, teachers consistently ranked second in importance as influencers of these practices. With both paraprofessional programs and differentiated staffing half of the respondents indicated that teachers had "much" influence in the adoption process.

With the exception of volunteer aides, superintendents were also viewed as having influence in the adoption process. Superintendents received their highest rating with elementary guidance, where 48.8 per cent of the respondents reported them as having "much" influence, and nearly 45 per cent were seen as having "little" or "no" influence.

Except for differentiated staffing, the ratings of the central office staff were rather consistent. With each of the other three practices approximately 15 per cent of the principals rated central office personnel as having "much" influence, 20 per cent as having "some" influence, 10 per cent as having "little" influence, and 25 per cent as having "no" influence.

Citizens were only influential in the adoption of volunteer aides, with 22.4 per cent of the principals rating them as having "much" influence in the adoption of this practice. With the other three practices less than 5 per cent reported citizens to have "much" influence.

The board of education appeared most influential in the adoption of elementary guidance, with 12.2 per cent of the respondents reporting boards as having "much" influence. With the other three practices less than 6 per cent indicated the board to have "much" influence.

The extent of teacher involvement with four practices related to personnel is presented in Table 28.

Paraprofessional programs appeared to have greater staff involvement than the other three programs in this category. Nearly 80 per cent of the respondents indicated that "all" or "most" staff members were involved with paraprofessional programs in their buildings.

Over two-thirds of the principals indicated that either "all" or "most" staff members were involved with paraprofessional programs in their buildings.

Over two-thirds of the principals indicated that either "all" or "most" teachers were involved with the guidance program. The remaining one-third were almost equally divided between the responses of "some" and "few" teachers involved.

With both the volunteer aides and differentiated staffing programs approximately half of the principals marked that "all" or "most" teachers were involved. In each of these practices nearly one-fifth reported that only "few" teachers were involved.

Table 29 reports that nearly 95 per cent of the respondents indicated that paraprofessional programs were either "very well received" or "well received" by teachers. Approximately 65 per cent reported the other three practices to be at least "well received" in their buildings.

Nearly 38 per cent reported differentiated staffing to be only "fairly well received," and approximately 27 per cent gave this same response for volunteer aides and elementary guidance. Less than 6 per cent chose "fairly well received" to describe teacher receptiveness to paraprofessional programs.

With all four practices less than 5 per cent of the respondents marked "not well received" to describe teacher receptivity. None of the principals reported that any of the practices were "poorly received."

Table 30 presents principals' perceptions of the change required of teachers as a result of four practices related to personnel.

Differentiated staffing was reported as requiring more change by teachers than the other three practices. Nearly 90 per cent of the principals reported that either "much" or "some" change was required of teachers upon the adoption of this practice. Nearly one-third indicated that the practice required "much" change by teachers.

Approximately 80 per cent of the respondents reported either "much" or "some" to indicate the amount of change required of teachers due to the adoption of paraprofessional programs. One-fifth reported the practice required "much" change by teachers.

About 65 per cent of the principals reported that volunteer aides and elementary guidance programs required at least "some" change on the part of teachers. Less than 10 per cent reported that the two practices required "much" change.

The percentage of principals marking "little" change required of teachers ranged from 12.5 per cent for differentiated staffing to 34.1 per cent for elementary guidance. "No" change required on the part of teachers was marked by less than 8 per cent of the respondents for all four practices.

Table 31 presents the preservice training provided before implementation of the four practices related to personnel.

Differentiated staffing received the highest rating of the four practices in this category, with 87.5 per cent of the principals reporting the preservice training to be "adequate." Also receiving a majority of at least "adequate" ratings were preservice programs for paraprofessional programs and elementary guidance. The actual percentages were 58.6 per cent and 65.8 per cent, respectively.

The volunteer aides program was the only practice in this category where more than half of the respondents reported that an inadequate preservice training program had been provided. Here, 48.7 per cent indicated "some, but inadequate" training.

The percentages of principals rating the preservice training for these personnel practices as "totally inadequte" ranged from 0 per cent for differentiated staffing to 12.2 per cent for elementary guidance.

Data concerning principals' perceptions of inservice training provided for the four practices related to personnel are presented in Table 32.

Differentiated staffing received the highest rating in this category, with 93.8 per cent of the respondents indicating the inservice program provided as "adequate." Over 60 per cent viewed the inservice training for paraprofessional programs and elementary guidance as at least "adequate."

Only volunteer aides received inadequate ratings by more than half of the respondents.

With three of the programs: paraprofessional programs, volunteer aides, and elementary guidance, from 7[illegible].8 per cent to 42.1 per cent of the principals indicated that "some, but inadequate" inservice had been provided. "Totally inadequate" inservice was reported by 6.2 per cent, 10.5 per cent, and 7.3 per cent, respectively.

Programs Related to Instruction

Table 33 relates information concerning original proposers of six programs related to instruction as perceived by elementary princ[illegible]s (See Appendix E).

Approximately half of the principals listed teachers as first proposing four of the six programs included in this category: tutorial programs, unstructured time, independent study, and interest centers. One-fourth indicated teachers first proposed individualized instruction in their buildings. Though teachers apparently proposed individualized instruction less often than they did the four other programs mentioned, their percentage of proposals for this program was much larger than four of the six sources. Only 7 per cent of the respondents reported teachers as proposers of behavioral objectives, a rating far below those they received for the other five programs.

Principals also saw themselves as important in proposing instructional programs. Their ratings were rather consistent for all six programs, ranging from 23.2 per cent for tutorial programs to 37.8 per cent for individualized instruction. Approximately 75 per cent named either themselves or teachers as proposers of tutorial programs, unstructured time, independent study, and interest centers, while 63.4 per cent named the same two sources as proposers of individualized instruction.

Principals, central office personnel, and superintendents first proposed behavioral objectives in 77.4 per cent of the cases studied. This was the only program which indicated superintendents and central office personnel as important program proposers.

In none of the six programs were citizens and boards of education viewed as important proposers.

A team effort was noted in proposing individualized instruction and interest centers by approximately 14 per cent of the principals, while about 6 per cent indicated a team effort in proposing the other four programs.

Principals' perceptions of the influence exerted by six sources in the adoption of programs related to instruction are reported in Tables 34 through 39.

In each of the six programs principals and teachers were reported to be by

far the most influential of the sources investigated. With the exception of behavioral objectives teachers were regarded as most influential of the six sources in the adoption process. In these five programs 63 per cent or more of the principals reported teachers to have "much" influence. The actual percentages ranged from 63 per cent for unstructured time to 71.5 per cent for interest centers.

Principals also rated themselves as influential in the adoption of the six programs, their ratings consistently in second place except for those for behavioral objectives. With behavioral objectives principals received the highest rating as the source of influence. The percentages indicating "much" influence by principals ranged from 43.9 per cent for interest centers to 61.1 per cent for individualized instruction.

With only two programs, individualized instruction and behavioral objectives, was the superintendent rated as having "much" influence by more than 20 per cent of the respondents. Central office personnel appeared to be most influential in the areas of behavioral objectives and individualized instruction, where they were rated as having "much" influence by 12.2 per cent and 18.3 per cent of the principals, respectively.

Boards of education and citizens were not seen as exerting influence in the adoption of the six programs. In each case approximately 50 per cent of the principals saw these two sources as having "little" or "no" influence.

Table 40 describes the extensiveness of teacher involvement with six programs related to instruction.

Behavioral objectives appeared to be the most extensively implemented program in this category, with nearly three-fourths of the respondents reporting that either "all" or "most" staff members in their buildings were involved with their use. Less than 3 per cent indicated that only "few" teachers were involved.

Over half of the principals indicated that "all" or "most" teachers were involved with individualized instruction and interest centers to the degree specified in the questionnaire. Approximately one-third reported that "some" teachers were involved with these two practices.

About one-third of the respondents reported that "all" of "most" teachers participated in tutorial or independent study programs. Over 40 per cent reported such participation for unstructured time. Of the 71.6 per cent, 58.7 per cent, and 66.6 per cent who marked "some" or "few" to indicate the extent of teacher involvement with tutorial programs, unstructured time, and independent study, respectively, over 20 per cent marked that only "few" teachers were involved with the three programs.

Table 41 shows teacher receptiveness to six programs related to instruction as perceived by elementary principals.

The most highly acclaimed programs appeared to be the tutorial program, individualized instruction, and interest centers, all of which received at least 60 per cent of their ratings in the "very well" and "well" received columns. Slightly less than half, 47.8 per cent and 44.4 per cent, respectively, reported the two most positive responses for unstructured time and independent study.

Least popular among teachers seemed to be the use of behavioral objectives. Here over half the respondents marked "fairly well received" as best describing teacher receptivity in their buildings, and 14 per cent chose either of the two negative responses. This represented the largest negative response in the instructional programs category. Independent study also appeared to be a less popular program, with 8.9 per cent reporting the practice to be "not well received."

Table 42 reports that 55 per cent or more of the responding principals perceived at least "some" change required of teachers upon implementation of all six programs related to instruction.

Behavioral objectives and individualized instruction were rated as requiring the most change. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents indicated that "much" change was required upon implementation of individualized instruction. Over one-third noted this same response for behavioral objectives. Principals marking either "much" or "some" change required for each of these two programs totaled over 90 per cent.

Approximately three-fourths of the principals reported that unstructured time and interest centers required at least "some" change. About 20 per cent indicated "much" change needed for these two programs.

Respondents indicated that less change was required for tutorial and independent study programs. "Some" change required was still marked by over half of the principals, and 13.3 per cent marked "much" to be describe teacher change for independent study.

Principals' perceptions of preservice training provided before implementation of the six practices related to instruction are presented in Table 43.

Half or more of the respondents reported that at least "adequate" preservice training had been provided for four of the six programs included in this category: unstructured time, behavioral objectives, interest centers, and individualized instruction. The percentages of principals marking either of the two positive responses ranged from 50 per cent for unstructured time to 61.1 per cent for individualized instruction. At least 10 per cent of the respondents indicated "highly adequate" training prior to the implementation of behavioral objectives and individualized instruction.

The preservice preparation of two programs, tutorial programs and independent study, failed to receive positive ratings by half of the respondents. Only 42.2 per cent and 37.8 per cent, respectively, reported either "highly adequate" or "adequate" training for these programs. The percentages of principals describing the preservice preparation as "some, but inadequate" ranged from approximately 35 per cent for unstructured time, individualized instruction, and interest centers to approximately 45 per cent for tutorial programs, independent study, and behavioral objectives. Preservice training for unstructured time and independent study was described as "totally inadequate" by approximately 15 per cent of the respondents. Nearly 10 per cent gave this same negative response for tutorial programs.

The inservice training provided after program implementation of the six programs is detailed in Table 44.

Inservice ratings for both individualized instruction and interest centers

were similar, with 62.2 per cent and 59.3 per cent of the respondents, respectively, reporting at least "adequate" training after program implementation.

The other four programs failed to receive either of the two adequate ratings by over half of the responding principals. Ratings for tutorial programs, independent study, and behavioral objectives were similar, with approximately 54 per cent indicating inadequate training. Unstructured time had the lowest rating, with over 60 per cent reporting inadequate inservice programs. In four of the six practices over 10 per cent of the principals reported "totally inadequate" inservice. The actual percentages for these four practices ranged from 11.4 per cent for interest centers to 22.1 per cent for tutorial programs.

Materials Related to Instruction

Table 45 reports principals' perceptions of who first proposed certain materials related to instruction (See Appendix F).

Both principals and teachers were rated as important proposers of three of the five types of materials studied. Together they were by far the most important proposers of programmed instruction and learning packages, with 63.6 per cent and 74.4 per cent of the respondents naming either themselves or teachers as proposers of these materials. These two sources were perceived to have originally proposed the use of teaching machines by 44.8 per cent of the principals.

The respondents reported that superintendents, central office personnel, and principals originally proposed programmed instruction and the use of teaching machines over 60 per cent of the time. The combined percentages of superintendent and central office proposals for programmed instruction, however, was smaller than those held by either principals or teachers individually.

Boards of education and citizens exhibited minor importance as proposers of the five types of materials related to instruction.

Schools using computer assisted instruction and dial access were too few to allow for meaningful interpretation. Information concerning these two types of materials appears in the tables, but remarks throughout the remainder of this section will be limited to the other three types of materials included in this category.

Tables 46 through 50 show principals' perceptions of the degree of influence exerted by six sources in the adoption of materials related to instruction. As noted above, computer assisted instruction (Table 46) and dial access (Table 50) are not included in this discussion.

Principals viewed themselves and teachers as influential sources in the adoption of the types of materials that were included in this category. Teachers were rated as having "much" influence in the adoption of programmed instruction, learning packages, and teaching machines by 51.8 per cent, 62.8 per cent, and 42.1 per cent of the principals, respectively. Principals' ratings of themselves as having "much" influence for the adoption of these same materials ranged from 33.3 per cent for learning packages to 52.9 per cent for programmed instruction.

Less than 14 per cent of the principals saw central office personnel as having "much" influence in the adoption process. Citizens and boards of education were not seen as influential sources.

The degree of staff involvement with certain materials related to instruction is presented in Table 51.

Most responding principals indicated little teacher participation with the types of materials surveyed. Less than 30 per cent of the respondents marked "all" or "most" to indicate the degree of staff involvement with the three materials: programmed instruction, learning packages, and teaching machines. Of the 70 per cent or more who marked either "some" or "few" teachers involved, 25.9 per cent, 35.9 per cent, and 47.4 per cent, respectively, indicated that only "few" teachers in their buildings used such materials.

Table 52 summarizes teacher receptivity to five types of materials related to instruction.

Programmed instruction appeared to be the most highly received of the materials surveyed, as 55.3 per cent of the principals indicated the materials to be at least "well received." Nearly one-fourth chose "very well received" to best describe teacher receptivity to the use of such materials. Learning packages and teaching machines were both rated as at least "well received" by 47.4 per cent of the respondents. Over 70 per cent marked all three types of materials as at least "fairly well received" in their buildings.

Learning packages and teaching machines were reported either "not well received" or "poorly received" in over 10 per cent of the responding schools. Nearly 6 per cent chose these same two responses to best describe programmed instruction.

Table 53 presents principals' perceptions of the change required of teachers as a result of implementation of the five types of materials related to instruction.

Principals indicated that programmed instruction and learning packages required considerable change by teachers. With both of these materials over 80 per cent of the respondents reported that either "much" or "some" change was required. A smaller, but still large percentage, 63.2 per cent, gave these same two responses to indicate the change required with the use of teaching machines.

Table 54 presents preservice training provided before implementation of five types of materials related to instruction.

The highest ratings in this category were received by teaching machines, where nearly 70 per cent of the respondents reported at least "adequate" preparation before use of such materials. Programmed instruction received at least an "adequate" rating by 60 per cent of the respondents.

Of the materials included in this category only learning packages had less than 50 per cent of the respondents selecting either of the two positive responses. Preservice training for learning packages was marked either "highly adequate" or "adequate" by 42.3 per cent of the principals. Nearly 45 per cent chose "some, but inadequate" to be describe their preservice training. The percentages of principals who chose either of the two negative responses to describe their training ranged from 31.6 per cent for teaching machines to 56.4 per cent for learning packages.

Table 55 reports that only learning packages failed to receive at least

"adequate" ratings for inservice training by half of the respondents.

The inservice training provided for programmed instruction and teaching machines was quite similar, with approximately 60 per cent of the respondents indicating at least an "adequate" rating. One difference in the two programs appeared in the rating of "highly adequate," where 10.6 per cent of the principals indicated the inservice training provided for programmed instruction was "highly adequate" and none of the respondents gave this highest rating to the inservice program for teaching machines.

The inservice programs for learning packages and teaching machines were reported as "totally inadequate" by 12.8 per cent and 10.5 per cent of the respondents, respectively.

Two Other Practices

Table 56 reports on the two practices, micro teaching and specific learning disabilities, which did not logically fall into the five categories previously discussed (See Appendix G).

Approximately 40 per cent of the principals named themselves as the person who first proposed both micro teaching and specific learning disabilities. Another 40 per cent of the respondents named either the superintendent or central office personnel as the original proposers of micro teaching. Nearly 30 per cent named these same two sources as proposers of specific learning disability programs.

Teachers were not viewed as important proposers of these two practices. Boards of education and citizens were rated even less often as important initiators.

Less than 10 per cent of the principals reported a team effort in proposing either practice.

Tables 57 and 58 report principals' perceptions of the degree of influence exerted by six sources on the adoption of micro teaching and specific learning disabilities.

Elementary principals viewed themselves as most influential of the six sources in the adoption of the two practices. Approximately 60 per cent reported themselves as having "much" influence in the adoption process.

Superintendents were rated as influential in the adoption of micro teaching, where 40 per cent of the respondents indicated superintendents had "much" influence. This rating was over twice as large as the percentage computed for superintendents who were viewed as having "much" influence in the adoption of specific learning disability programs.

Teachers were reported as having "much" influence in the adoption of micro teaching and specific learning disabilities by 24 per cent and 30.6 per cent of the principals, respectively. Teachers were most often reported to have "some" influence in the adoption of the two practices.

Approximately 20 per cent of the principals reported central office personnel as having "much" influence in the adoption of the two practices

Neither citizens nor boards of education were reported to be influential in

the adoption of the two programs. The percentages of principals who indicated these two sources to have "little" or "no" influence were 44 per cent for micro teaching and 64 per cent for specific learning disabilities.

Staff involvement with the two practices, micro teaching and specific learning disabilities, is reported in Table 59.

The extent of staff involvement with the two practices appeared quite similar. With each practice approximately 30 per cent of the respondents reported that "all" or "most" teachers were involved. Over one-third indicated that "some" teachers were involved, while another one-third reported that only "few" teachers were involved with the practices.

Teacher receptiveness to micro teaching and specific learning disabilities is shown in Table 60.

Approximately one-fourth of the principals reported that micro teaching was either "very well" or "well" received in their buildings. Over 40 per cent marked this practice as "fairly well received," and 32 per cent marked "not well received."

Principals' perceptions of teachers' receptivity to specific learning disabilities programs appeared more favorable. Nearly 60 per cent indicated the program as either "very well received" or "well received." "Fairly well received" was used to describe the teachers' receptiveness by 37.5 per cent of the respondents. Only 3.2 per cent marked either "not well received" or "poorly received" to describe teacher receptivity.

Change required of teachers because of the adoption of micro teaching and specific learning disability programs is reported in Table 61.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents reported that micro teaching required either "much" change or "some" change by teachers. Over 80 per cent of the principals gave these same two responses to indicate change required as a result of the adoption of specific learning disability programs.

About one-third of those responding reported that micro teaching required "little" or "no" change by teachers, while nearly one-fifth gave this same response concerning specific learning disabilities.

Table 62 indicates that the preservice training for micro teaching was viewed as at least "adequate" by 52 per cent of the responding principals. A lesser percentage, 41.7 per cent, gave at least "adequate" ratings for the preservice training provided for specific learning disabilities.

Approximately 40 per cent of the respondents described the training for the two programs as "some, but inadequate." Twelve per cent of the respondents reported the preservice training as "totally inadequate" for the two programs.

The inservice training provided for the practices of micro teaching and specific learning disabilities is presented in Table 63.

The responses of the principals toward the inservice training provided for these two programs were very similar. In both instances approximately 45 per cent of the respondents reported at least "adequate" inservice training. A slightly larger percentage of respondents reported the training for specific learning disability programs to be "highly adequate."

The percentages indicating inadequate inservice training, 52 per cent and 52.8 per cent, respectively, were also very similar for the two practices.

Chapter IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of Problem and Procedure

The purposes of this study were: 1) to determine the prevalence of selected programs and practices in the elementary schools of Iowa, and 2) to investigate principals' perceptions of certain aspects of the adoption process involved with these practices and programs.

Two questionnaires were used to gather the data. The first questionnaire was sent to principals in each of the elementary schools in the state of Iowa. Its purpose was to determine the prevalence of the selected practices in Iowa's elementary schools.

A second questionnaire was designed to investigate six sources for their importance in proposing programs and for the degree of influence these sources has on the decision to adopt the programs. The questionnaire was also constructed to gain information about five other factors related to the adoption of these practices and programs. This questionnaire was individualized to the extent that respondents were asked about only those practices or programs that had been listed, through the first questionnaire, as present in their buildings. The questionnaire was sent to 231 randomly selected principals.

Percentages were tabulated to indicate the degree of involvement each of the six sources had both in proposing the practices and programs and in influencing their adoption. Percentages were also tabulated on the responses to the five questions asked about each practice.

Summary of Findings

Prevalence of Selected Practices In Iowa Elementary Schools

Only two practices, interest centers and paraprofessional programs, were reported in more than 70 per cent of Iowa's elementary schools. Between 50 per cent and 70 per cent of the principals indicated drug abuse, individualized instruction, and specific learning disabilities programs were present in their buildings. Ten of the practices and programs were found in from 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the schools, while eleven practices were reported in less than 25 per cent of the schools.

Principals' Perceptions of the Adoption Process

Program proposers. Principals viewed themselves in the most important position as program proposers. With fourteen of the twenty-six practices and programs the largest percentage of principals reported themselves to be the original program proposers. Principals appeared most often to be proposers of organizational practices, practices related to personnel, and the two "other" practices, micro teaching and specific learning disabilities. Considerable importance was also evident with programs related to instruction and with materials related to instruction. Principals appeared to be less important as proposers of curricular-type programs.

Principals also viewed teachers as important program proposers. With nine of the practices teachers received higher ratings as program proposers than the other five sources. Teachers appeared to be most influential as proposers of curricular-type programs, programs related to instruction, and materials related to instruction. They displayed lesser importance as proposers of practices in the remaining three categories.

Superintendents and central office personnel appeared less important as program proposers than did principals and teachers. Superintendents received their highest ratings as proposers of organizational practices and practices related to personnel. Central office personnel were most important as proposers of curricular-type programs.

Boards of education and citizens were viewed as least important of the six sources as program proposers. Boards of education showed importance only with computer assisted instruction and dial access programs. These same two programs and volunteer aides were the only programs where citizens displayed an importance as program proposers.

Sources of influence in program adoption. Principals viewed themselves as the most influential of the six sources in the adoption of the selected practices and programs. They received the highest percentages of responses indicating "much" influence with fifteen programs, and the second highest percentages indicating this same influence with ten other practices. Principals appeared especially influential in the adoption of organizational practices, practices related to personnel, and the two practices of micro teaching and specific learning disabilities.

Teachers were seen as the second most influential source in the adoption process. In twenty-one of the practices teachers received either the highest or second highest number of responses reporting "much" influence. They displayed most influence in the adoption of programs related to instruction.

Superintendents were rated far less often as important sources of influence. Their highest ratings were with open space schools, elementary guidance, computer assisted instruction, and micro teaching. Central office personnel displayed influence only with career education and dial access. Boards of education and citizens were viewed as least influential sources in the adoption process

Staff involvement The nongraded organization and paraprofessional programs

appeared to be the most highly implemented programs, with approximately 80 per cent of the respondents reporting these programs to involve "all" or "most" teachers in their buildings.

Between 50 per cent and 75 per cent of the principals reported that at least "most" teachers were involved with nine of the other practices: multiage grouping, open space schools, career education, differentiated staffing, elementary guidance, behavioral objectives, individualized instruction, interest centers, and computer assisted instruction. Responses of "all" or "most" teachers involved were reported with ten of the remaining fifteen practices in from one-third to one-half of the schools.

Least teacher involvement was noted with learning packages, where only 20.5 per cent indicated staff participation by at least "most" teachers. Tutorial programs, programmed instruction, teaching machines, and micro teaching were also less widely implemented programs, with less than 30 per cent indicating at least "most" teacher involvement with these programs.

Teacher receptiveness. Eighteen of the twenty-six practices were reported to enjoy positive receptivity by at least 50 per cent of the responding principals. Organizational practices and practices related to personnel were viewed as especially well received.

Two practices, open space schools and paraprofessional programs, were reported to be either "very well" or "well" received in their buildings by over 75 per cent of the respondents. Paraprofessional programs ranked especially high, with nearly 75 per cent of the principals rating this program as "very well received." Twelve other practices were viewed as at least "well received" by more than 60 per cent of the principals.

Only two programs, computer assisted instruction and micro teaching, were viewed to be either "very well" or "well" received by 12 per cent or less of the responding principals. Micro teaching appeared to be the least popular practice, with 32 per cent reporting this practice to be "not well received" in their buildings.

Change required. With the exception of dial access, 50 per cent of the principals reported that at least "some" change was required of teachers upon implementation of the twenty-six practices.

Organizational practices: team teaching, multiage grouping, nongraded organization, and open space schools, seemed to require the most change of teachers. With these practices from 89.3 per cent to 100 per cent indicated that at least "some" change was required upon practice implementation, and at least 50 per cent indicated that "much" change was needed. Open space schools were reported to require "much" change by more than 75 per cent of the respondents. Approximately two-thirds indicated this same response for the nongraded organization. In addition to the four organizational practices, process science and individualized instruction were reported to require "much" change by 53.4 per cent and 65.6 per cent of the principals, respectively.

Six practices: team teaching, multiage grouping, open space schools, process science, behavioral objectives, and individualized instruction, were reported to have required at least "some" change of teachers by 90 per cent or more of the respondents.

Preservice training. Principals tended to view the preservice training offered for the twenty-six practices and programs investigated as basically positive. With nineteen of the practices 50 per cent to 87.5 per cent reported their preservice programs as at least "adequate." None of the preservice programs, however, received "highly adequate" ratings by more than 15 per cent of the respondents.

The category of organizational practices was the only category in which all practices received at least "adequate" preservice ratings by 50 per cent or more of the principals. Only one or two programs in each of the other categories failed to receive similar ratings, however.

Inadequate preservice was reported by more than half of the principals for the following seven programs: drug abuse, volunteer aides, tutorial programs, independent study, learning packages, dial access, and specific learning disabilities.

Three programs, open space schools, minority cultures, and independent study, received "totally inadequate" preservice ratings by from 15.6 per cent to 26.5 per cent of the respondents.

Inservice training. Principals tended to view the inservice programs provided for new practices and programs in their buildings as slightly less effective than their preservice programs. Fifteen of the twenty-six practices received at least "adequate" ratings by 50 per cent or more of the respondents. Again, none of the programs received "highly adequate" ratings by more than 15 per cent of the principals. By far the highest percentage of "adequate" ratings, 93.8 per cent, was tabulated for differentiated staffing. Three programs the nongraded organization, open space schools, and elementary guidance, received either of the two "adequate" ratings by two-thirds of the respondents.

The category of organizational practices was again the only category in which all practices received at least "adequate" inservice ratings by 50 per cent of more of the respondents. Least effective inservice was noted for two categories: programs related to instruction, where only two of the six programs in this category received at least "adequate" ratings by 50 per cent or more of the respondents, and the two practices in the "other" category, where neither program received a majority of positive ratings.

Inadequate inservice was reported by 50 per cent to 66.7 per cent of the respondents for half of the practices. "Totally inadequate" inservice for thirteen programs and practices was indicated by 10.5 per cent to 22.1 per cent of the respondents.

Curricular-type programs, programs related to instruction, and the practices of micro-teaching and specific learning disabilities received the most totally negative ratings.

Observations and Suggestions

The respondents overwhelmingly named principals and teachers as the proposers and as the major sources of influence in the adoption of the programs and practices investigated. The apparent low ratings of the other four sources may be due, at least in part, to the parochialism that often exists in buildings and therefore

limits the scope of an elementary staff as it works to meet the immediate needs of its young clientele.

Although the initial survey reported the presence of numerous practices in Iowa's elementary schools, respondents indicated that a majority of the programs were operating on less than a building-wide basis. This situation possibly indicates individual teacher or small group interest in a specific program or programs, rather than program adoption on the basis of a building or district philosophy.

It would appear that considerable improvements are needed in the preservice and inservice training programs that are offered for newly initiated programs if the new programs are to achieve their full potential. While principals tended to view the training provided as basically satisfactory, their responses appeared to meet only minimal levels of adequacy.

The scope of this study was rather board in nature, and thus failed to answer many specific questions concerning the change process itself. The writers would suggest the following possibilities for further research in this area: 1) Apply the same basic format used in this study with all six sources so that a statistical analysis could be used to compare source impressions of proposers and influencers of change, 2) Select an innovative school and/or school district and conduct an intensive study to determine the specific characteristics that contribute to that school's innovativeness, 3) Prepare a case study of a specific program in a school and/or school district from its initial inception to its total implementation, 4) Compare innovative and non-innovative schools and/or school districts to determine what similarities and what differences exist between these two types, 5) From repeated development of new programs must come established guidelines for initiating, developing, supporting, evaluating, and sustaining such programs. Schools that have developed such guidelines should be identified and utilized as prototypes for other school districts, 6) Schools, interested in testing a new program, curriculum, practice, technique, or organization should be very systematic in the collection of data from those districts that have worked with the change, 7) Districts (schools) must develop a general strategy for installation of the proposed change, The specific component of the change must be identified, with approximately implementation dates, 8) Generally, a financial commitment must be built into the new program change. Few programs can succeed without adequate financing. Commitment within the district is a first step in planned change, 9) Determine for yourself that the new program is in fact wanted by staff, administration and public. Collect data to support its further consideration, 10) Insure that adequate preservice and inservice experiences are provided to staff and administration, 11) Insist that a formal evaluative provision be included in the over-all format of the proposed change. Develop continuous assessment procedures of the change, 12) It would appear that the following activities are most vital to the change: (a) established guidelines, (b) selection of the most appropriate type of change, (c) appropriating adequate budgetory resources, (d) preparing staff and support facilities for the change, (e) managing the change over a period of time, (f) assessing the change (continually and periodically), (g) revising the change where necessary, (h) demonstrating the change to others who are interested.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Buchan, William J. "A Design for Introducing Educational Change," Education, 91:298-300, April-May, 1971.

Faber, Charles F. and Gilbert F. Shearron. Elementary School Administration. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Garrison, Martin. "Change for Change's Sake?", Educational Leadership, 25:432-435, February, 1968.

Hearn, Norman. "The Where, When, and How of Trying Innovations," Phi Delta Kappan. 53:358-361, February, 1972.

Iowa State Education Association. "Iowa Instructional Changes Revealed," ISEA Communique, 8, April, 1971.

Marx, Thomas F. "A Factor Analytic Study of Educational Innovations and Aspects of the Adoption Process." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1970.

Miles, Matthew B. "Innovation in Education: Some Generalizations," Innovation in Education, Matthew B. Miles, editor. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Rogers, Everett M. "What are Innovators Like?", Change Processes in the Public Schools, by Richard O. Carlson, Art Gallaher, Jr., Matthew B. Miles, Roland J. Pellegrin, and Everett M. Rogers. Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.

Snow, C. P. "Miasma, Darkness and Torpidity," New Statesman, 62:186-187, August 1961.

Appendix A

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

On the following pages are listed several programs and practices that this study is attempting to investigate. In the spaces provided please check (/) whether or not the listed practices are present in your building. For those practices that you mark YES please (1) circle the appropriate number to indicate how many years the practice has been in effect in your building and (2) circle the appropriate response to indicate the grade level(s) involved with the practice.

1. TUTORIAL PROGRAM - An organized program in which one child, acting as a teacher, works with another child as a tutor. The tutor may give direct instruction or reinforce previously learned material.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. TEAM TEACHING - A type of instructional organization in which two or more teachers assume joint responsibility for all or a significant part of the planning, instruction, and evaluation of a group of students.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAM - The use of paid non-degree persons for assisting teachers with non-instructional tasks.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. VOLUNTEER AIDES - An organized program using volunteer helpers for assisting teachers with non-instructional tasks.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. UNSTRUCTURED TIME - A regularly scheduled period of time that is not planned by the teacher, but is left for the student to utilize as he desires (within broad guidelines established by the school).

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. INDEPENDENT STUDY - A procedure which allows students the opportunity and the time to pursue a learning activity that has been proposed or elected by the individual student. It should not be confused with teacher initiated projects, uniform homework, or seatwork.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. COMPUTER ASSISTED/MANAGED INSTRUCTION - A form of instruction which uses the capabilities of a computer. The student may react directly with the computer during the learning process or the computer may be used to direct instruction or monitor the learning progress of a child.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

(OVER)

8. PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION - Learning materials designed so that the student proceeds in small sequential steps, responds to the material presented, and is informed immediately whether or not the response selected is correct.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

9. MULTIAGE OR MULTIGRADE GROUPING - A form of school organization where children of different chronological and grade levels are deliberately grouped together for instructional purposes.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

10. MINORITY CULTURES - A course of study designed for the purpose of helping children obtain a better understanding and appreciation of minority culture groups.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. LEARNING PACKAGES OR LEARNING CONTRACTS - Activities developed by the teacher and designed in such a manner that a child may proceed through the learning activity independently.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING - A staffing pattern which formally places teachers at various levels of responsibility according to defined roles or tasks. Teachers are placed in these roles according to their particular talents and strengths. Remuneration varies according to the role assignment.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

13. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES - The objectives for the major portion of one course or curricular area are written in terms of behavior that can be specified and measured.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

14. SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES - A program where children with specific learning disabilities are diagnosed and an appropriate instructional program formulated.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

15. TEACHING MACHINE - A mechanical device which presents an educational program designed to teach a student through a controlled learning sequence.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

16. MICRO TEACHING - An organized and continuing program that makes use of videotaping as an in-service tool for the improvement of instruction. Lessons taught by a teacher are videotaped to allow the teacher an opportunity to observe himself and make a self evaluation of the lesson taught.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

17. DIAL ACCESS - An audio visual technique that allows students to select audio and/or video recordings from a centralized source by dialing predetermined codes.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

18. INTEREST CENTERS - Areas, established by the teacher, where students may go, individually or in small groups, to work when time allows.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

19. NONGRADED ORGANIZATION - An arrangement in which the usual grade labels are removed from some or all classes. It is an organizational approach which seeks to implement the idea of continuous pupil progress.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

20 ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE - A program which provides the services of a certified elementary counselor on a full or part time basis.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

21. DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM - A course of study designed to acquaint children with the topic of drugs, their use and abuse.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

22. OPEN SPACE SCHOOL - A building constructed in such a manner that the instructional program takes place in a large open area(s). Provisions may or may not be available for dividing the large open area into several smaller areas.

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

23. FAMILY LIFE OR SEX EDUCATION - A course of study that focuses on human sexuality as it applies to an individual's total adjustment to his family and so [illegible].

___YES ___NO
Years 1 2 3 4 5+
Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

(OVER)

24. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION - The major portion of at least one curricular area is organized in such a manner that each child is allowed to move at his own pace through a learning program designed to meet the interests, needs, and abilities of the child.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

25. A PROCESS APPROACH TO SCIENCE - A science program where the primary emphasis is on developing the same processes that scientists employ in scientific inquiry.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

26. CAREER EDUCATION - A program designed to help students develop positive attitudes toward work and recognize the important role work plays in individual life styles.

___YES ___NO

Years 1 2 3 4 5+

Grade(s) K 1 2 3 4 5 6

(20-21)

TUTORIAL PROGRAM - An organized program in which one child, acting as a teacher, works with another child as a tutor. The tutor may give direct instruction or reinforce previously learned material.

Degree of Influence

[illegible]		Much (1)	Some (2)	Little (3)	None (4)	Unknown (5)	
	1 Superintendent						(23)
	2 Central Office Staff						(24)
	3 Board of Education						(25)
	4 Building Principal						(26)
	5 Teacher(s)						(27)
	6 Citizens						(28)
	7 Unknown						
(22)							

1. How extensively is the staff involved with this practice in your building? (29)

___ 1. All teachers involved ___ 3. Some teachers involved
___ 2. Most teachers involved ___ 4. Few teachers involved

2. Indicate how well you feel this practice has been received in your building. (30)

___ 1. Very well received ___ 3. Fairly well received ___ 5. Poorly received
___ 2. Well received ___ 4. Not well received

3. Indicate how much change has been required of teachers as a result of this practice. (31)

___ 1. Much ___ 2. Some ___ 3. Little ___ 4. None

4. Indicate the amount of preservice preparation that teachers received before this practice was implemented. (32)

___ 1. Highly adequate ___ 2. Adequate ___ 3. Some, but inadequate ___ 4. Totally inadequate

5. Indicate the amount of inservice training that teachers received after the practice was implemented.

___ 1. Highly adequate ___ 2. Adequate ___ 3. Some, but inadequate ___ 4. Totally inadequate (33)

(20-21)

TEAM TEACHING - A type of instructional organization in which two or more teachers assume joint responsibility for all or a significant part of the planning, instruction, and evaluation of a group of students.

Degree of Influence

[illegible]		Much (1)	Some (2)	Little (3)	None (4)	Unknown (5)	
	1 Superintendent						(23)
	2 Central Office Staff						(24)
	3 Board of Education						(25)
	4 Building Principal						(26)
	5 Teacher(s)						(27)
	6 Citizens						(28)
	7 Unknown						
(22)							

1. How extensively is the staff involved with this practice in your building? (29)

___ 1. All teachers involved ___ 3. Some teachers involved
___ 2. Most teachers involved ___ 4. Few teachers involved

2. Indicate how well you feel this practice has been received in your building. (30)

___ 1. Very well received ___ 3. Fairly well received ___ 5. Poorly received
___ 2. Well received ___ 4. Not well received

3. Indicate how much change has been required of teachers as a result of this practice. (31)

___ 1. Much ___ 2. Some ___ 3. Little ___ 4. None

4. Indicate the amount of preservice preparation that teachers received before this practice was implemented. (32)

___ 1. Highly adequate ___ 2. Adequate ___ 3. Some, but inadequate ___ 4. Totally inadequate

5. Indicate the amount of inservice training that teachers received after the practice was implemented.

___ 1. Highly adequate ___ 2. Adequate ___ 3. Some, but inadequate ___ 4. Totally inadequate (33)

Appendix B

Organizational Practices

Table 2

Principals' Perceptions of Proposers of Four Organizational Practices

		Team Teaching	Multiage Grouping	Nongraded Organization	Open Space School
Superintendent	N	5	4	4	3
	%	7.2	11.8	14.3	18.8
Central Office Staff	N	2	1	3	0
	%	2.9	2.9	10.7	0.0
Board of Education	N	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Principal	N	35	21	13	7
	%	50.7	61.8	46.4	43.8
Teachers	N	14	2	2	0
	%	20.3	5.9	7.1	0.0
Citizens	N	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
More Than One	N	10	3	3	5
	%	14.5	8.8	10.7	31.3
Unknown	N	1	1	1	0
	%	1.4	2.9	3.6	0.0
Unmarked	N	2	2	2	1
	%	2.9	5.9	7.1	6.2

Table 3

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Team Teaching

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	10	28	8	8	3	12
	%	14.5	40.6	11.6	11.6	4.3	17.4
Central Office	N	7	17	8	20	2	15
	%	10.1	24.6	11.6	29.0	2.9	21.7
Board of Education	N	1	7	19	23	6	13
	%	1.4	10.1	27.5	33.3	8.7	18.8
Principal	N	55	7	2	0	0	5
	%	79.7	10.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	7.2
Teachers	N	35	22	3	1	0	8
	%	50.7	31.9	4.3	1.4	0.0	11.6
Citizens	N	0	7	15	26	7	14
	%	0.0	10.1	21.7	37.7	10.1	20.3

Table 4

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Multiage Grouping

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	8	6	6	7	1	6
	%	23.5	17.6	17.6	20.6	2.9	17.6
Central Office	N	3	4	8	11	0	8
	%	8.8	11.8	23.5	32.4	0.0	23.5
Board of Education	N	1	3	4	17	1	8
	%	2.9	8.8	11.8	50.0	2.9	23.5
Principal	N	27	4	1	0	0	2
	%	79.4	11.8	2.9	0.0	0.0	5.9
Teachers	N	19	9	1	0	0	5
	%	55.9	26.5	2.9	0.0	0.0	14.7
Citizens	N	0	4	5	14	2	9
	%	0.0	11.8	14.7	41.2	5.9	26.5

Table 5

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of the Nongraded Organization

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	10	9	1	3	0	5
	%	35.7	32.1	3.6	10.7	0.0	17.9
Central Office	N	5	7	2	7	0	7
	%	17.9	25.0	7.1	25.0	0.0	25.0
Board of Education	N	4	5	6	4	1	8
	%	14.3	17.9	21.4	14.3	3.6	28.6
Principal	N	21	2	0	0	0	5
	%	75.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.9
Teachers	N	15	9	1	0	0	3
	%	53.6	32.1	3.6	0.0	0.0	10.7
Citizens	N	0	6	9	6	1	6
	%	0.0	21.4	32.1	21.4	3.6	21.4

Table 6

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Open Space Schools

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	9	5	1	0	0	1
	%	56.3	31.3	6.2	0.0	0.0	6.2
Central Office	N	2	6	3	3	0	2
	%	12.5	37.5	18.8	18.8	0.0	12.5
Board of Education	N	5	3	7	0	1	0
	%	31.3	18.8	43.8	0.0	6.2	0.0
Principal	N	12	2	1	0	1	0
	%	75.0	12.5	6.2	0.0	6.2	0.0
Teachers	N	8	4	2	1	1	0
	%	50.0	25.0	12.5	6.2	6.2	0.0
Citizens	N	0	4	3	7	0	2
	%	0.0	25.0	18.8	43.8	0.0	12.5

Table 7

Principals' Perceptions of Staff Involvement with Four Organizational-Type Practices

		All Teachers Involved	Most Teachers Involved	Some Teachers Involved	Few Teachers Involved	Unmarked
Team Teaching	N	14	14	24	17	0
	%	20.3	20.3	34.8	24.6	0.0
Multiage Grouping	N	14	5	15	0	0
	%	41.2	14.7	44.1	0.0	0.0
Nongraded	N	16	7	5	0	0
Organization	%	57.1	25.0	17.9	0.0	0.0
Open Space Schools	N	6	2	4	4	0
	%	37.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	0.0

Table 8

Principals' Perceptions of Teacher Receptiveness to Four Organizational-Type Practices

		Very Well Received	Well Received	Fairly Well Received	Not Well Received	Poorly Received	Unmarked
Team	N	17	32	18	2	0	0
Teaching	%	24.6	46.4	26.1	2.9	0.0	0.0
Multiage	N	8	15	10	1	0	0
Grouping	%	23.5	44.1	29.4	2.9	0.0	0.0
Nongraded	N	8	9	11	0	0	0
Organization	%	28.6	32.1	39.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Open Space	N	5	7	3	1	0	0
Schools	%	31.3	43.8	18.8	6.2	0.0	0.0

Table 9

Principals' Perceptions of Change Required of Teachers by Four Organizational-Type Practices

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unmarked
Team Teaching	N	41	23	4	0	1
	%	59.4	33.3	5.8	0.0	1.4
Multiage Grouping	N	17	14	3	0	0
	%	50.0	41.2	8.8	0.0	0.0
Nongraded Organization	N	18	7	3	0	0
	%	64.3	25.0	10.7	0.0	0.0
Open Space Schools	N	12	4	0	0	0
	%	75.0	25.0	0	0	0

Table 10

Principals' Perceptions of Preservice Training Provided Before Implementation of Four Organizational-Type Practices

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Team Teaching	N	6	33	26	3	1
	%	8.7	47.8	37.7	4.3	1.4
Multiage Grouping	N	3	16	13	1	1
	%	8.8	47.1	38.2	2.9	2.9
Nongraded	N	4	15	7	2	0
Organization	%	14.3	53.6	25.0	7.1	0.0
Open Space	N	2	8	3	3	0
Schools	%	12.5	50.0	18.8	18.8	0.0

Table 11

Principals' Perceptions of Inservice Training Provided After Implementation of Four Organizational-Type Practices

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Team Teaching	N	4	35	27	3	0
	%	5.8	50.7	39.1	4.3	0.0
Multiage Grouping	N	1	16	16	1	0
	%	2.9	47.1	47.1	2.9	0.0
Nongraded	N	4	15	8	1	0
Organization	%	14.3	53.6	28.6	3.6	0.0
Open Space	N	1	10	3	2	0
Schools	%	6.2	62.5	18.8	12.5	0.0

Appendix C

Curricular Type Programs

Table 12

Principals' Perceptions of Proposers of Five Curricular-Type Programs

		Minority Cultures	Drug Abuse	Family Life	Career Education	Process Science
Superintendent	N	2	15	5	5	4
	%	5.9	16.0	11.1	19.2	4.5
Central Office Staff	N	8	16	8	7	21
	%	23.5	17.0	17.8	26.9	23.9
Board of Education	N	1	0	2	1	1
	%	2.9	0.0	4.4	3.8	1.1
Principal	N	4	13	3	5	19
	%	11.8	13.8	6.7	19.2	21.6
Teachers	N	9	21	9	1	24
	%	26.5	22.3	20.0	3.8	27.3
Citizens	N	2	2	5	0	0
	%	5.9	2.1	11.1	0.0	0.0
More Than One	N	3	14	6	3	12
	%	8.8	14.9	13.3	11.5	13.6
Unknown	N	3	3	2	2	1
	%	8.8	3.2	4.4	7.7	1.1
Unmarked	N	2	10	5	2	6
	%	5.9	10.6	11.1	7.7	6.8

Table 13

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Minority Cultures

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	7	8	8	5	0	6
	%	20.6	23.5	23.5	14.7	0.0	17.6
Central Office	N	8	10	4	6	0	6
	%	23.5	29.4	11.8	17.6	0.0	17.6
Board of Education	N	2	9	8	6	2	7
	%	5.9	26.5	23.5	17.6	5.9	20.6
Principal	N	11	15	2	0	0	6
	%	32.4	44.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	17.6
Teachers	N	16	10	5	0	0	3
	%	47.1	29.4	14.7	0.0	0.0	8.8
Citizens	N	2	6	12	7	0	7
	%	5.9	17.6	35.3	20.6	0.0	20.6

Table 14

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Drug Abuse Programs

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	28	33	9	8	2	14
	%	29.8	35.1	9.6	8.5	2.1	14.9
Central Office	N	25	15	8	22	3	21
	%	26.6	16.0	8.5	23.4	3.2	22.3
Board of Education	N	10	26	21	16	2	19
	%	10.6	27.7	22.3	17.0	2.1	20.2
Principal	N	35	33	10	1	0	15
	%	37.2	35.1	10.6	1.1	0.0	16.0
Teachers	N	39	29	16	0	0	10
	%	41.5	30.9	17.0	0.0	0.0	10.6
Citizens	N	20	8	27	23	12	4
	%	21.3	8.5	28.7	24.5	12.8	4.3

Table 15

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Family Life or Sex Education

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	13	17	7	1	0	7
	%	28.9	37.8	15.6	2.2	0.0	15.6
Central Office	N	15	7	3	11	0	9
	%	33.3	15.6	6.7	24.4	0.0	20.0
Board of Education	N	5	16	10	5	0	9
	%	11.1	35.6	22.2	11.1	0.0	20.0
Principal	N	21	14	4	0	0	6
	%	46.7	31.1	8.9	0.0	0.0	13.3
Teachers	N	18	11	9	0	0	7
	%	40.0	24.4	20.0	0.0	0.0	15.6
Citizens	N	9	12	9	3	2	10
	%	20.0	26.7	20.0	6.7	4.4	22.2

Table 16

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Career Education

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	5	13	4	1	1	2
	%	19.2	50.0	15.4	3.8	3.8	7.7
Central Office	N	9	6	2	3	1	5
	%	34.6	23.1	7.7	11.5	3.8	19.2
Board of Education	N	3	3	9	5	1	5
	%	11.5	11.5	34.6	19.2	3.8	19.2
Principal	N	10	9	2	1	0	4
	%	38.5	34.6	7.7	3.8	0.0	15.4
Teachers	N	6	10	7	1	0	2
	%	23.1	38.5	26.9	3.8	0.0	7.7
Citizens	N	1	2	10	8	1	4
	%	3.8	7.7	38.5	30.8	3.8	15.4

Table 17

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Process Science

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	12	29	12	12	1	21
	%	13.6	33.0	14.8	13.6	1.1	23.9
Central Office	N	28	11	2	22	3	22
	%	31.8	12.5	2.3	25.0	3.4	25.0
Board of Education	N	1	13	22	21	7	24
	%	1.1	14.8	25.0	23.9	8.0	27.3
Principal	N	37	32	4	0	0	15
	%	42.0	36.4	4.5	0.0	0.0	17.0
Teachers	N	42	26	9	0	0	11
	%	47.7	29.5	10.2	0.0	0.0	12.5
Citizens	N	0	5	13	40	6	24
	%	0.0	5.7	14.8	45.5	6.8	27.3

Table 18

Principals' Perceptions of Staff Involvement with Five Curricular-Type Programs

		All Teachers Involved	Most Teachers Involved	Some Teachers Involved	Few Teachers Involved	Unmarked
Minority Cultures	N	8	7	12	7	0
	%	23.5	20.6	35.3	20.6	0.0
Drug Abuse	N	20	19	37	18	0
	%	21.3	20.2	39.4	19.1	0.0
Family Life	N	10	12	14	9	0
	%	22.2	26.7	31.1	20.0	0.0
Career Education	N	9	4	7	5	1
	%	34.6	15.4	26.9	19.2	3.8
Process Science	N	18	22	41	7	0
	%	20.5	25.0	46.6	8.0	0.0

Table 19

Principals' Perceptions of Teacher Receptiveness to Five Curricular-Type Programs

		Very Well Received	Well Received	Fairly Well Received	Not Well Received	Poorly Received	Unmarked
Minority Cultures	N	2	9	20	2	1	0
	%	5.9	26.5	58.8	5.9	2.9	0.0
Drug Abuse	N	13	44	31	5	0	1
	%	13.8	46.8	33.0	5.3	0.0	1.1
Family Life	N	7	22	13	2	1	0
	%	15.6	48.9	28.9	4.4	2.2	0.0
Career Education	N	4	9	10	2	0	1
	%	15.4	34.6	38.5	7.7	0.0	3.8
Process Science	N	13	36	34	5	0	0
	%	14.8	40.9	38.6	5.7	0.0	0.0

Table 20

Principals' Perceptions of Change Required of Teachers by Five Curricular-Type Programs

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unmarked
Minority Cultures	N	2	18	10	4	0
	%	5.9	52.9	29.4	11.8	0.0
Drug Abuse	N	2	48	37	6	1
	%	2.1	51.1	39.4	6.4	1.1
Family Life	N	5	24	15	1	0
	%	11.1	53.3	33.3	2.2	0.0
Career Education	N	5	10	10	0	1
	%	19.2	38.5	38.5	0.0	3.8
Process Science	N	47	36	4	1	0
	%	53.4	40.9	4.5	1.1	0.0

Table 21

Principals' Perceptions of Preservice Training Provided Before Implementation of Five Curricular-Type Programs

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Minority Cultures	N	1	16	8	9	0
	%	2.9	47.1	23.5	26.5	0.0
Drug Abuse	N	4	39	39	10	2
	%	4.3	41.5	41.5	10.6	2.1
Family Life	N	5	25	12	2	1
	%	11.1	55.6	26.7	4.4	2.2
Career Education	N	1	12	9	2	2
	%	3.8	46.2	34.6	7.7	7.7
Process Science	N	8	41	33	5	1
	%	9.1	46.6	37.5	5.7	1.1

Table 22

Principals' Perceptions of Inservice Training Provided After Implementation Of Five Curricular-Type Programs

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Minority Cultures	N	2	14	11	7	0
	%	5.9	41.2	32.4	20.6	0.0
Drug Abuse	N	2	43	36	11	2
	%	2.1	45.7	38.3	11.7	2.1
Family Life	N	3	24	14	3	1
	%	6.7	53.3	31.1	6.7	2.2
Career Education	N	2	11	7	4	2
	%	7.7	42.3	26.9	15.4	7.7
Process Science	N	7	42	31	7	1
	%	8.0	47.7	35.2	8.0	1.1

Appendix D

Practices Related To Personnel

Table 23

Principals' Perceptions of Proposers of Four Practices Related to Personnel

		Paraprofessional Program	Volunteer Aides	Differentiated Staffing	Elementary Guidance
Superintendent	N	25	2	3	8
	%	19.5	2.6	10.8	19.5
Central Office Staff	N	15	6	1	5
	%	11.7	7.9	6.2	12.2
Board of Education	N	1	0	0	0
	%	.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Principal	N	40	27	9	14
	%	31.3	35.5	31.3	34.1
Teachers	N	21	7	1	3
	%	16.4	9.2	6.2	7.3
Citizens	N	0	12	0	0
	%	0.0	15.8	0.0	0.0
More Than One	N	13	14	4	6
	%	10.2	18.4	25.0	14.6
Unknown	N	7	1	0	3
	%	5.5	1.3	0.0	7.3
Unmarked	N	6	7	2	2
	%	4.7	9.2	12.5	4.9

Table 24

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Paraprofessional Programs

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	49	44	8	5	2	20
	%	38.3	34.4	6.2	3.9	1.6	15.6
Central Office	N	20	28	9	30	11	30
	%	15.6	21.9	7.0	23.4	8.6	23.4
Board of Education	N	7	35	26	21	10	29
	%	5.5	27.3	20.3	16.4	7.8	22.7
Principal	N	84	25	1	0	3	15
	%	65.6	19.5	.8	0.0	2.3	11.7
Teachers	N	64	39	4	0	2	19
	%	50.0	30.5	3.1	0.0	1.6	14.8
Citizens	N	1	14	27	38	19	29
	%	.8	10.9	21.1	29.7	14.8	22.7

Table 25

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Volunteer Aides

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	8	14	17	17	3	17
	%	10.5	18.4	22.4	22.4	3.9	22.4
Central Office	N	12	16	7	23	1	17
	%	15.8	21.1	9.2	30.3	1.3	22.4
Board Of Education	N	2	5	17	31	5	16
	%	2.6	6.6	22.4	40.8	6.6	21.1
Principal	N	51	15	2	0	0	8
	%	67.1	19.7	2.6	0.0	0.0	10.5
Teachers	N	25	29	11	1	0	10
	%	32.9	38.2	14.5	1.3	0.0	13.2
Citizens	N	17	17	8	17	1	16
	%	22.4	22.4	10.5	22.4	1.3	21.1

Table 26

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Differentiated Staffing

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	5	3	1	1	0	6
	%	31.3	18.8	6.2	6.2	0.0	37.5
Central Office	N	0	5	0	5	0	6
	%	0.0	31.3	0.0	31.3	0.0	37.5
Board of Education	N	0	3	3	3	0	7
	%	0.0	18.8	18.8	18.8	0.0	43.8
Principal	N	12	2	0	0	0	2
	%	75.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5
Teachers	N	8	5	0	0	0	3
	%	50.0	31.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8
Citizens	N	0	1	2	7	0	6
	%	0.0	6.2	12.5	43.8	0.0	37.5

Table 27

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Elementary Guidance Programs

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	20	7	5	2	0	7
	%	48.8	17.1	12.2	4.9	0.0	17.1
Central Office	N	6	9	5	9	2	10
	%	14.6	22.0	12.2	22.0	4.9	24.4
Board of Education	N	5	10	8	6	3	9
	%	12.2	24.4	19.5	14.6	7.3	22.0
Principal	N	25	7	4	1	0	4
	%	61.0	17.1	9.8	2.4	0.0	9.8
Teachers	N	13	14	5	3	1	5
	%	31.7	34.1	12.2	7.3	2.4	12.2
Citizens	N	2	3	11	12	2	11
	%	4.9	7.3	26.8	29.3	4.9	26.8

Table 28

Principals' Perceptions of Staff Involvement with Four Practices to Personnel

		All Teachers Involved	Most Teachers Involved	Some Teachers Involved	Few Teachers Involved	Unmarked
Paraprofessional	N	7x	30	17	9	0
Program	%	56.3	23.4	13.3	7.0	0.0
Volunteer Aides	N	16	20	24	15	1
	%	21.1	26.3	31.6	19.7	1.3
Differentiated	N	5	3	5	3	0
Staffing	%	31.3	18.8	31.3	18.8	0.0
Elementary Guidance	N	20	8	7	6	0
	%	48.8	19.5	17.1	14.6	0.0

Table 29

Principals' Perceptions of Teacher Receptiveness to Four Practices Related to Personnel

		Very Well Received	Well Received	Fairly Well Received	Not Well Received	Poorly Received	Unmarked
Para professional Program	N	94	26	7	1	0	0
	%	73.4	20.3	5.5	0.8	0.0	0.0
Volunteer Aides	N	30	22	21	3	0	0
	%	39.5	28.9	27.6	3.9	0.0	0.0
Differentiated Staffing	N	3	7	6	0	0	0
	%	18.8	43.8	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Elementary Guidance	N	15	12	11	2	0	1
	%	36.6	29.3	26.8	4.9	0.0	2.4

Table 30

Principals' Perceptions of Change Required of Teachers by Four Practices Related to Personnel

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unmarked
Paraprofessional Program	N	26	76	23	3	0
	%	20.3	59.4	18.0	2.3	0.0
Volunteer Aides	N	5	47	18	6	0
	%	6.6	61.8	23.7	7.9	0.0
Differentiated Staffing	N	5	9	2	0	0
	%	31.3	56.3	12.5	0.0	0.0
Elementary Guidance	N	3	22	14	2	0
	%	7.3	53.7	34.1	4.9	0.0

Table 31

Principals' Perceptions of Preservice Training Provided Before Implementation of Four Practices Related to Personnel

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Paraprofessional	N	4	71	41	8	4
Program	%	3.1	55.5	32.0	6.2	3.1
Volunteer Aides	N	1	31	37	6	1
	%	1.3	40.8	48.7	7.9	1.3
Differentiated	N	0	14	2	0	0
Staffing	%	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0
Elementary	N	1	26	9	5	0
Guidance	%	2.4	63.4	22.0	12.2	0.0

Table 32

Principals' Perceptions of Inservice Training Provided After Implementation of Four Practices Related to Personnel

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Paraprofessional	N	6	72	40	8	2
Program	%	4.7	56.3	31.3	6.2	1.6
Volunteer Aides	N	1	32	32	8	3
	%	1.3	42.1	42.1	10.5	3.9
Differentiated	N	0	15	1	0	0
Staffing	%	0.0	93.8	6.2	0.0	0.0
Elementary	N	2	25	11	3	0
Guidance	%	4.9	61.0	26.8	7.3	0.0

Appendix E

Programs Related to Instruction

Table 33

Principals' Perceptions of Proposers of Six Programs Related to Instruction

		Tutorial Program	Unstruct. Time	Independent Study	Behavioral Objectives	Individ. Instruct.	Interest Centers
Superintendent	N	3	0	2	14	8	1
	%	3.2	0.0	4.4	19.7	8.9	0.8
Central Office Staff	N	0	1	1	15	6	0
	%	0.0	2.2	2.2	21.1	6.7	0.0
Board of Education	N	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
Principal	N	22	13	14	26	34	29
	%	23.2	28.3	31.1	36.6	37.8	23.6
Teachers	N	49	24	20	5	23	63
	%	51.6	52.2	44.4	7.0	25.6	51.2
Citizens	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
More Than One	N	6	3	3	4	13	8
	%	6.3	6.5	6.7	5.6	14.4	14.6
Unknown	N	5	2	2	3	1	3
	%	5.3	4.3	4.4	4.2	1.1	2.4
Unmarked	N	10	3	3	3	5	9
	%	10.5	6.5	6.7	4.2	5.6	7.3

Table 34

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Tutorial Programs

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	3	15	12	41	3	21
	%	3.2	15.8	12.6	43.2	3.2	22.1
Central Office	N	0	10	11	45	1	28
	%	0.0	10.5	11.6	47.4	1.1	29.5
Board of Education	N	0	1	12	50	9	23
	%	0.0	1.1	12.6	52.6	9.5	24.2
Principal	N	49	26	3	0	0	17
	%	51.6	27.4	3.2	0.0	0.0	17.9
Teachers	N	61	23	0	1	0	10
	%	64.2	24.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	10.5
Citizens	N	0	4	12	42	14	23
	%	0.0	4.2	12.6	44.2	14.7	24.2

Table 35

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Unstructured Time

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	1	9	8	17	3	8
	%	2.2	19.6	17.4	37.0	6.5	17.4
Central Office	N	1	5	7	20	2	11
	%	2.2	10.9	15.2	43.5	4.3	23.9
Board of Education	N	0	0	5	25	5	11
	%	0.0	0.0	10.9	54.3	10.9	23.9
Principal	N	25	15	2	0	0	4
	%	54.3	32.6	4.3	0.0	0.0	8.7
Teachers	N	29	12	1	0	0	4
	%	63.0	26.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	8.7
Citizens	N	0	2	4	24	5	11
	%	0.0	4.3	8.7	52.2	10.9	23.9

Table 36

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Independent Study

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	6	9	10	13	2	5
	%	13.3	20.0	22.2	28.9	4.4	11.1
Central Office	N	3	7	6	20	1	8
	%	6.7	15.6	13.3	44.4	2.2	17.8
Board of Education	N	1	4	10	18	5	7
	%	2.2	8.9	22.2	40.0	11.1	15.6
Principal	N	26	11	4	0	0	4
	%	57.8	24.4	8.9	0.0	0.0	8.9
Teachers	N	31	7	3	1	0	3
	%	68.9	15.6	6.7	2.2	0.0	6.7
Citizens	N	0	5	8	19	6	7
	%	0.0	11.1	17.8	42.2	13.3	15.6

Table 37

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Behavioral Objectives

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	21	26	6	9	0	9
	%	29.6	36.6	8.5	12.7	0.0	0.0
Central Office	N	13	10	6	25	1	16
	%	18.3	14.1	8.5	35.2	1.4	22.5
Board of Education	N	0	8	16	23	8	16
	%	0.0	11.3	22.5	32.4	11.3	22.5
Principal	N	38	22	2	1	0	8
	%	55.5	31.0	2.8	1.4	0.0	11.3
Teachers	N	29	20	11	2	0	9
	%	40.8	28.2	15.5	2.8	0.0	12.7
Citizens	N	0	3	12	31	9	16
	%	0.0	4.2	16.9	43.7	12.7	22.5

Table 38

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Individualized Instruction

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	19	23	15	11	0	22
	%	21.1	25.6	16.7	12.2	0.0	24.4
Central Office	N	11	12	9	29	3	26
	%	12.2	13.3	10.0	32.2	3.3	28.9
Board of Education	N	2	13	23	19	8	25
	%	2.2	14.4	25.6	21.1	8.9	27.8
Principal	N	55	19	0	0	0	16
	%	61.1	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.8
Teachers	N	57	18	2	0	0	13
	%	63.3	20.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	14.4
Citizens	N	1	12	14	29	8	26
	%	1.1	13.3	15.6	32.2	8.9	28.9

Table 39

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Interest Centers

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	9	17	34	35	3	25
	%	7.3	13.8	27.6	28.5	2.4	20.3
Central Office	N	6	18	18	44	5	32
	%	4.9	14.6	14.6	35.8	4.1	26.0
Board Of Education	N	1	4	18	54	17	29
	%	.8	3.3	14.6	43.9	13.8	23.6
Principal	N	54	48	7	0	0	14
	%	43.9	39.0	. 7	0.0	0.0	11.4
Teachers	N	88	22		0	0	10
	%	71.5	17.9	.4	0.0	0.0	8.1
Citizens	N	1	5	20	52	15	30
	%	.8	4.1	16.3	42.3	12.2	24.4

Table 40

Principals' Perceptions of Staff Involvement with Six Practices Related to Instruction

		All Teachers Involved	Most Teachers Involved	Some Teachers Involved	Few Teachers Involved	Unmarked
Tutorial Program	N	4	23	40	20	0
	%	4.2	24.2	50.5	21.1	0.0
Unstructured Time	N	8	11	17	10	0
	%	17.4	23.9	37.0	21.7	0.0
Independent Study	N	3	12	20	10	0
	%	6.7	26.7	44.4	22.2	0.0
Behavioral Objectives	N	32	20	17	2	0
	%	45.1	28.2	23.9	2.8	0.0
Individualized	N	33	17	28	12	0
Instruction	%	36.7	18.9	31.1	13.3	0.0
Interest Centers	N	24	38	45	16	0
	%	19.5	30.9	36.6	13.0	0.0

Table 41

Principals' Perceptions of Teacher Receptiveness to Six Practices Related to Instruction

		Very Well Received	Well Received	Fairly Well Received	Not Well Received	Poorly Received	Unmarked
Tutorial	N	19	42	32	1	1	0
Program	%	20.0	44.2	33.7	1.1	1.1	0.0
Unstructured	N	6	16	21	2	1	0
Time	%	13.0	34.8	45.7	4.3	2.2	0.0
Independent	N	2	18	21	4	0	0
Study	%	4.4	40.0	46.7	8.9	0.0	0.0
Behavioral	N	4	20	36	7	3	1
Objectives	%	5.6	28.2	50.7	9.9	4.2	1.4
Individualized	N	21	34	31	4	0	0
Instruction	%	23.3	37.8	34.4	4.4	0.0	0.0
Interest	N	36	49	35	2	1	0
Centers	%	29.3	39.8	28.5	1.6	0.8	0.0

Table 42

Principals' Perceptions of Change Required of Teachers by Six Practices Related to Instruction

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unmarked
Tutorial Program	N	0	53	37	5	0
	%	0.0	55.8	38.9	5.3	0.0
Unstructured Time	N	11	25	9	1	0
	%	23.9	54.3	19.6	2.2	0.0
Independent Study	N	6	24	12	3	0
	%	13.3	53.3	26.7	6.7	0.0
Behavioral Objectives	N	26	38	7	0	0
	%	36.6	53.5	9.9	0.0	0.0
Individualized Instruction	N	59	26	5	0	0
	%	65.6	28.9	5.6	0.0	0.0
Interest Centers	N	23	69	23	6	2
	%	18.7	56.1	18.7	4.9	1.6

Table 43

Principals' Perceptions of Preservice Training Provided Before Implementation of Six Practices Related to Instruction

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Tutorial Program	N	1	39	45	9	1
	%	1.1	41.1	47.4	9.5	1.1
Unstructured Time	N	0	23	16	6	1
	%	0.0	50.0	34.8	13.0	2.2
Independent Study	N	0	17	20	7	1
	%	0.0	37.8	44.4	15.6	2.2
Behavioral	N	8	31	30	2	0
Objectives	%	11.3	43.7	42.3	2.8	0.0
Individualized	N	9	46	31	4	0
Instruction	%	10.0	51.1	34.4	4.4	0.0
Interest	N	3	69	43	6	2
Centers	%	2.4	56.1	35.0	4.9	1.6

Table 44

Principals' Perceptions of Inservice Training Provided After Implementation of Six Practices Related to Instruction

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Tutorial Program	N	2	41	30	21	1
	%	2.1	43.2	31.6	22.1	1.1
Unstructured Time	N	1	16	22	6	1
	%	2.2	34.8	47.8	13.0	2.2
Independent Study	N	1	19	16	8	1
	%	2.2	42.2	35.6	17.8	2.2
Behavioral	N	6	26	37	2	0
Objectives	%	8.5	36.6	52.1	2.8	0.0
Individualized	N	7	49	30	4	0
Instruction	%	7.8	54.4	33.3	4.4	0.0
Interest Centers	N	3	70	34	14	2
	%	2.4	56.9	27.6	11.4	1.6

Appendix F

Materials Related To Instruction

Table 45

Principals' Perceptions of Proposers of Five Types of Materials Related to Instruction

		Computer Assisted Instruction	Programmed Instruction	Learning Packages	Teaching Machine	Dial Access
Superintendent	N	1	6	3	6	0
	%	50.0	7.1	3.8	15.8	0.0
Central Office Staff	N	0	11	4	7	3
	%	0.0	12.9	5.1	18.4	0.0
Board of Education	N	0	1	0	0	0
	%	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Principal	N	0	35	17	12	0
	%	0.0	41.2	21.8	31.6	0.0
Teachers	N	0	19	41	5	0
	%	0.0	22.4	52.6	13.2	0.0
Citizens	N	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
More Than One	N	1	8	6	6	0
	%	50.0	9.4	7.7	15.8	0.0
Unknown	N	0	1	1	0	0
	%	0.0	1.2	1.3	0.0	0.0
Unmarked	N	0	4	6	2	0
	%	0.0	4.7	7.7	5.3	0.0

Table 46

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Computer Assisted/Managed Instruction

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	2	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Central Office	N	0	0	1	1	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Board of Education	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Principal	N	1	1	0	0	0	0
	%	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teachers	N	1	1	0	0	0	0
	%	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Citizens	N	0	1	0	1	0	0
	%	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

Table 47

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Programmed Instruction

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	14	23	17	14	2	15
	%	16.5	27.1	20.0	16.5	2.4	17.6
Central Office	N	11	12	5	35	5	17
	%	12.9	14.1	5.9	41.2	5.9	20.0
Board of Education	N	4	8	17	33	7	16
	%	4.7	9.4	20.0	38.8	8.2	18.8
Principal	N	45	25	3	2	1	9
	%	52.9	29.4	3.5	2.4	1.2	10.6
Teachers	N	44	25	5	0	1	10
	%	51.8	29.4	5.9	0.0	1.2	11.8
Citizens	N	3	7	88	38	12	17
	%	3.5	8.2	9.4	44.7	14.1	20.0

Table 48

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Learning Packages

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	8	17	9	23	5	16
	%	10.3	21.8	11.5	29.5	6.4	20.5
Central Office	N	4	11	4	34	3	22
	%	5.1	14.1	5.1	43.6	3.8	28.2
Board of Education	N	0	6	9	34	10	19
	%	0.0	7.7	11.5	43.6	12.8	24.4
Principal	N	26	34	7	0	0	11
	%	33.3	43.6	9.0	0.0	0.0	14.1
Teachers	N	49	20	4	0	0	5
	%	62.8	25.6	5.1	0.0	0.0	6.4
Citizens	N	0	5	8	38	8	19
	%	0.0	6.4	10.3	48.7	10.3	24.4

Table 49

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Teaching Machines

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	10	8	6	3	0	11
	%	26.3	21.1	15.8	7.9	0.0	28.9
Central Office	N	5	5	3	11	3	11
	%	13.2	13.2	7.9	28.9	7.9	28.9
Board of Education	N	0	4	8	11	3	12
	%	0.0	10.5	21.1	28.9	7.9	31.6
Principal	N	18	10	5	0	0	5
	%	47.4	26.3	13.2	0.0	0.0	13.2
Teachers	N	16	10	4	0	1	7
	%	42.1	26.3	10.5	0.0	2.6	18.4
Citizens	N	0	2	3	17	4	12
	%	0.0	5.3	7.9	44.7	10.5	31.6

Table 50

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Dial Access

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	0	2	0	0	1	0
	%	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
Central Office	N	3	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Board of Education	N	0	1	0	1	1	0
	%	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
Principal	N	0	1	1	1	0	0
	%	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Teachers	N	0	1	1	1	0	0
	%	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Citizens	N	0	0	0	3	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

Table 51

Principals' Perceptions of Staff Involvement with Five Types of Materials Related to Instruction

		All Teachers Involved	Most Teachers Involved	Some Teachers Involved	Few Teachers Involved	Unmarked
Computer-Assisted Instruction	N	1	0	0	1	0
	%	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Programmed Instruction	N	11	14	38	22	0
	%	12.9	16.5	44.7	25.9	0.0
Learning Packages	N	5	11	34	28	0
	%	6.4	14.1	43.6	35.9	0.0
Teaching Machine	N	4	6	10	18	0
	%	10.5	15.8	26.3	47.4	0.0
Dial Access	N	0	1	2	0	0
	%	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0

Table 52

Principals' Perceptions of Teacher Receptiveness to Five Types of Materials Related to Instruction

		Very Well Received	Well Received	Fairly Well Received	Not Well Received	Poorly Received	Unmarked
Computer-Assisted Instruction	N	0	0	2	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Programmed Instruction	N	20	27	33	5	0	0
	%	23.5	31.8	38.8	5.9	0.0	0.0
Learning Packages	N	10	27	33	7	1	0
	%	12.8	34.6	42.3	9.0	1.3	0.0
Teaching Machine	N	5	13	15	4	1	0
	%	13.2	34.2	39.5	10.5	2.6	0.0
Dial Access	N	0	2	1	0	0	0
	%	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 53

Principals' Perceptions of Change Required of Teachers by Five Types of Materials Related to Instruction

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unmarked
Computer-Assisted Instruction	N	0	1	0	0	1
	%	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Programmed Instruction	N	26	44	13	1	1
	%	30.6	51.8	15.3	1.2	1.2
Learning Packages	N	32	32	13	1	0
	%	41.0	41.0	16.7	1.3	0.0
Teaching Machine	N	3	21	12	2	0
	%	7.9	55.3	31.6	5.1	0.0
Dial Access	N	0	0	3	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

Table 54

Principals' Perceptions of Preservice Training Provided Before Implementation of Five Types of Materials Related to Instruction.

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Computer-Assisted	N	0	1	1	0	0
Instruction	%	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Programmed	N	7	44	29	5	0
Instruction	%	8.2	51.8	34.1	5.9	0.0
Learning	N	4	29	35	9	1
Packages	%	5.1	37.2	44.9	11.5	1.3
Teaching	N	1	25	9	3	0
Machine	%	2.6	65.8	23.7	7.9	0.0
Dial Access	N	0	1	2	0	0
	%	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0

Table 55

Principals' Perceptions of Inservice Training Provided After Implementation of Five Types of Materials Related to Instruction

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Computer-Assisted	N	0	1	1	0	0
Instruction	%	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Programmed	N	9	43	28	5	0
Instruction	%	10.6	50.6	32.9	5.9	0.0
Learning	N	3	32	32	10	1
Packages	%	3.8	41.0	41.0	12.8	1.3
Teaching	N	0	22	12	4	0
Machine	%	0.0	57.9	31.6	10.5	0.0
Dial Access	N	0	1	2	0	0
	%	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0

Appendix G

Two Other Practices

Table 56

Principals' Perceptions of Proposers of Two Other Practices

		Micro Teaching	Specific Learning Disability
Superintendent	N	6	7
	%	24.0	9.7
Central Office Staff	N	4	13
	%	16.0	18.1
Board of Education	N	0	2
	%	0.0	2.8
Principal	N	10	28
	%	40.0	38.9
Teachers	N	2	4
	%	8.0	5.6
Citizens	N	0	3
	%	0.0	4.2
More Than One	N	1	6
	%	4.0	8.3
Unknown	N	1	5
	%	4.0	6.9
Unmarked	N	1	4
	%	4.0	5.6

Table 57

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Micro Teaching

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	10	7	2	2	1	3
	%	40.0	28.0	8.0	8.0	4.0	12.0
Central Office	N	4	8	0	6	1	6
	%	16.0	32.0	0.0	24.0	4.0	24.0
Board of Education	N	0	7	5	6	2	5
	%	0.0	28.0	20.0	24.0	8.0	20.0
Principal	N	15	8	0	0	0	0
	%	60.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teachers	N	6	10	7	0	0	0
	%	24.0	40.0	28.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
Citizens	N	0	1	3	13	4	4
	%	0.0	4.0	12.0	52.0	16.0	16.0

Table 58

Principals' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence Exerted by Six Sources in the Adoption of Specific Learning Disabilities

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unknown	Unmarked
Superintendent	N	14	24	16	7	1	10
	%	19.4	33.3	22.2	9.7	1.4	13.9
Central Office	N	15	9	3	22	4	19
	%	20.8	12.5	4.2	30.6	5.6	26.4
Board of Education	N	4	16	15	19	6	12
	%	5.6	22.2	20.8	26.4	8.3	16.7
Principal	N	41	20	4	0	0	0
	%	56.9	27.8	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teachers	N	22	32	8	1	1	8
	%	30.6	44.4	11.1	1.4	1.4	11.1
Citizens	N	2	10	14	24	7	15
	%	2.8	13.9	19.4	33.3	9.7	20.8

Table 59

Principals' Perceptions of Staff Involvement with Two Other Practices

		All Teachers Involved	Most Teachers Involved	Some Teachers Involved	Few Teachers Involved	Unmarked
Micro Teaching	N	4	3	9	9	0
	%	16.0	12.0	36.0	36.0	0.0
Specific Learning Disabilities	N	11	12	28	21	0
	%	15.3	16.7	38.9	29.2	0.0

Table 60

Principals' Perceptions of Teacher Receptiveness to Two Other Practices

		Very Well Received	Well Received	Fairly Well Received	Not Well Received	Poorly Received	Unmarked
Micro Teaching	N	3	3	11	8	0	0
	%	12.0	12.0	44.0	32.0	0.0	0.0
Specific Learning Disabilities	N	19	23	27	2	1	0
	%	26.4	31.9	37.5	2.8	1.4	0.0

Table 61

Principals' Perceptions of Change Required of Teachers by Two Other Practices

		Much	Some	Little	None	Unmarked
Micro Teaching	N	3	13	5	3	1
	%	12.0	52.0	20.0	12.0	4.0
Specific Learning Disabilities	N	17	42	11	2	0
	%	23.6	58.3	15.3	2.8	0.0

Table 62

Principals' Perceptions of Preservice Training Provided Before Implementation of Two Other Practices

		Highly Adequate	Adaquate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Micro Teaching	N	1	12	9	3	0
	%	% 4.0	48.0	36.0	12.0	0.0
Specific	N	8	22	32	9	1
	%	11.1	30.6	44.4	12.5	1.4

Table 63

Principals' Perceptions of Inservice Training Provided After Implementation Of Two Other Practices

		Highly Adequate	Adequate	Some, but Inadequate	Totally Inadequate	Unmarked
Micro Teaching	N	1	10	11	3	0
	%	4.0	40.0	44.0	12.0	0.0
Specific Learning	N	9	24	29	9	1
Disabilities	%	12.5	33.3	40.3	12.5	1.4