

Survey  
No. 306

Report  
No. 45

THE READERSHIP OF "SCHOOL LIFE"

July 25, 1951

National Opinion Research Center  
University of Chicago  
4901 Ellis Avenue  
Chicago 15, Illinois

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER  
University of Chicago  
4901 Ellis Avenue  
Chicago 15, Illinois

Clyde W. Hart, Director  
Herbert Goldstein, Business Manager

Jacob J. Feldman, Study Director

Research Consultant: Shirley A. Star    Coding Supervisor: Patricia Collette  
Field Supervisor: Betty Iwatsuki

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
Summary of Main Findings.....	3
I. Extent and Character of Readership.	5
II. The Educators' Evaluation of SCHOOL LIFE.....	18
III. Subject-Matter Interests of Readers	27
IV. Criticisms and Suggestions Bearing on SCHOOL LIFE's Approach.....	34
V. Some Factors Related to SCHOOL LIFE Readership.....	42
VI. Readership of SCHOOL LIFE's Regular Features.....	54
VII. Special Issues.....	62
VIII. Cover and Format.....	77
Appendix I (Tables).....	83
Appendix II (The Questionnaire).....	96

## INTRODUCTION

In May, 1951, the National Opinion Research Center was commissioned by the United States Office of Education to interview certain types of school personnel about their use of, and their reactions to, SCHOOL LIFE. These interviews were completed in early June. A copy of the questionnaire that was used is appended to this report. The persons interviewed were:

1. Fifty-one state administrators in thirteen state offices of education, selected from the free distribution list for SCHOOL LIFE;
2. Thirty-four city superintendents of schools (including some superintendents of parochial schools), selected from the free distribution list;
3. Thirty-one city supervisors (mainly of elementary education), selected from the free distribution list;
4. Forty-four high-school principals, selected from the free distribution list;
5. Thirty-two elementary-school principals, whose supervisors were on the free distribution list;
6. One hundred thirty-five high-school teachers, in schools where the principal was on the free distribution list; and
7. One hundred forty-three persons selected from the list of paid subscribers to SCHOOL LIFE (some of these were school teachers or administrators, some were school board members, some were teachers or students of education, some were representatives of citizen groups having a special interest in the schools; etc.).

Thus, about one-third of the 470 persons interviewed were subscribing readers selected randomly from the paid circulation list in selected communities (after eliminating certain types of institutional subscribers) without reference to their general or specific occupational classification. This group was treated as a unit in the analysis in order to reveal any significant readership differences between subscribers and persons receiving the magazine free. The percentage distribution of the remaining 327 interviews among six types of school personnel does not reflect the actual percentage distribution of all school teachers and administrators into these types, nor does it reflect the actual division of the readership of SCHOOL LIFE into these types. It would not have been possible to make the distribution of persons interviewed in these several categories representative of the entire readership in the absence of prior knowledge of the size and character of this readership, or without following a sampling plan that would have been far beyond the budgetary limits imposed on this study. But in any event, the number selected from each of the categories of school personnel had to be of sufficient size to reveal differences between categories within minimal limits of dependability.

The composition of the free distribution list, which directly or indirectly determined the persons classified in the several categories of school personnel in this report, does not reflect the actual geographical distribution of school teachers and administrators. The high-school principals on this distribution list are all attached to schools having fewer than 1,000 students (60% of them to schools having fewer than 300 students). Most of these schools are located in small towns or rural areas. Thus, the high-school teachers and principals drawn from the free distribution lists for interview in the present study worked in relatively small schools located in relatively small towns. The city superintendents receiving free issues of SCHOOL LIFE are all located in towns of more than 10,000 population, while the city supervisors are all located in towns of more than 2,500 population. For budgetary reasons, it was necessary to draw a disproportionately large number of state administrators from the more populous states, and elementary-school principals from metropolitan areas.

Most of the subscribers drawn from the paid list were residents of metropolitan areas.

Because of these factors governing the selection of persons to be interviewed, no attempt has been made in this report to generalize to the whole group of SCHOOL LIFE readers.

The geographical spread of the interviews was quite adequate. Interviews were conducted in some 75 communities in 24 different states.

The educators selected for interview were extremely cooperative. Only 5% of the originally assigned respondents were unavailable or refused to be interviewed.

Since there were marked associations between the educators' positions in the school system and their reactions to SCHOOL LIFE, it was deemed necessary in most instances to treat each class of readers separately in this report. Thus, many of the tabulations are based on extremely few observations and are therefore subject to considerable unreliability due to sampling error. The percentage distributions presented for specific groups should therefore be taken as only rough indications of the reactions of those groups rather than as precise estimates. A few of the estimates based on the smallest sub-groups (e.g., readers of SCHOOL LIFE among elementary-school principals) could be as much as 25 to 30 percentage points away from the true value in the population, but in most instances the sampling error is much smaller. For a group like the state administrators, the sampling error is probably not in excess of 10 to 15 percentage points on either side of the estimated percentage. The reader should keep this source of unreliability in mind in interpreting the data bearing on specific small sub-groups.

Notwithstanding all the above limitations, the data that were secured directly from school people and other recipients of SCHOOL LIFE do reveal generally dependable facts about the use that is made of the publication, and about the reactions of the various groups of educators to its various types of content and features. These findings should be useful to the Office of Education in gauging the effectiveness of the magazine.

This report covers questionnaire data bearing directly on the extent and character of SCHOOL LIFE readership. The interviews produced, also, much conceptual and attitudinal material bearing on the school situation generally, which will have to be explored subsequently and on our own time. Memoranda will report results of such exploration.

### SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

Most of the educators who received SCHOOL LIFE directly at least scanned its contents regularly, and about two-fifths of the educators generally read at least a few articles per issue thoroughly. However, high-school teachers who did not receive the magazine directly but who taught in schools where the principal received free copies, read the magazine very infrequently if at all.

Most of the readers of SCHOOL LIFE had a rather neutral attitude towards it--only a rather small minority of its readers were either particularly enthusiastic about it or very critical of it. Most readers considered it as being moderately useful to them. State administrators, who were recipients of free copies, and paid subscribers tended to be more favorably disposed to SCHOOL LIFE as presently constituted than were other readers.

In general, SCHOOL LIFE readers professed little interest in the material most nearly peculiar to SCHOOL LIFE (i.e., information about the activities of the Office of Education and other governmental agencies). Most of them read several periodicals other than SCHOOL LIFE which treated essentially the same types of curricular and administrative subject-matters handled by SCHOOL LIFE. These two considerations would seem to underlie the generally moderate evaluation of SCHOOL LIFE among most of its readers.

In accordance with the first consideration above, it was mainly the educators who had had some outside contact with the Office of Education and who were most informed about its activities who read SCHOOL LIFE the most. While it is possible that in some cases reading SCHOOL LIFE had led educators to turn to the Office of Education for help, probably in most instances contact with the Office had inspired interest in it and in the material carried by SCHOOL LIFE. This dependence of the extent of reading of SCHOOL LIFE on the educator's relation to the Office of Education may be due largely to the contents of the magazine as presently constituted. The reading of SCHOOL LIFE might be more nearly independent of the educator's over-all relation to the Office if greater emphasis were laid on content areas of more general interest to educators.

It is also noteworthy that the extent of readership of SCHOOL LIFE was markedly a function of the extent to which the educator read educational periodicals other than SCHOOL LIFE. Educators who read a considerable number of other periodicals were considerably more likely to read SCHOOL LIFE than were those who read few other periodicals. Thus, it must be borne in mind that reading SCHOOL LIFE largely supplemented the reading of other periodicals rather than acted as a singular source of educational information and ideas.

By and large, only the top administrators, particularly those on the state level, considered either SCHOOL LIFE or the Office of Education as a whole to be a principal liaison with the national government. Educators on lower levels of the school system frequently considered superiors within the school system as their bond to the federal government. Thus, SCHOOL LIFE and the Office of Education communicated with the lower echelons of the school systems through a two-step process--SCHOOL LIFE and the Office reached the top administrators who in turn communicated relevant information to their subordinates. There was by and large little evidence of a desire on the part of educators on the lower levels for more direct information on federal programs and activities.

Only a minority of SCHOOL LIFE readers had given sufficient thought to the magazine to suggest any changes in its general approach. Among those making suggestions, though, the most prevalent was that the magazine should be more practical in its approach--that it should offer more aid in the solution of day-to-day problems facing the educators in their work. This was the most frequent suggestion among all groups of readers.

Recommendations for changes in the allocation of space to various subject-matters were in line with the desire for a more practical approach. The most prominent recommendations were more space devoted to teaching aids and methods, and more discussions of educational developments and problems. These preferences are striking in light of the fact that most SCHOOL LIFE readers also read a number of other educational periodicals devoted largely to topics falling under these headings. It would thus seem that the educators' needs for aid in the solution of their practical problems were not completely satisfied by the already existent multitude of educational periodicals. It would also seem that while educators were relatively uninterested in articles dealing with Office of Education personnel and program, they were interested in articles written by the Office's specialists and dealing with specific problems of substantive interest.

These conclusions are elaborated in the following report. Special attention is also given to the reader's evaluation of SCHOOL LIFE's regular features, its cover and format, and special issues of the magazine.

In discussing the educators' evaluation of SCHOOL LIFE, the report probably lays somewhat undue stress on the educators' criticisms and suggestions at the expense of the praise accorded the magazine by some. We feel that this emphasis in the analysis and presentation of the survey results enhances the survey's value as a factual basis upon which possible alternative changes in the magazine might be evaluated.

No specific recommendations for changes in SCHOOL LIFE have been made by us in this report. Such recommendations would have to be based upon a firm set of objectives for the publication. For instance, if the main function of SCHOOL LIFE is the dissemination of information concerning the structure, personnel, and program of the Office of Education to those interested in these areas, then a very different set of conclusions would have to be drawn from those that would be drawn if SCHOOL LIFE's function is to inform the general mass of educators of the latest educational developments, or to inspire in educators more devotion to their work. Also, of course, the amount of resources to be devoted to the magazine would closely govern any recommendations. Since the choice of objectives for the magazine and the allocation of resources are not in our province, we did not recommend changes. We have simply supplied a factual base to choose between alternatives designed to fulfill SCHOOL LIFE's purposes.

## I. EXTENT AND CHARACTER OF READERSHIP

Acquaintance with and readership of SCHOOL LIFE were markedly related to the educator's position in the school system; they were highest among educators on the state administrative level and lowest among teachers.

While almost all top administrators were at least acquainted with SCHOOL LIFE, over half the teachers in high schools where the principal receives free copies of the magazine stated that they generally did not see it at all:

"One source of information about the educational services of the federal government is, of course, SCHOOL LIFE, a monthly magazine put out by the Office of Education. How regularly, if at all, have you seen this publication--quite regularly, only occasionally, or not at all?"

	Percent of each class of respondents having seen SCHOOL LIFE:			Total
	"Quite regularly"	"Only occa- sionally"	"Not at all"	
State administrators (on S. L. free distri- bution list).....	80%	18%	2%	100% (51)*
City superintendents (on S. L. free distri- bution list).....	82	9	9	100% (34)*
City supervisors (on S. L. free distri- bution list).....	64	26	10	100% (31)*
High-school principals (on S. L. free distri- bution list).....	52	30	18	100% (44)*
Elementary-school principals (not on S. L. free distri- bution list).....	13	34	53	100% (32)*
High-school teachers (in high schools where prin- cipal is on S. L. free dis- tribution list).....	11	31	58	100% (135)*
Subscribers (including principals of schools where the school itself is the subscriber).	71	23	6**	100% (143)*

\*Number of respondents on which percentages are based is given in parentheses below the total throughout this report.

\*\*Several of the respondents whose names were taken from the subscription list had ordered SCHOOL LIFE but had not yet received any copies at the time of the survey.

Among the respondents acquainted with SCHOOL LIFE, the degree of readership was associated with position in the school system in the same manner as acquaintance with the magazine. While more than half of the state administrators acquainted with the magazine had read every issue during the last year at least in part, only about one in seven of the high-school teachers acquainted with the magazine had read something in every issue. Reading by individuals on the other free distribution lists fell between these extremes essentially in descending order with descending rank. Regular subscribers were of course very frequent readers while the elementary-school principals, not having immediate access to SCHOOL LIFE as had all the other groups, were very infrequent readers. The percentage distribution of readership for each of the classes of reader is shown in the following tables. The first table is based only on those respondents who were acquainted with the magazine while the second table is based on all respondents:

"About how many issues of SCHOOL LIFE have you read during the present school year?"

	Percent of those acquainted with SCHOOL LIFE in each class having read:				No issues	Don't know; no answer	Total
	Every issue*	6 or 7 issues	4 or 5 issues	1, 2, or 3 issues			
State administrators ac- quainted with S. L.....	54%	14%	14%	16%	2%	100% (50)	
City superintendents ac- quainted with S. L.....	52	6	13	23	-	100% (31)	
City supervisors ac- quainted with S. L.....	50	11	14	21	4	100% (28)	
High-school principals ac- quainted with S. L.....	39	19	11	25	-	100% (36)	
Elementary-school prin- cipals acquainted with S. L.....	13	7	13	47	-	100% (15)	
High-school teachers ac- quainted with S. L.....	14	7	18	40	-	100% (57)	
Subscribers.....	60	9	11	14	3	100% (134)	

\*There had been eight issues of SCHOOL LIFE published during the 1950-51 school year as of the time of the survey.

"About how many issues of SCHOOL LIFE have you read during the present school year?"

	Percent of each class of respondents having read:				No issues	Percent not acquainted with S. L.	Don't know; no answer	Total
	Every issue	6 or 7 issues	4 or 5 issues	1, 2, or 3 issues				
All state administrators.....	53%	14%	14%	15%	-%	2%	2%	100% (51)
All city superintendents.....	47	6	12	20	6	9	-	100% (34)
All city supervisors.....	45	10	13	19	-	10	3	100% (31)
All high-school principals.....	32	16	9	20	5	18	-	100% (44)
All elementary-school principals.....	6	3	6	22	10	53	-	100% (32)
All high-school teachers.....	6	3	7	17	9	58	-	100% (135)
Subscribers.....	57	8	10	13	3	6	3	100% (143)

The proportion of articles read in issues of SCHOOL LIFE that the respondents did read was also related to position in the school system in much the same way as was acquaintance with the magazine and frequency of readership. It will be noted in the following table that, while about 55% of the state administrators and city superintendents reported generally reading half or more of the articles in issues they did read, only 31% of the high-school teachers reported reading that high a proportion of the articles. The city supervisors dropped further below the other two top administrative groups in the proportion of articles read than they did with respect to frequency of readership. Subscribers were high in the coverage of their reading, as they were with respect to frequency:

"About how many articles would you say you generally read in any issue of SCHOOL LIFE---  
all of them, half or more, less than half, not more than one article?""\*

	Percent of each class of readers generally having read:			Don't know; no answer	Total
	"All" but not all	"Half or more" but more than one	"Less than half" but more than one article"		
State administrators.....	8%	46%	42%	4%	100% (50)
City superintendents.....	3	52	32	10	100% (31)
City supervisors.....	11	28	54	7	100% (28)
High-school principals.....	5	39	39	17	100% (36)
Elementary-school principals..	7	26	47	20	100% (15)
High-school teachers.....	7	24	60	7	100% (57)
Subscribers.....	18	41	33	7	100% (134)

\*This question and all other questions bearing directly on SCHOOL LIFE were asked only of respondents acquainted with the magazine. The percentage distribution presented for such questions is based only on those respondents who were acquainted with the magazine unless otherwise specified.

Since the classes with the higher frequency of readership were by and large also the classes who read more completely the issues that were read, there would appear to be a tendency for those readers who read SCHOOL LIFE most frequently also to be those who read it most completely. This relationship is borne out by the following table. While almost 70% of the respondents who had read all the issues of SCHOOL LIFE in 1950-51 generally read half or more of the articles per issue, only 25% of the respondents who had read only one, two, or three issues and only 20% of the respondents who had read no issues in 1950-51 generally read as many as half the articles in an issue they did happen to read:\*

Percent of those readers having read:

	<u>Every issue</u> <u>in 1950-51</u>	<u>4-7 issues</u> <u>in 1950-51</u>	<u>1-3 issues</u> <u>in 1950-51</u>	<u>No issues</u> <u>in 1950-51**</u>
<u>Generally read:</u>				
All the articles....	16%	10%	6%	-%
Half or more of the articles but not all of them.....	53	35	19	20
Less than half of the articles but more than one.....	28	49	60	45
Not more than one article.....	3	6	15	35
	100% (162)	100% (81)	100% (79)	100% (20)

A third aspect of readership is the thoroughness with which articles are read. About three out of every four readers of SCHOOL LIFE reported that they read at least some articles thoroughly while the remaining one in four reported that they generally only scanned articles:

---

\*The nine readers who failed to answer either one or both of the questions are excluded from this tabulation.

\*\*These respondents had read SCHOOL LIFE during some period previous to 1950-51.

"For the articles you read, how do you rate your reading of them-- do you read them thoroughly, or just scan them?"

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>
"Read thoroughly".....	26%
"Read some thoroughly, just scan others".....	47
"Scan".....	26
Don't know, no answer.....	1
	<hr/> 100% (351)

Readers who generally read half or more of the articles in an issue of SCHOOL LIFE were more likely to read at least some articles thoroughly than were the readers who generally read less than half the articles. Although approximately equal proportions of the relatively complete and of the partial readers read thoroughly every article they read at all,\* 84% of the complete readers read at least some articles thoroughly while only 64% of the partial readers read any articles thoroughly:\*\*

	<u>Percent of those readers who generally read:</u>	
	<u>"All" or "half or more" of the articles in an issue</u>	<u>"Less than half" or "not more than one" of the articles in an issue</u>
"Read thoroughly"....	28%	25%
"Read some thoroughly, just scan others"..	56	39
"Scan".....	16	36
	<hr/> 100% (173)	<hr/> 100% (173)

\*It is obvious that the reader who examines only one or two articles in an issue may far more easily read thoroughly "every" article examined than may the reader who examines most of the articles in the issue.

\*\*The five readers who failed to answer either one or both of the questions are excluded from this tabulation.

When we consider the three aspects of reading jointly, a number of definite readership types emerge. The six major types,\* as well as the percentage of all readers falling into each of them, were:

31%..."Constant readers": those who read half or more of the articles in every or almost every issue and read at least some articles thoroughly;

12%..."Frequent selective readers": those who generally read less than half (but more than one) of the articles in every or almost every issue and read at least some articles thoroughly;

10%..."Periodic readers": those who generally read more than one article in about half the issues and read at least some articles thoroughly;

13%..."Frequent scanners": those who generally scanned more than one article in every or almost every issue but read few, if any, articles thoroughly;\*\*

17%..."Occasional readers": those who generally read less than half the articles in less than half the issues but read some articles thoroughly;\*\*\*

14%..."Occasional scanners": those who generally scanned less than half the articles in half or less the issues and seldom, if ever, read an article thoroughly.\*\*\*\*

97%...are thus classified into the six major types.

3%...are unclassifiable since no information is available for them for at least one of the three reading questions.

100%...All readers.  
(351)

\*The reading patterns of a small proportion of the respondents were deviant from the major readership types. It was necessary for analytic purposes to group readers having these deviant patterns with the readers of the most nearly similar major readership type.

Some of the deviant patterns may well have been due to factors extraneous to the readers' evaluation of SCHOOL LIFE. Such factors as illness, leave of absence from regular job, or the initiation of subscription during the course of the school year were indicated by some respondents as accounting for their unusual reading patterns.

\*\*Included with the "frequent scanners" are the 2% of all readers who read only one article in practically every issue and read that one article thoroughly.

\*\*\*Included with the "occasional readers" are the 5% of all readers who read less than half the issues but in the issues they did read, they read more than half the articles and they read some articles thoroughly.

\*\*\*\*Included with the "occasional scanners" are the 2% of all readers who generally scanned half or more of the articles but only in half or less the issues and read no articles thoroughly. Also included are the 1% of the readers who scanned only one article in practically every issue and read no articles thoroughly.

The top administrative groups, the high-school principals, and subscribers were far more regular readers of SCHOOL LIFE than were the high-school teachers and elementary-school principals.\* The following table shows the percentage distribution into readership types for the various classes of respondents, first for all respondents, including both readers and non-readers, and second for readers only:

---

\*It should be remembered that the elementary-school principals were not on SCHOOL LIFE distribution lists.

## Percent of all:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scrib- ers	All respond- ents
Constant readers.....	35%	26%	22%	27%	6%	4%	39%	23%
Frequent selec- tive readers.	19	6	19	11	-	1	13	9
Periodic readers.....	8	9	13	7	6	7	6	7
Frequent scanners.....	16	18	13	7	3	4	13	10
Occasional readers.....	12	12	10	14	16	17	10	13
Occasional scanners.....	6	17	10	16	16	8	9	10
Not acquainted with <u>S. L.</u> ....	2	9	10	18	53	58	6	26
Not classifiable	2	3	3	-	-	1	4	2
	100% (51)	100% (34)	100% (31)	100% (44)	100% (32)	100% (135)	100% (143)	100% (470)

Percent of those who are acquainted with S. L. and who are:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scrib- ers	All respond- ents
Constant readers.....	36%	29%	25%	33%	13%	9%	41%	31%
Frequent selec- tive readers.	20	7	21	14	-	4	14	12
Periodic readers.....	8	10	14	8	14	16	7	10
Frequent scanners.....	16	19	14	8	7	9	14	13
Occasional readers.....	12	13	11	17	33	40	10	17
Occasional scanners.....	6	19	11	20	33	19	10	14
Not acquainted with <u>S. L.</u> ....	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not classifiable	2	3	4	-	-	3	4	3
	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (28)	100% (36)	100% (15)	100% (57)	100% (134)	100% (351)

While the small number of cases in the individual respondent classes does not allow definitive distinctions to be made between the reading patterns of the different administrative classes, certain differences in this sample are at least suggestive.

It should be noted that the state administrators were the most regular readers of SCHOOL LIFE among administrators; 78% of them were at least "frequent scanners" and 54% of them were at least "frequent selective readers."\*

City superintendents showed a tendency to be "scanners" rather than thorough readers of SCHOOL LIFE; note that a higher proportion of all city superintendents were "frequent scanners" (18%) than were both "frequent selective" and "periodic" readers combined (15%), while for the six other classes, the combined proportions of "frequent selective" and "periodic" readers generally exceeded substantially the proportion of "frequent scanners." Also occasional readers among the city superintendents showed a slightly greater tendency toward scanning than did any other class of occasional readers.\*

City supervisors tended toward selectivity in their reading; 32% were either "frequent selective" or "periodic" readers as compared to 22% "constant readers," while among the other high readership groups, a majority of the relatively regular readers who read some articles thoroughly were "constant readers."\*

It is also noteworthy that even among the sub-group of respondents who were at all acquainted with SCHOOL LIFE, administrators were far more likely to be regular readers of SCHOOL LIFE than were the teachers; for instance, 80% of state administrators acquainted with the magazine were at least "frequent scanners" while only 38% of those high-school teachers who had seen the magazine were. Thus, the wide differences in SCHOOL LIFE readership between classes of educators are not solely a function of the differences in the degree to which the classes were acquainted with it. While most administrators were acquainted with the magazine and read it at least fairly often and completely, even those teachers who did know SCHOOL LIFE were infrequent readers who seldom read it with care.

I N S U M M A R Y:

Among the groups receiving free copies of SCHOOL LIFE, the state administrators were the most consistent and regular readers of the magazine. City superintendents and supervisors and high-school principals also tended to be rather regular readers. A majority of teachers in high schools on the free distribution list didn't see the magazine at all and those who did see it, read it only occasionally.

Subscribers, including the principals of schools which subscribed, were generally regular readers.

---

\*The percentages given in this paragraph refer to the section of the preceding table dealing with all respondents.

Elementary-school principals, not receiving free copies of SCHOOL LIFE, generally didn't see the magazine or were only occasional readers at most.

The readers who read more issues of the magazine also read more articles in individual issues and were more likely to read some articles thoroughly, while readers who saw only a few issues, tended to read only a few articles in those issues and to scan the articles they did read.

## II. THE EDUCATORS' EVALUATION OF SCHOOL LIFE

Only a relatively small proportion of the educators considered SCHOOL LIFE as one of their primary sources of information or ideas bearing on their problems. Thus, SCHOOL LIFE served most of its readers as only a subsidiary to other educational periodicals. This secondary status of the magazine does not, of course, bear on the question of the extent to which SCHOOL LIFE fulfills its objectives--SCHOOL LIFE is clearly not intended to compete with other educational periodicals as a primary source for information covering the entire range of educational problems. Nevertheless, the position of SCHOOL LIFE relative to the other educational periodicals should be borne in mind in interpreting the over-all results of this survey.

The state administrators, city superintendents, and subscribers as a whole found SCHOOL LIFE to be considerably more serviceable than did the other classes of SCHOOL LIFE readers. About one-quarter of each of those three groups spontaneously referred to SCHOOL LIFE when asked to mention journals they found to be generally useful sources:\*

"Which, if any, of the school journals are generally useful sources of information or ideas about problems (facing the schools today) like those you've mentioned?" (Asked only of respondents having previously said that they at least occasionally found useful discussions of problems in school journals.)

	Percent of each class mentioning:		Percent answering "don't know"	Percent who did not ever find useful discus- sions of prob- lems in educa- tional perio- dicals	Total
	SCHOOL LIFE	One or more magazines but not mentioning SCHOOL LIFE			
State administrators	25%	73%	2%	—%	100% (51)
City superintendents....	24	70	—	6	100% (34)
City supervisors...	6	83	3	3	100% (31)
High-school principals....	9	84	2	5	100% (44)
Elementary-school principals....	6	91	—	3	100% (32)
High-school teachers.....	1	83	3	8	100% (135)
Subscribers.....	29	65	1	5	100% (143)

\*The question was asked early in the interview, before any questions referring specifically to SCHOOL LIFE had been asked.

When asked to rate the serviceability of SCHOOL LIFE, the most frequent rating in most classes of readers was "only a moderately convenient and valued source." This is in accord with the infrequency of spontaneous reference to it as a generally useful source.

The predominance of the "moderate" rating would tend to indicate the absence of either a generally strong like or dislike for the magazine--neutrality seems to have been the preponderant attitude in most of the classes of readers.

Very few readers were outspokenly hostile to the magazine; even a few among the respondents who said they could "easily get along without SCHOOL LIFE" said that they rather liked it anyway and certainly wouldn't want to see it discontinued. Others also rating it as highly expendable said that they must have been able "to get along easily without it" since they seldom read it; these respondents also failed to indicate any particular ill-will against the magazine.

The state administrators again showed a relatively high regard for SCHOOL LIFE when they were asked to rate its serviceability to them. Among state officers acquainted with SCHOOL LIFE, 22% said they found it a "very convenient, highly valued source of information and ideas" while only 8% said that they could "very easily get along without it."

Among the other classes of readers from the SCHOOL LIFE free list, a considerably larger proportion said they could "very easily get along without it" than rated it very serviceable. Again, the high-school teachers were the group least favorable to SCHOOL LIFE; among the teachers acquainted with the magazine, 44% said that they could "very easily get along without it."

Although the predominant attitude among the subscribers also seems to have been rather neutral, about one of every five of them did rate SCHOOL LIFE as highly serviceable.

The ratings by the different classes in detail:

"Taking SCHOOL LIFE as a whole, how serviceable is it to you--that is, is it a very convenient, highly valued source of information and ideas; is it only a moderately convenient and valued source; or could you very easily get along without it?" (Asked only of respondents acquainted with S. L.)

Percent of each class of readers  
having rated SCHOOL LIFE as:

	"Very convenient, highly valued"	"Moderately convenient and valued"	"Easily get along with- out it"	Don't know	Total
State administrators...	22%	70%	8%	-	100% (50)
City superintendents...	13	61	26	-	100% (31)
City supervisors.....	11	53	36	-	100% (28)
High-school principals.	19	45	33	3	100% (36)
Elementary-school principals.....	13	40	40	7	100% (15)
High-school teachers...	12	42	44	2	100% (57)
Subscribers.....	22	53	22	3	100% (134)

There was an extremely marked relationship between the respondent's rating of the magazine and his pattern of reading it. Among those readers who felt that SCHOOL LIFE was a very convenient, highly valued source of information, 64% were constant readers and only 8% were just occasional readers or scanners while among the readers stating they could easily get along without it, merely 6% were constant readers and 54% were only occasional readers or scanners. This high correspondence between rating and reading pattern tends to indicate the general absence of extraneous factors, like a lack of time for reading or the reading of SCHOOL LIFE from a sense of duty, having governed the reading pattern.

At one extreme were the readers who both read the magazine constantly and rated it as very valuable while at the other extreme were those who read it highly irregularly and said they could easily get along without it. It thus seems plausible that the view of SCHOOL LIFE's content as being valuable led

to constant readership of it although it is of course possible that those who had read it regularly for some other reason grew eventually to find its content very valuable:\*

Percent of those  
who rated SCHOOL LIFE as:

	<u>"Very convenient, highly valued"</u>	<u>"Moderately convenient and valued"</u>	<u>"Easy to get along without"</u>
Constant readers.....	64%	33%	6%
Frequent selective readers.....	14	14	8
Periodic readers.....	6	11	10
Frequent scanners.....	8	14	16
Occasional readers.....	6	18	23
Occasional scanners....	2	8	31
Not classifiable.....	-	2	6
	<u>100%</u> (63)	<u>100%</u> (187)	<u>100%</u> (94)

The general neutrality of attitude toward SCHOOL LIFE is again apparent if we view ratings of the different readership type. A majority even of the constant readers consider SCHOOL LIFE as only "moderately convenient and valued." A majority of each of the other types of reader with the exception of the occasional scanners also rated the magazine in the middle of the category. Thus, even with the very marked positive relation between readership type and rating of the magazine, the neutral rating of SCHOOL LIFE is seen to have been preponderant among all but the most irregular and cursory readers:\*\*

---

\*The seven readers who did not rate SCHOOL LIFE are excluded from this table.

\*\*This table is based on the same data as the preceding table, the only difference being that in the present table the percentage distribution of ratings is shown for the different readership types while in the preceding table the percentage distribution of readership types is shown for groups of respondents making the different ratings.

Percent of readers of each type  
having rated SCHOOL LIFE as:

	<u>"Very convenient, highly valued"</u>	<u>"Moderately convenient and valued"</u>	<u>"Easy to get along without"</u>	<u>Don't know</u>	<u>Total</u>
Constant readers.....	37%	56%	6%	1%	100% (108)
Frequent selective readers..	21	63	16	-	100% (43)
Periodic readers.....	12	62	26	-	100% (34)
Frequent scanners.....	11	56	33	-	100% (46)
Occasional readers.....	7	54	36	3	100% (61)
Occasional scanners.....	2	33	61	4	100% (48)
Not classifiable..	-	27	55	18	100% (11)

A partial explanation for the relative absence of enthusiasm over SCHOOL LIFE may lie in the infrequency with which the readers rated as being "valuable information conveniently available only in SCHOOL LIFE" that content which is probably most distinctive to the magazine. For instance, only 10% of the readers questioned referred to SCHOOL LIFE's coverage of the Office of Education's activities as being valuable and distinctive. Only 14% referred to the bibliographic features.

The readers were somewhat more likely to consider articles that gave perspective to their own activities as being SCHOOL LIFE's distinctive contribution. Almost one of every four of the readers who had rated SCHOOL LIFE as at least moderately serviceable considered such articles as "those that tell you what others are thinking and doing," "articles about what is going on in other states," "the ones about problems in the country as a whole," and "articles that give us a broader view of the school situation" as being both valuable and distinctive. In a similar vein, 16% referred to articles on current events or developments in the field of education without reference to the perspective to be gained from such articles. These readers referred to such articles as "ones dealing with the problems facing the schools," "articles that keep one up-to-date on current events," "articles on educational movements and trends," and "reports on conferences."

More than one-third of the readers who had rated SCHOOL LIFE as moderately or highly serviceable either couldn't think of any valuable information distinctive to SCHOOL LIFE or else stated explicitly that anything to be found in SCHOOL LIFE could be readily found in other publications.

Thus, only a minority of the readers spontaneously rated as an asset SCHOOL LIFE's coverage of the very areas it covers most fully. Most of the readers questioned could either think of nothing distinctive and valuable in SCHOOL LIFE or else spoke of aspects of the magazine wherein it actually would seem to differ relatively little from other general national educational periodicals:\*

---

\*Thirty percent of the readers questioned mentioned at least one of the first four types of content listed in this table; some readers mentioned more than one of these types so the total number of references to SCHOOL LIFE's more specialized content was greater than the number of respondents who had referred to at least one such type of content.

"What kind of valuable information or ideas do you get from SCHOOL LIFE that you couldn't conveniently find elsewhere?" (Asked of those respondents acquainted with S. L. who had rated it moderately or very convenient.)

	Percent of respondents:	
	Acquainted with <u>S. L.</u>	Acquainted with <u>S. L.</u> and who had rated it moderately or very convenient
<u>Information about the activities of the Office of Education: ties us to the top office, learn about O. of E. policy, etc.....</u>	7%	10%
<u>Bibliographic: references, tells us how to get materials for use with classes, etc.....</u>	10	14
<u>Information pertaining to federal government (other than O. of E.): reflects thinking of Washington, information on legislation, etc.</u>	8	12
<u>Defense information: school building priorities, draft deferments, etc.....</u>	1	2
<u>Articles giving perspective: what is going on in other states, statistical information of a national character, broader perspective on school progress, etc.....</u>	16	23
<u>Current events and developments in the field of education: leaders and leadership in education, keeps one up-to-date on developments, trends in educational philosophy, etc.</u>	11	16
<u>Articles on specific subject-matter: articles dealing with my own field, teaching techniques and aids, articles on human relations in the schools, articles on trends in curriculum, occupational guidance information, etc.</u>	8	11
<u>Likes magazine for miscellaneous reasons: subject-matter treated (unspecified), point of view, style, format, speed in getting out material, etc.....</u>	8	12
<u>All material can be found elsewhere but likes magazine anyway (explicit).....</u>	6	8
<u>All material can be found elsewhere (no reference to liking magazine anyway).....</u>	8	11
<u>Nothing; don't know; can't think of anything..</u>	13	19
<u>Question not asked: could easily get along without or did not rate <u>S. L.</u>.....</u>	29	-
Some respondents gave more than one answer..	125% (351)	138% (250)

Readers who found SCHOOL LIFE's content dealing with the Office of Education and its bibliographic features useful and distinctive were more likely to read the magazine constantly than were those who didn't mention these features. While 60% of the former group were constant readers, only 24% of the readers who could think of nothing both distinctive and valuable about SCHOOL LIFE's content read it with such regularity and completeness. It is of course always possible that continuous reading of SCHOOL LIFE for its more usual rather than its peculiar content made regular readers aware of the value and distinctiveness of the peculiar content, but it seems somewhat more likely that those who were already interested in those areas treated most fully by SCHOOL LIFE turned to the magazine regularly to satisfy that interest:

Percent of those readers who:

	Mentioned bibliography and/or information about O. of E.	Mentioned neither bibliography nor information about O. of E. but mentioned other content	Couldn't think of anything both distinctive and valuable to be found in S. L.	Could easily get along without S.L. or did not rate it
Constant readers.....	60%	44%	24%	7%
Frequent selective readers..	17	12	15	7
Periodic readers.....	4	10	14	9
Frequent scanners.....	13	11	14	15
Occasional readers.....	4	17	18	24
Occasional scanners.....	2	6	12	30
Not classifiable	-	-	3	8
	<u>100%</u> (53)	<u>100%</u> (110)	<u>100%</u> (87)	<u>100%</u> (101)

In spite of the above relationship, only a minority of even the constant readers spontaneously referred to either SCHOOL LIFE's content dealing with Office of Education activities or its bibliography as being both valuable and distinctive. If we view the above table in the opposite fashion, taking the percentage of the various readership types who mentioned SCHOOL LIFE's specialized content, we see that only 30% of the constant readers and an even lower percentage of the other types mentioned such content. It is thus apparent that many respondents read SCHOOL LIFE quite regularly and fully even though they were not particularly impressed with the value and distinctiveness of its more specialized content:

Percent of each readership type who:

	Mentioned bibliography and/or information about O. of E.	Mentioned neither bibliography nor information about O. of E. but mentioned other content	Couldn't think of anything both distinctive and valuable to be found in S. L.	Could easily get along without S.L. or did not rate it	Total
Constant readers...	30%	44%	19%	7%	100% (103)
Frequent selective readers...	21	33	30	16	100% (43)
Periodic readers...	6	33	35	26	100% (34)
Frequent scanners..	15	26	26	33	100% (46)
Occasional readers...	3	31	26	40	100% (61)
Occasional scanners..	2	12	21	65	100% (48)
Not classifiable....	-	-	27	73	100% (11)

I N S U M M A R Y:

SCHOOL LIFE did not seem to be a particularly important source of information for its readers, except for the state officers and subscribers. A majority of the readers expressed a rather neutral attitude toward the magazine. Many readers couldn't think of any of its content which they considered both valuable and distinctive to SCHOOL LIFE. Among those readers who did consider some type of SCHOOL LIFE content as both valuable and distinctive, as many referred to the same general type of material as may be found in other general national educational magazines as referred to content more peculiar to SCHOOL LIFE. The readers who considered SCHOOL LIFE's coverage of the areas it treats most fully as being valuable and distinctive in general read the magazine more regularly and fully than the readers who weren't particularly appreciative of its specialized coverage.

### III. SUBJECT-MATTER INTERESTS OF READERS

The readers of SCHOOL LIFE indicated a pronounced preference for articles of direct practical use and articles dealing with general problems of education over articles pertaining to the Office of Education or other federal agencies. While 84% said they were "very interested" in "information about new educational aids--teaching devices, methods, etc.," only 22% expressed great interest in "articles introducing new specialists on the staff of the Office of Education."

The relatively high rank in the interest hierarchy of articles on educational aids and educational developments and problems is in accordance with the readers' references to this type of material as being the valuable and distinctive information to be found in SCHOOL LIFE. Thus, even though material of this general type is to be found in other magazines, SCHOOL LIFE's readers were in general so much more interested in these practical and timely discussions than they were in the less obviously utilitarian subject-matter more peculiar to SCHOOL LIFE, that they were as inclined to mention the former material as being distinctive to the magazine as they were the latter. By and large, SCHOOL LIFE's readers appear to have been more interested in reading useful articles written by Office of Education specialists than they were in reading articles about the Office of Education and its specialists.

Of the several content areas in which SCHOOL LIFE might be considered as being particularly distinctive, the areas of legislative and defense information appeared to be of greatest concern to the readers.

The subject-matter interests in detail:\*

---

\*In this table the subject-matter areas are presented in rank order of respondent preference. On the list given the respondent the subject-matter areas were presented in an essentially randomized order.

"For their own guidance, editors of SCHOOL LIFE would like to know what kinds of articles school teachers and administrators find most interesting or helpful. Will you run through this list of subjects with me, and indicate how interested you would be in a good article on each of them? How about No. 1--would you be very interested, only moderately interested, or not interested in it?"

Percent of those respondents who were  
acquainted with SCHOOL LIFE who:

	Were "mod-				Total
	Were "very interested"	erately interested"	Were "not interested"	"Didn't know"	
1) Information about new educational aids--teaching devices, methods, etc...	84%	12%	3%	1%	100% (351)
2) Articles pointing out new or imminent educational developments and problems with discussion of their implications.....	76	21	2	1	100% (351)
3) Information about federal legislation pertaining to education.....	65	28	6	1	100% (351)
4) Summaries and interpretations of findings of educational research.....	60	34	5	1	100% (351)
5) Information about defense regulations and discussions of how the schools can fit into the defense program.....	59	32	8	1	100% (351)
6) Summaries and highlights of certain educational conferences.....	48	43	8	1	100% (351)
7) Information about services available through the federal government in connection with shortages of critical materials and equipment.....	43	37	19	1	100% (351)
8) Articles on the program and activities of the U. S. Office of Education..	40	54	5	1	100% (351)
9) Information about international educational organizations--objectives, programs, activities, etc.	35	53	11	1	100% (351)
10) Information about educational programs and activities of other federal agencies.....	23	63	13	1	100% (351)
11) Articles introducing new specialists on the staff of the Office of Education.....	22	53	24	1	100% (351)

The interest hierarchies of the various classes of readers were quite similar to each other with only a few exceptions.

State officers were somewhat less interested in educational aids and methods and more interested in legislative information and summaries of conferences than were the other readers. They also showed on the whole more interest in articles introducing new Office of Education specialists than did the readers in most of the other groups.\* These differences in interest pattern may well be partially responsible for the greater acclaim accorded SCHOOL LIFE by the state officers than by the various other classes of readers:

Percent of readers in each class who were "very interested" in articles on given subject-matter:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
1) Teaching aids, methods.....	62%	87%	82%	89%	73%	96%	86%
2) Educational de- velopments and problems.....	88	90	68	64	80	81	72
3) Federal legisla- tion.....	74	68	61	67	47	68	62
4) Educational re- search.....	52	68	71	61	53	54	60
5) Defense regula- tions.....	70	65	36	75	73	54	53
6) Conferences.....	66	45	46	42	47	35	48
7) Shortages.....	46	61	32	36	40	40	42
8) Activities of O. of E.....	42	35	32	44	40	40	40
9) International ed- ucational or- ganizations....	28	26	46	25	47	35	38
10) Educational pro- grams of other governmental agencies.....	16	22	21	19	33	23	27
11) New O. of E. spe- cialists.....	36	23	29	14	27	19	19
Number of re- spondents on which per- centages are based.....	(50)	(31)	(28)	(36)	(15)	(57)	(134)

\*While the proportion of state officers rating themselves as "very interested" in O. of E. specialists was only slightly higher than the proportion of other readers expressing such interest, only 10% of the officers said they had no interest at all in the O. of E. specialists while 32% of the teachers and 24% of the subscribers expressed this lack of interest.

The readers' suggestions for changes in the allocation of space devoted to various subject-matters were by and large in accordance with the over-all interest hierarchy. While a majority of the readers suggested devoting more space to teaching aids and methods and educational developments and problems, only 13% asked that more space be given to introductions of new Office of Education specialists.

Five of the areas were particularly singled out for more space. A substantially greater proportion of readers suggested more space than suggested less space for teaching aids and methods, educational developments and problems, summaries and interpretations of research, defense information, and legislative information.

Opinion was rather evenly divided on four of the areas, essentially equal proportions suggesting more space and suggesting less space. These areas were Office of Education activities and program, reports of conferences, international educational organizations, and information about shortages of materials.

The proportion suggesting less space was considerably larger than the proportion suggesting more space for the educational activities of other federal agencies and the introduction of new Office of Education specialists.

The space suggestions for information about legislation were somewhat out of line with the degree of interest reported in such information. The proportion of respondents saying they were very interested in legislative information was larger than the proportion expressing high interest in research summaries and defense information. Yet, the proportion of readers suggesting an increase in the space allotted to research summaries and defense information was greater than the proportion suggesting an increase for the legislative area. This probably indicates that SCHOOL LIFE has done a better job in satisfying its readers' interests in legislative information than in satisfying their interests in defense and research information. Of the latter two areas, the readers were considerably more likely to view research summaries as deserving a larger share of space than they were so to view defense information.

It should be noted that about 20% of the readers failed to express an opinion on the allocation of space in SCHOOL LIFE. Most of these respondents felt that they weren't sufficiently aware of the present space distribution to recommend changes. Some others felt that their opinion on this technical matter wouldn't be worth much and that the editors were in a better position to make such decisions than they were. A few others clearly had no interest in the space allocations in SCHOOL LIFE since they didn't particularly intend to read the magazine much regardless of any changes in emphasis that might take place.

The suggestions for changes in the allocation of space in detail:\*\*

---

\*Note that the subject-matter areas are presented in rank order of respondent interest in this table.

"Which, if any, of these subjects (same list) do you think the magazine SCHOOL LIFE should give more space to and which, if any, should it give less space to?"

Percent of those readers who were acquainted with S.L. who suggested:

	<u>More space</u>	<u>Same space</u>	<u>Less space</u>	<u>Don't know</u>	<u>Total</u>
1) Teaching aids, methods...	62%	14%	6%	18%	100%
					(351)
2) Educational developments and problems.....	53	22	5	20	100%
					(351)
3) Federal legislation.....	31	31	17	21	100%
					(351)
4) Educational research.....	42	24	14	20	100%
					(351)
5) Defense regulations.....	35	29	14	22	100%
					(351)
6) Conferences.....	25	29	24	22	100%
					(351)
7) Shortages.....	24	30	25	21	100%
					(351)
8) Activities of O. of E....	25	33	20	22	100%
					(351)
9) International educational organizations.....	25	29	25	21	100%
					(351)
10) Educational programs of other governmental agencies.....	18	33	27	22	100%
					(351)
11) New O. of E. specialists.	13	31	34	22	100%
					(351)

Percent of those readers expressing an opinion who suggested:

	<u>More space</u>	<u>Same space</u>	<u>Less space</u>	<u>Don't know</u>	<u>Total</u>
1) Teaching aids, methods...	76%	17%	7%	-%	100%
					(286)
2) Educational developments and problems.....	66	27	7	-	100%
					(280)
3) Federal legislation.....	39	39	22	-	100%
					(274)
4) Educational research.....	53	30	17	-	100%
					(280)
5) Defense regulations.....	45	37	18	-	100%
					(274)
6) Conferences.....	32	37	31	-	100%
					(275)
7) Shortages.....	31	37	32	-	100%
					(277)
8) Activities of O. of E....	33	42	25	-	100%
					(274)
9) International educational organizations.....	32	36	32	-	100%
					(276)
10) Educational programs of other governmental agencies.....	23	42	35	-	100%
					(275)
11) New O. of E. specialists.	17	39	44	-	100%
					(274)

In general, the pattern of space suggestions made by the different classes of readers was in fairly close correspondence with their interest patterns. The outstanding exception to the correspondence was, as was shown for the total group, the reversal between the relative positions of summaries of research and legislative information. The tendency for the proportion of readers requesting that more space be devoted to legislative information to be small relative to the interest expressed in such information was marked in each class of readers with the exception of the high-school teachers. For instance, among the state officers, while 74% of the readers said they were very interested in legislative information and only 52% expressed such interest in research summaries, only 48% of those expressing an opinion wanted a space increase for legislative information and yet 57% wanted an increase for the research summaries.

The space suggestions of different classes of readers:

Percent of those readers expressing an opinion in each class who suggested "more space" be allocated to given subject-matter:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
1) Teaching aids, methods.....	56%	76%	77%	87%	100%	84%	74%
2) Educational de- velopments and problems.....	74	74	70	52	75	53	67
3) Federal legisla- tion.....	48	37	27	45	27	46	37
4) Educational research.....	57	68	57	54	73	38	50
5) Defense regulations..	57	32	23	48	55	54	43
6) Conferences....	53	20	41	38	18	17	29
7) Shortages.....	30	36	18	38	27	31	30
8) Activities of O. of E.....	24	24	36	38	45	53	29
9) International educational organizations	33	16	30	25	36	51	31
10) Educational pro- grams of other governmental agencies.....	19	12	30	17	18	29	25
11) New O. of E. specialists..	32	8	18	7	27	17	14
Average num- ber of re- spondents on which percentages are based*	(42)	(25)	(22)	(29)	(11)	(36)	(111)

\*Since the number of "don't know" responses varied slightly from question to question, there was some minor variation in the number of cases on which the different percentages within a given column were based. The variation from the average presented was almost never more than one or two cases.

I N S U M M A R Y :

The readers as a whole indicated greater interest in articles of a practical and timely character than they did in articles of a less obviously utilitarian nature. Even though articles on teaching aids or educational developments and problems are rather readily available in other educational periodicals, SCHOOL LIFE's readers would by and large like to see more space in SCHOOL LIFE devoted to such subjects and only the same space as at present or even less space to more specialized subject-matter like introductions of new Office of Education specialists and the educational activities of other federal agencies.

#### IV. CRITICISMS AND SUGGESTIONS

##### BEARING ON SCHOOL LIFE'S APPROACH

Relatively few readers made any specific criticisms of the manner in which SCHOOL LIFE currently handles its materials. Almost two-thirds of the readers could think of no changes they would like to see made in SCHOOL LIFE's treatment of its substantive material. Yet, only 11% of the readers volunteered that the reason they had no suggestions was that they were satisfied with the magazine at present:

"Aside from the amount of space devoted to these subjects, what changes, if any, would you like to see SCHOOL LIFE make in the way it handles any of these subjects?" (The subjects on the list that was handed the respondent.)

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>
Made a suggestion or criticism.....	36%
No suggestion--liked magazine as it is.....	11
No suggestion--not familiar enough with magazine.....	17
None, don't know.....	36
	100%
	(351)

The small incidence of criticisms or suggestions is particularly striking in the light of the opinion generally held by the readers that SCHOOL LIFE was only moderately of service to them. It seems possible that many of the respondents made no suggestions for changes mainly because, owing to their indifference to the magazine, they had never before thought about what they liked or disliked about it. The fact is, the staunchest supporters of the magazine were more likely to make criticisms or suggestions than were those less favorably disposed. Among the readers who had rated SCHOOL LIFE as a very valuable and convenient source, 43% offered suggestions while only 27% of those who felt that they could easily get along without it could think of any changes they wanted. Thus, the absence of criticism cannot be taken to indicate only complete satisfaction with the magazine as presently constituted. It may also well indicate that the reader did not particularly care about the magazine and was simply not aware of any way in which it might be improved so that it would be of greater interest to him:

Percent of those readers who rated S. L.:

	<u>As a "very convenient, highly valued source"</u>	<u>As a "moderately convenient and valued source"</u>	<u>"Could easily get along without it" or didn't rate it</u>
Made a suggestion or criticism.....	43%	38%	27%
No suggestion--liked magazine as it is.	22	8	10
No suggestion--not familiar enough with magazine.....	3	12	34
None, don't know....	32	42	29
	<hr/> 100% (63)	<hr/> 100% (187)	<hr/> 100% (101)

The most frequent specific suggestion that was made was that SCHOOL LIFE's content should be of a more practical nature. About one of every eight respondents said that at present SCHOOL LIFE was too "theoretical" or "abstract" or had "too many generalities" and that it needed to "state the implications for local school systems" or "tell the reader what can be done about it." Such criticisms and suggestions were made concerning the handling of all areas of subject-matter. This point of view is in definite accord with the subject-matter interest hierarchy discussed in the previous section.

A specific suggestion made by 8% of the readers was that SCHOOL LIFE should be broader in its coverage and point of view. Some expressed the feeling that at present SCHOOL LIFE was to too large a degree "simply a house organ of the Office of Education." A few suggested including articles written by educators not associated with the Office of Education while others even suggested having articles by laymen. There were also suggestions simply for a wider variety of articles and broader coverage of educational problems and research.

Another 6% felt that the magazine was too superficial, that it lacked depth and continuity. A few felt that there was too much variety. Others said that it was too glowing in its accounts of conferences and the like--that it should go "more deeply into situations and get at the facts beneath the surface." Some felt that it shied away from controversial issues and wanted to see it "give both the pro's and con's in disputes of interest to educators."

About 4% of the readers volunteered that the material in SCHOOL LIFE was not current enough--that SCHOOL LIFE's content was simply a "re-hash of material that had already appeared months earlier in some other source."

Another 8% of the readers wanted a style change. The most frequent suggestion here was for greater conciseness and brevity. There were also a few readers who suggested a general simplification of style, the use of less statistics, better written first paragraphs, and a slant towards greater human interest.

Eleven percent of the respondents suggested new subjects they would like to see handled by SCHOOL LIFE. These subject-matter recommendations were extremely heterogeneous. In illustration, "articles designed to give the teacher a personal challenge," "more on fiscal matters," "religion in education," "more on rural schools," and "material on libraries" were among the recommendations made.

Five percent of the readers made suggestions or criticisms not classifiable in any of the above categories. Among these were general suggestions like "SCHOOL LIFE should be reportorial rather than interpretive" and "it should be more distinctive" as well as specific criticism like "it should be less pessimistic about our chances of avoiding a war."

Although each of the above suggestions was made by only a very small proportion of readers, it would seem quite possible that many of the readers who hadn't thought of any changes they would like to see made would actually have concurred with these suggestions--particularly, since most of those failing to suggest changes did not appear to be especially satisfied with SCHOOL LIFE.

The suggestions and criticisms:

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>	<u>Percent of those readers who made a criticism or suggestion</u>
<u>Greater practicality:</u> greater concreteness, few generalities, less theoretical, more applicable to the local situation, how to handle the class-room situation, etc.....	13%	34%
<u>Broader coverage:</u> more variety, have articles by non-administrators, now simply O. of E. house organ, beats own drum too much, fuller coverage of educational research, too restricted, etc....	8	22
<u>Greater depth:</u> too superficial, too much variety, too glowing, more discussion of controversial issues, should give pro's and con's, etc.....	6	16
<u>Greater timeliness:</u> more current, should be right up to the minute, simply a re-hash, you can always find it somewhere else first, etc.....	4	10
<u>Style changes:</u> more concise summaries, less statistics, use digest form, greater brevity, simplify writing, use of more human interest material, etc.....	8	21
<u>Miscellaneous new subject-matter recommendations:</u> more on extra-curricular activities, more on rural schools, articles designed to give teachers a personal challenge, report services and objectives of educational organizations, etc.....	11	29
<u>Miscellaneous suggestions:</u> it should be reportorial rather than interpretive, more distinctive, have a calendar of coming events in field of education, make it a magazine for educators rather than general public, etc.....	5	13
<u>Like magazine as it is:</u> doing fine job now, no complaints, am satisfied, etc...	11	-
<u>Not familiar enough with magazine to make any suggestions.....</u>	17	-
<u>None, don't know:</u> can't say offhand, requires more thought, I have no idea, etc.....	36	-
Some readers made more than one suggestion or criticism.....	119% (351)	145% (128)

The comments of several readers in detail:\*

"The ideas get so damnably time-worn--it's rehash-rehash-rehash. I've been in the game 23 years. I've heard all that before. It (S. L.) needs to have more specificity in it. That's what I like about Teacher's Letter (of E. W. D.) -- it takes a typical case study and analyzes it. Briefly, there's so much literature that comes across your desk--it's rehash--you haven't got time for it. I'm letting my hair down because I assume you want an honest answer. Now isn't it just wonderful--they had a White House Conference and came up with these conclusions-- There's nothing grass roots about it at all--Nothing you can get down and do in a given community--I do think they have a lot of good statistics in it.....(would be very interested in summaries of educational conferences) provided it was terse and to the point and not time-worn--(would be very interested in articles on educational developments and problems) if they're earthy.....(would be very interested in articles on services available through federal government in connection with shortages) but it should be accurate in terms of stating exactly how it works.....I think I'd like to see something quite different--why not a little tiny magazine you can carry in your pocket that hits these things--come to the point with the idea and let it go at that.....We work pretty closely with the city civilian defense program--We've had to improvise a lot--there the O. E. could have come up with some concrete suggestions. Come up with a program and say this at the moment is the way it should be and modify it later." (From an interview with the superintendent of public schools in a far-western community of about 25,000 population--he was a "frequent scanner" of S. L.)

"A lot of it is pretty remote. They present articles too general or national in scope--seldom anything particular or practical for my own use and not detailed enough. It doesn't discuss particular problems and show how they can be helped. They should discuss situations in particular localities and get down to realities. (But) I like their references to current literature and the summary of court decisions and I was very impressed with their article on the use of the U. N. flag in schools. I clipped that out--I'd say not to be too general, too philosophical or too abstract--get down to the particular, the real, the actual - almost use the case method by taking a particular case and identify it. Carry columns of new developments in particular states on things like finance and legislation--They seem hard-pressed for materials and just throw in these articles--They're on too high an intellectual level to be practical for people that have practical problems. For instance take this article on the 50th anniversary of Cuba - Why waste time reading that?--No (S. L. or other O. of E. publications have never had an important effect on action) -- that's what bothers me--Why can't I really find something in there and really make use of them." (From an interview with a subscriber who was a school board member in a large eastern metropolitan center--he was a "frequent selective reader.")

---

\*The comments presented here are taken from various parts of the interview.

"Too many articles are written in praise of the U. S. Office of Education. The articles should be objective and the magazine should not convey the feeling that it is a propaganda magazine---It makes no difference to me what the itinerary is of the members of the Office of Education---If I wanted to see them, I'd write and find out where they were---I would feel that a magazine would have more weight if it brought in outside articles other than those written by staff members. It gives the impression of being a house organ." (From an interview with a subscriber who was a high-school principal in a western city of about 150,000 people. He was a frequent user of O. of E. publications but expressed no interest in articles concerning the Office itself--he was a "frequent selective reader" of S. L.)

"I wonder what I think is wrong with it -- S. L. -- It has never made any impression on me--I don't look to it as I look to other magazines--I think probably if they had some way of informing us of what they were particularly trying to do--most magazines have a particular purpose--but that is general--I don't look to it for any specific program. I don't think it's so much the way it handles its subjects--It's sort of a re-hash and not the basic place to look for things - I think it's the type of thing they carry - everybody else has it first - (does not find "Education for the Nation's Defense" very useful) -- I suspect that's one thing wrong with it - the things you find in there you get elsewhere - it becomes an echo---No (S. L. or other O. of E. publications have never had an important effect on action) -- I would cite this instance -- we had a meeting on the White House Conference -- we had a very full report on it -- and we were all through before S. L. came out on it." (From an interview with the supervisor of general elementary and kindergarten instruction in a far-western city of 100,000 population--she was a "frequent scanner.")

"Well, I think in part they've been too far removed from actual problems that are confronting administrators.....They haven't done very much on that (summaries and interpretations of educational research).....They're too brief in most (subject-matter areas)--try to cover too much--too briefly.....They should devote more space to educational research. They have resources and facilities to do it--now we have to go to a dozen different magazines (to get such material).....("Education for the Nation's Defense") is elementary to a certain extent -- should have more examples on what the schools are doing. The main problem is how to guard against duplication of material with other magazines. I'd like to know what school A, B, and C are doing to meet this problem--should get down to the level of the field .....(concerning the bibliographies in S. L.) we receive now, from the government printing office the monthly list of educational publications--here again is a lot of duplication..... Maybe S. L. should do something like we do in the A. S. C. D.-- for instance, in meetings like in Detroit we decided upon what should be covered during 1951-52 -- we decided a year in advance. SCHOOL LIFE should bring before public materials that aren't duplicated in other publications. SCHOOL LIFE should report to us on problems of a national, political, educational nature.

I think S. L. could cover a job much as the Metropolitan School Study Groups are now doing on a local limited basis--studies have been made in Detroit, Chicago, and New York. They could do it on the same basis--they are weak in that area--the federal office is the natural one to do it. They could cover each area and problems in local areas. They conducted a series of studies in various areas a year or so ago--and it was good but it should be done more--should study school problems on a national basis--They should make a careful study of the tax structure and report it. Right now SCHOOL LIFE has so much duplication--all it is is duplication. The article on civilian defense in the April issue was old stuff by the time it was put out..... But, SCHOOL LIFE should get away from all its duplication of other publications. It could give us comparative material that would help us locally - on anything - it's weak in that area of study.....I'm not interested in its (the Office of Education's) activities--If they would deal with problems or areas of interest to me, then they wouldn't have to worry about getting me to read their magazine." (From an interview with the assistant superintendent of schools in a community of about 50,000 population in an east north central state--he was an "occasional scanner.")

It should be kept in mind that the foregoing excerpts are not representative of the interviews with the 64% of the readers who suggested no changes, although they are typical of a sizeable proportion of the interviews held with the 36% of the respondents who did suggest changes in SCHOOL LIFE. They illustrate the essential indifference rather than dislike with which the magazine was generally viewed.

Some suggestions not bearing on the way SCHOOL LIFE handles its substantive material were also made.\* About 10% of the readers suggested that SCHOOL LIFE be made a larger publication. Some of these readers felt that what there was of the magazine was good and so they wanted it to have even more content. Others felt simply that the present size was rather anomalous--that it either should become a full-scale magazine with much fuller coverage or else simply an Office of Education bulletin.

About another 5% of the readers voiced irritation over minor procedural matters. Several respondents felt that the manner in which the magazine is folded for mailing made it practically impossible to read or file it. A few subscribers felt that it was too difficult to keep track of when the subscription expired and that much greater promptness was needed in sending the magazine to new subscribers once their subscription was entered.

---

\*These suggestions occurred in response to a number of different questions in the interview. They occurred mainly, though, in response to a closing omnibus question: "Well, I have asked you a lot of questions about the content and form of SCHOOL LIFE. Now, do you have any particular criticisms or suggestions about aspects of SCHOOL LIFE which we have not covered?"

I N S U M M A R Y :

A majority of the readers voiced no suggestions or criticisms of SCHOOL LIFE except for the suggested changes in the allocation of space discussed in the previous section. This was probably due to indifference rather than complete satisfaction with the magazine. The most frequent specific criticisms that were made were that the magazine should have a more practical slant and that it should have a broader coverage.

V. SOME FACTORS RELATED TO SCHOOL LIFE READERSHIP

The classes of readers who read SCHOOL LIFE most constantly were also the classes whose members had had the most outside contact with the Office of Education. While almost 90% of the state officers and a majority of the other top administrators had at one time or other turned to the Office of Education for help, only a little more than 10% of the teachers had ever done so. Almost half of the subscribers had also sought some sort of help from the Office:

"Have you ever tried to get help from the Office of Education in dealing with your own problems of school administration or teaching?"

Percent of each class of readers who:

	<u>Had turned</u>	<u>Had not turned</u>	<u>Didn't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>to the O. of E.</u>	<u>to the O. of E.</u>	<u>answer</u>	
State administrators.....	88%	12%	-%	100% (51)
City superintendents.....	53	47	-	100% (34)
City supervisors.....	60	40	-	100% (31)
High-school principals.....	30	70	-	100% (44)
Elementary-school principals.....	16	84	-	100% (32)
High-school teachers.....	12	87	1	100% (135)
Subscribers.....	45	53	2	100% (143)

Even within classes of readers, this same relationship held. While 87% of the constant and frequent selective readers in the top administrative classes had turned to the Office of Education for help, only 41% of the occasional scanners and non-readers in those classes had ever done so. Among the subscribers, 61% of the top two readership types had had this kind of outside contact while only about 30% of the rest of this class had:

Percent of those respondents in  
each group of readership types  
within given classes of readers who:

	<u>Had turned</u>	<u>Had not turned</u>	<u>Didn't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>to the O. of E.</u>	<u>to the O. of E.</u>	<u>answer</u>	
<u>State administrators, city super-</u>				
<u>intendents and supervisors</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent se-				
lective" readers.....	87%	13%	-%	100%
				(52)
"Periodic" or "occasional"				
readers, "frequent scanners"	64	36	-	100%
				(42)
"Occasional scanners," non-				
classifiable readers, or				
non-readers*.....	41	59	-	100%
				(22)
<u>Subscribers</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent se-				
lective" readers.....	61	38	1	100%
				(73)
"Periodic" or "occasional"				
readers, "frequent scanners"	29	69	2	100%
				(42)
"Occasional scanners," non-				
classifiable readers, or				
non-readers.....	32	64	4	100%
				(28)

Information about the Office of Education's activities was also related to SCHOOL LIFE readership. The classes of readers who read SCHOOL LIFE most regularly and fully were the classes knowing the most about the Office of Education. While 78% of the state administrators were at least moderately well informed about the general program and activities of the Office, only 18% of the teachers were that well informed.\*\* The remaining classes fell between these extremes, the city superintendents and supervisors being among the better informed, the high-school and elementary-school principals among the less informed:

---

\*In this section of this report, those readers whose type was indeterminate have been included in the lowest readership groups since it is clear from their rating of SCHOOL LIFE (Cf. section on evaluation of S. L.) that they were similar to the "occasional scanners."

\*\*The degree to which the respondent was informed about the Office of Education was inferred from his response to the question: "What are the activities of the Office of Education at present?" The rating of "at least moderately well informed" was given to respondents who indicated at least general knowledge of three or more areas of activity or full specific knowledge of one area and at least general knowledge of another. The rating was done in the central office.

"Now I would like to ask some questions about the United States Office of Education and some of its publications. As far as you've had any opportunities to observe, what are the activities--or kinds of activities--of the Office of Education at present?"

	Percent of each class of readers who were:			Total
	At least moderately well informed	Slightly informed	Completely uninformed or misinformed	
State administrators...	78%	20%	2%	100% (51)
City superintendents...	71	26	3	100% (34)
City supervisors.....	58	42	-	100% (31)
High-school principals.	32	36	32	100% (44)
Elementary-school principals.....	40	44	16	100% (32)
High-school teachers...	18	44	38	100% (135)
Subscribers.....	49	43	8	100% (143)

There were fairly marked informational differences associated with the degree to which the respondent read SCHOOL LIFE within the different classes of readers. Seventy-nine percent of the state administrators who read SCHOOL LIFE most regularly and fully were at least moderately informed about the Office of Education while 59% of those least exposed to SCHOOL LIFE were that well-informed. Among the subscribers, 55% of the constant and frequent selective readers, but only 29% of least regular and thorough readers, were at least moderately well-informed about the Office of Education. The major differences with respect to level of information between the high-school teachers with varying degrees of exposure to SCHOOL LIFE lay in the proportions having no correct information at all. While about one-quarter of the high-school teachers in the higher readership groups were completely uninformed about the Office, almost half the teachers who only occasionally scanned SCHOOL LIFE or who were not even acquainted with the magazine completely lacked information:

Percent of those respondents in each group of readership types within given classes of readers who were:

	At least moderately well informed	Slightly informed	Completely uninformed or misinformed	Total
<u>State administrators, city superintendents and supervisors</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers.....	79%	21%	—%	100% (52)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".	67	31	2	100% (42)
"Occasional scanners," non-classifiable readers, or non-readers.....	59	36	5	100% (22)
<u>High-school principals</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers.....	65	23	12	100% (17)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".	42	25	33	100% (12)
"Occasional scanners," non-classifiable readers, or non-readers.....	20	27	53	100% (15)
<u>High-school teachers</u>				
"Constant," "frequent selective" or "periodic" readers, "frequent scanners"*......	29	42	29	100% (21)
"Occasional" readers.....	22	61	17	100% (23)
"Occasional scanners," non-classifiable, or non-readers.	14	40	46	100% (91)
<u>Subscribers</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers.....	55	41	4	100% (73)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".	52	43	5	100% (42)
"Occasional scanners," non-classifiable readers, or non-readers.....	29	46	25	100% (28)

\*The grouping of readership types differs for the high-school teachers from that used in the other classes because there were too few teachers in the highest two readership types to constitute an analytic group.

The fact that the most faithful readers of SCHOOL LIFE tended also to be the respondents who had turned to the Office of Education for help and who were best informed about the Office would seem to indicate the joint influence of reading SCHOOL LIFE and of outside contact with the Office upon each other. It should be noted that 59% of the top administrators who were at best only occasional scanners of SCHOOL LIFE were at least moderately well-informed about the Office, while only 29% of even the most faithful readers among the teachers were so well-informed. It is obvious from this fact, as well as on a priori grounds, that the top administrators were in a far closer relation to the Office of Education regardless of SCHOOL LIFE than were the other classes of readers. Since these top administrators were by and large SCHOOL LIFE's most faithful readers among educators receiving free copies, it is clear that a relatively close relation to the Office of Education and/or other factors associated with being in an educational position involving such contact with the Office led to reading SCHOOL LIFE. But, the association between SCHOOL LIFE readership and the educator's relation to the Office within the several classes of readers indicates the possibility that reading SCHOOL LIFE increased the educator's information about the Office and led him to turn to the Office for help, although even here reading SCHOOL LIFE may conceivably have been largely a secondary aspect of an over-all relation to the Office of education.

The more constant readers of SCHOOL LIFE also read regularly more educational periodicals other than SCHOOL LIFE than did those who seldom or never read the magazine. In other words, there was a tendency for the educators to read SCHOOL LIFE as a supplement to a number of other periodicals rather than in place of other periodicals. Educators who didn't read many other periodicals tended also not to read SCHOOL LIFE.

For instance, while 61% of the top administrators who were at least "frequent selective readers" of SCHOOL LIFE read six or more other periodicals regularly, only 23% of those who were only "occasional scanners" or less read that many other periodicals. About one-quarter of the most faithful SCHOOL LIFE readers among the high-school teachers read six or more other educational periodicals regularly, but only 2% of the lowest SCHOOL LIFE readership types read other periodicals to that large an extent. Much the same relation also held within the other classes of readers:\*

---

\*The number of educational periodicals other than SCHOOL LIFE read regularly was determined from the educators' responses to two questions--a question in which the respondent was asked which of the periodicals from a list of eleven (other than S. L.) he read regularly and from the succeeding question which asked for any other national, state, or local educational periodicals read regularly.

Percent of those respondents in each group of readership types within given classes of readers who read regularly:

	6 or more periodicals other than <u>S. L.</u>	3-5 periodicals other than <u>S. L.</u>	2 or fewer periodicals other than <u>S. L.</u>	Total
<u>State administrators, city superintendents and supervisors</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers.....	61%	37%	2%	100% (52)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".	50	28	22	100% (42)
"Occasional scanners," non-classifiable readers, or non-readers.....	23	45	32	100% (22)
<u>High-school principals</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers.....	29	65	6	100% (17)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".	33	59	8	100% (12)
"Occasional scanners," non-classifiable readers, or non-readers.....	20	40	40	100% (15)
<u>High-school teachers</u>				
"Constant," "frequent selective" or "periodic" readers, "frequent scanners".....	24	48	28	100% (21)
"Occasional" readers.....	4	31	65	100% (23)
"Occasional scanners," non-classifiable, or non-readers.	2	34	64	100% (91)
<u>Subscribers</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers.....	47	30	23	100% (73)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".	33	50	17	100% (42)
"Occasional scanners," non-classifiable readers, or non-readers.....	22	39	39	100% (28)

Characteristics Related to SCHOOL LIFE Readership Among the Top Administrators

We have seen that both contact with the Office of Education and the general amount of reading of educational periodicals were each individually highly related to the reading of SCHOOL LIFE among the top administrators. When the relationships of both contact and general reading to SCHOOL LIFE readership are considered simultaneously, much the same result is obtained. Thus, within the group of top administrators who had been in touch with the Office of Education, those who regularly read a relatively large number of other educational journals were also more likely to be regular readers of SCHOOL LIFE than were those who read fewer publications. Similarly, within the group of top administrators who regularly read six or more other educational journals, those who had dealings with the Office of Education were more likely to be regular readers of SCHOOL LIFE than those who had not. Nevertheless, it should be noted that those who had dealt with the Office of Education were more likely to be regular readers of SCHOOL LIFE than those who had not, regardless of their general reading habits.

The joint relationship of contact and general reading habits with SCHOOL LIFE readership was so great that while 65% of the administrators who had sought help from the Office and who read six or more other journals regularly were at least "frequent selective readers" of SCHOOL LIFE, only 6% of those who had never sought help and who read five or fewer other journals were such faithful readers of the magazine.

It should also be noted that the relation between the reading of SCHOOL LIFE and the reading of other periodicals was particularly pronounced among the administrators who had not sought help from the Office. While among those who read regularly six or more other periodicals only 11% were "occasional scanners" or non-readers of SCHOOL LIFE, 65% of the administrators who read five or fewer other periodicals read SCHOOL LIFE that little:

Percent of those top administrators who had:

	<u>Turned to the Office for help and who read:</u>		<u>Not turned to the Office for help and who read:</u>	
	<u>6 or more other educ. per.'s regularly</u>	<u>5 or fewer other educ. per.'s regularly</u>	<u>6 or more other educ. per.'s regularly</u>	<u>5 or fewer other educ. per.'s regularly</u>
"Constant" or "fre- quent se- lective" readers..	65%	46%	33%	6%
"Periodic" or "occa- sional" readers, "frequent scanners"	27	39	56	29
"Occasional scanners," non-classi- fiable readers, or non-readers	8 <hr/> 100% (40)	15 <hr/> 100% (41)	11 <hr/> 100% (18)	65 <hr/> 100% (17)

The administrators who read SCHOOL LIFE most constantly evaluated other periodicals differently from those who didn't read it as much. The "constant" and "frequent selective" readers were more likely to mention periodicals dealing primarily with curricular and teaching problems, such as Periodicals A, B, and E, as being generally useful sources than were those who read SCHOOL LIFE less.\* This latter group tended relatively more toward periodicals dealing largely with problems of physical plant like Periodicals H, J, and particularly Periodical I.\*\* Apparently SCHOOL LIFE was more interesting to those administrators whose chief interests were in the areas of teaching and curriculum than to those whose primary concern was physical plant:

---

\*Specific educational periodicals other than SCHOOL LIFE are designated by code letters in this report.

\*\*The top two SCHOOL LIFE readership types tended to mention a considerably larger number of periodicals than did the others. Thus, the fact that the proportion mentioning Periodical H or Periodical J in each group of readership types was about equal indicates relatively greater emphasis on these magazines in the lower readership groups.

Percent of those administrators of specified  
readership types who mentioned given periodical  
as being a generally useful source:

	<u>"Constant" or "frequent se- lective" readers</u>	<u>"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "fre- quent scanners"</u>	<u>"Occasional scan- ners," non-class- ifiable readers, or non-readers</u>
Periodical A.....	25%	10%	9%
Periodical B.....	31	7	9
Periodicals C and D....	10	12	18
Periodical E.....	19	10	-
Periodical F.....	10	2	-
Periodical G.....	60	48	45
Periodical H.....	35	29	28
Periodical I.....	21	31	45
Periodical J.....	29	21	32
SCHOOL LIFE.....	29	17	5
Mentioned only periodicals not on above list....	-	5	18
Mentioned no educational periodicals.....	-	7	9
Some respondents men- tioned more than one periodical.....	269% (52)	199% (42)	218% (22)

Characteristics Related to SCHOOL LIFE Readership Among the High-school Teachers

High-school teachers who were acquainted with SCHOOL LIFE tended to be teachers of different subjects, and to have different job histories and preferences, from those teachers who were not acquainted with the magazine. Readers tended to be teachers of the more academic subjects (e.g., English, mathematics, social studies, etc.), whereas non-readers tended to be teachers of the less academic subjects (e.g., manual training, physical education, music, home economics, etc.):

Percent of those high-school teachers who:

	<u>Read S. L. at least occasionally</u>	<u>Didn't read S. L. at all</u>
<u>Semi-administrators:</u> librarians, counselors, vice-principals, etc...	21%	17%
<u>Teachers of academic sub- jects: English, mathe- matics, history, etc...</u>	65	50
<u>Teachers of non-academic subjects only.....</u>	14	33
	<hr/> 100% (57)	<hr/> 100% (78)

The teachers who read SCHOOL LIFE also tended to be those who had at some time in the past held an administrative post or had had some other non-teaching duties like library work or guidance counselling. Twenty-six percent of the readers had held some such post while only 9% of the non-readers had:

"Aside from your present position, what other kinds of school work have you done--teaching, administrative work, other (specify)?"

Percent of those high-school teachers who:

	<u>Read S. L. at least occasionally</u>	<u>Didn't read S. L. at all</u>
Had been a school adminis- trator, librarian, guidance counsellor....	26%	9%
Had not held any position previously involving ad- ministrative or semi- administrative duties..	74	91
	<hr/> 100% (57)	<hr/> 100% (78)

Teachers who read SCHOOL LIFE were more likely to prefer such duties as administration, teacher-training, guidance work, and education of special groups to regular teaching than were the non-readers:

"If you were absolutely free to choose, what kind of educational work would you like most to do?"

Percent of those high-school teachers who:

	<u>Read S. L. at least occasionally</u>	<u>Didn't read S. L. at all</u>
Preferred administrative or guidance work, education of special groups, teacher training.....	37%	18%
Preferred regular teaching.....	63	82
	<u>100%</u> (57)	<u>100%</u> (78)

Thus, the teachers who were likely to read SCHOOL LIFE were the ones who taught the more literary subjects and the ones who either had held in the past or desired for the future a position involving administrative or other special duties like counselling, the teaching of the handicapped, and teacher training. The teachers in the relatively non-literary fields like manual training, physical education, music, and home economics and those who in the past had held and for the future desired only positions involving class-room teaching were less likely to read SCHOOL LIFE.

Among the teachers who did read SCHOOL LIFE, those who read it most regularly generally expressed considerably more interest in the areas of subject-matter which might be considered to be peculiar to the magazine than did the teachers who were less regular readers. For instance, 95% of the more regular readers were "very interested" in information about federal legislation while only 38% of the less regular readers expressed such interest. A similar relation held for the other areas:\*

---

\*The only exception to this general relation was in the area of "information about federal services in connection with shortages," where approximately equal proportions of the two extreme readership groups were "very interested". But, while only 15% of the more regular readers said they were "not at all" interested in such information, 31% of the least regular readers expressed a complete lack of interest in that area.

Percent of high-school teachers "very interested"  
in given subject-matter among those who were:

	"Constant," "frequent selective," or "per- iodic" readers or "frequent scanners"	"Occasional readers"	"Occasional scanners" or non-classifiable
<u>"Very interested" in:</u>			
Information about federal legislation.....	95%	61%	38%
Information about defense program.....	76	43	38
Information about the pro- gram and activities of the O. of E.....	67	26	15
Information about federal services in connection with shortages.....	43	35	46
Information about educa- tional programs and ac- tivities of other fed- eral agencies.....	38	17	8
Information about new specialists on the staff of the O. of E.....	33	13	8
Number of cases on which percentages are based	(21)	(23)	(13)

I N S U M M A R Y:

SCHOOL LIFE readership seems to have been to a large extent a function of the relation of the educator to the Office of Education--the closer the relation, the more likely the educator was to be a faithful reader of SCHOOL LIFE. Also, educators who read regularly the most educational journals aside from SCHOOL LIFE were more likely to read SCHOOL LIFE faithfully than were those who read fewer other journals. These two factors jointly accounted for a large share of the variation in the magazine's readership within the top administrative group. There were also indications that reading SCHOOL LIFE may have led to increased knowledge about the Office of Education and may have led to contacts with it. Among high-school teachers, the more regular SCHOOL LIFE readers evidenced far greater interest in the subject-matter most peculiar to the magazine than did the less regular readers, suggesting once again that those whose interests lie closest to the Office of Education are most likely to read SCHOOL LIFE.

## VI. READERSHIP OF SCHOOL LIFE'S REGULAR FEATURES

### Bibliographic Features

A substantial majority of those who read SCHOOL LIFE in all classes of readers except the high-school principals and teachers generally at least scanned the bibliographic portions of the magazine. The city supervisors and subscribers were most likely to go over the bibliographies completely:

"How useful do you find these bibliographical features which SCHOOL LIFE carries at the back of each monthly issue? Do you generally go over these lists rather completely, do you scan them quickly, or do you seldom read them at all?"

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class  
who generally:

	<u>Went over bibliographies completely</u>	<u>Scanned bibliographies</u>	<u>Seldom read bibliographies</u>	<u>Total</u>
State administrators..	36%	30%	34%	100% (50)
City superintendents...	26	35	39	100% (31)
City supervisors.....	43	28	29	100% (28)
High-school principals.	22	28	50	100% (36)
Elementary-school principals.....	27	53	20	100% (15)
High-school teachers...	18	29	53	100% (57)
Subscribers..	43	28	29	100% (134)

Those who read the magazine as a whole most faithfully were also the ones who were most likely to go over the bibliographies completely. While 46% of the state administrators who were "constant" or "frequent selective" readers of SCHOOL LIFE generally went over the bibliographies completely, only 7% of the least regular readers did so. The same general relation held among the other classes of readers:

Percent of those readers in each group of  
readership types within given classes of  
readers who generally:

	<u>Went over bibliographies completely</u>	<u>Scanned bibliographies</u>	<u>Seldom read bibliographies</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>State administrators, city superintendents or super- visors</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers...	46%	37%	17%	100% (52)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".....	31	31	38	100% (42)
"Occasional scanners" or non-classifiable.....	7	13	80	100% (15)
<u>High-school teachers and principals</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers...	42	33	25	100% (24)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".....	12	31	57	100% (49)
"Occasional scanners" or non-classifiable.....	10	15	75	100% (20)
<u>Subscribers</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers...	60	22	18	100% (73)
"Periodic" or "occasional" readers, "frequent scanners".....	19	48	33	100% (42)
"Occasional scanners" or non-classifiable.....	32	5	63	100% (19)

It should be noted that about three-quarters of the "constant" and "frequent selective" readers in each of the classes generally at least scanned the bibliographies. Thus, a substantial majority of those who apparently found the magazine as a whole interesting, also found the bibliographies to be of some interest.

Most of those who generally went over the bibliography obtained at least occasionally some of the material listed there. In fact, about 60% of those top administrators and subscribers who examined the bibliographies generally obtained materials listed there three or more times during an average school year. The high-school teachers and principals obtained materials less frequently; only 31% of the bibliography readers in those groups obtained materials as often as three times a year:

"About how many times during an average school year do you order or get from a library any of the books, pamphlets, and theses you find out about through these listings?" (Asked only of those who at least generally scanned the bibliographies.)

	<u>Percent of those who were SCHOOL LIFE readers and who were:</u>			<u>Percent of those who generally at least scanned the biblio- graphic features and who were:</u>		
	<u>State adm., city super- intendents and super- visors</u>	<u>High- school princi- pals and teachers</u>	<u>Sub- scribers</u>	<u>State adm., city super- intendents and super- visors</u>	<u>High- school princi- pals and teachers</u>	<u>Sub- scribers</u>
<u>Number of times ma- terials ordered during average school year</u>						
Eight or more (very often)	16%	4%	15%	24%	9%	20%
Five, six, or seven.....	9	4	16	14	9	22
Three or four	13	7	13	20	13	19
One or two (oc- casionally)	14	17	17	22	36	25
Never.....	10	16	7	15	33	11
Don't know or no answer..	4	-	2	5	-	3
Question not asked (re- spondent seldom read bibliography)	34	52	30	-	-	-
	<u>100%</u> (109)	<u>100%</u> (93)	<u>100%</u> (134)	<u>100%</u> (72)	<u>100%</u> (45)	<u>100%</u> (94)

"Education for the Nation's Defense"

A substantial majority of SCHOOL LIFE readers in all classes except the high-school teachers generally at least scanned "Education for the Nation's Defense." But, not more than about a quarter of the magazine's readers in any one of the classes generally read the feature thoroughly. Most readers usually simply scanned that particular article:

"As you know, 'Education for the Nation's Defense' is a regular feature of SCHOOL LIFE. Do you generally read this feature thoroughly, just scan it, or do you seldom read it at all?"

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class  
who generally:

	Read "E. N. D." thoroughly	Scanned "E. N. D."	Seldom read "E. N. D." at all	Total
State administrators..	26%	60%	14%	100% (50)
City superintendents...	7	74	19	100% (31)
City supervisors.....	18	53	29	100% (28)
High-school principals.	25	47	28	100% (36)
Elementary school principals.	27	40	33	100% (15)
High-school teachers...	14	35	51	100% (57)
Subscribers..	25	50	25	100% (134)

More than 85% of the most faithful SCHOOL LIFE readers within each class of respondents generally at least scanned "Education for the Nation's Defense." But, even these readers tended only to scan the feature rather than read it thoroughly. Those who were less faithful readers of SCHOOL LIFE as a whole showed an even greater tendency only to scan "Education for the Nation's Defense" if they read it at all:

Percent of these readers in each group of  
readership types within given classes of  
readers who generally:

	Read "E. N. D." thoroughly	Scanned "E. N. D."	Seldom read "E. N. D." at all	Total
<u>State administrators, city superintendents or super- visors</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers...	27%	65%	8%	100% (52)
"Periodic" or "occasion- al" readers, "frequent scanners".....	14	64	22	100% (42)
"Occasional scanners" or non-classifiable.....	-	47	53	100% (15)
<u>High-school principals</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers...	35	53	12	100% (17)
"Periodic" or "occasion- al" readers, "frequent scanners".....	17	50	33	100% (12)
"Occasional scanners" or non-classifiable.....	14	29	57	100% (7)
<u>High-school teachers</u>				
"Constant," "frequent se- lective," or "periodic" readers, "frequent scanners".....	33	53	14	100% (21)
"Occasional readers"...	4	26	70	100% (23)
"Occasional scanners" or non-classifiable.....	-	23	77	100% (13)
<u>Subscribers</u>				
"Constant" or "frequent selective" readers...	36	53	11	100% (73)
"Periodic" or "occasion- al" readers, "frequent scanners".....	14	53	33	100% (42)
"Occasional scanners" or non-classifiable.....	5	32	63	100% (19)

A majority of those who generally at least scanned "Education for the Nation's Defense" rated it as being only "fairly useful" to them. But no more than one-third of those who at least scanned the feature in any class of readers (and, for several classes, considerably less than a third) rated it as being "not particularly useful" at all. Thus, the readers generally tended to rate "Education for the Nation's Defense" in much the same way as they rated SCHOOL LIFE as a whole--as being moderately useful:

"How useful do you find the information you get there--very useful, fairly useful, not particularly useful?" (Asked only of those who generally at least scanned "E. N. D.")

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class who:

Found "E. N. D.":

	<u>Very useful</u>	<u>Fairly useful</u>	<u>Not particularly useful</u>	<u>Did not read "E. N. D."</u>	<u>Total</u>
State administrators.....	24%	50%	12%	14%	100% (50)
City superintendents.....	13	42	26	19	100% (31)
City supervisors.....	18	39	14	29	100% (28)
High-school principals.....	28	33	11	28	100% (36)
Elementary-school principals.....	7	53	7	33	100% (15)
High-school teachers.....	12	28	9	51	100% (57)
Subscribers.....	17	38	20	25	100% (134)

Percent of those who generally at least scanned "Education for the Nation's Defense" in each class who:

Found "E. N. D.":

	<u>Very useful</u>	<u>Fairly useful</u>	<u>Not particularly useful</u>	<u>Did not read "E. N. D."</u>	<u>Total</u>
State administrators.....	28%	58%	14%	-%	100% (43)
City superintendents.....	16	52	32	-	100% (25)
City supervisors.....	25	55	20	-	100% (20)
High-school principals.....	39	46	15	-	100% (26)
Elementary-school principals.....	10	80	10	-	100% (10)
High-school teachers.....	25	57	18	-	100% (28)
Subscribers.....	23	51	26	-	100% (100)

A few respondents volunteered the reasons for the only moderate rating they gave "Education for the Nation's Defense." Some said that they had usually already received the information from other sources. Others said that much of the information included was not particularly pertinent to activities that fell under their jurisdiction. Some readers felt that the information was of too general a nature to help them meet their own problems in the area of defense.

I N S U M M A R Y:

A majority of the SCHOOL LIFE readers in most of the classes generally at least scanned both the regular bibliographic features and "Education for the Nation's Defense." Readership of the features was particularly high among the most faithful readers of the magazine as a whole. Those who generally went over the bibliographies followed up on references found there rather frequently. "Education for the Nation's Defense" was generally rated as being only moderately useful.

## VII. SPECIAL ISSUES

Opinion of SCHOOL LIFE readers among the respondents as to the desirability of special issues of the magazine devoted to single subjects (like the Atomic Energy issue and the White House Conference issue) was quite evenly divided; approximately one-third of the respondents stated a preference for more special issues, another third favored only occasional special issues, while the remaining third favored having no special issues at all:

"(Show respondent the March issue of SCHOOL LIFE.) This was a special issue of SCHOOL LIFE devoted to the White House Conference on Children and Youth. You may recall an earlier special issue that was devoted entirely to Atomic Energy and Education. By and large, would you prefer to see more issues devoted to a single subject in this fashion, would you prefer to have them only occasionally, or would you rather have all issues carry articles on a variety of subjects?"

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>
Favored having more special issues.....	36%
Favored having them only occasionally.....	30
Favored having no special issues.....	31
Don't know, don't care.....	3
	<hr/>
	100%
	(351)

City supervisors from the free distribution list, the elementary-school principals, and paid subscribers tended to favor special issues more than did the other classes of readers. The high-school principals on the free distribution list and the teachers in high schools receiving free copies of SCHOOL LIFE were most inclined to favor cutting out special issues completely:

Percent of readers in each class  
who favored having:

	More spe- cial issues	Only occa- sional spe- cial issues	No special issues	Don't know; don't care	Total
State administrators.....	28%	36%	34%	2%	100% (50)
City superintendents.....	23	45	26	6	100% (31)
City supervisors.....	46	29	21	4	100% (28)
High-school principals...	30	17	47	6	100% (36)
Elementary-school principals.....	47	20	33	-	100% (15)
High-school teachers.....	28	21	47	4	100% (57)
Subscribers.....	43	32	23	2	100% (134)

Since there are few respondents in some of the classes in this sample, the magnitude of the difference in preference between some of the groups is subject to considerable sampling variation, but there is little question that city supervisors and the paid subscribers favored special issues more than did most of the other classes.\* An internal analysis of the data gives us at least suggestive leads as to some of the possible sources of the variation.

It will be noticed that of the three classes on the state and municipal supervisory level, the city supervisors are by far most in favor of special issues. In the section on readership it was pointed out that, while members of all three of the top supervisory groups tend to read at least something in practically every issue of SCHOOL LIFE, the state administrators and city superintendents read or scan a larger proportion of the articles in each issue than do the city supervisors (about 55% of the former two groups and only 39% of the latter group at least scanned half or more of the articles in an issue they happened to see). Thus, while all three groups were quite receptive to SCHOOL LIFE, the over-all present content of regular issues was apparently of more interest to the state administrators and city superintendents than it was to city supervisors. It seems possible that the present diversity of subject-matter in issues

---

\*The sample of readers among the elementary-school principals is too small to make any definitive statement about their attitude towards special issues.

of SCHOOL LIFE made it most serviceable to the two higher administrative groups while the city supervisors, with less broad duties and interests, would prefer special issues devoted to subjects of interest to them. The following tabulation of preference for special issues by proportion of articles in current issues read by the top administrative groups shows that those administrators who look at half or more of the articles in an issue of SCHOOL LIFE were less likely to favor having more special issues than those who looked at fewer than half the articles:

Percent of those readers who are  
state administrators, city superintendents,  
or city supervisors who at least looked at:

	<u>Half or more of the articles in an issue</u>	<u>Less than half of the articles in an issue</u>
Favored having more special issues.....	26%	38%
Favored having them only occasionally..	47	26
Favored having no special issues.....	27	28
Don't know, don't care.....	-	8
	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 100% (55)*	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 100% (53)*

In general, it might be expected that readers who found the regular issues most valuable would have been least likely to favor a change to more frequent special issues, while those who derived less benefit from regular issues would have been more disposed to welcome special issues. As the data below indicate, this is the case: The readers who said they valued the information on the activities of the Office of Education and other government agencies carried regularly by SCHOOL LIFE, and who felt that this information could not be readily found elsewhere were less likely than any other group of readers to want more special issues:

---

\*The two groups do not total to the 109 top administrators interviewed because one supervisor failed to answer the question on the proportion of articles read.

Percent of those readers who are  
state administrators, city superintendents,  
or city supervisors who stated that:

	They found in- formation on O. of E. or other Gov. agencies valu- able and dis- tinctive to <u>S. L.</u>	They found in- formation on matters other than O. of E. or other Gov. agencies valu- able and dis- tinctive to <u>S. L.</u>	They found <u>S. L.</u> is at least mod- erately conven- ient but can think of no dis- tinctive valu- able informa- tion it con- tains	They could easily get along without <u>S. L.</u>
Favored having more special issues.....	5%	32%	50%	31%
Favored having them only occa- sionally.....	67	34	27	26
Favored having no special issues.....	28	34	20	30
Don't know, don't care.....	-	-	3	13
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(21)	(35)	(30)	(23)

As may be seen above, among those readers more favorably disposed to special issues there are three groups:

First, there were those readers who felt that SCHOOL LIFE was an at least moderately valued source of information but who couldn't think of any valuable information or ideas to be in SCHOOL LIFE which couldn't be readily gotten from some other source. These readers were most in favor of special issues. This is no doubt due to the fact that their generally favorable feeling towards SCHOOL LIFE leads them to believe that special issues would be of interest to them while their feeling that the regular issues had no distinctive value prevented the possible loss of a regular issue from being a deterrent to special issues.

Second, there are the readers who stated that they valued SCHOOL LIFE for general attributes of the information it carries (for instance, the perspective given to the reader's own activities or the timeliness of the information), as a bibliographic source, or for other similar features probably not so distinctive to SCHOOL LIFE as the information on the activities of the Office of Education and other government agencies. This group was rather evenly split in opinion on special issues. This may

well be due to the fact that some of these readers did depend on the regular issues for certain types of information and could see no reason to have special issues while others used it only as a secondary source and so they wanted to see more special issues devoted to subjects of interest to them.

The third group of readers more favorably disposed to special issues expressed the feeling that they could easily get along without SCHOOL LIFE. Opinion on special issues is also quite evenly divided in this group. This might possibly be due to the fact that part of the group would have liked to have SCHOOL LIFE more interesting to them and so wanted to see a change made from the regular issues while the rest of the group wasn't particularly interested in SCHOOL LIFE and didn't particularly feel it would be more interested even if SCHOOL LIFE put out special issues.

We have seen that among administrators, the readers who found the regular issues particularly valuable were far less likely to favor having more special issues than the readers who got less service from the regular issues. As was indicated in the section on readership of the magazine, the principals and teachers from the high schools on the free distribution list as a whole found SCHOOL LIFE far less useful than did the top administrators. One might thus expect these high-school principals and teachers to have been particularly in favor of having more special issues of SCHOOL LIFE devoted to subjects of interest to them. But, earlier in this section it was shown that the high-school principals and teachers were more opposed to special issues than was any other group of readers (47% of the two high-school groups preferred to have no special issues at all as compared to 31% for the total sample of readers).

An explanation for this lack of desire for special issues on the part of the teachers and principals might lie in their generally only moderate interest in Office of Education publications and activities. It seems possible that readers who did not express any particular interest in the Office of Education and its publications might not have expected to be any more interested in special issues than they were in regular issues of SCHOOL LIFE and thus not see any particular reason for having special issues. The table below supports this explanation. It can be seen that high-school teachers and principals who stated that they were "very interested" in reading articles on the "program and activities of the U. S. Office of Education" were more likely to favor having special issues of SCHOOL LIFE than were those teachers and principals who were only "moderately" or "not" interested:

Percent of teachers and principals from  
high schools on the free distribution list  
who were:

	<u>"Very interested" in the activities of the O. of E.</u>	<u>Not "very interested" in the activities of the O. of E.</u>
Favored having more special issues.....	44%	19%
Favored having them only occasionally...	18	20
Favored having no special issues.....	38	54
Don't know, don't care.....	-	7
	<hr/> 100% (39)	<hr/> 100% (54)

This relation between high interest in the activities of the Office of Education and preference for special issues of SCHOOL LIFE does not contradict the relation established for the administrative group between the rating of SCHOOL LIFE's material on the Office of Education's activities as valuable and distinctive and the preference for regular issues over special issues. Only 2% of the teachers and principals (as compared with 23% of the administrators) named SCHOOL LIFE as their normal source of information about the activities of federal agencies. Thus, it is clear that high interest in information about the activities of the Office of Education did not in itself necessarily lead to the view that such information carried in regular issues of SCHOOL LIFE was particularly valuable or distinctive. For this reason, it was possible for high interest in information about the Office's activities to have made one more likely to prefer special issues to regular issues, while at the same time a high regard for such information carried in SCHOOL LIFE had the opposite effect.

The following table illustrates the operation of these two factors simultaneously. Here, the relation of the respondent's rating of the utility of one of the regular features of SCHOOL LIFE, "Education for the Nation's Defense", with his attitude towards special issues is examined at two levels of interest in the Office of Education's activities. It will be noted that at both levels of interest in the Office, the higher the rating given the utility of this regular feature of SCHOOL LIFE, the less likely the reader was to prefer special issues. It will also be noted that at each of the three levels of the utility rating of the regular feature, the higher the reader's interest in the Office, the more likely he was to prefer special issues. The readers most in favor of having more special issues were the ones who were very interested in the Office of Education but who seldom or never read the regular feature of SCHOOL LIFE:\*

---

\*Although the number of respondents in each of the groups in this table is extremely small, the symmetry of the percentages when considered in conjunction with the size of the differences leads to the conclusion that this result is statistically reliable.

Percent of teachers and principals from high schools on the free distribution list who:

	Favored having more special issues	Favored having occasional special issues	Favored having no special issues	Don't know; don't care	Total
20%	20%	60%	-%		100% (10)
47	16	37	-		100% (19)
60	20	20	-		100% (10)
14	-	86	-		100% (7)
17	22	61	-		100% (18)
21	24	41	14		100% (29)

SCHOOL LIFE readers who were:

"Very interested" in the activities of the O. of E. and who:  
 Found "Education for the Nation's Defense" very useful.....  
 Found "Education for the Nation's Defense" moderately or not very useful.....  
 Seldom or never read "Education for the Nation's Defense".

Not "very interested" in the activities of the O. of E. and who:  
 Found "Education for the Nation's Defense" very useful.....  
 Found "Education for the Nation's Defense" moderately or not very useful.....  
 Seldom or never read "Education for the Nation's Defense".....

The class of readers composed of paid subscribers to SCHOOL LIFE was one of the groups most likely to prefer special issues. From the fact that these respondents have subscribed to the magazine and from the interview material discussed in the section on general readership, it is clear that this group is by and large favorably disposed to SCHOOL LIFE. It is also clear, though, that as a whole, the subscribers, among whom are educators at all levels in the school system, were less interested in the type of information particularly distinctive to SCHOOL LIFE than were the top administrators from the free distribution lists; for instance, 30% of the top administrators were "very interested" in articles introducing new specialists on the staff of the Office of Education while only 18% of the subscribers were "very interested" in such articles. Thus, the subscribers as a group have the two attributes that would have led them to prefer an increase in the number of special issues of SCHOOL LIFE: a favorable attitude toward the magazine but an only moderate interest in the more distinctive content of the regular issues.

Many subscribers thus appear to have read the magazine for its general content rather than for its more specialized material. Some readers, when asked what sort of information they got in SCHOOL LIFE that they couldn't readily get elsewhere, volunteered that they could get just about anything they get out of SCHOOL LIFE out of Periodical G or their state educational association journal. Such readers might well be expected to have preferred special issues in place of the regular issues of SCHOOL LIFE.

The following table bears out this expectation. The respondents were asked: "Which, if any, of the school journals are generally useful sources of information or ideas about problems (facing the schools today) like those you've mentioned?" It can be seen that those subscribers who mentioned SCHOOL LIFE as a generally useful source of information or ideas were less likely to prefer special issues than those who didn't mention SCHOOL LIFE, whether or not they also mentioned Periodical G or state journal. It can also be seen that those respondents who mentioned Periodical G or the state journal as a generally useful source were more likely to prefer special issues to regular issues than those who didn't mention these journals in both the group that mentioned SCHOOL LIFE and the group that did not. It is thus clear that for the subscribers, also, the readers who found SCHOOL LIFE's regular content most valuable or who were most dependent on it were less likely to want special issues than were the readers who had other preferred sources for the information in the regular issues:

	Percent of subscribers who:			
	Mentioned S. L. as a generally useful source and who:	Didn't mention S. L. as a generally useful source and who:	Mentioned the state EA or Periodical G	Didn't mention the state EA or Periodical G
Favored having more special issues.....	32%	25%	59%	40%
Favored having them only occasionally.....	36	35	30	31
Favored having no special issues.....	27	40	11	25
Don't know, don't care....	5	-	-	4
	100% (22)	100% (20)	100% (44)	100% (48)

A qualification to the foregoing analysis arises out of the distribution pattern of SCHOOL LIFE. The high schools receiving free issues of SCHOOL LIFE are generally small (all the schools have fewer than 1,000 students and 60% of them have fewer than 300 students) and are located in small towns (almost all are in towns of fewer than 50,000 population and the vast majority are located in rural areas or towns of under 10,000). The subscribers work predominantly in large schools in the large metropolitan centers. Unquestionably, there are marked differences between the needs and attitudes of the personnel of small schools in small towns and of the personnel of large schools in urban centers. Thus, the difference between the personnel of the high schools on the free distribution list and the subscribers in preference for special issues may have been due in large part to the differences in needs and attitudes arising from the dissimilarity of situations in which these two groups work. In fact, the respondents' attitudes towards SCHOOL LIFE that we found to be related to their preference for special issues may be attitudes reflective of the dissimilarity in situations.

It is impossible to examine this speculation from the present study because the sample of readers interviewed was based on the free distribution list and the subscription list and thus almost no small-town or rural readers not on the free distribution list and almost no teachers or principals from urban centers who were not subscribers were interviewed. We cannot, for instance, determine whether non-subscribers in urban centers favor having more special issues. The fact remains, though, that teachers and principals in the smaller towns and in rural areas evidenced relatively little desire for more than occasional special issues of SCHOOL LIFE.

#### I N S U M M A R Y :

Opinion on the desirability of special issues of SCHOOL LIFE was evenly divided, about a third of the respondents favoring more special issues than at present, a third favoring only occasional special issues, and a third favoring having no special issues. City supervisors and subscribers were most in favor while teachers and principals from the free distribution list were least in favor of having special issues. Two factors related to preferences with respect to special issues were the degree to which the reader found the regular content of SCHOOL LIFE of value and the reader's interest in the activities of the Office of Education. The readers who found SCHOOL LIFE's regular content particularly valuable were less likely to favor special issues than those who found the regular content of less value. The readers who were most interested in the Office's activities were more likely to prefer special issues of SCHOOL LIFE than were those readers who were less interested. Respondents who were not particularly interested in the Office's activities probably felt that even though the usual content of SCHOOL LIFE was not of great value to them, they had no reason to assume they would be any more interested in the content of special issues.

Suggestions for Topics to be Discussed in Special Issues

The readers suggested an overwhelming variety of topics they would like to have discussed in special issues of SCHOOL LIFE, if there were to be special issues. No single fairly specific topic was mentioned by a substantial proportion of respondents. The following table shows the percentage of respondents suggesting topics in various different subject-matter areas. It should be remembered that since many of the suggestions were highly specific, this tabulation of necessity indicates only the general areas of interest and not the specific topics requested. Illustrative examples of suggestions falling into the various categories follow the table:

"If there are to be special issues, what topics would you like to have discussed in them?"

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>
1) Life adjustment education and its specific aspects.....	21%
2) Techniques in the teaching and handling of students.....	16
3) Administrative problems.....	14
4) Over-all theory and evaluation of education...	10
5) General social problems.....	9
6) Curricular problems.....	9
7) School and community.....	9
8) Defense.....	7
9) Government and the schools.....	7
10) Democracy, Communism, totalitarianism, international relations.....	5
11) Professional training and development of educators.....	4
12) Education for special groups.....	3
13) Miscellaneous specific problems.....	5
14) Timely subjects or current events in the field of education (the responses in this category were predominantly vague and general).....	16
Don't know.....	23
Some respondents gave more than one answer....	158% (351)

## Illustrative Examples of the Suggestions

### Falling into the Various Categories

- 1) Life adjustment education and its specific aspects: life adjustment education for world citizenship, what the secondary-school pupil of the atomic age is thinking, business education and work experience programs, the teaching of handicapped pupils, individuality of the child, guidance and mental hygiene.
- 2) Techniques in the teaching and handling of students: new teaching aids and devices, audio-visual instruction, education potentials in television, discipline, teaching driver safety, trends in teaching the tool subjects, relation between teacher and pupil.
- 3) Administrative problems: teacher shortage, school housing needs, more equitable distribution of finances to the public schools, school district re-organization, school organization with stress on practical things that have been tried.
- 4) Over-all theory and evaluation of education: philosophy of education, elementary school evaluation, adequate program of elementary education, new theories of learning, values of education, modern trends in education.
- 5) General social problems: delinquency, racial tolerance, housing, causes of graft and corruption, assimilation of foreign born, dissolution of the family, community planning.
- 6) Curricular problems: curriculum planning for social studies in the elementary schools, curricular revision, place of athletics in the high school, place of required library reading in high-school English courses, suggestions for different programs in teaching English.
- 7) School and community: public relations of the schools, role of parent vs. role of teacher, cooperation between schools and parents, how to explain the role of the school to the community.
- 8) Defense: schools and the defense program, civilian defense, defense regulations.
- 9) Government and the schools: congressional activities and debate concerning education, national and state legislative trends concerning education, effects of federal aid to education, activities of the Office of Education.
- 10) Democracy, Communism, totalitarianism, international relations: Communism in the schools, Democracy vs. totalitarianism, the MacArthur situation, foreign policy, the role of the schools in preventing World War III.
- 11) Professional training and development of educators: teacher education, in-service training, preparation for educational leadership.

- 12) Education for special groups: Negro education, adult education, vocational schools.
- 13) Miscellaneous specific problems: study of relative change in autonomy at state and local level and state and national level, schools of special localities, study of a single classroom, modern science developments.
- 14) Timely subjects or current events in the field of education: current educational problems, take problems as they come up, outstanding problems of the day, anything that is vital, current programs and conferences, American Book Week.

By and large, the differences between the various classes of readers in suggestions for special issues were in the direction one would expect on a priori grounds. Administrators tended to suggest topics in the areas of the "over-all theory and evaluation of education" and "administrative problems" more frequently than did the teachers. The teachers' responses were more heavily restricted to the areas of "techniques in the teaching and handling of students" and "life adjustment education and its specific aspects" than were those of the other classes of reader:

Percent of readers in each class suggesting topics in given subject-matter area:

	State admin- istrators	City super- intendents	City supervisors	H. S. principals	E. S. principals	H. S. teachers	Sub- scribers
1) Life adjustment.....	20%	13%	21%	17%	13%	25%	23%
2) Techniques.....	8	3	14	17	7	19	22
3) Administrative.....	16	32	11	14	20	7	12
4) Theory and evaluation....	18	13	11	8	13	5	9
5) General social problems..	8	10	-	11	13	12	10
6) Curricular problems.....	10	16	11	17	-	5	7
7) School and community.....	4	10	14	8	27	5	9
8) Defense.....	12	6	4	11	7	7	5
9) Government and schools...	8	13	11	11	7	7	3
10) Democracy, Communism, etc.	6	3	-	3	-	9	6
11) Professional training....	12	6	4	-	-	2	4
12) Special groups.....	12	3	4	3	-	2	1
13) Miscellaneous specific...	2	-	4	3	-	5	9
14) Timely subjects.....	20	23	14	14	13	16	13
Don't know.....	22	26	25	19	40	18	22
Some respondents made more than one suggestion.....	178% (50)	177% (31)	148% (28)	156% (36)	160% (15)	144% (57)	155% (134)

I N S U M M A R Y :

The suggestions for topics to be discussed in special issues were extremely heterogeneous. No single specific topic was mentioned by a substantial proportion of readers.

VIII. COVER AND FORMATThe Cover

The covers were very well received. Two-thirds of the readers particularly commended them, while only about one in ten made any criticisms or suggestions for change:

"For some time now, SCHOOL LIFE has used this type of cover (show respondent front cover). How does it strike you--is there anything you especially like or dislike about it?"\*

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>	<u>Percent of those readers expressing a positive or negative opinion</u>
Commendation only.....	67%	85%
Mixed response--a sugges- tion for change along with a commendation.....	2	3
Unfavorable criticism or a suggestion for change only.....	9	12
Doesn't care about cover, it's all right, it's at- tractive enough, I wouldn't bother to change it.....	21	-
Don't know.....	1	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100% (351)	100% (273)

The commendations of the cover were primarily directed at the picture or at the cover as a whole. The criticisms and suggestions were more heterogeneous in character. In more detail:

---

\*The respondents were shown the March and April, 1951 covers of SCHOOL LIFE.

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>	<u>Percent of all readers expressing a positive or negative opinion</u>
<u>Commendations</u>		
<u>Like the pictures.....</u>	31%	40%
<u>Like routing box, summarized table of contents.....</u>	5	7
<u>Like heaviness of paper, colors.</u>	6	8
<u>Cover improved over what it used to be.....</u>	2	3
<u>Cover as a whole is distinctive, (or) pleasing, (or) distin- guished looking, etc.....</u>	30	39
<u>Criticisms and Suggestions</u>		
<u>Change the subject matter of the pictures.....</u>	4	5
<u>Dislike layout: routing box shouldn't be on front page, layout is messy.....</u>	3	4
<u>Miscellaneous specific sugges- tions: use heavier paper, use brighter colors, use softer colors, naturally colored pictures.....</u>	3	3
<u>General dislike for cover: it looks awful, it looks cheap, it looks like advertising matter.....</u>	3	4
<u>Neutral Opinions</u>		
<u>Doesn't care about cover, it's all right, it's attractive enough, I wouldn't bother to change it.....</u>	21	-
<u>Don't know.....</u>	1	-
Some respondents gave more than one answer.....	109% (351)	113% (273)

Because readers were free to talk about any aspect of the cover that seemed important to them, the wide array of responses to this question indicates an apparent lack of any highly specific consensus in reaction to the cover. The following discussion illustrates the variety of the responses summarized in the foregoing table. The reader should keep in mind the essentially idiosyncratic character of the individual responses.

Some of the respondents praising the cover were quite enthusiastic about it. Examples of features of the pictures mentioned as praiseworthy are: "the activity in the picture," "the human interest," "the democratic nature," and "the variety." Many respondents were particularly pleased by the covers shown them because they contained pictures of children--for example: "I think the covers are fine; the children look happy. The cover points out that, after all, the well-being of children is our main concern."

Several respondents volunteered that they used the covers for display purposes and a few respondents even stated that they would like to get reprints of the cover.

One of the covers shown the respondents, the cover of the March, 1951 issue, has a picture of a group containing both Negro and white children. Three respondents (all Southern) voiced an objection to the association of Negro and white children, while a few other Southern respondents volunteered that this aspect of the picture didn't bother them. Over 95% of the respondents didn't appear to take notice of the inter-group aspect one way or the other, although several respondents did commend the cover as being democratic and were undoubtedly referring to this feature.

A few readers favored greater variety in the subject-matter of the pictures. A high-school teacher who had attempted to have her students read the magazine felt that the youthfulness of the children pictured tended to deter high-school students from reading the magazine, so she favored having older children pictured more often. Another reader favored having teachers pictured more often. Other similarly unique suggestions were made.

There was no appreciable variation in response to the cover by the different classes of respondents (state administrators, municipal administrators, principals, etc.).

#### I N S U M M A R Y :

By and large, the readers of SCHOOL LIFE indicated satisfaction with the current type of cover. The few unfavorable criticisms that were made were heterogeneous in character and usually involved aspects of the cover that were specifically commended by other readers.

### The Format

About one out of every five readers either suggested some change in SCHOOL LIFE format or expressed disapproval of the present format. Most of the rest of the respondents either expressed explicit satisfaction with the present format, stated they had no suggestions to make, or stated that format didn't concern them. The question:

"What about the format or physical make-up of the magazine otherwise (aside from the cover)--what, if any, changes would you suggest?":\*

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>	<u>Percent of those readers expressing a positive or negative opinion</u>
Commendation only.....	33%	60%
Mixed response--a sugges- tion for change along with a commendation.....	4	8
Unfavorable criticism or a suggestion for change only.....	18	32
No suggestions for change, it's all right now, I don't care about format.	38	-
Not well enough acquainted with magazine to say, don't know.....	7	-
	<u>100%</u> (351)	<u>100%</u> (193)

The specific aspects of format most frequently discussed were the page size, the type of paper, and the need for more or better illustrations. In detail:

---

\*It should be noted that in the question on format, the respondent was asked only for suggestions for changes, while in the question on the cover he was asked for both suggestions and commendations. Thus, the lower percentage of commendations for the format than for the cover cannot be taken to indicate less satisfaction with format.

	<u>Percent of all readers</u>	<u>Percent of all readers expressing a positive or negative opinion</u>
<u>Commendations</u>		
<u>Commended present page size.....</u>	3%	6%
<u>Commended paper presently in use...</u>	6	10
<u>Miscellaneous specific commenda- tions: like type, pictures are good, headings are good, page layout is good, etc.....</u>	11	20
<u>General approval: like everything as it is, it looks dignified, very readable, etc.....</u>	24	43
<u>Criticisms and Suggestions</u>		
<u>Should use smaller pages.....</u>	9	17
<u>Dislike glossiness of paper.....</u>	5	8
<u>Need more or better illustrations, pictorial material, charts and graphs.....</u>	6	11
<u>Miscellaneous specific suggestions or unfavorable criticisms: type hard on eyes, shouldn't use three columns of type, use larger type, articles shouldn't be split into parts and scattered throughout magazine, etc.....</u>	7	13
<u>General suggestions or disapproval: make it look more like a commer- cial publication, it looks too cheap, it needn't be so fancy-- they're wasting too much money on format, etc.....</u>	3	5
<u>Neutral Opinions</u>		
<u>No suggestions for change, it's all right now, I don't care about format.....</u>	38	-
<u>Not well enough acquainted with the magazine to say, don't know.....</u>	7	-
<u>Some respondents gave more than one answer.....</u>	119% (351)	133% (193)

As in the case of the question concerning the cover, the specific responses summarized by the above table were highly diversified. The following elaboration on some of the content categories should be taken as being merely illustrative.

Suggestions for a smaller page size varied from pocket-size up to about 7 x 10 inches. There was no particular clustering of responses around any particular page size among the 9% of the readers suggesting smaller pages.

Among the reasons given for smaller pages were the difficulty of filing the magazine at its present size and the difficulty of handling it owing to its thinness. Several respondents suggested that it should be pocket-sized for increased convenience in carrying the magazine around with them so that it could be read in spare moments. Other respondents, commending the present page size, gave as their reason the fact that the magazine was easy to handle and file.

It should be pointed out that only 12% of the respondents even mentioned page size in response to the unstructured question on format. This indicates that page size is not a particularly salient consideration to a majority of SCHOOL LIFE's readers and that there certainly is no strong general dissatisfaction with the present size of the pages. It is possible that, if given the specific choice, a majority of the readers might select a somewhat different page size, but there was no strong pressure for such a change and no clear indication of what the preferred page size might be.

The criticisms of the paper used were mainly that its glossiness made the magazine difficult to read under certain lights. A few respondents felt that the use of such high quality paper was an unnecessary extravagance.

In the case of the paper used, as well as in the case of the use of more pictorial materials or changes in general make-up of the magazine, the same consideration as was discussed under changes in page size holds. Although it might be that the majority of readers would prefer certain changes in format, no such change is felt to be particularly necessary by any appreciable proportion of readers; the majority of the readers expressed general satisfaction with the present format and suggested no particular changes.

#### I N S U M M A R Y:

The present data do not allow us to conclude whether or not a majority of the readers, if given the choice, might favor some specific format changes such as a decrease in page size, the use of a paper with a duller finish, or an increase in the use of pictorial materials. But, it is clear that most readers are not dissatisfied with the present format of the magazine and that no specific aspect of it is found to be generally objectionable.

A P P E N D I X I

Tables

APPENDIX TABLE I

"How or where do you normally get your information about the activities of federal agencies which pertain to education and the schools?" (Asked of all respondents.)

	Percent of respondents in each class mentioning given source of information about activities of federal agencies pertaining to education and the schools:					
	State administrators	City superintendents	City super- visors	H. S. principals	E. S. principals	High- school teachers
<u>SCHOOL LIFE</u> .....	27%	18%	16%	5%	-%	25%
<u>U. S. Office of Education</u> .....	59	29	23	14	-	19
<u>Other federal government agencies</u> .....	31	15	32	9	12	39
<u>National Education Association</u> .....	24	18	26	27	34	13
<u>National professional periodicals or organizations</u> .....	43	26	23	18	38	41
<u>State or local professional periodicals or organizations</u> .....	2	9	23	14	19	7
<u>Mass media</u> .....	4	6	6	16	12	21
<u>State or local school system</u> .....	12	24	32	32	41	19
<u>Teachers' institutes, colleges</u> .....	4	15	6	9	19	6
<u>Miscellaneous</u> .....	12	12	6	9	-	8
<u>Unclassifiable</u> .....	-	-	-	-	-	1
<u>None, don't know</u> .....	-	9	6	5	3	3
Some respondents mentioned more than one source of information.....	218% (51)	181% (34)	199% (31)	158% (44)	178% (32)	171% (135)
						202% (143)

APPENDIX TABLE II

"In general, what are your chief sources for information concerning defense regulations and programs affecting the schools?" (Asked of readers only.)

	Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given source of defense information:						
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
	24%	6%	7%	3%	7%	5%	7%
<u>SCHOOL LIFE</u> .....	22	6	4	6	7	4	4
<u>U. S. Office of Education</u> .....	20	23	18	8	7	9	19
<u>Federal government agencies (other than O. of E.)</u> .....	14	10	4	17	-	12	15
<u>Professional publications</u> .....	20	10	-	17	13	33	16
<u>Mass media and non-school journals</u> .....	18	6	4	-	-	2	4
<u>Professional associations</u> .....	30	42	79	44	47	40	43
<u>Through own state or local school system</u> .....	4	3	4	-	13	2	1
<u>Non-professional associations</u> .....	16	42	25	36	47	18	25
<u>Local civilian defense organizations</u> .....	4	3	-	-	-	4	2
<u>Miscellaneous</u> .....	2	3	-	-	-	-	1
<u>Vague, unclassifiable</u> .....	6	-	4	6	-	12	11
<u>None, don't know</u> .....	180% (50)	154% (31)	149% (28)	137% (36)	141% (15)	141% (57)	148% (134)
Some readers mentioned more than one source.....							

APPENDIX TABLE III

"What sorts of material do you usually obtain?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who at least scanned the bibliographic features and obtained materials on the basis of these listings.)

	Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning that they obtained material on given subject-matter:						
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
Teachers and teaching.....	22%	26%	18%	28%	53%	18%	37%
Current administrative considerations	16	35	14	6	13	5	10
Education for special groups.....	8	-	4	-	-	-	7
Jobs and occupations.....	4	-	4	6	-	4	6
The school and the community.....	4	-	4	3	7	-	4
International relations.....	2	6	4	-	7	2	6
Obtained material but type unclassifiable.....	14	16	25	3	7	5	15
Miscellaneous.....	2	-	-	3	-	-	5
No answer, don't remember.....	2	-	4	-	-	2	4
Question not asked.....	48	45	36	61	40	70	34
Some readers mentioned more than one type of material.....	122% (50)	128% (31)	113% (28)	110% (36)	127% (15)	106% (57)	128% (134)

APPENDIX TABLE IV

"What (other) sources do you use for information about government publications in the field of education?" (Asked of readers only.)

	Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given source of information about government publications:						
	State administrators	City superintendents	City supervisors	H. S. principals	E. S. principals	High-school teachers	Subscribers
G. P. O. list and other federal government agencies.....	50%	32%	32%	14%	7%	16%	43%
Professional journals, educational organizations.....	38	42	64	22	47	32	34
Mass media and not specifically professional magazines.....	4	-	7	8	7	9	6
Libraries (except Library of Congress).....	14	3	7	8	20	12	5
State or local school system.....	16	13	7	17	13	18	10
College or university.....	2	3	4	-	-	9	4
Miscellaneous organizations (non-professional).....	2	3	-	3	-	4	3
Miscellaneous.....	6	6	-	6	-	2	10
Vague, unclassifiable.....	-	-	4	-	-	2	4
SCHOOL LIFE only source.....	2	3	4	3	-	-	1
Doesn't need information--publications are sent unsolicited.....	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
None, don't know, not interested in government publications.....	6	6	7	25	20	28	15
Some readers mentioned more than one source.....	146% (50)	111% (31)	136% (28)	106% (36)	114% (15)	132% (57)	135% (134)

APPENDIX TABLE V

"What regular procedures, if any, do you use in your office to bring SCHOOL LIFE to the attention of board members, members of your staff, and others who should see it or who should see some articles in it?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who were school administrators including school librarians, high-school principals, and subscribers who were elementary-school principals.)

	Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given procedure:						
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
Leave issues in regular, available spot.....	32%	19%	25%	42%	-%	-%	23%
Circulate regularly to staff.....	20	35	14	11	-	-	5
Call special attention to various articles.....	40	48	57	44	-	-	31
Discuss in staff meetings.....	6	6	21	22	-	-	9
Use no special procedures--practically everyone gets it.....	12	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know, don't do anything.....	24	29	21	14	-	-	6
Question not asked.....	-	-	-	-	100	100	50
Some respondents mentioned more than one procedure.....	134% (50)	137% (31)	138% (28)	133% (36)	100% (15)	100% (57)	124% (134)

APPENDIX TABLE VI

"Among the members of your staff, or the teachers under your supervision, what proportion would you estimate to read SCHOOL LIFE at all regularly--more than half, less than half, none of them?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who were school administrators including school librarians, high-school principals, and subscribers who were elementary-school principals.)

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given proportion of staff reading SCHOOL LIFE regularly:

	State administrators	City superintendents	City supervisors	H. S. principals	E. S. principals	High-school teachers	Subscribers
<u>More than half</u> .....	46%	10%	4%	6%	-%	-%	8%
<u>Less than half</u> .....	36	64	53	67	-	-	34
<u>None of them</u> .....	6	3	7	19	-	-	4
<u>Don't know</u> .....	12	23	36	8	-	-	4
<u>Question not asked</u> .....	-	-	-	-	100	100	50
	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (28)	100% (36)	100% (15)	100% (57)	100% (134)

APPENDIX TABLE VII

"Do you make any special use of the contents of SCHOOL LIFE in your own bulletins or other publications; if so, how and about how often do you do so?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who were school administrators, including school librarians, high-school principals, and subscribers who were elementary-school principals.)\*

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given use made of contents of SCHOOL LIFE:

	State administrators	City superintendents	City superintendents	H. S. principals	E. S. principals	High-school teachers	Subscribers
Use in bulletins, speeches, manuals, etc.....	46%	42%	22%	33%	-%	-%	15%
Do not use, don't know.....	54	58	78	67	-	-	35
Question not asked.....	-	-	-	-	100	100	50
	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (28)	100% (36)	100% (15)	100% (57)	100% (134)

\*Since very few respondents were able to give any indication of how frequently they made use of the contents of SCHOOL LIFE in their own publications, this information is not presented here.

APPENDIX TABLE VIII

"How do you currently have access to SCHOOL LIFE--do you receive it directly by mail, is it routed to you in your office or at your school, or how?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who were elementary-school principals but not subscribers, all teachers, and all subscribers who were not administrators.)

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given means of access to SCHOOL LIFE:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers*
Get it by mail.....	4%	0%	0%	13%	4%	41%	
Routed by office or school.....	-	-	-	47	50	4	
Read it at place of work.....	-	-	-	13	16	2	
Miscellaneous.....	-	-	-	7	25	3	
No answer, don't know.....	-	-	-	7	5	-	
Question not asked.....	100	100	100	100	13	-	50
	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (28)	100% (36)	100% (15)	100% (57)	100% (134)

\*Several of the respondents whose names were taken from the subscription list had ordered SCHOOL LIFE but had not yet received any copies at the time of the survey.

APPENDIX TABLE IX

"How soon do you usually get to see it (S. L.)—right after it comes, or later? How much later?"  
 (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who do not receive SCHOOL LIFE by mail. Cf. Appendix Table VIII.)

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given amount of time elapsed before they see SCHOOL LIFE:

	State	City	City	H. S.	H. S.	E. S.	High-	Sub-
	adminis-	superin-	super-	princi-	princi-	pals	school	Sub-
	trators	tendents	visors	pals	pals		teachers	scribers
Right after it comes.....	-%	-%	-%	-%	20%	23%	1%	1%
Not immediately, but within a week...	-	-	-	-	7	17	3	3
After a week, but within two weeks...	-	-	-	-	-	14	2	2
More than two weeks later.....	-	-	-	-	33	32	2	2
Don't know, no answer.....	-	-	-	-	27	10	1	1
Question not asked.....	100	100	100	100	13	4	91	91
	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (28)	100% (36)	100% (15)	100% (57)	100% (134)	100% (134)

APPENDIX TABLE X

"How regularly does anyone call your attention to articles that may be of special interest to you--regularly, occasionally, or seldom or not at all?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who do not receive SCHOOL LIFE by mail. Cf. Appendix Table VIII.)

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioned given regularity with which their attention was called to articles of special interest:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
<u>Regularly</u> .....	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (28)	100% (36)	100% (15)	9% (57)	1% (134)
<u>Occasionally</u> .....	-	-	-	-	20	21	1
<u>Seldom, or not at all</u> .....	-	-	-	-	47	61	7
<u>Don't know, no answer</u> .....	-	-	-	-	13	5	-
<u>Question not asked</u> .....	100	100	100	100	13	4	91

APPENDIX TABLE XI

"Just off-hand what proportion of your colleagues would you say read SCHOOL LIFE at all regularly-- more than half, less than half, none of them?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who were elementary- school principals but not subscribers, all teachers, and all subscribers who were not administrators.)

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given proportion of colleagues reading SCHOOL LIFE regularly:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visor	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
<u>More than half</u> .....	- %	- %	- %	- %	13%	4%	7%
<u>Less than half</u> .....	-	-	-	-	60	68	27
<u>None of them</u> .....	-	-	-	-	7	10	9
<u>Don't know, no answer</u> .....	-	-	-	-	20	18	7
<u>Question not asked</u> .....	100	100	100	100	-	-	50
	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (28)	100% (36)	100% (15)	100% (57)	100% (134)

APPENDIX TABLE XII

"How often do you discuss things you read in SCHOOL LIFE with any of your colleagues--often, only occasionally, or not at all?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who were elementary-school principals but not subscribers, all teachers, and all subscribers who were not administrators.)

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioning given frequency with which they discussed SCHOOL LIFE with colleagues:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
<u>Often</u> .....	-%	-%	-%	6	7%	14%	7%
<u>Occasionally</u> .....	-	-	-	-	53	28	30
<u>Not at all</u> .....	-	-	-	-	27	56	13
<u>Don't know, no answer</u> .....	-	-	-	-	13	2	-
<u>Question not asked</u> .....	100	100	100	100	-	-	50
	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (28)	100% (36)	100% (15)	100% (57)	100% (134)

APPENDIX TABLE XIII

"With whom (do you discuss things you read in SCHOOL LIFE)?" (Asked of SCHOOL LIFE readers who said they discussed material from SCHOOL LIFE with colleagues at least occasionally. Cf. Appendix Table XII.)

Percent of SCHOOL LIFE readers in each class mentioned given classes of colleagues with whom they discussed material from SCHOOL LIFE:

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	High- school teachers	Sub- scribers
Peers.....	-%	-%	-%	-%	27%	39%	28%
Superiors.....	-	-	-	-	-	14	9
Subordinates.....	-	-	-	-	47	2	4
Students.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Miscellaneous.....	-	-	-	-	13	4	6
Don't know, no answer.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Question not asked.....	100	100	100	100	27	58	63
Some respondents mentioned more than one class of colleague.....	100% (50)	100% (31)	100% (23)	100% (36)	114% (15)	117% (57)	112% (134)

APPENDIX II

The Questionnaire

The Questionnaire:

The following is an exact reproduction of the questionnaire employed in the study:

I am working on a study for the United States Office of Education. This survey is part of the agency's effort to evaluate its current program of activities. Perfectly frank, honest answers will therefore be greatly appreciated.

Everything that you say will be kept completely anonymous. It will be used only in impersonal tabular summaries of answers obtained from some 500 teachers and administrators in a large number of states and local communities.

I would like to ask first--

1. As you see the school situation in this country at the present time, what seem to you to be some of the more important problems which the schools are commonly up against? Any others? (Probe fully.)

IMPORTANT NOTE: Record below as completely as you possibly can the verbatim answers, using the suggested probe--"any other problems?"--and such other probes as may be necessary to get a clear statement of each problem. Also, record in parentheses every probe used. Later--preferably after the interview is over--go over this verbatim material and list the several problems in the space that is provided at the top of Page 2.

(List here problems mentioned in verbatim answer to Q. 1.)

2. Of the problems you have just mentioned, which are particularly important here in \_\_\_\_\_ (use name of State or city)?
- 2A. Are there any particular problems, other than the ones you've mentioned, that are important to you as a school administrator or teacher here in \_\_\_\_\_ (city or State)?
3. Where do you usually turn for information and ideas bearing on any of these problems? Anywhere else? (Probe fully.)

Source of Information or Ideas

Comments, if volunteered

4. How frequently, if at all, do you find useful discussions of any of these problems in the school journals or other educational publications--very frequently, only occasionally, or not at all?
- 4A. (Ask those answering "very frequently" or "occasionally"): Which, if any, of the school journals are generally useful sources of information or ideas about problems like those you've mentioned? Any others? (Probe fully.)

5. Of course, no one could keep up with all the educational literature; everyone has to be satisfied with a limited amount of reading. Just because of this, we would like to find out what publications teachers and administrators, by and large, have found especially useful and read more or less regularly. Here is a brief list of periodicals. (Hand respondent List I.)

5A. Will you tell me which of the periodicals on this list you read regularly, which only occasionally, and which very seldom or not at all? Let's say that reading a periodical "regularly" means that you spend some time reading at least half the issues of it.

- (1) NEA JOURNAL
- (2) NATION'S SCHOOLS
- (3) SCHOOL REVIEW
- (4) THE GRADE TEACHER
- (5) SCHOOL LIFE
- (6) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL JOURNAL
- (7) PHI DELTA KAPPAN
- (8) THE INSTRUCTOR
- (9) SCHOOL AND SOCIETY
- (10) EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
- (11) THE SCHOOL EXECUTIVE
- (12) EDUCATION DIGEST

5B. What other educational periodicals, if any,--national, state, or local--do you read regularly?

6. Now I would like to ask some questions about the United States Office of Education and some of its publications. As far as you've had any opportunities to observe, what are the activities--or kinds of activities--of the Office of Education at present? Any other activities that you know of? (Probe fully.)

7. What (other) activities, if any, do you think the Office of Education should undertake? Any others?

8. From what you know or may have heard, how would you rate the job that the U. S. Office of Education is now doing--would you say it's good, fair, or poor?

8A. (If "fair" or "poor"): Why would you rate it that way?

9. Have you ever tried to get help from the Office of Education in dealing with your own problems of school administration or teaching?

9A. (If "yes"): What were some of these problems? Any others?

Problems

Comments, if volunteered

10. How or where do you normally get your information about the activities of federal agencies which pertain to education and the schools?

11. One source of information about the educational services of the federal government is, of course, SCHOOL LIFE, a monthly magazine put out by the Office of Education. How regularly, if at all, have you seen this publication--quite regularly, only occasionally, or not at all?

FOR THOSE ANSWERING "NOT AT ALL" IN QUESTION 11, SKIP TO QUESTION 30. FOR ALL OTHER RESPONDENTS, ASK QUESTION 12 AND ALL FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

ASK QUESTIONS 12-29 ONLY OF THOSE PERSONS WHO, IN RESPONSE TO Q. 11, ANSWERED "Quite regularly", OR "Only occasionally". FOR ALL OTHER RESPONDENTS SKIP TO QUESTION 30.

12. About how many issues of SCHOOL LIFE have you read during the present school year? (Enter number of issues read.)

13. About how many articles would you say you generally read in any issue of SCHOOL LIFE--all of them, half or more, less than half, not more than one article?

14. For the articles you read, how do you rate your reading of them--do you read them thoroughly, or just scan them?

15. Taking SCHOOL LIFE as a whole, how serviceable is it to you--that is, is it a very convenient, highly valued source of information and ideas; is it only a moderately convenient and valued source; or could you very easily get along without it?

15A. (Unless "could easily get along without it"): What kind of valuable information or ideas do you get from SCHOOL LIFE that you couldn't conveniently find elsewhere?

16. For their own guidance, editors of SCHOOL LIFE would like to know what kinds of articles school teachers and administrators find most interesting or helpful. Will you run through this list of subjects with me (hand respondent List II), and indicate how interested you would be in a good article on each of them? How about No. 1--would you be very interested, only moderately interested, or not interested in it? (Run through entire list.)

- (1) Summaries and highlights of certain educational conferences
- (2) Information about international educational organizations--objectives, programs, activities, etc.
- (3) Information about new educational aids--teaching devices, methods, etc.
- (4) Articles pointing out new or imminent educational developments and problems with discussion of their implications
- (5) Summaries and interpretations of findings of educational research
- (6) Information about federal legislation pertaining to education
- (7) Articles on the program and activities of the U. S. Office of Education
- (8) Information about educational programs and activities of other federal agencies
- (9) Information about defense regulations and discussions of how the schools can fit into the defense program
- (10) Information about services available through the federal government in connection with shortages of critical materials and equipment
- (11) Articles introducing new specialists on the staff of the Office of Education

17. Which, if any, of these subjects (same list) do you think the magazine SCHOOL LIFE should give more space to and which, if any, should it give less space to?

(1) - (11) -- same list as question 16.

18. Aside from the amount of space devoted to these subjects, what changes, if any, would you like to see SCHOOL LIFE make in the way it handles any of these subjects? Any other changes? (Probe fully and record suggestions clearly.)

No. (on list) of subject mentioned.	Suggested changes in handling subject.
-------------------------------------	--

19. (Open April issue of SCHOOL LIFE to "Education for the Nation's Defense," p. 104.) As you know, "Education for the Nation's Defense" is a regular feature of SCHOOL LIFE. Do you generally read this feature thoroughly, just scan it, or do you seldom read it at all?
- 19A. (Ask unless "seldom read it at all"): How useful do you find the information you get there--very useful, fairly useful, not particularly useful?
- 19B. (ASK OF ALL RESPONDENTS): In general, what are your chief sources for information concerning defense regulations and programs affecting the schools?
20. How useful do you find these bibliographical features which SCHOOL LIFE carries at the back of each monthly issue (open the April issue to p. 112)? Do you generally go over these lists rather completely, do you scan them quickly, or do you seldom read them at all?
- 20A. (If "go over completely" or "scan"): About how many times during an average school year do you order or get from a library any of the books, pamphlets, and theses you find out about through these listings?
- 20A(1) (If any): What sorts of material do you usually obtain?
21. What (other) sources do you use for information about government publications in the field of education?
22. (Show respondent the March issue of SCHOOL LIFE.) This was a special issue of SCHOOL LIFE devoted to the White House Conference on Children and Youth. You may recall an earlier special issue that was devoted entirely to Atomic Energy and Education. By and large, would you prefer to see more issues devoted to a single subject in this fashion, would you prefer to have them only occasionally, or would you rather have all issues carry articles on a variety of subjects?
23. If there are to be special issues, what topics would you like to have discussed in them?
24. For some time now, SCHOOL LIFE has used this type of cover (show respondent front cover). How does it strike you--is there anything you especially like or dislike about it? Anything else?
25. What about the format or physical make-up of the magazine otherwise--what, if any, changes would you suggest?
26. Well, I have asked you a lot of questions about the content and form of SCHOOL LIFE. Now, do you have any particular criticisms or suggestions about aspects of SCHOOL LIFE which we have not covered? If so, I would like very much to have them.

QUESTIONS 27-29 WILL BE ASKED OF (1) ALL SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, INCLUDING SCHOOL LIBRARIANS, (2) HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, AND (3) ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS WHO ARE SUBSCRIBERS. See Interviewer Assignment Sheet to check proper category of individual respondent.

27. What regular procedures, if any, do you use in your office to bring SCHOOL LIFE to the attention of board members, members of your staff, and others who should see it or who should see some articles in it?
28. Among the members of your staff, or the teachers under your supervision, what proportion would you estimate read SCHOOL LIFE at all regularly--more than half, less than half, none of them?
29. Do you make any special use of the contents of SCHOOL LIFE in your own bulletins or other publications; if so, how and about how often do you do so?

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS 27-29 WILL BE ASKED OF (1) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS WHO ARE NOT SUBSCRIBERS, (2) ALL TEACHERS, AND (3) ALL SUBSCRIBERS WHO ARE NOT ADMINISTRATORS. See Interviewer Assignment Sheet to check proper category of individual respondents.

27. How do you currently have access to SCHOOL LIFE--do you receive it directly by mail, is it routed to you in your office or at your school, or how?  
(If "routed" or "other", ask 27A and B)
- 27A. How soon do you usually get to see it--right after it comes, or later? How much later?
- 27B. How regularly does anyone call your attention to articles that may be of special interest to you--regularly, occasionally, or seldom or not at all?
28. Just off-hand what proportion of your colleagues would you say read SCHOOL LIFE at all regularly--more than half, less than half, none of them?
29. How often do you discuss things you read in SCHOOL LIFE with any of your colleagues--often, only occasionally, or not at all? (Unless "none" in answer to Q. 28.)
- 29A. (If "often" or "occasionally"): With whom?
30. I know this is a difficult question, but can you recall any instances where articles in SCHOOL LIFE or other Office of Education publications had an important effect on action--i.e., on what was done, or the way it was done? (Specify)

31. Finally, may I ask whether you have any suggestions as to how the Office of Education could do a more adequate job of keeping people like yourself informed about its activities?

FACTUAL DATA

1. What is your present job? (Probe for specific description.)
2. How long have you held this position?
3. With what kind, or kinds, of school is your work associated?
4. How long have you been in school work of some kind?
5. Aside from your present position, what kinds of school work have you done--teaching, administrative work, other (specify)?
6. Do you plan to stay in some kind of school work? (Record any qualifications.)
7. If you were absolutely free to choose, what kind of educational work would you like most to do?
8. Will you please tell me about your educational background--your formal schooling?
9. Sex
10. Age. What is your approximate age?
11. Race
12. (Teachers, principals, and librarians only): What is the name of the school in which you work?
13. Where is your place of work? Town or City, State.
14. Had you heard anything about this survey before I began talking to you here today?
- 14A. (If "yes"): What did you hear this survey was about?
15. Interviewer's signature
16. Date of interview
17. Time of interview
18. Enter here respondent's number from assignment sheet

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE I, Part A

"As you see the school situation in this country at the present time, what seem to you to be some of the more important problems which the schools are commonly up against?"

"Of the problems you have just mentioned, which are particularly important here in \_\_\_\_\_ (use name of state or city)?"

"Are there any particular problems, other than the ones you've mentioned, that are important to you as a school administrator or teacher here in \_\_\_\_\_ (city or state)?"\*

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Given Problem							
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>PROBLEMS OF FINANCE AND FACILITIES (excluding simply low salaries)</u>								
<u>Inadequate finances, general facilities.....</u>	86%	85%	74%	61%	66%	67%	64%	59%
<u>Need for more special facilities (better audio-visual aids, larger libraries, better dietary program, more p.e. equipment)....</u>	22	15	10	14	16	33	14	17
<u>RELATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY</u>								
<u>Public relations of schools (parents don't understand what schools are trying to do, hatred by rank and file of what is going on in the schools, lay public isn't interested enough in the schools)....</u>	41	47	58	34	44	25	18	38
<u>Organized obstructionist movements against public schools (movement on part of parochial and private schools to discredit public schools, red-baiting of teachers, men like Zoll).....</u>	12	12	19	2	6	4	1	12
<u>Political pressure and interference in schools (political corruption in the schools, political appointments to school positions).....</u>	8	3	6	16	6	4	8	5

\*The responses to all three questions were combined for this tabulation.

(Table continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE I (Continued), Part B

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Given Problem							
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>DIFFERENTIALS IN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES</u>								
<u>Differentials in educational opportunities (segregation, race, class, or regional differentials).....</u>	12%	18%	6%	7%	3%	2%	4%	9%
<u>PROBLEM ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR OF STUDENTS (including drop-outs, truancy, lack of diligence, character problems)</u>								
<u>Attitude and behavior problems due to improper home training (working mothers make it necessary for schools to engage in character training previously done by home, parents no longer teach morality and respect for others).....</u>	2	12	13	34	22	16	15	17
<u>Attitude and behavior problems due to general social conditions (unrest in students due to uncertainty about draft, war; too many distractions in modern society).....</u>	2	3	6	20	3	18	12	18
<u>Attitude and behavior problems due to miscellaneous or un- ascribed factors (discipline problem due to the breakdown of the hold of the church, general unrest among students).....</u>	6	18	3	23	34	23	36	18

(Table continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE I (Continued), Part C

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Given Problem							Sub- scrib- ers
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>SCHOOL PERSONNEL</u>								
<u>Shortage of teachers (without reference to their competence)...</u>	16%	15%	13%	11%	9%	7%	9%	9%
<u>Shortage of competent, motivated, teachers.....</u>	63	53	48	30	50	25	26	34
<u>Shortage of competent administrators.....</u>	12	-	-	5	6	2	3	4
<u>Low salaries and economic insecurity of teachers.....</u>	25	32	39	27	25	35	37	22
<u>Low salaries and economic insecurity of administrators.....</u>	6	-	-	2	3	-	-	1
<u>Need for more and better teacher training and guidance (more in- service training, better guidance at teachers' colleges).....</u>	35	18	19	2	9	9	3	17
<u>Need for changes in internal school organization (more super- vision of teachers, teachers should be allowed more discretion)</u>	4	-	3	5	3	7	6	7
<u>Hardships of the teacher and their consequences (over-crowded classes produce mental strain in the teacher, lack of free time for the teacher, lack of public appreciation of teacher's prob- lems makes her job unendurable).....</u>	-	3	6	5	12	9	21	11
<u>Miscellaneous personnel problems (high turn-over of teachers, a system should be found to retire teachers on the basis of in- competency rather than age, need for teacher affiliation with national and local organizations to build their morale).....</u>	12	6	19	2	6	4	5	14

(Table continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE I (Continued), Part D

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Given Problem							
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>TEACHING, CURRICULUM, STUDENT GUIDANCE</u>								
Adjustment of the curriculum to meet the needs of the student in modern life (need for an experience-centered curriculum, education for life adjustment, teach citizenship and democracy, make education more practical).....	41%	26%	35%	18%	22%	23%	12%	27%
Trend towards "progressive education" (respondent disapproves of the trend) (need more stress on learning of the basic skills (3 R's, tool subjects), we're being too democratic in schools, it is impossible to handle children when you are not allowed to punish them physicaly)..	-	3	-	5	-	9	18	8
Reconciliation of "modern" and "regular" education--teaching and curricular decisions in general (with no identifiable preference for the predominance of either type of education) (maintaining the proper balance between the hand and the mind, making curriculum decisions, current curriculum is too much of a hodge-podge, we need standards for grading and promotion, we need a philosophy of education).....	18	24	19	16	16	9	21	14
Need for more and better facilities for guidance and for the handling of exceptional children (excluding "slow learner" and "gifted child")	22	24	13	9	31	5	3	17
Slow learner (heterogeneity of present groupings is bad, need for vocational education for slow learner, need for special education for those not going to college).....	12	21	10	9	9	2	13	15
Gifted child (need special facilities for fast learner).....	4	3	6	2	3	4	3	6
Need for co-ordination and standardization of education and facilities (problem of transfer of credits, integrating transfer students, co-ordination of community health and welfare services with the school).	16	9	-	5	3	5	3	1
Need to teach morality and religion in the school (religious training should be introduced in the public schools).....	6	12	3	2	3	-	3	7
Miscellaneous teaching and curricular problems (how to set up a program of elementary school evaluation, how to interest rural students in literature).....	6	9	16	23	25	11	27	21

(Table continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE I (Continued), Part E

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Given Problem							
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>MISCELLANEOUS PROBLEMS BEARING ON NONE OF THE ABOVE</u> <u>MAJOR CATEGORIES</u>								
(re-districting of schools, consolidation of schools, improvement of county roads so that rural children can get to school, educational problems of children of migrant workers).....	<u>20%</u>	<u>21%</u>	<u>29%</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>20%</u>
Respondents mentioned more than one problem.....	509% (51)	492% (34)	473% (31)	407% (44)	451% (32)	363% (57)	391% (78)	448% (143)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE II

"Where do you generally turn for information and ideas bearing on any of these problems? (problems mentioned in response to Question 1)"

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Given Source of Information and Ideas

	State administrators	City superintendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub scribers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
SCHOOL LIFE.....	2%	6%	6%	2%	-%	-%	-%	12%
U. S. Office of Education (other than references to S. L. specifically)	63	26	13	14	3	4	1	15
State, county, or local school system (to my superiors, to my principal, faculty conferences, board of education, superintendent of public instruction).....	61	50	61	61	59	51	50	37
National Education Association (and its publications).....	31	26	26	23	25	16	14	22
Educational organizations (exclusive of NEA) (CTA, Headmaster's Association, PTA, Phi Delta Kappa).....	45	29	35	14	34	12	8	15
Professional meetings and conferences (conventions, outstanding national leaders in the field).....	8	26	13	14	12	9	5	21
Professional education and training (extension courses, summer institutes, workshops).....	-	9	10	9	12	21	10	17
Professional literature and libraries.....	39	68	58	48	41	51	44	57
College or university consultative services.....	33	35	23	14	28	14	8	15
General reading (not specifically in the field of education).....	2	9	16	5	16	14	18	17
General community sources and specifically non-educational reading (informed lay people in the community, church officials, Saturday Evening Post, service clubs, welfare agencies).....	27	21	29	25	28	18	24	23
Informal conversation and exchange (compare ideas with others, talk to other educators, friends of mine).....	18	15	13	16	28	21	23	23
Miscellaneous (experiences of similar agencies, political science)	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	1
Don't know, no answer, uncodable answer only.....	8	-	6	9	-	2	8	3
Some respondents mentioned more than one source.....	339%	320%	305%	254%	286%	233%	216%	278%
	(51)	(34)	(31)	(44)	(32)	(57)	(78)	(43)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE III

"How frequently, if at all, do you find useful discussions of any of these problems (problems mentioned in Question 1) in the school journals or other educational publications--very frequently, only occasionally, or not at all?"

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Finding Useful Discussions of Problems with Given Frequency

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>Very frequently</u> .....	69%	62%	81%	64%	69%	55%	45%	57%
<u>Only occasionally</u> .....	31	32	16	32	31	40	45	38
<u>Not at all</u> .....	-	3	3	4	-	5	10	5
<u>Don't know, no answer</u> .....	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	100% (51)	100% (34)	100% (31)	100% (44)	100% (32)	100% (57)	100% (78)	100% (143)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE IV

"Now I would like to ask some questions about the United States Office of Education and some of its publications. As far as you've had any opportunities to observe, what are the activities--or kinds of activities--of the Office of Education at present?"

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Given Type of Activity							
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
					Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.		
Research in the field of education.....	55%	56%	42%	27%	31%	23%	13%	36%
Publication and distribution of educational materials.....	71	65	74	32	56	49	27	72
Provision of assistance, consultation, information to educators and local school systems.....	76	62	52	23	28	21	18	41
Leadership in the improvement of the schools (works out educational poli- cies, sets up conferences, favors a more active program to meet the needs of the learner, helps make teaching a real profession).....	35	24	29	20	12	23	19	14
Administration of federal aid--liaison between the schools and federal agencies (administers P.L. 815 and 874, helps schools get building priori- ties, in charge of the distribution of federal funds to assist vocational education, administers agricultural education program).....	20	21	10	-	6	5	6	9
Promotion of federal aid to education (discusses and investigates federal aid to education, serves as a lobbying group for funds, responsible for P.L.'s 815 and 874, they're behind the federal aid plan).....	-	18	6	14	-	5	5	7
Action as a pressure group--influencing of federal legislation (aside from federal aid)--does public relations work for the schools (supports public education before Congress, promotes favorable public opinion for the schools)	4	18	19	14	9	12	3	9
Administration of programs of international education exchange.....	2	3	13	-	9	4	1	3
Dissemination of information about governmental activities.....	12	12	10	2	3	-	-	5
Miscellaneous (sponsors Future Homemakers of America, services the National Science Register).....	2	3	-	2	3	-	1	1
Clearly mistaken conceptions (administers federal laws on what should be taught in the schools, administration of Indian schools, governs and regu- lates curriculum).....	-	-	3	5	3	2	4	2
Don't know, no answer.....	2	3	-	30	16	25	47	9
Some respondents mentioned more than one type of activity.....	279%	285%	258%	169%	176%	169%	144%	208%
	(51)	(34)	(31)	(44)	(32)	(57)	(78)	(143)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE V

RATING OF RESPONDENTS' KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION\*

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Indicating Given Degree of Knowledge About the Office of Education's Activities							
	State administrators	City superintendents	City supervisors	H. S. principals	E. S. principals	H. S. Teachers		Subscribers
						Acquainted with S. L.	Not acquainted with S. L.	
Fairly full or full knowledge about the O. of E.'s activities.....	27%	29%	14%	5%	-%	7%	1%	6%
Moderate knowledge about O. of E.'s activities.....	51	41	43	27	40	12	15	43
Slight knowledge about O. of E.'s activities.....	20	27	43	36	44	55	36	43
No correct knowledge about O. of E.'s activities.....	2	3	-	32	16	26	48	8
	100% (51)	100% (34)	100% (31)	100% (44)	100% (32)	100% (57)	100% (78)	100% (143)

\*These ratings are based on the response to the question reported in Supplementary Table IV ("As far as you've had any opportunities to observe, what are the activities--or kinds of activities--of the Office of Education at present?")

The highest rating, "fairly full or full knowledge", was given when the response indicated knowledge about at least three or four areas of activity with at least fairly full knowledge about at least two of them or general knowledge about at least four or five areas and a clear correct conception of the general function of the Office. Examples of responses receiving this rating are:

"I would say first and foremost to gather and disseminate useful information to the local school. Leadership in assisting schools to improve their services through co-operative planning in conferences...support of public education on a national level through Congress and other sources, they support better understanding through the public generally... the distribution of federal funds to state and local districts."

"Publication of SCHOOL LIFE; general supervision of vocational education; supervision of federal school building surveys; publication of biennial reports and other factual information; holding of work conferences on regional and national basis; promotion of life adjustment program."

(Table continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE V (Continued)

The "moderate knowledge" rating was given when the response indicated vague, general knowledge of three different types of activities, or fairly full knowledge of one type of activity and at least general knowledge about some other type, or full knowledge about one type of activity. Examples of responses receiving this rating are:

"They do a lot of surveys and have a lot of publications that we get and speakers that we hear...activities about exchange teachers with foreign countries."

"To be honest, I'm not too familiar. I do know they hold conferences, they make various statistical studies, they issue bulletins that are valuable to both the elementary and secondary teacher. I presume they have helped in getting legislation passed."

The third rating, "slight knowledge", was given for a vague, general, but correct response like "I suppose they put out lots of things useful to teachers", "they publish all sorts of pamphlets", or "they publish the research they do on educational problems." Also, highly specific responses that indicated knowledge of only one form of activity like "I recently saw a pamphlet they put out on home economics", or "they administer P.L. 874" were given this rating.

The lowest rating, "no correct knowledge", was given when the respondent did not even venture a guess or guessed incorrectly about the O. of E.'s activities.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE VI

"What (other) activities, if any, do you think the Office of Education should undertake?"

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Suggesting That the Office of Education Engage in Given Type of Activity							
	State administrators	City superintendents	City super-visors	H. S. principals	E. S. principals	H. S. Teachers		Subscribers
						Ac- quainted with S. L.	Not ac- quainted with S. L.	
<u>Equalization and standardization of education throughout the country (see that people in all parts of the country have the same educational opportunities, standardize curriculum, set up uniform personnel and facilities standards throughout the country, standardize college entrance requirements).....</u>	2%	9%	6%	14%	22%	9%	18%	13%
<u>Co-ordination of activities of local units (set up and co-ordinate research studies schools can work on together, co-ordinate education and child welfare agencies throughout country, encourage activities on a regional rather than state basis).....</u>	8	6	13	5	-	5	1	6
<u>Solution of financial problems of schools (should give financial aid to schools, should promote federal aid).....</u>	2	6	6	16	12	9	15	6
<u>Public relations or lobbying for schools (give more information about school problems to the general public, propaganda--sell schools to public, direct and influence legislation of interest to education).....</u>	8	21	10	7	16	7	8	10
<u>Research and evaluation (look into school housing program, evaluate teaching credentials, work on curriculum problems).....</u>	16	21	29	16	16	7	6	14
<u>Publication and distribution of materials (develop more vocational training films, distribute materials for use in in-service teacher training, more guidance materials).....</u>	12	3	3	5	6	4	6	10
<u>Provision of assistance, consultation, information (help us improve our curriculum, expand its advisory facilities, provide guidance for new teachers, help us solve our problems).....</u>	24	15	13	2	19	7	9	12
<u>Improvement of educational system by supplying leadership or by unspecified means (see to it that we get higher salaries, give us more free time, raise compulsory attendance age, encourage us to read more, supply national leadership).....</u>	8	9	19	11	16	16	12	17
<u>Miscellaneous (bring materials up to date, support private as well as public education, take the small school into account).....</u>	8	3	-	5	-	2	5	6
<u>No suggestions--am satisfied now.....</u>	4	12	6	11	6	4	-	8
<u>Don't know, no suggestions.....</u>	45	32	39	36	41	49	44	40
<u>Some gave more than one suggestion.....</u>	137%	137%	144%	128%	154%	119%	124%	142%
	(51)	(34)	(31)	(44)	(32)	(57)	(78)	(143)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE VII

"From what you know or may have heard, how would you rate the job that the U. S. Office of Education is now doing--would you say it's good, fair, or poor?"

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Rating the Office of Education at Given Level

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Sub- scrib- ers
<u>Good</u> .....	41%	56%	42%	55%	53%	34%	26%	50%
<u>Fair</u> .....	45	29	36	16	16	30	22	27
<u>Poor</u> .....	8	3	6	5	6	4	10	5
<u>Don't know, no answer</u> .....	6	12	16	24	25	32	42	18
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(51)	(34)	(31)	(44)	(32)	(57)	(78)	(113)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE VIII, Part A

"Why would you rate it that way?" (asked in connection with the respondent's rating of the Office of Education--the question reported in Supplementary Table VII)\*

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Offering Given Explanation or Qualification of Rating of the Office of Education

	State administrators	City superintendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scribers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
Owing to its position in the governmental structure (lacks authority to carry out a program, political uncertainties hamper its activities, should have independent cabinet status, too highly subject to political pressures, has no power, should be divorced from FSA, should be removed from Ewing's control).....	31%	24%	16%	18%	6%	9%	6%	15%
Owing to inadequate funds and facilities (needs more funds, needs a larger staff, its travel budget is too restricted).....	43	9	16	-	-	5	3	7
Owing to its own organization (tries to do too much, poor in- ternal co-ordination of its activities, it lacks a program, too frequent changes in personnel).....	8	6	13	2	-	-	-	2
Owing to its impersonality--lack of practicalness of help offered (personnel has been away from active school work too long, they seem so remote from us, they deal with intangibles too much, not much help in solving local problems, they should visit us more often, lack warm personal touch).....	33	15	23	2	16	9	10	16
Owing to inadequate publicity of its activities (too few people know about it, they need wider publicity, they don't keep people well enough informed of their activities).....	2	3	6	-	19	11	8	10

\*This question was asked only of those respondents who rated the O. of E. as "fair" or "poor". Some respondents who rated it as "good" or who failed to rate it at all volunteered certain qualifications or other comments that were also included in this tabulation.  
(Continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE VIII (Continued), Part B

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Offering Given Explanation or Qualification of Rating of the Office of Education

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>Owing to their lack of accomplishment (for unspecified reasons)</u> (should be more of a moving force toward improvement, should offer dynamic leadership, they haven't really improved the schools so far).....	6%	3%	13%	5%	6%	5%	1%	6%
<u>Education should be locally autonomous*</u> (direction of education should remain with the states, the states are big enough to take care of their own problems, the federal government shouldn't interfere with education, O. of E. should advise--not dictate to the states).....	6	9	10	20	12	11	14	11
<u>Miscellaneous</u> (they should collaborate more with the NEA, they should be more autonomous of the NEA, their field men are not competent enough).....	6	3	3	-	3	-	-	1
<u>Vague, irrelevant, general discontent</u> (I think they could do so much better, I don't say anything is good unless I know more about it, if it were good I'd have heard more about it).....	-	6	3	2	3	9	9	4
<u>Don't know, no answer</u> .....	2	3	-	-	-	4	3	1
<u>Question not asked and no additional qualifications volunteered.</u>	22	35	45	55	56	54	52	49
<u>Some respondents offered more than one explanation or qualification</u>	159% (51)	116% (34)	148% (31)	104% (44)	121% (32)	117% (57)	106% (78)	122% (143)

\*All comments concerning the need for local autonomy in education were tabulated here regardless of where in the interview they were made. Many of these comments were not made as criticisms of the O. of E.'s current activities but rather as admonitions against future expansion of authority by the O. of E. or the federal government in general.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE IX, Part A

"What were some of these problems?" (Asked only of those respondents who answered "yes" to the question: "Have you ever tried to get help from the Office of Education in dealing with your own problems of school administration or teaching?"--the tabulation for this question is presented on page 43 of the full report.)

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Having Turned to the Office of Education for Help in Given Area of Activity

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>Administrative problems</u> (record-keeping procedures, personnel problems, school health program, setting up evaluation programs, drop-out problem, school costs, public relations problems, teacher training).....	59%	41%	39%	20%	9%	-%	3%	24%
<u>Teaching and handling of children</u> (exclusive of special education) (how to develop ideals of democracy in children, nutrition education, studies of adolescents, children 1-6, how to teach science, material on teaching 3 R's, playground and free activities).....	22	6	16	5	-	4	4	15
<u>Special education</u> (problems of slow learner, what is being done for deaf and blind, Negro education in South, practical nursing, dental assisting, vocational education).....	24	6	3	2	-	-	1	8
<u>Guidance</u> (vocational counseling, job finding, information on scholarships).....	20	6	3	-	3	4	1	6

(Continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE IX (Continued), Part B

	Percent of Respondents in Each Class Mentioning Having Turned to the Office of Education for Help in Given Area of Activity							
	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>Help in setting up conferences, study groups, institutes (they've supplied resource people for us, helped in setting up summer institute, material for PTA programs, materials for education faculty meeting, conference programming, they've sent a speaker for workshop).....</u>	18%	3%	3%	-%	6%	-%	1%	8%
<u>Miscellaneous (material on Pt. 4 program, junior college move- ment, "Survival Under Atomic Attack").....</u>	2	-	-	2	-	4	-	5
<u>Area in which help sought indeterminate (they've sent us statistical material, posters, books and pamphlets, resource people, I don't recall, don't know).....</u>	6	6	6	5	3	2	3	6
<u>Question not asked (hadn't turned to O. of E. for help).....</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>55</u>
Some respondents mentioned more than one area.....	163% (51)	115% (34)	110% (31)	104% (44)	105% (32)	102% (57)	101% (78)	127% (43)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE X, Part A

"Finally, may I ask whether you have any suggestions as to how the Office of Education could do a more adequate job of keeping people like yourself informed about its activities?"\*

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Offering the Given Suggestion as to How the Office of Education Could Do a Better Job in Keeping Them Informed

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	Not ac- quaint- ed with S. L.	
<u>Distribution of more timely informational material (issue weekly newsletter, send out special bulletin whenever anything of importance occurs, information should come out more promptly, by the time something comes out in S. L. it is already a dead issue, include an insert with last minute news in S. L.)</u> .....	10%	12%	13%	2%	3%	7%	3%	8%
<u>Wider and more direct distribution of informational material (send letter directly to teachers telling them what O. of E. does, send out more free materials, send out a free copy of S. L. at the beginning of each school year, communicate directly with teachers rather than through schools)</u> .....	18	21	32	27	49	40	50	30
<u>Distribution of briefer, more concise informational materials (send out short, concise bulletins, condense materials more)</u> .....	2	12	19	5	3	11	4	6
<u>Distribution of more attractive informational materials (put more punch into S. L., improve style of writing)</u> .....	4	-	6	2	-	-	-	7

\*Most of the respondents made suggestions concerning media of communication other than SCHOOL LIFE. About 10% of the respondents in each class made suggestions involving only modification of the content or distribution procedures of SCHOOL LIFE.

(Continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE X (Continued), Part B

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Offering the Given Suggestion as to How the Office of Education Could Do a Better Job in Keeping Them Informed

	State administrators	City superintendents	City superintendents	H. S. principals	E. S. principals	H. S. Teachers		Subscribers
						Acquainted with S.L.	Not acquainted with S. L.	
<u>Give O. of E. activities wider publicity (send more releases to newspapers, have other educational periodicals carry stories on O. of E., present material on O. of E. on radio and television, hire a public relations man).....</u>	6%	6%	-%	7%	25%	12%	10%	10%
<u>Establish more and better face-to-face contact between O. of E. representatives and educators (send field men around to the schools, give us more personal contact, have representatives talk to us at conferences, have a representative at each state capital--they are too distant from us now).....</u>	29	15	23	11	16	-	8	9
<u>Have superiors inform subordinates--disseminate information during teacher training (have principals discuss O. of E. at faculty meetings, work through state department of education, have O. of E. discussed at teachers college).....</u>	2	3	10	2	-	9	9	7
<u>More personalized attention (answer letters more promptly, give more specific aid to teachers, help out more with local problems)</u>	6	-	3	2	3	4	4	3
<u>Miscellaneous suggestions (make S. L. larger, regularly include a list of O. of E. services in S. L., send out separate bulletins covering specific fields, send out frequent flyers, have a special seal on O. of E. publications so that they will be readily identifiable, send out posters we can display in the library).....</u>	10	9	3	11	-	5	5	10

(Table continued on next page)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE X (Continued), Part C

Percent of Respondents in Each Class Offering the Given Suggestion as to How the Office of Education Could Do a Better Job in Keeping Them Informed

	State adminis- trators	City superin- tendents	City super- visors	H. S. princi- pals	E. S. princi- pals	H. S. Teachers		Sub- scrib- ers
						Ac- quainted with S.L.	Not ac- quainted with S.L.	
<u>No suggestions--O. of E. does an adequate informational job already (the fault doesn't lie with them--they send out the material--we just don't read it, they give us plenty of information now).....</u>	29%	24%	23%	16%	9%	12%	4%	16%
<u>No specific suggestions but feels that more information should be disseminated (information about O. of E. should be more accessible).....</u>	2	-	-	5	3	-	6	4
<u>Don't know, no answer, can't think of anything.....</u>	10	21	6	23	19	28	24	22
Some respondents made more than one suggestion.....	128% (51)	123% (34)	138% (31)	113% (44)	130% (32)	128% (57)	127% (78)	132% (143)