

~~FEB 9 1973~~ R47

~~FEB 5 1974~~ R50

~~FEB 28 1974~~ R4

~~FEB 5 1974~~ R15

~~MAR 15 1973~~

~~FEB 27~~ R16

~~MAR 2 1973~~ R17

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R14
R51

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R50

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R319

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R50

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R16

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R16

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R161

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R44

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R11

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R-058

~~MAY 28 1974~~ R10

ABSTRACT

EXPECTATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND RELEVANT OTHERS FOR THE ROLE OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN TEACHER - BOARD NEGOTIATIONS

by John H. Pylman

The Problem

This study attempts to clarify the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations by determining what high school principals, high school teachers, superintendents, and board members think this role should be. Inter-group differences were particularly sought as potential areas of role-conflict.

Procedure

Questionnaires recorded the expectations which the four respondent groups held for four groups of negotiation issues: administrative, curricular, evaluative, and teacher-salary -- each in relation to four principal-participation categories: involvement, negotiator-role, adviser-role, and educational-expert-role. The chi-square statistic (significance level = .05) was applied to determine inter-group differences. Of the 13 school districts in the study population, twelve districts participated; and more than 80% of the educators in these districts submitted usable study responses.

Findings

- I All groups (with 80% agreement) responded that high school principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies are determined.
- II Two thirds of the teacher and board member respondents believe that high school principals should not be involved when teacher salaries are negotiated. The expectations which high school principals presently hold for involvement in this area, therefore, cannot be realized unless teacher and board attitudes change.
- III Teachers, principals, and superintendents consistently contend that high school principals should not be negotiators in teacher-board negotiations on any issue. Board support for using principals as board-negotiators on evaluative or curricular issues will probably produce role-conflict for principals.
- IV Teacher and principal groups believe high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues are negotiated; the failure of superintendent and board member groups to agree on the question reflects a reluctance to share the principal-adviser. An adviser-both role, however, probably offers considerable potential for successful utilization of principals in teacher-board negotiations.

John H. Pylman

- V All groups with at least 68% agreement support the position that a high school principal representative, chosen by principals, should participate in teacher-board negotiations as an educational expert when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies are determined, and that no such educational expert should be involved when teacher salaries are negotiated.
- VI High school principals perceive fully the expectations held by board member and superintendent groups for the role of high school principals in teacher-board negotiations; and they perceive teacher expectations with 80% accuracy.
- VII High school principals as a group are consistent in their expectations for the role of high school principals in teacher-board negotiations, manifesting a 78% agreement level.

In short the results of this study suggest that high school principals should choose a principal representative who, as an educational expert, would advise both sides when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues are negotiated; attempts to involve principals when teacher salaries are negotiated will create disharmony.

**EXPECTATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
AND RELEVANT OTHERS FOR THE ROLE
OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
IN TEACHER - BOARD
NEGOTIATIONS**

by

John H. Pylman

A THESIS

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

College of Education

1968

651518

Copyright by
JOHN H. PYLMAN
1968

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges that the contributions of others have made this project possible. Appreciative expressions of thanks are extended:

To my wife Betty, for the inspiration and understanding that initiated and sustained this graduate program.

To Dr. Richard L. Featherstone whose vitally needed guidance of this project as committee chairman was accomplished in an atmosphere of professional encouragement, interest, and support.

To Dr. J. Allan Beegle, Dr. Charles A. Blackman, and Dr. Fred Vescolani for their valuable suggestions and recommendations which contributed greatly to the successful completion of this research.

To the many individuals and groups whose cooperation and participation made this study a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction to the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Definition of Terms	6
Objectives of the Study	8
Research Questions	8
General Study Hypotheses	9
Procedure	10
Limitations of the Study	11
Overview of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
Role Theory	14
Related Role Research	23
Related Negotiation Research	27
Summary	33
III. PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY	34
Introduction	34
General Methods of the Study	34
Development of the Instrument	35
The Sample	38
Statistical Hypotheses	38
Analysis Procedure	43
Summary	44
IV. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	44
Introduction	44
The Instrument	45
Participation Summary	46
Inter-Group Analysis	47
Principal Perceptions	69
Intra-Group Analysis:	
High School Principals	75
Board Members	78
High School Teachers	80

Chapter	Page
Summary:	
Inter-Group Analysis	93
Intra-Group Analysis	101
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	103
Introduction	103
Summary	103
Conclusions	111
Recommendations	112
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	114
Appendix B	146
BIBLIOGRAPHY	183

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participation Summary	46
2. Involvement of principals when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues are negotiated	47
3. Involvement of principals when teacher salary issues are negotiated	49
4-5. Principals as negotiators for curricular issues	50-51
6-7. Principals as negotiators for teacher-salary issues ..	53-54
8-10. Principals as negotiators for administrative issues ..	56-58
9-11. Principals as negotiators for evaluative issues	57-59
12-13. Principals as advisers for teacher-salary issues	60-62
14. Principals as advisers for administrative issues	64
15. Principals as advisers for evaluative issues	64
16. Principals as educational experts for administrative, curricular, evaluative, or teacher-salary issues ..	68
17. Principal perceptions of relevant groups and principal involvement in negotiations	71
18. Principal perceptions of relevant groups and principal involvement as negotiators	72
19. Principal perceptions of relevant groups and principal involvement as advisers	73
20. Principal perceptions of relevant groups and principal involvement as educational experts	74
21. Intra-group agreement among principals	77
22. Board member responses correlated with educational preparation	81

Table		Page
23.	Board member responses correlated with employment status	83
24.	Board member responses correlated with negotiator experience	85
25.	Board members as negotiators correlated with selected variables	87
26.	Teacher organizationalism correlated with selected variables	94
27.	Teachers as negotiators correlated with selected variables	96
28.	Principals correlated with district size	147-48
29.	Principals correlated with age	149-50
30.	Principals correlated with educational preparation ...	151-52
31.	Principals correlated with years as a high school principal	153-54
32.	Principals correlated with years as an educator	155-56
33.	Principals correlated with negotiations involvement ..	157-58
34.	Board members correlated with district size	159-60
35.	Board members correlated with years as board members .	161-62
36.	Board members correlated with age	163-64
37.	Board members correlated with union composite	165-66
38.	Teachers correlated with district size	167-68
39.	Teachers correlated with years as educators	169-70
40.	Teachers correlated with educational preparation	171-72
41.	Teachers correlated with age	173-74
42.	Teachers correlated by sex	175-76
43.	Teachers correlated by union composite	177-78
44.	Teachers correlated by organizationalism	179-80
45.	Teachers correlated with negotiator experience	181-82

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The dominant characteristic of our times is rapid change which pervades all aspects of our living. No individual, no group, and no institution ... can avoid this reality or escape its consequences.¹

Among the major changes occurring in education, collective negotiations are being initiated with increasing frequency between teachers and boards of education. Since 1965, twelve states have joined Wisconsin in granting legislative authorization to teacher negotiations; and twelve other states have similar legislation under consideration. Existing negotiations statutes cover approximately 25% of the teachers staffing schools throughout the United States, a fifth of this total being added during the 1965-66 legislative year.² In addition, many boards of education are negotiating voluntarily with teachers in the absence of legislation. Since the American Association of School Administrators and various school board associations now recognize negotiation as an appropriate means of

¹Archie R. Dykes, "The Emergent Role of Administrators and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships," Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration, eds. Roy B. Allen and John Schmid (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966), p. 23.

²"Professional Negotiations: Growth and Prospects," Education Digest (April, 1967), p. 14.

settling teacher-board differences, this trend should continue.

In Michigan, collective negotiations were approved for teachers in 1965 by Public Law 379, an amendment to the state labor law, the Hutchinson Act of 1947. More than 400 local teacher groups organized for negotiations during that first year, establishing precedents for other states. Since Michigan took the labor law route to negotiations, the management-employee approach has become part of the basic framework within which its educators operate today. For example, Michigan law has been officially interpreted to specify that principals and supervisors cannot participate on teacher bargaining teams and cannot vote in elections to determine the exclusive teacher bargaining unit. Clearly this management designation of principals may affect their interaction with teachers, as well as with superintendents and board members. Several authorities describe the position of middle administration as follows:

From the point of view of collective negotiations, the position of the teachers and board are relatively clear ... the positions of offices at various administrative levels in relation to these negotiations is by no means clear; ... [there is] growing frustration among administrators who see negotiations going on around them but rarely with them.³

The initial practical impact of a negotiated agreement in a school system falls most heavily on the local school principal. If representatives of this group have not had a voice in the drafting and bargaining of the contract, resentment and disaffection often follow.⁴

³Luvern L. Cunningham, "Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," A Paper Presented at the Conference on Professional Negotiations in Public Education (Chicago: August, 1966), p. 6.

⁴Wesley A. Wildman, "Teachers' Expectations for School Boards," A Paper Presented at the Cubberly Conference (Stanford University: July, 1966), p. 11.

Principals are generally excluded from the bargaining process ... yet these administrators ... [are] faced with responsibility for dealing with the new arrangements and agreements growing out of the bargaining process How can the principal influence the conditions of work when his discretion in this area is constantly eroded through agreements which he had no part in making?⁵

Non-participation ... [of principals] in the negotiations process is clearly unacceptable. No responsible group of principals would choose to sit on the sidelines while important matters of educational policy are being formulated. Nor would the negotiations process be as meaningful without the knowledge and insights that many principals can provide Above all, principals must not be spectators when decisions are made about the course of education in their communities.⁶

Have principals been relegated to an increasingly insignificant position in any negotiations? Such a shift would certainly depart considerably from previous educational practice. Close working relationships among teachers, principals, supervisors, and administrators, a requirement for good educational practices, have usually involved the principal extensively in policy making related to the working conditions of his teaching staff. The situation has apparently changed: teachers now discuss working conditions at the bargaining table with the board of education, no longer utilizing or involving the high school principals as in the past. Watson points to the potential danger this approach entails when he concludes that teacher negotiation of such issues as class size, promotions, assignments, transfers, and length of the school day, curbs the discretion and power of the principal.⁷ Where this situation exists the status of education as a

⁵Bernard C. Watson, "The Principal: Forgotten Man in Negotiation," Administrators Notebook, XV:2 (October, 1966), p. 18.

⁶William G. Carr, "The Principal's Role in Professional Negotiations," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin (April, 1966), p. 53.

⁷Watson, Administrators Notebook, p. 18.

unique enterprise, whose success depends largely upon the closeness of the working relationships among teachers, principals, administrators, and supervisors, is jeopardized.⁸ As Epstein, writing for the National Association of Secondary School Principals, observes:

The changing relationships among teachers, administrators, and school boards emerging from this heightened teacher militancy and producing sweeping forces that alter the status of the principal, his effectiveness in fulfilling administrative and supervisory responsibilities, and his role in educational leadership ... the NASSP is convinced that the best education of our students demands a genuine partnership of teachers, principals, superintendents, and school boards ... characterized by devotion to common aims, by mutual respect, by continuous frank communication, and by thorough recognition by each of the contributions, problems, and responsibilities of the others ... the task of educating youth is far too crucial and demanding to have it impeded by needless conflict among those dedicated to its maximum productiveness ... principals and other administrators have an important stake in the process of negotiations and agreement writing. Their functions, activities, responsibility, and authority are always a salient part of the discussions and decisions which emerge from negotiations. It is already too common a practice for principals not to participate or even be consulted during the process.

.....

In any negotiating process, principals, whose experience and activities give them a critical overall knowledge of the day-to-day functioning of the total school, can contribute uniquely to the discussion of items under consideration. The counsel, criticism, and contributions of principals at the negotiating table can be an invaluable service to teachers, school boards, and superintendents in reaching decisions that can produce better schools.⁹

Excluding principals from the negotiation process probably leads to contract agreements that contain built-in problems. Cronin cites negotiated contracts that contain policies, regarding teacher transfers,

⁸Education Digest, p. 15.

⁹Benjamin Epstein, The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations between Teachers and School Boards (Washington, D.C.: NASSP, 1965), pp. 1-6.

notice of promotions, and school scheduling, unworkable in practice. He notes the evidence from many superintendents of how useful a principal's testimony has often been in shaping workable contract provisions.¹⁰ Epstein as well contends that negotiations in which administrators have not participated directly generally produce contracts with serious built-in defects.¹¹

Jenkins and Blackman¹² concur with the American Association of School Administrators¹³ in arguing that close working relationships among educators contribute greatly to the quality of education in any community, and that these working relationships are important in all educational areas, including teacher-board negotiations. Considerable evidence suggests that these close relationships often do not extend to teacher-board negotiations, particularly when high school principals are excluded. In such cases, the various relevant groups¹⁴ will frequently have conflicting expectations concerning the high school

¹⁰Joseph H. Cronin, "School Boards and Principals - Before and After Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX:3 (November, 1967), p. 125.

¹¹Epstein, pp. 9-10.

¹²David H. Jenkins and Charles A. Blackman, Antecedents and Effects of Administrative Behavior (Columbus, Ohio: University Press, Ohio State University, 1956), p. 7.

¹³American Association of School Administrators, School Administrators View Professional Negotiations (Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1966), p. 38.

¹⁴In this study, the relevant others (or groups) include high school teachers, superintendents, and board of education members from the participating school districts.

principals' role. Epstein writing in the Nations School describes the typical situation thus:

Teacher organizations don't want ... [principals] to be a part of the negotiations and the school board and superintendent find it expedient to yield to the duress of teacher pressures and keep principals away from the bargaining table. Under the circumstances principals ... have begun to feel themselves in the middle of a squeeze play in which the social needs and educational pressures of our times cause their responsibilities and duties to be on the increase while their power and authority to bring their responsibilities to successful fruition are either slowly or rapidly chopped away by the agreements and policies that result from teacher - board of education negotiations.¹⁵

On the basis of the preceding introductory data, the specific problem with which this study is concerned can be defined.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This research examines the possibility that high school principals are too seldom involved in negotiations between teachers and boards of education. Considerable evidence indicates that in many negotiations there is little meaningful participation of high school principals, underscoring the need to seek ways of increasing such involvement. Probably the role high school principals should play in teacher-board negotiations needs clarification. This study seeks to determine what high school principals and relevant others think this role should be, and to analyze the various viewpoints.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The definitions which follow are provided so that the results of this project can be explicitly understood and accurately interpreted.

¹⁵Benjamin Epstein, "Why Principals Want to Negotiate for Themselves," The Nations Schools, LXXVIII:4 (October, 1966), pp. 66-7.

Collective negotiations. The legally approved process whereby a majority of teachers in a school district select a representative organization which in turn selects from its membership a bargaining team which meets with the board of education bargaining team to devise a written contract determining salaries and working conditions for all teachers in the school district.

High school principal. A public school administrator whose full time supervisory assignment includes grades 10-12 plus any other grades the school district may elect to include.

High school teacher. A fully certificated public school instructor who is teaching at least half-time in grades 9-12.

Board of education member. A resident of a local school district who is elected to the governing board of the school district and thus shares its responsibilities and duties, including formulation of policies governing the operation of the school district.

Superintendent. A public school administrator whose full time assignment includes personal responsibility for the total operation of all of the schools in his school district.

Relevant others. High school teachers, superintendents, and board of education members from the school districts involved in this study.

Expectation. "An evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position [principal]. This refers to what should happen, not to what will happen in the sense of anticipation."¹⁶

¹⁶Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 60.

Role. "A set of expectations, or evaluative standards, applied to an incumbent of a particular position [principal]."17

Role conflict. "Any situation in which the incumbent of a focal position [principal] perceives that he is confronted with incompatible expectations."18

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Accurately formulated study objectives provide a guide for an organized approach to a research project. In this study research is planned:

1. To judge, on the basis of the expectations held by high school principals and relevant others, the extent to which high school principals should be involved in teacher-board of education negotiations.
2. To identify issues where high school principals and relevant others hold convergent expectations for the involvement of high school principals in teacher-board of education negotiations. These could offer possible avenues to utilize in exploring participation of principals in negotiations.
3. To identify issues where high school principals and relevant others hold divergent expectations for the involvement of high school principals in negotiations. These are possible areas of conflict that may encourage divisiveness in education. Awareness of these conflict areas facilitates exploration into ways to resolve the difficulties.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

These questions were drafted to assist the researcher in his analysis. They represent certain fundamental ideas that this research could logically be designed to investigate.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 58.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 248

1. Do high school principals and relevant others believe that high school principals should be involved in teacher-board negotiations?
2. How extensive is the present involvement of high school principals in teacher-board negotiations?
3. What expectations do high school principals and relevant others have for the role of the high school principal in negotiations?
4. Where do the expectations of high school principals and relevant others for the role of high school principals in negotiations converge and diverge?
5. Do high school principals' perceptions of the expectations held by the relevant groups, for the role of the high school principal in negotiations, agree with the actual expectations held by these groups?
6. Do high school principals concur in their expectations for their role in teacher-board negotiations?

GENERAL STUDY HYPOTHESES

This study assumes that high school principals and relevant others do hold expectations for the role of the high school principal in teacher-board negotiations. General hypotheses derived from this basic assumption have been designed with reference to the research questions; they are drafted in general terms to form an appropriate part of this introductory chapter. Specific research hypotheses are contained in Chapter III where the methodology of this study is treated.

- H₁ All groups agree in specific expectations for the involvement of high school principals in teacher-board negotiations when administrative policies are determined regarding such things as class size, length of the school day, and scheduling of staff meetings.
- H₂ All groups agree in specific expectations for the involvement of high school principals in teacher-board negotiations when curricular policies are determined regarding such things as courses of study, selection of textbooks, and teaching procedures.

- H₃ All groups agree in specific expectations for the involvement of high school principals in teacher-board negotiations when evaluative policies are determined regarding such things as evaluation of teachers and teacher transfers between buildings.
- H₄ All groups agree that high school principals should not be involved in teacher-board negotiations when policies are determined regarding teacher salaries.
- H₅ High school principals accurately perceive the expectations of relevant groups regarding the involvement of high school principals in teacher-board negotiations.
- H₆ High school principals hold convergent expectations for their role in teacher-board negotiations.

PROCEDURE

The research area of this study included the 13 school districts within a 10 mile radius of Grand Rapids, Michigan. Superintendents, board of education members, high school teachers, and high school principals of these districts comprised the study population. Every effort was extended to include all of the school districts in the study. Twelve districts agreed to participate providing a study population of 12 superintendents, 86 board of education members, 17 high school principals, and more than 800 teachers.

The project director arranged to administer the survey instruments to the superintendent and board of education members at a regular board meeting in nine of the twelve districts; the other three districts elected to administer the survey instrument to the superintendent and board of education members at a time other than that of a regular board session. Thus, all superintendents and 76 of the board members participated in the study. Similarly the project director administered the survey instrument to the high school principal and high school teachers at a regular staff meeting in each of the participating schools,

resulting in returns from all of the principals and 649 teachers.

The survey instrument consisted of 20 minute questionnaires for each of the relevant groups and a 30 minute questionnaire for the focal group, the high school principals. Questionnaires (included in Appendix A) were based on research sources and screened for clarity, completeness, and statistical appropriateness. Selected personnel from the staff of the Michigan State University College of Education, the Michigan Department of Education, the Michigan Education Association, the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, the Michigan Association of School Boards, the Michigan Association of School Administrators, and selected practicing administrators and teachers were consulted in the final screening process. The survey procedures and questionnaires were pre-tested utilizing the corresponding personnel of the Sparta Public schools, a neighboring, non-participating school district. The pre-test indicated good instrumentation and no major problems

Interviewing high school teachers concerning collective negotiations suggested the advisability of securing the approval of each local teachers' association for such participation. This approval was readily secured in all participating districts, thus identifying the project as a joint teacher-administrator enterprise.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Conclusions that are drawn from this study should be interpreted in the light of limitations that apply to this research.

1. Although all levels of the principalship could be included in such a middle-management study, this project limits its focus to high school principals.

2. This study is limited geographically to the Grand Rapids area of western Michigan, probably one of the most conservative sections in the state. Consequently the study responses will reflect expectations drawn from educators who have conservatism as a basic part of their outlook on life.
3. The twelve school districts included in this study are all affiliated with the Michigan Education Association. It is quite possible that teachers who are affiliated with the Michigan Federation of Teachers could hold differing expectations for the role of high school principals in teacher-board negotiations.
4. Expectations of participating groups will be based predominantly on their experiences with their particular high school principal and the collective negotiations experience in their school district.
5. Recognition that this study is based entirely upon expectations and as such is necessarily limited to one of a number of important perceptions.

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This first chapter has attempted to establish the need for studying the problem of high school principal involvement in teacher-board negotiations. In addition to a problem statement, terms have been defined, objectives outlined, research questions posed, general hypotheses stated, the procedure described, and certain limitations suggested. In Chapter II, the related literature in three areas is reviewed: role theory, role-related research in education, and principal-related collective negotiations research.

Chapter III outlines the general methods of the study, details of instrumentation, the selected sample, statistical hypotheses, and

specific analysis techniques utilized. Chapter IV presents the study findings, and discusses the results of this research. Chapter V summarizes the data and states conclusions of the study. Implications for future research are noted.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The focal point of this study is high school principal involvement in teacher-board negotiations. Principals are customarily responsible for administering the negotiated contract terms; so their non-participation in negotiations, in the face of their subsequent responsibility for its end product, often creates confusion and uncertainty, as well as calling into question their total role in the educational hierarchy. Since the author's initial research design revealed the importance of role perception to the research, this chapter begins with a discussion of role theory, while further sections deal with role related research in education as well as other research into principals and negotiations.

ROLE THEORY

Students of role theory generally agree that all individuals occupy a number of roles, and that a person's role perceptions, whether self-defined or imposed by others, derive from his position in a given social system. As Getzels points out:

All social systems have certain imperative functions that come in time to be carried out in certain routinized ways. These functions - say, governing, educating, policing ... - may be said to have become "institutionalized", and the agencies established to carry out these ... functions for the social system ... may be termed "institutions". The most important analytic

subunit of the institution is the role.¹

Parsons and Shils generalize the role concept as follows:

The allocative foci of social systems are roles or role expectations. The social system is in a sense composed of a variety of roles or role expectations.²

Social scientists consider the school one of the institutionalized functions of a social system, as Bidwell specifically contends:

A school system is ... an integrated system of roles organizing the activities of its members toward common goals. The administrative organization of the school is a subsystem ... in which the roles of the teacher and administrator are relationships of subordinate and superordinate.³

Since the concept of role expectation supplies a theoretical foundation for this study, it is imperative that its definition be clearly understood. According to Newcomb:

The ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position constitute the role associated with that position[A role] is something dynamic; it refers to the behavior of the occupants of a position[and]what they do as occupants of the position.⁴

And Getzels holds that role:

Has certain normative obligations and responsibilities which may be termed "role expectations", and when the role incumbent puts these ... into effect, he is said to be performing his role.⁵

¹Jacob W. Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process." Administrative Theory in Education, ed. Andrew W. Halpin (Chicago: Midwest Administrative Center, University of Chicago, 1958), p. 153.

²Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils, Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 62.

³Charles E. Bidwell, "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX:1 (Sept., 1955), p. 41.

⁴Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York: Dryden Press, 1950), p. 280.

⁵Getzels, Administrative Theory in Education, p. 153.

Sarbin defines role as:

A patterned sequence of learned actions ... performed by a person in an interaction situation The person learns to expect or anticipate certain actions from other persons and that others have expectations of him.⁶

Brookover and Gottlieb hold that much of the behavior of any person is influenced by the actions and expectations of others and that the expectations imposed within a particular situation, as interpreted by the actors in that situation, constitutes the role.⁷

Gross, Mason, and McEachern, in their authoritative review of role related literature, regard role as a set of expectations or evaluative standards that apply to the incumbent of a particular position. They contend that:

People do not behave in a random manner. Their behavior is influenced to some extent by their own expectations and those of others in the group or society in which they are participants Regardless of their deviation, expectations are presumed by most role theorists to be an essential ingredient in any formula for predicting social behavior. Human conduct is in part a function of expectations.⁸

Kahn et al further indicate the centrality of expectations to role theory when they conclude that:

Each person responds to the organization in terms of his perception of it He, too, has a conception of his office and a set of attitudes and beliefs about what he should and should not

⁶Theodore R. Sarbin, "Role Theory," Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardner Linzey (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., 1954), p. 225.

⁷Wilbur B. Brookover and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education (New York: American Book Co., 1964), p. 61.

⁸Gross, Mason, and McEachern, p. 60.

do while in that position. He has some awareness of what behavior will fulfill his responsibilities, lead to the accomplishment of the organizational objectives, or further his own interests. He may even have had a major part in determining the formal responsibilities of his office. Through a long process of socialization and formal training he has acquired a set of values and expectations about his own behavior and abilities.⁹

It is important to note that the term expectations either occurs or is implied in each of these explanations of what role means.

Getzels expanded his definition by pointing out that expectations imply norms, telling the actor what he should or should not do.¹⁰

Gross et al concur, considering that an expectation deals with what should happen, not with what will necessarily happen.¹¹ Thus expectations imply that role occupants should conform to certain pre-established criteria. They also indicate the extent to which roles are interdependent among the many individuals and groups involved. This interdependency of roles is basic to the study of role theory.

As Parsons and Shils state:

Once an organized system of interaction ... becomes stabilized ... the role occupants build up reciprocal expectations of each others' actions and attitudes which are the nucleus of ... role expectations [One] is expected to behave in given situational conditions in certain relatively specific ways Reaction will then, contingent on the fulfillment or non-fulfillment of his expectations, be different; with fulfillment leading to ... favorable attitudes, and non-fulfillment leading to the reverse.¹²

⁹Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. D. Snoek, and Robert A. Rosenthal, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), p. 22.

¹⁰Getzels, p. 153.

¹¹Gross, et al., p. 67.

¹²Parsons and Shils, p. 19.

And Getzels observes that:

Roles are complementary. Roles are interdependent in that each derives its meaning from other related roles in the institution. In a sense, a role is a prescription not only for the given role incumbent, but also for the incumbent of other roles within the organization, so that in a heirachal setting the expectations of one role may to some extent also form the sanctions for a second interlocking role It is this quality of complementarity which fuses two or more roles into a coherent, interactive unit and which makes it possible for us to conceive of an institution as having a characteristic structure.¹³

Hartley and Hartley hold that this interdependency exists in all institutions:

To include all aspects of role requirements we must define social role as an organized pattern of ... [expectations] that relate to the task, demeanors, values, and reciprocal relationships to be maintained by persons occupying specific membership positions and fulfilling desirable functions in any group The failure of a person in one position to perform as he is expected to interferes with the performance of people in other positions Roles therefore are interdependent.

Many social roles could not exist without the existence of complementary roles ... roles thus form interlocking systems in which each unit shapes and directs the other units in the system. This effect is reciprocal: changes in one role cannot be made without corresponding changes in other roles which are involved with it.¹⁴

The preceding discussion of the interrelationships among roles and role expectations implies that a given institution will function smoothly only as long as the appropriate role expectations are realized; hence the importance of role conflict. For example, Bidwell states:

One of the chief motivations of individuals in an organization is the satisfaction of their individual needs. Means toward this satisfaction are scarce, so that their distribution must be organized in accord with the group values. This organization is

¹³Getzels, p. 153

¹⁴Eugene L. Hartley and Ruth E. Hartley, Fundamentals of Social Psychology (New York: Alfred H. Knopf, 1961), p. 486.

a function of role expectations ... which allow alter to predict the behavior of ego and act toward ego in an appropriate way. It is impossible for an integrated social system to function unless such predictions are possible since, there being no basis for his actions toward ego, such action becomes difficult at best. A disruption of a system of role expectations should ... result in a disintegration of the organization, rendering it unable to achieve its goals, and satisfy the needs of its members.¹⁵

Kahn et al note that role conflict occurs when members of the focal group find that relevant others hold different expectations for the focal group:

Much of role conflict, as we have defined it, can be thought of as a kind of inadequate role sending; lack of agreement or coordination among role senders produces a pattern of sent expectations which contains logical incompatibilities or which takes inadequate account of the needs and abilities of the focal person.¹⁶

And Jackson supports the Kahn group, regarding role conflict as a product of situations where two or more groups make incompatible demands upon the focal group.¹⁷ Seeman agrees that some role conflict stems from disagreement among criterion groups over the nature of the given role.¹⁸ Gross et al refer to role conflict as any situation in which the incumbent of a social position perceives that he is confronted with incompatible expectations.¹⁹ In fact the literature on role conflict typically points to situations of this sort.

¹⁵Bidwell, Journal of Educational Psychology, p. 41.

¹⁶Kahn, et al., p. 21.

¹⁷Toby Jackson, "Some Variables in Role Conflict Analysis," Social Forces, XXX:3 (March, 1952), p. 326.

¹⁸Melvin Seeman, "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," American Sociological Review, XVIII:4 (August, 1953), p. 373.

¹⁹Gross, et al., p. 47.

The preceding role theory has been shown to apply to all institutions including schools. Consequently it can be concluded that harmonious role relationships should be promoted between high school principals and relevant others in all school systems. Brookover and Gottlieb point out that:

The relevant groups with which ... administrative personnel interact varies with each of the administrative positions. In general, however, teachers, school board members, ... and a variety of other public groups hold relevant expectations for many of the administrative positions in the school systems ... the more common ... [of which] are the superintendent and the school principals.²⁰

Clearly then, the roles of individuals (principals) and groups (relevant others) in institutions (schools) are arranged in a system of interlocking roles in which each unit shapes and directs the other units in a reciprocal relationship. Changes in one role cannot usually be made without affecting the other roles involved with it, if role harmony is to be maintained. Furthermore, any role performance differing from the expectations that are held by the various groups leads to role conflict. Sarbin emphasizes this point:

A person must move cautiously and uncertainly when role expectations of others are partly known or entirely unknown ... [role] conflicts are likely to follow from ambiguous role expectations. The persisting need for solution of such conflicts may lead to socially invalid role enactment.²¹

This study deals with the possibility that the expectations held by high school principals and relevant others regarding the principal's role in teacher - board negotiations may present a role conflict for principals. Certainly this new relationship within collective negotiations, along with legal rulings limiting principals'

²⁰Wilbur Brookover and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education (New York: The American Book Company, 1964), p. 340.

²¹Sarbin, p. 227.

participation, may have evoked differing expectations for his role from relevant others and from the principals themselves. Such divergent expectations could generate role conflict for high school principals with all the negative effects on educational practice that role theory implies. As Hartley and Hartley remind us:

Each individual's accurate perception of his role in relation both to the roles that others are fulfilling and to his own adequate performance of that role is basic to the effective functioning of any organized society ... for society these roles are a device to get the work done and to avoid chaos.²²

Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware specifically warn:

Failure to find appropriate ... means of involving ... principals in developing policy that directly concerns them will lead to divisiveness, tension, and conflict that will impair schools and adversely affect the education of children.²³

Significantly, negotiations between teachers and school boards represent a shift in roles for both of these groups. This change cannot but involve role conflict for all relevant others unless specific allowances are made for changing the roles of these groups implicated with teachers and boards of education. To fail to adjust these reciprocally related roles may disrupt the school. Cunningham indicates the real danger, describing how he recently:

Encountered a climate of considerable disquiet and uneasiness among principals and suspected that these feelings extend beyond the ... limited number of persons with whom [he] talked The spectre of two negotiating parties, neither one of which represents the principal, reaching accord by swapping such things as work rules that have been the principal's prerogatives until now, is the source of increased frustration, if not panic, for the building administrator.²⁴

²²Hartley and Hartley, p. 486.

²³T. M. Stinnett, Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha L. Ware, Professional Negotiation in Public Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 105.

²⁴Cunningham, p. 6.

Epstein describes the typical situation:

Teacher organizations don't want [principals] to be a part of the negotiations and the school board and superintendent find it expedient to yield to the duress of teacher pressures and keep principals away from the bargaining table. Under the circumstances principals ... have begun to feel themselves in the middle of a squeeze play in which the social needs and educational pressures of our times cause their responsibilities and duties to be on the constant increase while their power and authority to bring their responsibilities to successful fruition are either slowly or rapidly being chopped away by the agreements and policies that result from teachers - board of education negotiations.²⁵

Such situations prompted the American Association of School Administrators to strongly advocate that, regardless of the pattern of representation, no teacher, supervisor, principal, or administrator should remain unrepresented in the negotiations process.²⁶

In Michigan the problems of principals regarding negotiations are multiplied by the laws defining the status of teachers and boards of education in the negotiation process, but relegating principals to the limbo of middle management personnel where negotiation status is undetermined. Michigan has many high school principals engaged in frustrating attempts to administer negotiated contracts in which they have been minimally involved.

The subjective character of role definition provides the background and rationale of this study. The applicable theoretical base consists of roles that are particularly defined in terms of expectations held by relevant others concerning the role of a focal person. In this study, the focal person is the high school principal, and relevant others, high school teachers, superintendents, and board

²⁵Epstein, Nation's Schools, pp. 66-7.

²⁶School Administrators View Professional Negotiations, p. 38.

of education members. Practical directions are needed for working toward greater involvement of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations, but first the role-expectations of the respective groups must be clarified, particularly the areas of convergent and divergent expectations. These differing expectations may point to patterns for high school principal involvement that will best meet the observed expectations of all concerned and therefore offer the least possibility of role conflict. Cave stresses the utility of this approach:

A crucial problem confronting school administrators involved in the throes of the new era of collective negotiations is how they may establish appropriate behavior patterns which will satisfy the expectations of both school board and teachers' organizations. Failure of the administrator to accomplish this task brings about conflict with one or the other of these reference groups. To the degree that a school administrator is able to establish a behavior pattern which is acceptable to both the school board and the teachers' organization, the presence of conflict will be minimized.²⁷

RELATED ROLE RESEARCH

These studies illustrate how role theory has been utilized as an analytical tool in investigating the role expectations surrounding various educational positions.

McKee's²⁸ recent study of the continuing education of engineering managers employed an analysis of the engineering manager's

²⁷David R. Cave, "A Critical Study of the Leader Behavior of School Administrators in Conflict with Teachers' Unions" (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1967), p. 14.

²⁸Charles A. McKee, "A Study of the Role of the Engineering Manager and his Continuing Education Requirements," (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1967).

role, thus showing how role theory has been accepted as an approach to educational problems in the business field. Comparing the role perceptions of 199 engineering managers with the expectations held for that role by 122 immediate superiors, 168 direct subordinates, and 50 engineering faculty members, this project revealed many significant convergent and divergent expectations, with engineering managers showing the greatest agreement as a group. The closest consensus among groups was between the engineering managers and their immediate superiors.

A pioneering project by Getzels and Guba,²⁹ focusing on role conflict among public school teachers, employed an instrument which measured role conflict feelings in three areas: the citizen's role, the professional role, and the socio-economic role. The study population consisted of 344 teachers drawn from the 18 schools in 6 school districts. Returns from approximately half of the teachers sampled suggested that a teacher's role is defined both by a common core of expectations and by a mixture of expectations that relate to local school and community conditions. Getzels and Guba noted that some expectations were attached to other roles the teacher may occupy, and concluded that such role conflict points to professional expectations impossible to reconcile with other roles. Bidwell studied teacher role expectations and administrator role perceptions held by teachers, reasoning that convergence or divergence in teacher's role expectations toward an administrator and in the administrator's perception of the teacher's behavior would increase

²⁹Jacob W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in a Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (September, 1955), p. 40.

or decrease, respectively, the teacher's satisfaction with his job. Returns from just over half of the 368 teachers in the five participating school districts indicated that:

Convergence of teachers' role-expectations toward the administrator and their perceptions of his behavior will be accompanied by an expression by these teachers of satisfaction with the teaching situation.

Divergence of teachers' role-expectations toward the administrator and their perceptions of his behavior will be accompanied by an expression by these teachers of dissatisfaction with the teaching situation.³⁰

Doyle's³¹ study is particularly pertinent since the groups he studied closely parallel those involved in this research. He studied the expectations held by elementary teachers, administrators, board members, and parents for the role of the elementary teacher, viewing the 96 teachers from three communities, his sample, through a check-list instrument completed by the elementary teachers and the relevant groups. Doyle found significant discrepancies between the expectations for elementary teachers held by the teachers themselves and by administrators, parents, and school board members.

Morgan³² investigated the public school principalship using the expectations of teachers, principals, superintendents, and school

³⁰Bidwell, Journal of Educational Psychology, XXIX, p. 47.

³¹Louis A. Doyle, "A Study of the Expectations Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members, and Parents Have of the Elementary Teacher's Roles," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1956), pp. 158-62.

³²Stanley R. Morgan, Jr., "The Public School Principalship: Role Expectations by Relevant Groups," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Utah, 1965).

board members from nine metropolitan school districts. He concluded that the role of the principal is quite distinct from that of the teacher: specifically that different patterns of responsibility and authority exist for principal and teacher, and that these patterns of responsibility are commonly acknowledged by the relevant groups even when they disagree on how the principal's tasks should be executed. This research confirms the uniqueness of the responsibilities the principal bears, implying further that there is a unique range of insights that result from this jurisdiction. It is probable that these insights of principals may not be accurately represented in teacher - board negotiations.

The study by Gross et al of most of the school superintendents in Massachusetts, a classic in the field of role theory, investigated three areas: resolution of conflict, conformity to expectations, and problems of consensus. Using depth interviews of superintendents and board of education members, this team tested many theoretical hypotheses involving expectations and the behavior of educators as incumbents of administrative positions, particularly the major role conflicts that most superintendents faced. In the course of their research, they explained that, "for certain analysis problems, the more meaningful unit of analysis may be the position [principal] as defined by multiple relationships [relevant others]." ³³

³³Gross, et al., p. 43.

Boss³⁴ studied the position of the Intermediate School District superintendent in Michigan, determining how the expectations held by the superintendents, selected members of their boards of education, and experts in the field converged and diverged. Boss confirmed his hypotheses that the Intermediate School superintendents, their board of education members, and recognized authorities often hold conflicting expectations regarding various aspects of the Intermediate School superintendent's role: the study identified potential role conflict in at least one-third of the role categories analyzed.

In this study role concepts are used as the theoretical framework within which the problem of principal involvement in teacher - board negotiations is investigated. No attempt is made in this research to add to existing social science knowledge of role theory.

RELATED NEGOTIATION RESEARCH

Since 1965 when teacher negotiations first affected the educational scene on a national scale, its influence has mushroomed until today it stands as a real force for change in education. The brief history of teacher - board negotiations necessarily limits any review of related research to the relatively few projects presently completed.

³⁴LaVerne H. Boss, "Role Expectations Held for the Intermediate School District Superintendent in Michigan," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1963), p. 121.

Birdsell³⁵ in 1965 surveyed the state of professional negotiations in 12 midwestern states using a study population of 71 larger school districts of which 49 participated in the research project. He found considerable disagreement between teachers and superintendents over what educational positions should be classified as "teacher" positions: superintendents were much more inclined to include middle administrators as teachers than were the teachers themselves. The study also disclosed that significantly more superintendents than teachers thought that an effective teacher organization could afford to enroll administrators. At the very inception of teacher - board negotiations, then, the principal appears to be emerging as the man-in-the-middle.

Radebaugh³⁶ selected and validated a list of democratic values drawn from authoritative educational sources, and checked negotiated agreements against these values. One of the four values he emphasized, the importance of using the experts on a professional staff wisely, indicates that principals, as staff experts, should be involved in negotiations in order to produce the most workable agreements.

³⁵Donald F. Birdsell, "A Study of the Status of Professional Negotiations in Selected Schools in Twelve Midwestern States," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Iowa, 1965).

³⁶Byron F. Radebaugh, "Democratic Values and Collective Negotiations' Agreements," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Toledo, 1966).

Scott³⁷ surveyed the training school administrators receive in negotiations, utilizing personal interviews with key professors at each of ten midwestern universities, and taped telephone interviews with 98 school superintendents from randomly selected midwestern school districts which had employed teacher negotiations. Scott's main thrust was in determining whether administrators are adequately prepared to deal with collective negotiations and whether universities are ready to offer programs that prepare administrators to meet the challenge of negotiations. He found no appropriate graduate level programs, and scarcely any evidence of university planning or even agreement on what plan to pursue in teaching administrators about teacher negotiations. This study highlights the considerable need for increased dialogue regarding the administrator's role in negotiations.

Cunningham³⁸ interviewed principals and other administrators from schools in Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan that had teacher negotiations in order to evaluate what impact the negotiations had made on the role of the principal. He asked these administrators to judge the behavior of teachers, superintendents, boards of education, and others involved in collective activity. From this research, Cunningham concluded that principals must participate in the negotiations process in some meaningful way, predicting meanwhile

³⁷Walter W. Scott, "A Study of Preparation Programs in School Administration as Affected by Collective Negotiations," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1966).

³⁸Cunningham, pp. 8-9.

that intensified collectivity may see principals and other specialists forming their own power groups for negotiation purposes. His study pointed out the need for further research to determine what impact negotiations have on the school organization and productivity, and on relationships among teachers, principals, and other staff members.

Olson³⁹ found that most principals believe they should be involved in the negotiations process as members of an all-inclusive teachers' organization; they felt that their involvement was necessary to insure consideration of their concerns and to guard against teachers usurping the principal's authority. This survey concludes that, since the future of the child is at stake, teacher - principal conflicts should always be avoided.

Summerer⁴⁰ found that all of the negotiated agreements in selected school districts in Michigan contained specific and detailed grievance procedures involving both the board of education and bargaining unit representatives. About one-half of the districts favored binding arbitration for grievance problems, with nearly all of the others prescribing either advisory or mediation procedures. Three-fourths of the districts stated that resolution of any problem could be attempted by discussions with the principal without involving

³⁹Allen Dale Olson, "The Principal and Professional Negotiations," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (April, 1967), pp. 31-2 (A Summary of an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, School of Education, George Washington University, Washington D.C., 1966).

⁴⁰Kenneth Summerer, "Agreements Negotiated between Boards of Education and Teachers under Michigan Public Law Act 379 of 1965," Metropolitan Educational Research Association (Michigan State University, East Lansing: March, 1965), p. 20.

the bargaining unit, if the adjustment did not violate the teacher - board agreement.

Cave⁴¹ investigated how the leadership behavior of school administrators in conflict with teachers' unions contributes to the strife by visiting 10 school districts that were involved in such conflicts. After asking school board members, teachers' union representatives, and the school administrators themselves to describe ideal administrator behavior by means of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, and then to describe the actual behavior of their administrator, Cave concluded that the behavior of administrators often contributes to conflict with teachers. These administrators appeared to lack basic group skills and the ability to arbitrate conflicts, underscoring the urgency of developing training programs for administrators in negotiations.

Garver's⁴² study of the relationships between selected variables and the attitudes of 291 principals in Oakland County, Michigan toward teacher negotiations revealed that principals who had participated on the board of education bargaining team had better attitudes towards the negotiations process than those with no such experience. This research implies that involving the principals may help dissipate their negative attitudes toward teacher - board negotiations.

⁴¹Cave, pp. 14-15.

⁴²George G. Garver, "A Study of the Relationship between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Public School Principals in Oakland County, Michigan, Concerning Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1967).

Tabulating the composition of various board of education negotiating teams, Block⁴³ contacted 154 school districts in Michigan. Of the 126 responding districts, 33 indicated elementary principal membership and 44 indicated high school principal membership on the board of education negotiating team, but since many of the teams utilizing principals included both an elementary and secondary principal, principals actually participated in less than 30% of the surveyed districts. Block suggests the dilemma of a typical building principal in Michigan, finding himself at the beginning of the 1966-67 school year with a lengthy master contract to administer which he had not been allowed to help formulate.

Other related negotiations' research shows that principals should participate in teacher - board collective activity for a variety of reasons: more workable contracts, reduced chances of a divided profession, concern for principal interests, and less negative principal attitudes toward the negotiation process. Cunningham⁴⁴ specifically concludes that much more research needs to focus on the principal in negotiations. But no research to date has investigated specific ways in which principals could be involved in teacher - board negotiations. Undoubtedly the principal's role will continue to be unclear in the absence of directive evidence. This study is planned to research various possibilities for principal participation

⁴³Ralph Block, "Research on the Make-up of the Board of Education Negotiating Team," A Study Currently Underway for Dr. Herbert Rudman, College of Education, Michigan State University.

⁴⁴Cunningham, p. 9.

in negotiations, primarily by determining the expectations of groups that are vitally involved in negotiations.

Much refinement of the negotiation process in education is needed. Doherty and Oberer outline the framework within which this negotiations synthesis will occur:

It is true that school boards, administrators, and teachers constitute an educational team with a wide range of common interests. But it is also true that when it comes to working conditions they divide into employers and employees with significant areas of conflicting interests. Collective bargaining is not designed to remove these differences but to establish rules of the game whereby the means of resolution of conflict may be institutionalized.⁴⁵

Hopefully this study will facilitate the participation of high school principals in establishing the collective negotiation rules that will materially affect future educational trends.

SUMMARY

This review of role theory supports the validity of using expectations in social science analyses. The summary of related role-theory research in education outlines the role-research base upon which this study builds. Finally a survey of recent research into the principal and the negotiations process places this study in current perspective.

⁴⁵Robert E. Doherty and Walter E. Oberer, Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1967), p. 124.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This research had for its major objective the analysis of what expectations high school teachers, high school principals, superintendents, and board members hold for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations. Since convergent and divergent expectations were expected over the administrative, curricular, evaluative, and teacher-salary issues that occur in negotiations, the research plan placed particular emphasis on these differences as indications of potential conflicts, and proposed to test all such differences statistically.

GENERAL METHODS OF THE STUDY

As this study began, high school principals in Michigan had already worked for two years with contracts negotiated between teachers and boards of education. Most of these high school principals had not participated in the negotiation process, but were still left to administer the contracts which were negotiated without their contributions and insights. Many high school principals resented this non-involvement and contended that the contracts would be more workable if the high school principals' point of view was considered during the negotiations.

Research on negotiations, available only from 1965, the year negotiations came to education, was surveyed on the problem of middle management involvement in teacher - board negotiations; and selected educators familiar with negotiations in Michigan were interviewed on the need for a negotiation study focusing on the high school principal. Both of these sources indicated a considerable need for a determination of the role that high school principals should play in these negotiations. Many expressed the fear that serious subordinate and superordinate conflicts lay in wait for principals if the present trend of non-participation continues. An analysis of the problem, based on views from the literature, educators active in negotiations, and practicing high school principals, suggested the initial step of ascertaining the expectations held by high school principals themselves and all relevant others for the role of principals in these negotiations, information most readily secured with a questionnaire.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

Developing a questionnaire specifically to determine what the study participants thought the role of high school principals should be in teacher - board negotiations presented several problems. Since negotiation in education covers many topics, it was necessary to select a limited number of issues that each respondent could readily understand and relate to principal involvement. Since high school principals could be affiliated in teacher - board negotiations with one or both of the negotiating groups, or with neither, any

questionnaire needed to provide for each of the various ways that principal involvement could occur. And finally, since certain fundamental principles govern the reliability of a questionnaire, some theoretical justification, here the requirements of Goode and Hatt¹ concerning content, construction, procedures, length, and pre-testing, should be used as a procedural guide in the development of study questionnaires.

The initial draft of the questionnaires consisted of definitive responses organized in three sections: demographic and other data, issues that have occurred in teacher - board negotiations, and ways high school principals could be involved in negotiations. At this stage all-inclusiveness was emphasized in an attempt to comprehend all pertinent suggestions from the literature and other resources. This initially cumbersome draft of questionnaire items was screened for appropriateness, completeness, and clarity with the assistance of the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, the Michigan Association of School Administrators, the Michigan Education Association, the Michigan Association of School Boards, the State of Michigan Department of Education, and staff members from the Michigan State University College of Education. Many suggestions for additions and deletions yielded a

¹William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods of Social Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952), pp. 134-169.

second draft; and repeating this screening process produced revised questionnaires that were ready for pre-testing.

The revised questionnaires for high school teachers, superintendents, and board members each included thirty-four items: eighteen requesting demographic data and sixteen involving responses to four principal- involvement factors each in relation to four representative negotiation issues². Completion time was estimated to average less than thirty minutes. The revised questionnaire for high school principals had a total of eighty-two items: thirty-four paralleling the questionnaires of the other groups, plus forty-eight relating principal perceptions to the responses of the other groups³. These perception responses were designed to determine how aware high school principals are of the negotiation attitudes held by relevant groups. Completion time for the principal questionnaire was estimated to average less than forty minutes.

Prior to their use in this study, the questionnaires were pre-tested in a neighboring school district not included in the study population. The four participating groups, high school teachers, high school principals, superintendents, and board members, each completed their respective questionnaires. No major difficulties in format, administration, clarity, or timing were noticed. After making some necessary adjustments in procedure and form, the questionnaires were judged ready for research use.

²See Appendix A, pp. 121-133.

³See Appendix A, pp. 134-145.

Administration time estimates were revised downward to less than twenty minutes for relevant groups and less than thirty minutes for high school principals.

THE SAMPLE

The thirteen school districts within a ten mile radius of Grand Rapids comprised the population of this study, including 13 superintendents, 18 high school principals, 93 board members, and 850 high school teachers. The project director attempted to administer the questionnaires personally to each of these prospective respondents, preferably in the normal school setting: the superintendent and board members at any board of education session, and the high school principal and his instructors at any building staff meeting. Twelve of the thirteen school districts agreed to participate in the study after receiving and reviewing the research design of the project. Over 750 educators from these districts produced usable responses, specifically 12 superintendents, 17 high school principals, 76 board members, and 649 high school teachers.

STATISTICAL HYPOTHESES

This study assumes that high school teachers, high school principals, superintendents, and board members hold expectations for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations, and the statistical hypotheses developed for the study are based on this assumption. The following terms appear in these hypotheses:

Groups: high school teachers, high school principals, superintendents, and board members from participating school districts.

Relevant groups: high school teachers, superintendents, and board

members from participating school districts.

Administrative issues:⁴ for example, class size, length of school day, and scheduling of staff meetings.

Curricular issues: for example, courses of study, textbook selection, and teaching procedures.

Evaluative issues: for example, evaluation of teachers and teacher transfers between buildings.

Teacher-salary issues: all aspects of teacher salaries.

Statistical hypotheses provide a framework for analysis in social science research. In this study, the following hypotheses involving expectations will be examined for statistically significant differences.

H₁ Equal proportions of respondents in all groups indicate that high school principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues.

H₁ - H₀: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues.

H₂ Equal proportions of respondents in all groups indicate that high school principals should not be involved when policies are negotiated regarding teacher salaries.

⁴Class size and length of the school day are examples of negotiation issues that present educational practice recognizes as administrative prerogatives. They are regarded as administrative issues in this study solely on this basis which in no way negates their fundamental place in the curricular structure of education.

$H_2 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who do not think high school principals should be involved when policies are negotiated regarding teacher salaries.

H_3 Equal proportions of respondents in all groups indicate that high school principals should not be negotiators when policies are determined regarding curricular or teacher salary issues.

$H_3 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who do not think high school principals should be negotiators when policies are determined regarding curricular or teacher-salary issues.

H_4 Equal proportions of high school teacher and high school principal respondents indicate that high school principals should not be negotiators when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

$H_4 - H_0$: There is no difference between high school teacher and high school principal groups in the proportion of respondents who do not think high school principals should be negotiators when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

H_5 Equal proportions of superintendent and board member respondents indicate that high school principals should be negotiators for the board when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

$H_5 - H_0$: There is no difference between superintendent and board member groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be negotiators for the board when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

H_6 Equal proportions of respondents in all groups indicate that high school principals should not be advisers in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding teacher salaries.

$H_6 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should not be advisers in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding teacher salaries.

H_7 Equal proportions of respondents in all groups indicate that high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when policies are negotiated regarding curricular issues.

$H_7 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when policies are negotiated regarding curricular issues.

H_8 Equal proportions of high school teacher and high school principal respondents indicate that high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

$H_8 - H_0$: There is no difference between high school teacher and high school principal groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when policies are negotiated regarding administrative and evaluative issues.

H_9 Equal proportions of superintendent and board member respondents indicate that high school principals should be advisers only to the board when policies are negotiated regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

$H_9 - H_0$: There is no difference between superintendent and board member groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be advisers only to the board when policies are negotiated regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

H_{10} Equal proportions of respondents in all groups indicate that high school principals should not choose an educational expert to be their representative at teacher - board negotiations when

policies are determined regarding teacher salaries.

$H_{10} - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should not choose an educational expert to be their representative at teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding teacher salaries.

H_{11} Equal proportions of respondents in all groups indicate that high school principals should choose an educational expert to be their representative at teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues.

$H_{11} - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should choose an educational expert to be their representative at teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues.

H_{12} High school principal respondents accurately perceive the expectations held by the majority of relevant group respondents for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, evaluative, or teacher-salary issues.

$H_{12} - H_0$: There is no difference between the perceptions of high school principal respondents of the expectations held by relevant group respondents for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations, and the actual expectations held by the majority of relevant group respondents for that role, when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, evaluative, or teacher-salary issues.

H_{13} High school principal respondents agree regarding the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular evaluative, or teacher-salary issues.

H₁₃ - H₀: There is no significant correlation between demographic and other factors and high school principal responses to involvement of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, evaluative, or teacher-salary issues.

ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Thorough study of the convergent or divergent expectations the four respondent groups hold regarding the involvement of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations required statistical methods that were appropriate for both inter- and intra-group analysis. The chi-square statistic was selected because it can compare independent groups with discrete categories;⁵ the four respondent groups in this study are definitely independent, and the involvement responses are items in discrete categories. Processing of the questionnaire responses consequently employed computer techniques which produced chi-square analyses of both inter- and intra-group similarities and differences. A .05 significance level was adopted as the criterion for meaningful results.

In the inter-group analysis, responses of the four major groups and high school principal perceptions were compared on each of the four negotiation issues, and convergent and divergent expectations noted. The intra-group analysis did not include superintendents because there were so few participants. Intra-group analysis of the three remaining groups compared their responses on each of the four involvement issues with selected variables, and again convergent and divergent expectations were noted.

⁵Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 104.

SUMMARY

This chapter has described the general methods of the study, particularly the derivation of the questionnaires and the techniques of statistical analysis; it also states the hypotheses in research form.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on how the involvement of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations is seen by four groups of role definers: high school teachers, superintendents, board members, and high school principals: it analyses the agreements and disagreements among and within these four related groups of educators in an attempt to clarify the high school principals' role in negotiations.

Similarities and differences in expectations presumably existed among the four sets of role definers regarding this negotiation role of high school principals. In the form of statistical hypotheses, this supposition was analyzed according to how the various groups responded to four kinds of negotiation issues, in the light of four involvement factors. Further hypotheses examining the agreement within the focal group and the principals' perceptions of expectations held by relevant others were similarly treated. Each research hypothesis was analyzed with the chi-square statistic; any alpha level of .05 was considered significant.

With the exception of high school principal agreement, the intra-group analyses were unrelated to the research hypotheses. But

several important relationships, found when certain demographic and other variables were analyzed within groups, are presented as by-products of the basic research project.

THE INSTRUMENT

The research instrument¹ covered the following four types of negotiation issues:

Administrative issues -- such things as class size, length of the school day, and scheduling of staff meetings.

Curricular issues -- such things as courses of study, textbook selection, and teaching procedures.

Evaluative issues -- such things as evaluation of teachers and teacher transfers between buildings.

Teacher-salary issues -- items pertaining to teacher salaries.

Each of these issues was researched in terms of high school principal involvement:

Should high school principals be somehow involved in teacher - board negotiations on this issue?

Should high school principals serve as negotiators on this issue for the teachers, for the board, or not at all?

Should high school principals serve as advisers on this issue only to teachers, only to the board, to both sides, or not at all?

Should high school principals, chosen by other high school principals, serve as educational experts on this issue?

¹See appendix A, pp. 130-133.

The research instrument identified the following data for each respondent: size of school district, educational preparation, sex, age, years as an educator, involvement in the negotiation process, and union composite². Further identifications applied only to a specific group: high school teachers and organizational-ism³, principals and years as a high school principal, and board members and employment status.

PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

The study was planned around research questionnaires administered within the school setting. More than 90% of all respondents completed their questionnaires at high school staff meetings or board of education sessions where the author supervised the data-gathering process. Table I shows the resulting participation pattern:

TABLE I
PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

	Respondents		
	Possible	Actual	Per Cent
Board Members	86	76	88.4
H. S. Teachers	804	649	80.7
H. S. Principals	17	17	100
Superintendents	12	12	100
Total	919	754	82

²See definition in footnote 5, p. 78.

³See definition in footnote 7, p. 88.

INTER-GROUP ANALYSIS

The first eleven research hypotheses describe inter-group comparisons. The raw data and statistical results are presented here as a matter of record; summaries of all inter-group differences can be found on pages 93 - 100.

$H_1 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues.

The responses compiled in Table 2 support $H_1 - H_0$: at least 80% of the respondents think high school principals should be involved in negotiations when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies are determined.

TABLE 2

INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN NEGOTIATIONS WHEN POLICIES ARE DETERMINED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE, CURRICULAR, OR EVALUATIVE ISSUES

	2:1		2:2		2:3	
	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Board Members	61	14	70	6	70	6
Superintendents	11	1	12	0	12	0
H. S. Principals	16	1	17	0	17	0
H. S. Teachers	540	103	554	92	599	48
χ^2 df=3	NS	2.222	NS	6.941	NS	1.448

$H_2 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who do not think high school principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding teacher salaries.

The responses in Table 3:1 indicate rejection of $H_2 - H_0$: significant differences do exist between respondent groups. Responses in Tables 3:3, 3:5, and 3:6 show that these differences are between high school principals and the teacher, board member groups; superintendents tend to agree with the principals' position.

$H_3 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who do not think high school principals should be negotiators in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding curricular or teacher-salary issues.

The responses in Table 4:1 indicate rejection of $H_3 - H_0$ for curricular issues: significant differences do exist between respondent groups. Table 4:4 shows differences between the teacher and board member groups, with the teachers definitely opposed to the principal as a negotiator for curricular issues. Table 5 distinguishes the responses favoring negotiator-for-teachers or negotiator-for-board roles. Responses in Table 5:2 point to differences between teacher and board member groups while Table 5:4 indicates teacher, principal group differences. Despite 65% teacher agreement opposing a negotiator role for principals when curricular policies are determined, minority opinion within the teacher group for principals to be teacher-negotiators is sufficiently strong to suggest significant inter-group differences.

The responses in Table 6 support $H_3 - H_0$ for teacher-salary issues. There is no difference in the proportions of respondents who feel, with at least a two-thirds majority, that principals should not be negotiators when teacher salaries are the issue. In Table 7 the responses are presented with negotiator-for-teachers and negotiator-for-board selections. Significant differences occur

TABLE 3
INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN NEGOTIATIONS
WHEN THE ISSUE IS TEACHERS SALARIES

	3:1		3:2		3:3		3:4		3:5		3:6		3:7		3:8	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Board Members	24	52	24	52	24	52	24	52	24	52	-	-	24	52	-	-
Superintendents	7	5	7	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	5	7	5
H. S. Principals	12	5	-	-	12	5	-	-	12	5	12	5	-	-	-	-
H. S. Teachers	211	433	211	433	211	433	211	433	-	-	211	433	-	-	211	433
χ^2	.01		NS		.01		NS		.01		.01		NS		NS	
	df=3		df=2		df=2		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1	
	13.960		3.564		10.777		0.043		8.911		10.600		3.251		3.471	

TABLE 4
INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS NEGOTIATORS
FOR CURRICULAR ISSUES

	4:1		4:2		4:3		4:4		4:5		4:6		4:7	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Board Members	36	40	36	40	36	40	36	40	-	-	-	-	-	-
Superintendents	3	9	3	9	-	-	-	-	3	9	-	-	3	9
H. S. Principals	5	12	-	-	5	12	-	-	-	-	5	12	5	12
H. S. Teachers	222	421	-	-	-	-	222	421	222	421	222	421	-	-
χ^2	.05		NS		NS		.05		NS		NS		NS	
	df=3		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1	
	7.899		2.101		1.817		4.872		0.474		0.192		0.313	

TABLE 5
INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS NEGOTIATORS
FOR CURRICULAR ISSUES

	5:1			5:2			5:3			5:4			5:5			5:6			5:7		
	Tchr	Bd	Only	Tchr	Bd	Only	Tchr	Bd	Only	Tchr	Bd	Only	Tchr	Bd	Only	Tchr	Bd	Only	Tchr	Bd	Only
Board	2	34	40	2	34	40	2	34	40	-	-	-	2	34	40	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supts	0	3	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	3	9	0	3	9	0	3	9
Prins	0	5	12	-	-	-	0	5	12	0	5	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	5	12
Tchrs	164	58	421	164	58	421	-	-	-	164	58	421	-	-	-	164	58	421	-	-	-
χ^2	.001			.001			NS			.05			NS			NS			NS		
	df=6			df=2			df=2			df=2			df=2			df=2			df=2		
	94.296			84.912			2.027			11.617			2.227			5.717			0.313		

between respondent groups when these negotiator variables are introduced. These differences again reflect a minority opinion among teachers, favoring high school principals as teacher-negotiators. Responses in Table 7:4 indicate significant differences between high school teachers and board members, and Table 7:5 points to differences between high school teachers and superintendents. In each case, however, significant minorities of teachers and board members hold that principals should be negotiators for their respective sides, when teacher salaries are the issue.

$H_4 - H_0$: There is no difference between high school teachers and high school principals in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should not be negotiators when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

Responses in table 8:6 result in acceptance of $H_4 - H_0$ for administrative issues: high school principals and teachers agree that principals should not be negotiators when administrative policies are determined. Responses in Table 9:6 result in acceptance of $H_4 - H_0$ for evaluative issues: principals and teachers agree that high school principals should not be negotiators when evaluative policies are determined.

$H_5 - H_0$: There is no difference between superintendents and board members in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be negotiators for the board when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

Responses in Table 10:3 result in acceptance of $H_5 - H_0$ for administrative issues. Superintendents and board members agree, at a 67% majority level, that principals should not be negotiators when administrative policies are determined. Table 11:3 indicates acceptance of $H_5 - H_0$ for evaluative issues: superintendents and board

TABLE 6

INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS NEGOTIATORS
FOR TEACHER-SALARY ISSUES

	6:1		6:2		6:3		6:4		6:5		6:6		6:7	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Board Members	13	62	13	62	-	-	13	62	13	62	-	-	-	-
Superintendents	4	8	4	8	4	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	8
H. S. Principals	1	16	-	-	-	-	1	16	-	-	1	16	1	16
H. S. Teachers	87	558	-	-	87	558	-	-	87	558	87	558	-	-
χ^2	NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS	
	df=3		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1	
	1.767		1.684		3.788		1.409		0.831		0.831		1.932	

TABLE 7
INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS NEGOTIATORS
FOR TEACHER-SALARY ISSUES

	7:1		7:2		7:3		7:4		7:5		7:6		7:7	
	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd
	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No
Board	0	13	62	0	13	62	0	13	62	-	-	-	-	-
Supts	0	4	8	-	-	-	0	4	8	-	-	-	0	4
Prins	0	1	16	0	1	16	-	-	-	-	0	1	0	1
Tchrs	68	19	558	-	-	-	68	19	558	68	19	558	-	-
χ^2	.001		NS		NS		.001		.05		NS		NS	
	df=6		df=1		df=1		df=2		df=2		df=2		df=1	
	59.859		1.409		1.684		39.315		6.371		2.376		1.932	

members disagree regarding the principals' negotiator role, but the disagreement is not statistically significant.

Table 8 indicates at least 68% agreement among all respondent groups that high school principals should not be negotiators when administrative issues are determined. Responses in Table 10 confirm this agreement, but reveal (in Tables 10:4, 5, 6) significant differences in minority opinion between the teachers and each of the other groups, differences due to the belief of some teachers that principals should be teacher-negotiators.

Table 9:5 indicates significant differences between teachers and board members regarding high school principals as negotiators when evaluative policies are negotiated. Responses in Table 11:4 confirm this disagreement between teacher and board member groups, while Table 11:6 indicates a significant difference of agreement between teacher and principal groups. Board members believe that high school principals should be board-negotiators for evaluative issues: teachers contend that principals should not be negotiators for evaluative issues, with a strong minority believing that principals should be teacher-negotiators for this issue.

$H_6 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should not be advisers in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding teacher salaries.

Responses in Table 12:1 result in rejection of $H_6 - H_0$: significant differences do exist between groups on the teacher-salary issue. Table 12:2 reveals disagreement between high school principal and board member groups, while responses in Table 12:5

TABLE 8

**INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS NEGOTIATORS
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

	8:1		8:2		8:3		8:4		8:5		8:6		8:7	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Board Members	25	51	25	51	-	-	25	51	25	51	-	-	-	-
Superintendents	4	8	4	8	4	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	8
H. S. Principals	4	13	-	-	-	-	4	13	-	-	4	13	4	13
H. S. Teachers	163	477	-	-	163	477	-	-	163	477	163	477	-	-
χ^2	NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS	
	df=3		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1	
	3.177		0.001		0.382		0.568		1.935		0.033		0.431	

TABLE 9
INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS NEGOTIATORS
FOR EVALUATIVE ISSUES

	9:1		9:2		9:3		9:4		9:5		9:6		9:7	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Board Members	44	31	44	31	-	-	44	31	44	31	-	-	-	-
Superintendents	4	8	4	8	4	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	8
H.S. Principals	7	10	-	-	-	-	7	10	-	-	7	10	7	10
H.S. Teachers	289	350	-	-	289	350	-	-	289	350	289	350	-	-
χ^2	.05		NS		NS		NS		.05		NS		NS	
	df=3		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1		df=1	
	8.133		2.684		0.673		1.716		4.872		0.110		0.613	

TABLE 10

**INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS NEGOTIATORS
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

	10:1		10:2		10:3		10:4		10:5		10:6		10:7	
	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd
	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No
Board	1	24	51	1	24	51	1	24	51	-	-	-	-	-
Supts	0	4	8	-	-	-	-	-	0	4	8	-	0	4
Prins	0	4	13	0	4	13	-	-	-	-	0	4	0	4
Tchrs	114	49	477	-	-	-	114	49	477	114	49	477	114	49
χ^2	.001		NS		NS		.001		.05		.05		NS	
	df=6		df=2		df=2		df=2		df=2		df=2		df=2	
	61.374		0.700		0.173		50.151		11.789		8.209		0.431	

TABLE 11
INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS NEGOTIATORS
FOR EVALUATIVE ISSUES

	11:1		11:2		11:3		11:4		11:5		11:6		11:7	
	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd
	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No
Board	0	44	31	0	44	31	0	44	31	-	-	-	-	-
Supts	0	4	8	-	-	-	-	-	0	4	8	-	0	4
Prins	0	7	10	0	7	10	-	-	-	-	0	7	0	7
Tchrs	173	116	350	-	-	-	173	116	350	173	116	350	-	-
χ^2	.001		NS		NS		.001		NS		.05		NS	
	df=6		df=1		df=1		df=2		df=2		df=2		df=1	
	81.862		1.716		2.684		71.740		5.024		9.333		0.613	

TABLE 12
INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS ADVISERS
FOR TEACHER SALARY ISSUES

	12:1		12:2		12:3		12:4		12:5		12:6		12:7	
	Bd		Bd		Bd		Bd		Bd		Bd		Bd	
	Only Both	No	Only Both	No	Only Both	No	Only Both	No	Only Both	No	Only Both	No	Only Both	No
Board Members	20	7 48	20	7 48	20	7 48	20	7 48	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supts	4	4 4	-	-	4	4 4	-	-	-	-	4	4 4	4	4 4
Prins	1	11 5	1	11 5	-	-	-	-	1	11 5	-	-	1	11 5
Tchrs	25	201 418	-	-	-	-	25	201 418	25	201 418	25	201 418	-	-
χ^2	.001		.01		NS		.001		.02		NS		NS	
	df=6		df=2		df=2		df=2		df=2		df=2		df=2	
	90.663		27.219		6.507		66.844		9.223		5.096		4.761	

indicate disagreement between principal and teacher groups on this issue: high school principals stand alone by contending that they should be advisers to both sides when teacher salaries are negotiated. Responses in Table 12:4 reveal a significant difference in minority opinion between the teacher and board member groups, despite their 62% agreement favoring the no-adviser role for high school principals when teacher salaries are negotiated. These minority opinions indicate a tendency within both of these groups to involve principals in some type of advisory role when teacher salaries are negotiated.

$H_7 - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when policies are negotiated regarding curricular issues.

Responses in Table 13:1 require rejection of $H_7 - H_0$ for curricular issues: respondent groups do not agree that principals should advise both teachers and board when curricular issues are negotiated. Tables 13:2,3,6, and 7 indicate that superintendents and board members differ significantly with teachers and principals. Superintendent and board member groups take a no-majority position regarding principals as advisers to both sides for curricular issues, while teacher and principal groups strongly believe that high school principals should be advisers to both sides when curricular issues are negotiated.

TABLE 13

**INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS ADVISERS
FOR TEACHER SALARY ISSUES**

	13:1				13:2				13:3			
	Tchr Only	Bd Only	Bd Both	No	Tchr Only	Bd Only	Bd Both	No	Tchr Only	Bd Only	Bd Both	No
Board	0	29	39	8	0	29	39	8	0	29	39	8
Supts	0	6	6	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prins	0	2	15	0	0	2	15	0	-	-	-	-
Tchrs	45	31	486	84	-	-	-	-	45	31	486	84
x²	.001 df=9 124.487				.02 df=2 7.954				.001 df=3 102.030			

TABLE 13 (continued)

13:4				13:5				13:6				13:7			
Tchr Only	Bd Only	Both	No	Tchr Only	Bd Only	Both	No	Tchr Only	Bd Only	Both	No	Tchr Only	Bd Only	Both	No
-	-	-	-	0	29	39	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	0	6	6	0	0	6	6	0	0	6	6	0
0	2	15	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	2	15	0
45	31	486	84	-	-	-	-	45	31	486	84	-	-	-	-
NS df=3				NS df=2				.05 df=3				.05 df=1			
5.380				0.017				3.976				3.933			

$H_8 - H_0$: There is no difference between high school teachers and high school principals in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

Responses in Tables 14:6 and 15:4 indicate acceptance of

$H_8 - H_0$: At least 72% of the teachers and principals agreed that high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when administrative or evaluative issues are negotiated.

$H_9 - H_0$: There is no difference between superintendents and board members in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should be advisers only to the board when policies are determined regarding administrative or evaluative issues.

Responses in Tables 14:3 and 15:5 indicate acceptance of

$H_9 - H_0$: superintendent and board member groups both assume no-majority positions for the role of principals as advisers only to the board when administrative or evaluative issues are negotiated.

TABLE 14

SHOULD THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
BE AN ADVISER IN TEACHER-BOARD
NEGOTIATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES?

	14:1				14:2				14:3			
	Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd		
	Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No
Board	1	38	28	9	1	38	28	9	1	38	28	9
Supts	0	6	6	0	-	-	-	-	0	6	6	0
Prins	0	1	16	0	0	1	16	0	-	-	-	-
Tchrs	48	34	469	95	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
χ^2	.001		df=9		.001		df=3		NS		df=3	
	72.917				18.282				0.757			

TABLE 15

SHOULD THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
BE AN ADVISER IN TEACHER-BOARD
NEGOTIATIONS FOR EVALUATIVE ISSUES?

	15:1				15:2				15:3			
	Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd		
	Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No
Board	0	35	35	5	0	35	35	5	0	35	35	5
Supts	0	7	5	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prins	0	2	15	0	0	2	15	0	-	-	-	-
Tchrs	49	62	467	64	-	-	-	-	49	62	467	64
χ^2	.001				.01				.001			
	df=9				df=2				df=3			
	51.712				9.652				21.748			

TABLE 14 (continued)

14:4				14:5				14:6				14:7			
Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd		
Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No
1	38	28	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	0	6	6	0	-	-	-	-	0	6	6	0
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	16	0	0	1	16	0
48	34	469	95	48	34	469	95	48	34	469	95	-	-	-	-
.001 df=3				NS df=3				NS df=3				NS df=3			
40.532				2.997				4.824				5.933			

TABLE 15 (continued)

15:4				15:5				15:6				15:7			
Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd			Tchr	Bd		
Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Only	Both	No
-	-	-	-	0	35	35	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	0	7	5	0	0	7	5	0	0	7	5	0
0	2	15	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	2	15	0
49	62	467	64	-	-	-	-	49	62	467	64	-	-	-	-
NS				NS				.02				.02			
df=3				df=2				df=3				df=1			
2.024				0.104				5.664				5.817			

$H_{10} - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should not choose an educational expert to be their representative at teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding teacher salaries.

Responses in Table 16:4 require acceptance of $H_{10} - H_0$: all respondent groups agree that high school principals should not choose a representative who would act as an educational expert at negotiations when teacher-salary policies are determined.

$H_{11} - H_0$: There is no difference between groups in the proportion of respondents who think high school principals should choose an educational expert to be their representative at teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues.

Responses in Tables 16:1, 2, 3 require acceptance of $H_{11} - H_0$: at least 68% of all respondent groups agree that high school principals should choose a representative who would act as an educational expert at negotiations when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies are determined.

TABLE 16
INVOLVEMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND EDUCATIONAL EXPERTS
WHEN ADMINISTRATIVE, CURRICULAR, EVALUATIVE
OR TEACHER-SALARY ISSUES ARE NEGOTIATED

	16:1		16:2		16:3		16:4	
	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-salary Issues	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Board Members	55	19	55	20	53	22	31	44
Superintendents	8	1	8	1	8	1	4	5
H. S. Principals	13	4	13	4	13	4	8	9
H. S. Teachers	457	170	432	199	470	165	227	408
χ^2 df=3	NS 1.300		NS 2.817		NS 1.518		NS 1.959	

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF RELEVANT GROUPS

Each of the relevant groups involved in this study holds an opinion regarding the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations, a group opinion based upon the expectations of the respective group members. These collective positions make it possible to identify areas of convergent and divergent expectations among groups. Once these centers of agreement and disagreement are identified, implications can be deduced relating to principal involvement in the negotiation process.

This study asked earlier how accurately high school principals perceive the opinions of high school teachers, superintendents, and board members. This is important since high school principal awareness of their negotiation problems relates directly to how accurately they perceive the conflicting positions their closest educational associates have taken regarding the principals' role in these negotiations. This research examined high school principal perceptions of the negotiation-related positions held by relevant groups using the following statistical hypothesis:

H₁₂ - H₀: There is no difference in the proportion between the perceptions of high school principals of the expectations held by relevant group respondents for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations, and the actual expectations held by the majority of relevant group respondents for that role, when administrative, curricular, evaluative, or teacher-salary issues are negotiated.

High school principal perceptions of relevant group responses were secured by asking the principals to consider the four negotiation areas from the point of view of superintendents, board

members, and teachers respectively.⁴ The resulting perceptions and the corresponding relevant group responses are shown in Tables 17 to 20.

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS

Tables 17 to 20 show no significant differences on the four negotiation issues between high school principal perceptions and superintendent responses, despite the relatively limited number of respondents in each of these sample groups. On the basis of these results, $H_{12} - H_0$ was accepted: principals do accurately perceive the expectations of superintendents for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations.

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS

Tables 17 to 20 show no significant differences on the four negotiation issues between board member responses and principal perceptions. In fact, high school principal perceptions of board member responses are quite accurate. On the basis of these results, $H_{12} - H_0$ was accepted.

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS

Tables 17 to 20 show that significant differences exist between high school principal perceptions and high school teacher responses on the four negotiation issues in 3 of the 16 cells.

⁴See appendix A, pages 134-145.

TABLE 17

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF RELEVANT GROUPS

Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher - Board Negotiations?

	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Superintendents	11	1	12	0	12	0	7	5
Principal Perceptions	16	1	16	1	16	1	10	5
χ^2 df=1	NS	0.066	NS	0.731	NS	0.731	NS	0.001
Board Members	61	14	70	6	70	6	24	52
Principal Perceptions	15	2	15	2	15	2	8	9
χ^2 df=1	NS	0.460	NS	0.265	NS	0.265	NS	1.475
High School Teachers	540	103	554	92	599	48	211	433
Principal Perceptions	13	4	13	4	13	4	9	8
χ^2 df=1	NS	0.688	NS	1.154	.05	5.956	NS	3.037

TABLE 18
PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF RELEVANT GROUPS

Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher - Board Negotiations?												
	Administrative Issues			Curricular Issues			Evaluative Issues			Teacher-Salary Issues		
	Tchr	Bd	No	Tchr	Bd	No	Tchr	Bd	No	Tchr	Bd	No
Superintendents	0	4	8	0	3	9	0	4	8	0	4	8
Principal Perceptions	0	9	8	0	8	9	0	9	8	0	4	13
χ^2 df=1	NS	1.094		NS	1.454		NS	1.094		NS	0.338	
Board Members	1	24	51	2	34	40	0	44	31	0	13	62
Principal Perceptions	0	8	9	0	8	8	0	8	8	0	2	15
χ^2 df=2,2,1,1	NS	1.623		NS	0.519		NS	0.404		NS	0.315	
High School Teachers	114	49	477	164	58	421	173	116	350	68	19	558
Principal Perceptions	2	4	11	1	3	13	0	5	11	0	2	15
χ^2 df=2	NS	5.731		NS	4.189		NS	6.334		NS	5.859	

TABLE 19

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF RELEVANT GROUPS

Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher - Board Negotiations?									
	Administrative Issues			Curricular Issues			Evaluative Issues		
	Tchr	Bd	No	Tchr	Bd	No	Tchr	Bd	No
	Only	Only	Both	Only	Only	Both	Only	Only	Both
Superintendents	0	6	6	0	6	6	0	7	5
Principal Perceptions	0	8	9	0	7	10	0	7	10
χ^2	NS	df=1	0.024	NS	df=1	0.221	NS	df=1	0.829
Board Members	1	38	28	0	29	39	0	35	35
Principal Perceptions	0	9	7	0	9	7	0	8	8
χ^2	NS	df=3	0.776	NS	df=2	1.341	NS	df=2	0.014
High School Teachers	48	34	469	45	31	486	49	62	467
Principal Perceptions	0	3	12	0	1	12	0	2	13
χ^2	NS	df=3	5.922	NS	df=3	2.655	NS	df=3	1.458
Teacher-Salary Issues									
Tchr	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4
Bd	0	3	7	0	3	7	0	3	7
No	NS	df=2	0.945	NS	df=2	0.945	NS	df=2	0.945

TABLE 20

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF RELEVANT GROUPS

Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher - Board Negotiations?									
	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Superintendents	8	1	8	1	8	1	4	5	
Principal Perceptions	12	5	13	4	12	5	5	11	
χ^2 df=1	NS	1.110	NS	0.584	NS	1.110	NS	0.435	
Board Members	55	19	55	20	53	22	31	44	
Principal Perceptions	11	6	11	6	10	6	7	10	
χ^2 df=1	NS	0.642	NS	0.509	NS	0.413	NS	0.000	
High School Teachers	457	170	432	199	470	165	277	408	
Principal Perceptions	7	10	8	9	8	8	5	12	
χ^2 df=1	.02	8.264	NS	3.480	.05	4.613	NS	0.290	

Table 17 indicates a significant difference between teacher responses and principal perceptions regarding principal involvement in teacher - board negotiations on evaluative issues: teacher approval for principal involvement was significantly greater than principals perceived it to be. Table 20 shows significant differences over administrative and evaluative issues, with near-significant differences in curricular matters. It is apparent that a significantly greater proportion of teachers think high school principals should be involved in negotiations as educational experts than the principals perceived. In fact, high school principals seem relatively unaware of the "high school principal as educational expert" attitude of high school teachers on three of the four negotiation issues.

On the basis of these results it was concluded that high school principals do perceive at an 80% level the expectations of high school teachers for the role of principals in negotiations. Consequently $H_{12} - H_0$ was accepted for all issues. Lack of high school principal perception was noted regarding the teachers' belief that high school principals should function as educational experts when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues are negotiated.

INTRAGROUP ANALYSIS: HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

High school principals are the focal group in this study; and certainly their expectations for their own role in teacher - board negotiations constitute one of the four primary group positions involved in this research. The position high school principals adopt must be identified for use in the inter-group

analysis. The study assumed that the responses of the 17 high school principals participating in this research could be generalized to provide valid data on the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations, despite the variety of individuals and schools represented.

70% agreement among respondents constitutes majority-agreement in this study. Table 21 shows the responses of high school principal respondents to the four negotiation issues. Since total agreement for the 16 cells was .78, with only 3 cells falling below the .70 majority-agreement level, it was concluded that high school principals do hold an agreement position for their role in negotiations. Minority areas were noted: no-agreement for his negotiator role on the evaluative issue (.59) or for his role as an educational expert on the teacher-salary issue (.53); near agreement for his adviser role on the teacher-salary issue (.65), for his total role as an educational expert (.68), and for his total position on the teacher-salary issue (.68).

The consistency of the high school principals' majority-agreement position was tested with the chi-square statistic using the following hypothesis:

$H_{13} - H_0$: There is no difference between high school principals in the association between selected variables: school district size, age, years as an educator, educational preparation, and years as a high school principal; and their responses for the involvement of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations when policies are determined regarding administrative, curricular, evaluative, or teacher-salary issues.

Tables 28-33 (see appendix B pages 147-58) summarize the data pertaining to the internal consistence of the agreement among high school principals. $H_{13} - H_0$ was accepted: no significant differences were found within the focal group for any of the selected variables, including: school district size, educational preparation, age, years as an educator, years as a high school principal, and negotiations involvement.

INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS: BOARD MEMBERS

Board member intra-group analysis involved the variables: school district size, years as an educator, educational background, age, negotiator experience, union composite,⁵ and employment status.

Board member responses are arranged by school district size in Table 34 (see appendix B, page 159). School districts were classified as: Small (under 2,700 students enrolled in grades K - 12); Medium (2,700 - 5,500 students); and Large (over 5,500 students). No significant differences were found among board members based upon the size of their school district.

Board member responses according to the number of years they have served as board members are grouped in Table 35 (see appendix B, page 161); no significant differences were found among board

⁵Union composite was derived from items 8 - 10 of the respective questionnaires (see appendix A, page 122). Union relationships of each respondent were determined in three areas: years as a union member in other than education occupations; degree of family membership in unions; and degree of unionism among neighbors. Responses in each area were scored from low (1) to high (5) unionism. Totalled responses of 10 or more identified the high union composite respondents.

members based upon their years of service. Board member responses according to their educational preparation are presented in Table 22. Educational preparation of board members was classified as Low (less than a high school diploma), Medium (a high school graduate but less than 4 years of college), and High (at least a college graduate). Significant differences in board member responses occurred in relation to the negotiator role of high school principals. Board members with high educational preparation strongly support a no-negotiator position for principals on all issues, differing significantly in the curricular and evaluative areas with other board members who believe high school principals should act as board negotiators on these issues.

Board member responses are grouped according to age in Table 36 (see appendix B, page 163); no significant differences were found. Board member responses related to their self-employment status are presented in Table 23. Self-employed board members differ with other board members in two areas: they strongly believe high school principals should be advisers to both teachers and board for curricular issues and definitely tend toward this position for administrative and evaluative issues; and they strongly oppose high school principals as negotiators when teacher salaries are being determined.

Board member responses based upon their union composite as presented in Table 37 (see appendix B, page 165) show agreement in all areas. The difference in Table 37:1 is a simple matter of degree, where board members of low union composite believe significantly more strongly that high school principals should be involved

in negotiations when curricular policies are determined. Board member responses related to their experience as a board negotiator, presented in Table 24, reveal significant differences. Table 24:1 shows that board members with negotiator experience believe more strongly that high school principals should be involved in negotiations when administrative issues are determined and tend toward this position for curricular and evaluative issues. Table 24:2 points out that the negotiator board members are much more likely to believe that principals should negotiate for the board, differing significantly in this respect with non-negotiator board members on curricular issues. And responses in Table 24:3 indicate that these negotiator board members are much more inclined to believe that principals should be advisers only to the board of education.

Board negotiator responses were compared with other variables in Table 25. No significant differences were found relative to years as a board member, educational preparation, union composite, and self-employment status. One obvious difference occurred with respect to school district size: the larger the school district the less likely that a board member had served as a negotiator.

INTRA-GROUP RELATIONSHIPS: HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

High School teacher intra-group analysis involved the variables: school district size, educational preparation, years

TABLE 22

BOARD MEMBER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

(22:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher - Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Low		13	3	16	1	17	0	6	11
Medium		25	6	28	3	29	2	8	23
High		23	5	26	2	24	4	10	18
χ^2	df=2	NS		NS		NS		NS	
		0.022		0.252		3.119		0.808	
(22:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher - Board Negotiations?		Tchr Bd Only		Tchr Bd Only		Tchr Bd Only		Tchr Bd Only	
		No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Low		0	7	10	0	12	5	0	13
Medium		1	13	17	1	16	14	0	20
High		0	4	24	1	6	21	0	11
χ^2	df=4,2,2	NS		7.966		.05		11.582	
						.02		8.140	
								NS	
								0.869	

TABLE 22 (Continued)

(22:3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher - Board Negotiations?																			
Administrative Issues				Curricular Issues				Evaluative Issues				Teacher-Salary Issues							
		Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd		No		Tchr Bd		No		Tchr Bd							
		Only		Only		Only		Only		Only		Only							
		Beth		Beth		Beth		Beth		Beth		Beth							
		No		No		No		No		No		No							
Low		0	9	6	2	0	7	9	1	0	10	7	0	0	6	2	9		
Medium		1	14	12	4	0	12	16	3	0	13	16	2	0	8	1	22		
High		0	15	10	3	0	10	14	4	0	12	12	3	0	6	4	7		
χ^2	df=4	NS		df=6		1.807		NS		0.851		NS		2.954		NS		3.464	
(22:4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher - Board Negotiations?																			
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No							
Low		11		4		11		6		12		5		10		7			
Medium		22		9		24		7		23		7		12		18			
High		22		6		20		7		18		10		9		19			
χ^2	df=2	NS		0.455		NS		0.919		NS		1.071		NS		3.142			

TABLE 23

BOARD MEMBER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(23:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher - Board Negotiations?									
	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Self-Employed	23	5	28	1	27	2	5	24	
Not Self-Employed	37	9	41	5	43	3	19	27	
χ^2 df=1	NS 0.033		NS 1.331		NS 0.004		.05 4.733		
(23:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher - Board Negotiations?									
	Tchr Bd Only		Tchr Bd Only		Tchr Bd Only		Tchr Bd Only		
	1	6	22	1	13	15	0	15	13
Self-Employed	1	6	22	1	13	15	0	15	27
Not Self-Employed	0	18	28	1	21	24	0	29	34
χ^2 df=2,2,1,1	NS 4.076		NS 0.112		NS 0.648		NS 3.750		

TABLE 23 (Continued)

(23:3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher - Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No
Self-Employed		0	13	15	1	0	8	20	1
Not Self-Employed		1	25	12	8	0	21	18	7
χ^2	df=2	NS	df=3	7.078	.05	6.936	NS	4.194	NS
									4.632
(23:4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher - Board Negotiations?		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Self-Employed		20	8	22	7	21	8	10	19
Not Self-Employed		34	11	32	13	32	13	21	24
χ^2	df=1	NS	0.153	NS	0.202	NS	0.015	NS	1.075

TABLE 24

BOARD MEMBER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH NEGOTIATOR EXPERIENCE

(24:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher - Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
		46	6	51	2	50	3	19	34
Yes									
No		13	8	17	4	19	2	5	16
χ^2	df=1	.05	6.806	NS	4.709	NS	0.356	NS	0.995

(24:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher - Board Negotiations?		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
		1	23	29	No	2	29	22	No
		0	1	20		0	5	16	
Yes									
No									
χ^2	df=2,1,1	NS	0.043	.05	7.442	NS	1.972	NS	3.428

TABLE 24 (Continued)

(24.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher - Board Negotiations?																				
		Administrative Issues				Curricular Issues				Evaluative Issues				Teacher-Salary Issues						
		Tchr		Bd		Tchr		Bd		Tchr		Bd		Tchr		Bd				
		Only	Beth	No		Only	Beth	No		Only	Beth	No		Only	Beth	No				
Yes		0	31	16	6		0	24	27	2		0	29	22	1		0	19	3	30
No		1	7	10	3		0	5	11	5		0	6	12	3		0	1	4	16
χ^2	df=2	NS	df=3	5.787			.02	8.159				.05	7.187				.02	9.076		

		(24.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher - Board Negotiations?							
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes		40	11	40	12	37	15	25	28
	No	13	8	13	8	15	6	6	14
χ^2	df=1	NS	2.092	NS	1.696	NS	0.001	NS	1.752

TABLE 25
BOARD MEMBERS AS NEGOTIATORS BY SELECTED VARIABLES

Board Negotiator	District Size			Years An Educator		Educational Preparation			Union Composite			Self-Employed	
	S	M	L	Under 6	6 or More	Lo	Medium	Hi	Lo	Hi		Yes	No
Yes	17	29	7	28	25	15	19	19	47	16		20	33
No	0	14	7	14	7	2	11	8	6	5		9	12
χ^2	.01	df=2		NS	df=2	NS			df=2	NS	df=1	NS	df=1
	10.326			1.173		3.343			1.854			0.166	

as an educator, age, sex, union composite,⁶ organizationalism,⁷ and teacher-negotiator experience.

High school teacher responses by school district size as presented in Table 38:1 (see appendix B, page 167) indicate agreement among teachers that principals should be involved when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues are negotiated and should not be involved when teacher salaries are the issue. Whatever differences exist are differences of degree: the smaller the school district, for example, the more strongly teachers believe high school principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations.

Table 38:2 shows that teachers, regardless of school district size, agree that principals should not be involved in negotiations as negotiators. The significant difference over the administrative issue is purely one of degree: the smaller the school district, the more strongly teachers believe that high school principals should not be negotiators.

Responses in Table 38:3 indicate that teachers agree regarding a high school principal role as advisers to both sides

⁶See definition in footnote 5, page 78.

⁷Organizationalism was derived from items 7, 8, 10, and 11 of the teacher questionnaire (see appendix A, page 122). High organizational teachers met three criteria: they voted to ratify the negotiated contract for teachers, voted to select their local teachers' negotiation team, and were active in MEA activity (responded to 7d, 7e, or 8-yes). Any teacher that met all three of these conditions was designated "high-organizational".

in the negotiation process. Significant differences of degree again appear in the administrative, curricular, and evaluative areas; the smaller the school district, the more strongly high school teachers believe that principals should advise both sides. Responses in Table 35:4 show that teachers, regardless of school district size, agree that a high school principals' representative should be involved in negotiations as an educational expert when all but teacher-salary policies are determined.

High school teacher responses are related to their years as an educator in Table 39 (see appendix B, pages 169-70). Teachers generally agree on all issues in all involvement categories, with a few differences reflecting only the degree of agreement. Responses in Table 39:3 indicate that low preparation teachers believe more strongly that high school principals should be advisers to both sides when administrative policies are negotiated, and Table 39:4 shows that high preparation teachers believe principals should choose a representative to act as an educational expert when curricular policies are negotiated.

High school teacher responses are related to their educational preparation in Table 40 (see appendix B, pages 171-72). General agreement appeared on all issues in all involvement categories. The significant difference in Table 40:4 is one of degree: high school teachers with high educational preparation believe more strongly that principals should choose an educational expert representative when curricular policies are negotiated.

High school teacher responses by age are presented in Table 41 (see appendix B, pages 173-174). General agreement among all teacher age groups is indicated for high school principal involvement in negotiations when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies are determined and non-involvement when teacher salaries are negotiated. Significant differences that occur are differences of degree: the younger teachers generally believe principals should be involved in negotiations for administrative issues more than older teachers. The older the teacher, however, the more strongly he believes that principals should be involved in curricular negotiations.

Responses in Table 41:2 show all teacher age groups agreeing on a no-negotiator role for high school principals. Again the significant difference is one of degree: for administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues, the older teacher believes less strongly that principals should not be negotiators. Table 41:3 supports high school principals as advisers to both sides on administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues, and as no-advisers on the teacher-salary issue. Again significant differences are matters of degree: the younger teachers believe more strongly that principals should advise both sides in teacher - board negotiations.

Responses in Table 41:4 support the use of high school principals as educational experts when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues are negotiated. The significant difference over curricular issues indicates that older teachers believe more strongly that high school principals should select a representative

to be an educational expert when curricular policies are negotiated.

High school teacher responses presented by sex in Table 42 (see appendix B, pages 175-76) reveal general agreement between men and women teachers on all issues and in all involvement categories. The following differences in degree do appear: in Table 42:1, women are shown to believe more strongly than men that high school principals should be involved in the negotiation process; responses in Table 42:2 show that women believe more strongly in their minority opinion that principals should be negotiators for teachers when curricular or evaluative policies are determined; responses in Table 42:3 point out that women believe more strongly than men that principals should advise both sides when administrative issues are negotiated, in Table 42:4, men are shown to believe significantly more strongly that principals should choose an educational expert representative to participate when curricular policies are negotiated.

High school teacher responses by union composite⁸ are presented in Table 43 (see appendix B, pages 177-78). General agreement exists between low and high union composite teachers on all issues and in all involvement categories. Significant differences of degree include these: responses in Table 43:2 indicate that low union composite teachers believe more strongly that high school

⁸See definition in footnote 5, page 78.

principals should not be negotiators for the board; responses in Table 43:3 suggest that low union composite teachers believe more strongly that principals should not be advisers only to the board.

High school teacher responses presented in Table 44 (see appendix B, pages 179-80) show general agreement between high and low organizational⁹ teachers on all issues and in all involvement categories. Any differences that are significant are differences of degree: responses in Table 44:2 indicate that highly organizational teachers believe more strongly that high school principals should not be negotiators when administrative policies are determined; Table 44:4 shows that highly organizational teachers believe more strongly that principals should not be represented at negotiations by an educational expert representative when teacher salary policies are determined.

High school teacher organizationalism responses compared with other related variables in Table 26 reveal a number of significant correlations. Table 26:1 shows that the smaller the district the greater the proportion of high organizational teachers; and responses in Table 26:2 indicate that instructors with high educational preparation are more likely to be high organizational teachers. Responses in Table 26:3 show that many more men than women are high organizational teachers, while responses in Table 26:4 point out that high union composite teachers tend to be high

⁹See definition in footnote 7, page 88.

organizational people. Responses in Table 26:5 show that a significantly greater proportion of teachers with long service as educators are high organizational teachers, while responses in Table 26:6 reveal that a significantly greater proportion of teachers with negotiator experience are also high organizational teachers.

High school teacher responses by experience as teacher-negotiators (see Table 45 in appendix B, pages 181-82) show general agreement regardless of the teacher's experience as a negotiator. Any significant differences are differences in degree: teacher-negotiators believe more strongly that high school principals should be involved in negotiations when curricular policies are determined, and that principals should choose an educational expert to act as their representative when curricular policies are negotiated.

High school teacher responses by experience as teacher-negotiators are compared with other variables in Table 27. These correlations suggest that the typical teacher-negotiator has been an educator for 6 - 15 years (27:1), has high educational preparation (27:2), is a man (24:4) 30 - 45 years of age (27:3), and is a high organizational person (26:6).

SUMMARY: INTER-GROUP ANALYSIS

Chapter IV begins with a statistical analysis of the study data to determine areas of convergence and divergence of expectations held by the four respondent groups. Agreements and differences between groups regarding the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations were identified in each of the involvement categories.

TABLE 26

HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER ORGANIZATIONALISM BY SELECTED VARIABLES

26:1				26:2		26:3		26:4	
District Size				Educational Preparation		Sex		Union Composite	
	S	M	L	Less Than MA	MA or More	Women	Men	Lo	Hi
High	35	79	42	76	80	38	118	112	44
Low	47	204	242	327	158	218	270	422	71
x ²	.001	df=2		.001	df=1	.001	df=1	.001	df=1
	31.248			17.691		20.366		15.487	

TABLE 26 (Continued)

26:5			26:6		27:7		
Years An Educator			Teacher Negotiator		Age		
Under 6	6-15	Over 15	Yes	No	Under 30	30-45	Over 45
34	75	47	50	103	45	67	43
238	183	71	34	454	239	189	70
.001 df=2			.001 df=1		.001 df=2		
39.484			67.628		23.926		

Hypothesis I (Table 2) attempted to determine whether high school principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies were determined. H_1 was accepted: all four respondent groups agreed that principals should be involved for these issues.

Hypothesis II (Table 3) examined the premise that high school principals should not be involved in teacher - board negotiations when teacher-salary policies are determined. H_2 was rejected: significant differences were found between the principal group and the teacher, board groups. Teachers and board members agreed that principals should not be involved when teacher salaries are negotiated, while principals believed they should be involved in these negotiations; superintendents tended to agree with the principal group.

TABLE 27

HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS AS NEGOTIATORS BY SELECTED VARIABLES

	27:1			27:2			27:3			27:4			27:5	
	Years An Educator			Educational Preparation			Age			Sex			Union Comp	
Teacher Negotiator	Under 6	6-15	Over 15	Less Than MA	MA or More		Under 30	30-45	Over 45	Women	Men	Lo	Hi	
Yes	10	56	18	32	49		22	49	13	5	79	64	20	
No	261	199	96	367	185		261	194	96	247	305	463	94	
χ^2	.001 df=2			.001 df=1			.001 df=2			.001 df=1			NS	
	39.327			22.065			17.681			45.864			2.400	

Hypothesis III (Tables 4 and 6) attempted to determine whether high school principals should be negotiators when curricular or teacher-salary policies are determined. H_3 was rejected for curricular issues: significant differences were found between board member and teacher groups. Board members reached no agreement over principals as negotiators, while teachers contended that principals should not be negotiators when curricular policies are determined. Superintendent and principal groups agreed with the no-negotiator stand of the teacher group. H_3 was accepted for teacher-salary issues: all groups agreed with at least two-thirds consensus that principals should not be negotiators when teacher-salary policies are determined.

Significant differences in minority opinion (Tables 5 and 7) occurred between high school teacher and board member groups when the additional principal role variables of negotiator-for-teachers and negotiator-for-board were introduced. A considerable proportion (45%) of board members believe that principals should be board-negotiators for curricular issues, while one-fourth of the teachers contend that principals should be teacher-negotiators when curricular policies are determined. Similar significant differences that occurred for teacher-salary issues are relatively unimportant due to the 82% teacher and board member agreement for a no-negotiator role.

Hypothesis IV (Tables 8 and 9) attempted to establish that high school principals and teachers believe that principals should not be negotiators when administrative or evaluative policies are

determined. H_4 was accepted with 74% agreement for administrative issues and 55% agreement for evaluative issues.

Hypothesis V (Tables 10 and 11) postulated that equal proportions of superintendents and board members believed that high school principals should be board-negotiators when administrative or evaluative policies are determined. H_5 was accepted for administrative issues, but the 67% agreement between superintendent and board member groups was that principals should not be board-negotiators when administrative policies are determined. H_5 was also accepted for evaluative issues, but board member and superintendent groups tended to disagree: the board members believed that principals should be board-negotiators for evaluative issues, while superintendents agreed with the teacher and principal groups that principals should not be negotiators when evaluative policies are determined. Incidentally, about one-fifth of the teacher respondents indicated that principals should be teacher-negotiators when administrative or evaluative policies are determined.

Hypothesis VI (Table 12) attempted to establish that all respondent groups believe high school principals should not be advisers when teacher-salary policies are negotiated. H_6 was rejected: the high school principal group believed they should be advisers to both sides while teacher and board member groups strongly contended that principals should not be advisers when teacher salaries are negotiated. It was noted that, despite the 62% agreement between teacher and board member groups for this no-adviser role, significant minority opinions existed: 27% of the

board members believed principals should advise only the board while 31% of the teachers held that principals should be advisers to both sides when teacher salaries are negotiated.

Hypothesis VII (Table 13) suggested that all respondent groups believed high school principals should be advisers to both sides when curricular issues are negotiated. H_7 was rejected: the lack of agreement among the superintendent and board member groups differed clearly from the strong stand of the teachers and principals, who held that principals should advise both sides when curricular issues are negotiated.

Hypothesis VIII (Tables 14 and 15) attempted to establish that high school principal and high school teacher groups believed high school principals should be advisers to both sides when administrative or evaluative issues are negotiated. H_8 was accepted with 72% agreement.

Hypothesis IX (Tables 14 and 15) attempted to establish that superintendent and board member groups believed high school principals should be advisers only to the board when administrative or evaluative issues are negotiated. H_9 was accepted, but the agreement between superintendent and board member groups involved little clear-cut agreement on this issue: board member and superintendent groups do not strongly favor a board-adviser role for principals when administrative or evaluative issues are negotiated.

Hypothesis X (Table 16) postulated that all respondent groups believed high school principals should not choose an educational expert to be their representative when teacher salaries are negotiated. H_{10} was accepted: all groups agreed that no such educational expert should be selected for teacher-salary issues.

Hypothesis XI (Table 16) attempted to establish that all respondent groups believed high school principals should choose an educational expert to be their representative when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues are negotiated. H_{11} was accepted: all groups agreed that principals should be represented by their educational expert when these policies are negotiated.

Hypothesis XII (Tables 17 - 20) suggested that high school principals were aware of the negotiation-related attitudes of the relevant groups. H_{12} was accepted: principals were totally aware of superintendent and board member negotiation attitudes and were aware, with 80% accuracy, of the teachers' negotiation position. Significant differences were found, however, between principal perceptions and teacher responses in 3 of the 16 comparison tests. One of these differences was in degree of agreement where teachers believed more strongly than principals perceived that principals should be involved when evaluative policies are negotiated: the remaining differences indicate that principals are unaware of how strongly teachers believe principals should be represented by an educational expert when administrative or evaluative issues are negotiated.

SUMMARY: INTRA-GROUP ANALYSIS

The concluding section in this chapter concerned intra-group analysis of high school teacher, board member, and high school principal groups: superintendents were not included because there were so few participants.

High school principals were analyzed arithmetically for consistency of responses using .70 as a minimum-agreement level. Total agreement was found to be .78, with only 3 of the 16 cells failing to meet the minimum-agreement level. In addition Hypothesis XIII (Table 21, page 77) attempted to establish statistically that principals hold an agreement position for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations. H₁₃ was accepted: no significant differences were found on any of the selected variables which included: district size, educational preparation, age, years as an educator, years as a high school principal, and negotiation involvement.

Board members were analyzed statistically on the basis of selected variables which included: district size, years as an educator (board member), educational preparation, age, negotiator experience, union composite,¹⁰ and employment status. No significant differences appeared which were not differences in degree of agreement.

¹⁰ See definition in footnote 5, page 78.

High school teachers were analyzed statistically on the basis of selected variables which included: district size, educational preparation, years as an educator, age, sex, union composite,¹¹ organizationalism,¹² and teacher-negotiator experience. General agreement exists among teachers when correlated with each of these variables. Any significant differences are only in degree of agreement.

High school teacher organizationalism and teacher-negotiator experience responses were correlated with each of the demographic and other variables. Significant results that occurred suggest that:

(1) the typical high organizational teacher is a highly prepared male instructor in a smaller school district who has had many years of teaching experience; he very likely has been exposed to some union influences outside of education and he quite probably has served as a teacher-negotiator.

(2) the typical teacher-negotiator has been an educator for 6 - 15 years, has high educational preparation, and is a man 30 - 45 years of age who is highly organizational minded.

¹¹See definition in footnote 5, page 78.

¹²See definition in footnote 7, page 88.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

This study is an attempt to clarify the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations by determining what high school teachers, superintendents, high school principals, and board members believe that role should be. Expectations which the four respondent groups held for four kinds of negotiation issues: administrative, curricular, evaluative, and teacher-salary, were correlated with four principal-participation categories: involvement, negotiator-role, adviser-role, and educational-expert-role. Inter-group differences were particularly sought as potential areas of role conflict.

SUMMARY

Clarifying the negotiation role of high school principals required, first, determining whether principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations at all. At least 80% of each respondent group agreed that principals should be involved when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues were negotiated. The respondent groups disagreed, however, regarding principal involvement when teacher-salary policies are determined: high

school teacher and board member groups believed with 67% agreement that high school principals should not be involved, while the principal respondents, with some superintendent support, thought that they should be involved as advisers to both sides when teacher-salary policies are determined. Consequently it was concluded that, while high school principals should participate in teacher - board negotiations when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies are determined, they should not when teacher salaries are the issue.

Once the question of involvement is affirmatively answered, it is necessary to inquire how high school principals are best involved in teacher - board negotiations. Possibilities drawn from research sources included: negotiator-role, adviser-role, and educational-expert-role.

High school principals could be involved as teacher-negotiators or board-negotiators. At least two thirds of each group agreed that principals should not be negotiators when administrative and teacher-salary policies are determined. All groups also agreed that principals should not be negotiators for curricular issues, with a large minority of board members disagreeing. On evaluative issues as well, board members were the only group that believed principals should have a board-negotiator role, in contrast to all other groups who again believed principals should not be negotiators. The teacher-board group difference, statistically significant, definitely represents potential role conflict for principals. It is apparent that board members tend to consider principals as members of the administrative team, particularly when evaluative issues are negotiated.

Involving high school principals as advisers included these possibilities: advisers-only-to-teachers, advisers-only-to-board, and advisers-to-both. The four respondent groups show no agreement for the role of high school principals as advisers in teacher - board negotiations. For example, on administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues, high school teacher and principal groups contend that principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board; superintendents and board members reach no agreement. And on the teacher-salary issue, board member and teacher groups agree that high school principals should not be advisers, while the principals themselves believe they should act as advisers to both sides. This lack of agreement complicates any proposing of an appropriate advisory role, except with the teacher-salary issue where principals clearly must defer to the board member-teacher no-adviser position. In the administrative, curricular, and evaluative areas, however, an advisory role to both sides might hold some prospect for success: teacher and principal groups already strongly accept this possibility, while board member and superintendent groups are undecided. To the third suggestion, that principals select a high school principal to act as an educational expert in teacher - board negotiations, at least two thirds of all respondent groups agreed. Such a representative should participate as an educational expert when administrative, curricular, and evaluative (but not teacher-salary) policies are negotiated, an approach offering many possibilities for appropriate high school principal involvement in negotiations.

Awareness within the focal group of the attitudes held by relevant others is an important factor in role research. For example, if high school principals are reasonably aware of the expectations held by relevant groups regarding the principals' role in teacher - board negotiations, the prospects for success in attacking the problem are considerably increased. With this in mind, high school principal group perceptions of the responses of relevant groups were analyzed. Although no significant differences were found between high school principal perceptions and the responses of the superintendent and board member groups, principals' perceptions did differ from high school teacher responses in 3 of the 16 comparison tests: principals failed to perceive just how strongly teachers believe that high school principals should be involved in negotiation of evaluative issues, nor were they aware that teachers believe high school principals should be represented by an educational expert when administrative or evaluative issues are negotiated. Apparently, then, high school principals perceive quite fully the expectations of board member and superintendent groups for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations, and they perceive teacher expectations with at least 80% accuracy.

Demographic and other data was secured from each respondent and intra-group analyses made to determine what significant differences might relate to the negotiation role of high school principals. Intra-group summaries are as follows:

High school principals were analyzed arithmetically for consistency of responses using .70 as a minimum agreement level, revealing a total agreement of .78, with 3 of the 16 cells falling below .70. It was concluded that high school principals do hold an agreement position for their role in teacher - board negotiations. Areas that failed to meet the prescribed agreement level included: no-agreement for the high school principals' role as an educational expert on the teacher - salary issue (.53) and his negotiator-role on the evaluative issue (.59); and weak-agreement for his adviser-role on the teacher-salary issue (.65), his total role as an educational expert (.68), and his total position on the teacher-salary issue (.68). Selected demographic and other variables were also tested, and no significant differences found for any of the factors: school district size, educational preparation, age, years as an educator, years as a high school principal, and negotiation-involvement.

Board members were analyzed on the basis of school district size, years as an educator (board member), educational preparation, age, negotiator-experience, union composite,¹ and employment status. Only the following factors revealed significant differences in relation to the remaining variables: educational preparation -- highly educated board members believe more strongly that high school principals should not be negotiators on curricular or evaluative issues, and tend toward this position for administrative issues;

¹See definition in footnote 5, page 78.

employment status -- self-employed board members believe more strongly that high school principals should advise both sides for curricular issues, and tend toward this position for administrative and evaluative issues; board negotiator -- board members who have served as negotiators believe more strongly that high school principals should be involved in negotiations, that they should be involved as board-negotiators on curricular or evaluative issues, and that they should advise only the board for administrative, evaluative, or teacher-salary issues; board member negotiators also tend to regard the high school principal as part of the board's administrative team.

High school teachers were analyzed according to the variables of school district size, educational preparation, years as an educator, age, sex, union composite,² organizationalism,³ and teacher-negotiator experiences; generally they agree when grouped according to each of these variables. Significant differences in degree of agreement include: district size -- the smaller the teacher's school district, the more strongly he advocates principal involvement on all issues as an adviser to both sides and opposes principal involvement as a negotiator; educational preparation -- teachers with high preparation believe more strongly

²See definition in footnote 5, page 78.

³See definition in footnote 7, page 88.

that high school principals should choose a representative to act as an educational expert when curricular issues are negotiated; years as an educator -- less experienced teachers believe more strongly that high school principals should be advisers to both sides for administrative issues while more experienced teachers believe that high school principals should select a representative to act as an educational expert when curricular issues are negotiated; age -- younger teachers feel more strongly that principals should be involved in negotiations, and that the involvement should be as advisers to both sides as opposed to any kind of negotiator role; and older teachers feel more strongly that principals should be involved for curricular issues and that this involvement should be as an educational expert; sex -- women teachers believe more strongly that principals should be involved in the negotiation process and, for administrative issues, that this involvement should be as an adviser to both sides; men feel more strongly that principals should select a representative to act as an educational expert when curricular issues are negotiated; union composite -- high union composite teachers believe more strongly that principals should be board negotiators or advisers only to the board; organizationalism -- high organizationalism teachers believe more strongly that principals should not be negotiators for administrative issues; low organizational teachers believe more strongly that principals should not choose a representative to act as an educational expert when teacher salaries are negotiated; teacher-negotiator -- teacher negotiators believe more strongly that principals should be involved when curricular issues are negotiated and should select a representative to act as an educational expert when curricular policies are determined.

Since the teacher-organizationalism and teacher-negotiator variables might be expected to be closely related to the negotiation process, each of these factors was correlated with each of the other variables to see if negotiation-related differences could be found, with these significant conclusions: organizationalism -- smaller school districts have a higher proportion of high-organizational teachers, high-organizational teachers have high educational preparation, many more men than women are high-organizational teachers, high-organizational teachers have high union composites, high-organizational teachers rank high in years of teaching experience, and a significantly greater proportion of high-organizational teachers have had teacher-negotiator experience; teacher-negotiator -- most teacher-negotiators have had 6 - 15 years of teaching experience and are 30 - 45 years of age, teacher-negotiators are men with high educational preparation, and one out of three teacher-negotiators are high-organizational teachers.

Caution must be exercised in generalizing beyond the research population involved in this study since any conclusions that are drawn must be governed by the following limitations: negotiation-related data drawn from educators in a restricted geographic area necessarily reflects local experiences; responses were restricted to high school teachers and high school principals; the teachers in this study's 12 school districts are all affiliated with the Michigan Education Association; and the small number of available superintendent and principal respondents complicated and limited the statistical analysis.

CONCLUSIONS

- I All groups (with 80% agreement) responded that high school principals should be involved in teacher - board negotiations when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies are determined.
- II Two thirds of the teacher and board member respondents believe that high school principals should not be involved when teacher salaries are negotiated. The expectations which high school principals presently hold for involvement in this area, therefore, cannot be realized unless teacher and board attitudes change.
- III Teachers, principals, and superintendents consistently contend that high school principals should not be negotiators in teacher - board negotiations on any issue. Board support for using principals as board-negotiators on evaluative or curricular issues will probably produce role conflict for principals.
- IV Teacher and principal groups believe high school principals should be advisers to both the teachers and board when administrative, curricular, or evaluative issues are negotiated; the failure of superintendent and board member groups to agree on the question reflects a reluctance to share the principal-adviser. An adviser-both role, however, probably offers considerable potential for successful utilization of principals in teacher - board negotiations.

- V All groups with at least 68% agreement support the position that a high school principal representative, chosen by principals, should participate in teacher - board negotiations as an educational expert when administrative, curricular, or evaluative policies are determined, and that no such educational expert should be involved when teacher salaries are negotiated.
- VI High school principals perceive fully the expectations held by board member and superintendent groups for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations; and they perceive teacher expectations with 80% accuracy.
- VII High school principals as a group are consistent in their expectations for the role of high school principals in teacher - board negotiations, manifesting a 78% agreement level.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions reached in this exploratory study might be verified by replication in a number of ways:

- I With a larger sample of principals;
- II With elementary teachers and principals or junior high teachers and principals, board members and superintendents;
- III On a statewide basis;
- IV Or in other parts of Michigan, specifically in areas where the Michigan Federation of Teachers predominates.

This particular study was designed to determine whether high school principals should be involved in negotiations and, assuming involvement, whether they should serve as negotiators,

advisers, or educational experts. This research has suggested some direction for principal involvement, but much remains to be known:

- I How should the principals' representative function as an adviser to both sides? Is his advice available at all times, or only at negotiation sessions when both sides are present? Will an advisory role alone adequately reflect the principals' viewpoint? Will the principals feel that their concerns have been properly respected?
- II What accounts for the joint teacher-board reluctance to admit principals to teacher-salary negotiations?
- III How strongly do board members view the principal as a member of their administrative team?
- IV What are the implications of role-conflict theory for the role of principals in the negotiation process?

There is little doubt that principals in Michigan are presently disturbed with their non-involvement in teacher - board negotiations. Hopefully this study and others will suggest definite steps leading to principal involvement in negotiations. For certainly, negotiated contracts must represent the contributions of all educators if they are to ensure the best possible working conditions for teachers and maximize learning in students.

APPENDIX A

LETTERS AND INSTRUMENT USED

IN THIS STUDY

Directory:

	<u>Page</u>
Endorsement Letter of the MASSP	115
Confirmation Letter to Superintendents	116-17
Confirmation Letter to High School Principals	118-19
Introductory Letter to All Groups	120
General Information Data: High School Teachers	121-23
General Information Data: Superintendents	124-25
General Information Data: Board of Education Members	126-27
General Information Data: High School Principals	128-29
Basic Questionnaire Data: All Groups	130-33
Supplementary Questionnaire Data:	
High School Principals Only	134-45

(Sample letter from the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, supporting this research project, that was sent to each of the thirteen school districts)

September 27, 1967

Mr. Russell W. Formsma
Superintendent
Kelloggsville Public Schools
23 Jean Street S.W.
Wyoming, Michigan 49508

Dear Mr. Formsma:

The Executive Committee of the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals has endorsed John Pylman's research project which focuses on the problems of non-significant involvement of the high school principal in teacher-board of education collective negotiations. Since there are many areas of agreement and disagreement, the Executive Committee felt this study could point the way toward a clearer identification of the role the high school principal should perform in the negotiations process.

Your school district is one of the thirteen involved in this study and the Executive Committee of MASSP would like to encourage your cooperation and the cooperation of your high school principal and staff members.

Sincerely yours,

Theodore B. Southerland
Executive Secretary

TBS/af

(Sample letter of confirmation that was sent to each participating school district)

October 11, 1967

James F. Bale, Superintendent
Rockford Public Schools
Rockford, Michigan

Dear Mr. Bale:

I wish to thank you for your willingness to include your school district in the research project we recently discussed. I am very aware of the trust that this involves. Every possible effort will be extended to conduct this study on a high educational plane so that the results contribute to the worth of our profession.

Confirmation of our telephone arrangements is a second purpose of this letter. Busy superintendents have many things to remember so here are the basic details of this behavioral research study:

- a. This research involves the 13 school districts (K-12) in and around Grand Rapids. Its focus is the high school principal's involvement in teacher-board of education negotiations as it is seen by high school teachers, superintendents, board of education members, and the high school principals themselves.
- b. The basic survey instrument is a 20 minute questionnaire that is administered entirely by the project director. It is planned to schedule the instrument administration at times that are acceptable to the participants.
- c. The principal's questionnaire is longer since he is the focal person of this study. Completion time of his questionnaire should involve less than 30 minutes.
- d. Should identification of individuals or individual school districts result, this data will be treated confidentially and professionally.
- e. The project has been explained to your teachers' association president and his support has been secured.
- f. Results of the study will be forwarded to you as soon as they are available.

James F. Bale, Superintendent
Page 2
October 11, 1967

Kindly plan to refer any questions to me at your earliest convenience.
Leaving a message with my wife Betty at our home (949-4138) will
result in a prompt reply.

Thank-you again for your assistance.

John H. Pylman, Director
Behavioral Research Study
Michigan State University

(Sample letter of confirmation that was sent to each participating high school)

October 13, 1967

Jack De Waard, Principal
Kentwood Public Schools
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Dear Mr. De Waard:

I wish to thank you for your willingness to involve your staff and yourself in the research project we recently discussed. I am very aware of the trust that this involves. Every effort will be extended to conduct this study on a high educational plane so that the greatest possible benefit may accrue to our profession.

Confirmation of our telephone arrangements is a second purpose of this letter. I am planning to survey your school on Monday, November 6 at 3:00 P.M. I will report to your office not later than 2:30 P.M. to allow time for us to check procedures. As agreed, I will conduct the survey session.

This project has been discussed with Superintendent Hill and Ray Null, the KEA president. Their support for this research was solicited and has been received. A copy of this letter is being sent to your building representative of your teachers' association.

The purpose of this study is to investigate possible avenues that could lead to appropriate involvement of principals in the collective negotiations that occur between teachers and boards of education. It is not presumed that this project will solve the problems that presently exist. It is intended that this research would lead to middle-management involvement in negotiations, that would further the already apparent success of the negotiations process.

The questionnaires have been pre-tested. High school teachers will find that their questionnaire will require less than 20 minutes to complete. High school principals are somewhat less fortunate since their completion time involves up to 30 minutes of effort.

Should identification of individuals or individual school districts result, this data will be treated confidentially and professionally. Results of this study will be sent to you as soon as they are available.

Jack De Waard, Principal
Page 2
October 13, 1967

Kindly refer any questions to me at your earliest opportunity. Any message left with my wife Betty at our home (949-4138) will result in a prompt response.

Thank-you again for your assistance.

John H. Pylman, Director
Behavioral Research Project
Michigan State University

(Sample introductory letter that was used in all questionnaires)

Dear High School Staff Member

In most educational research, more information is needed from the people who make things happen. You are involved in this research because you are one of these people.

The material that follows begins with a general information page, followed by a check-list type of questionnaire. We have timed this, and it probably will take you less than 20 minutes to complete. Please do not identify yourself or your school.

Kindly accept our sincere thanks for your professional assistance. Results of this study will be forwarded to you as soon as they are available.

Appreciatively

John H. Pylman, Director
Behavioral Research Project
Michigan State University

GENERAL INFORMATION: High School Teachers**1. How many years have you been:**

(Please respond numerically to each item)

- a. an educator?..... years
- b. an educator in your present school district?..... years
- c. a teacher in grades K-12?..... years
- d. a teacher in grades 9-12?..... years
- e. a principal of any kind?..... years
- f. a high school principal?..... years
- g. a high school teacher in your present school district?.... years

2. What is the highest degree you held? (check one choice)

- a. Less than a Bachelors.....
- b. Bachelors.....
- c. Masters.....
- d. Masters plus 30 semester hours.....
- e. Specialist.....
- f. Doctors.....

3. What is your age?..... years**4. What is your sex?..... Female** Male**5. What is your present teaching assignment?**

	<u>Check One</u>	<u>Number of Sections</u>
a. Art, Music.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
b. Business Education.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
c. English, Speech, Foreign Language, Librarian	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
d. Industrial Arts, Home Economics.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
e. Mathematics or Science.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
f. Social Studies.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
g. Physical Education.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
h. Counselor.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
i. Other (please specify).....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

6. Is more than half of your teaching day spent instructing in grades 9-12?..... yes ☐
no ☐
7. Which of the following best describes your MEA Activity?
(check one)
- a. I am not a member of MEA..... ☐ 1
- b. I simply join each year to get the journal..... ☐ 2
- c. I attend a few meetings, but don't say much..... ☐ 3
- d. I attend some meetings and participate in discussions..... ☐ 4
- e. I attend all meetings and try to get others to think my way about policy..... ☐ 5
8. Have you ever been a district MEA chairman or MEA officer?..... yes ☐
no ☐
9. Have you ever served as a member of a teachers' collective negotiations team?..... yes ☐
no ☐
10. Did you vote in any election to select a local teachers' collective negotiations team?..... yes ☐
no ☐
11. Did you vote in any election that ratified a yearly contract for teachers?..... yes ☐
no ☐
12. In jobs that you may have held other than teaching, how many years were you a member of a labor union?..... (Check One)
- None..... ☐
- One..... ☐
- Two..... ☐
- Three..... ☐
- More than three..... ☐

13. How many members of your family (parents, spouse, brothers, or sisters, children) have been members of a labor union?..... (Check One)

None..... ☐
One..... ☐
Two..... ☐
Three..... ☐
More than three.... ☐

14. How many of your neighbors belong to labor unions?..... (Check One)

None..... ☐
A few..... ☐
Some..... ☐
Most..... ☐
All..... ☐

GENERAL INFORMATION: Superintendents
(Please respond numerically to each item)

1. How many years have you been:

- a. an educator?..... years
- b. an educator in your present school district?..... years
- c. a teacher in public or private schools?..... years
- d. a teacher in grades 9-12?..... years
- e. a public or private school principal?..... years
- f. a high school principal?..... years
- g. a superintendent of schools?..... years
- h. a superintendent of schools in your present district?... years

2. What is the highest degree you hold? (check one)

- a. Bachelors.....
- b. Masters.....
- c. Masters plus 30 semester hours.....
- d. Specialist.....
- e. Doctors.....

3. What is your age?..... years

4. What is the total student enrollment in grades 9-12 of your school district?.....

5. How many teachers (number) are employed at least half-time in grades 9-12 in your school district?.....

6. What organization represents your teachers? (check one).....

MEA

MFT

Other

7. What is your involvement in the teachers-Board of Education negotiations process? (check one)
- a. as chief negotiator for the Board of Education..... ☐
 - b. as a member of the Board of Education bargaining team..... ☐
 - c. as an educational expert who is not a member of either bargaining team..... ☐
 - d. other (please specify)_____ ☐
8. In jobs that you have held other than as an educator, how many years were you a member of a labor union? (check one)
- a. none..... ☐ years
 - b. one..... ☐ years
 - c. two ☐ years
 - d. three ☐ years
 - e. more than three..... ☐ years
9. How many members of your family (parents, spouse, brothers or sisters, children) are or have been members of a labor union? (check one)
- a. none..... ☐
 - b. one..... ☐
 - c. two ☐
 - d. three ☐
 - e. more than three..... ☐
10. How many of your neighbors belong to a labor union? (check one)
- a. none..... ☐
 - b. a few..... ☐
 - c. some..... ☐
 - d. most..... ☐
 - e. all..... ☐

GENERAL INFORMATION: Board of Education Members

1. How many years have you served education as:
(Please respond numerically to each item)

- a. an educator (School Board Member, Teacher, Principal, etc.)?... years
- b. an educator (School Board Member, Teacher, Principal. etc.)
in your present school district?..... years
- c. a teacher in public or private schools?..... years
- d. a teacher in grades 9-12? years
- e. a principal of any kind?..... years
- f. a high school principal?..... years
- g. a superintendent of schools?..... years
- h. a school board member in other school districts?..... years
- i. a school board member in your present district?..... years

2. What is your formal educational background? (check one)

- a. I did not complete high school..... ☐
- b. I am a high school graduate..... ☐
- c. I graduated from high school and attended post-graduate
school (business, trade, etc.)..... ☐
- d. I completed one to three years of college..... ☐
- e. I am a college graduate and hold a Bachelors degree..... ☐
- f. I am a college graduate and hold a Masters degree..... ☐
- g. I am a college graduate and hold a Doctors degree..... ☐

3. What is your age?..... years

4. What is your sex?.....Female ☐

Male ☐

5. Are you self employed?..... Yes ☐

No ☐

6. What kind of work do you do? _____

7. Are most of the employees where you work members of labor unions? (check one)..... yes ☐

no ☐

8. How many years of membership do you have in a labor union? (number)..... years

9. How many members of your family (parents, spouse, brothers or sisters, children) are or have been members of a labor union? (check one)

a. None ☐

b. One ☐

c. Two..... ☐

d. Three..... ☐

e. More than three..... ☐

10. How many of your neighbors belong to labor unions? (check one)

a. None..... ☐

b. A few..... ☐

c. Some..... ☐

d. Most..... ☐

e. All..... ☐

11. Have you ever served on a board of education contract negotiations team? (check one).....yes ☐

no ☐

GENERAL INFORMATION: High School Principals**1. How many years have you been:****(Please respond numerically to each item)**

- a. an educator?..... years
- b. an educator in your present district?..... years
- c. a teacher in grades K-12?..... years
- d. a teacher in grades 9-12?..... years
- e. a principal of any kind?..... years
- f. a high school principal?..... years
- g. a high school principal in your present school district?.. years

2. What is the highest degree you hold? (check one choice)

- a. Bachelors..... ☐
- b. Masters..... ☐
- c. Masters plus 30 semester hours..... ☐
- d. Specialist..... ☐
- e. Doctors..... ☐

3. What is your age?..... years**4. What grades do you supervise? (circle)**

7 - 8 - 9 - 10 - 11 - 12

5. What is the total student enrollment in your building?..... **6. How many (what number) of your teachers are assigned at least half-time in grades 9-12?.....** **7. How have you been involved in teachers' Board of Education negotiations?**

- a. as a negotiator for the Board of Education..... ☐
- b. as an advisor (formal or informal)to the Board of Education bargaining team..... ☐
- c. as an advisor (formal or informal)to the teachers' bargaining team..... ☐

d. as an advisor to both bargaining teams..... ☐

e. I haven't been involved in collective negotiations
of teachers..... ☐

f. Other (please specify)... _____

8. In jobs that you have held other than as an educator,
how many years were you a member of a labor union?

a. none..... ☐

b. one ☐

c. two..... ☐

d. three..... ☐

e. more than three..... ☐

9. How many members of your family (parents, spouse, brothers
or sisters, children) have been members of a labor union?

a. none..... ☐

b. one..... ☐

c. two ☐

d. three..... ☐

e. more than three..... ☐

10. How many of your neighbors belong to a labor union?

a. none..... ☐

b. a few..... ☐

c. some..... ☐

d. most..... ☐

e. all..... ☐

On the next four pages are some possible behaviors for high school principals in certain teachers' -Board of Education collective negotiation situations. Some of these behaviors are contrary to existing legal patterns but have been included to avoid limiting your range of choice. For each number (1-4) check the one response which comes closest to how you feel.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES COVERING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. The Size of Classes.
2. The Length of the School Day
3. Scheduling of Staff Meetings.

SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT.....

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations? (check one)..... ☐ yes
☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teacher?..... ☐
 - b. for the Board of Education, chosen by the administration..... ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the Board of Education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and Board of Education..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the high school principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify) _____

BEFORE YOU TURN THIS PAGE, BE SURE YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM (1 thru 4)

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES COVERING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Courses of Study.
2. Selection of Textbooks.
3. Teaching procedures.

SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT.....

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ **yes**

☐ **no**

2. serve as a negotiator (check one)

a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐

b. for the Board of Education, chosen by the
administration?..... ☐

c. for neither side?..... ☐

3. serve as an advisor (check one)

a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐

b. to the Board of Education ONLY?..... ☐

c. to BOTH the teachers and Board of Education?..... ☐

d. to neither side?..... ☐

4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the high school principals. (check one)

a. to present the views of high school principals
on this issue..... ☐

b. no such educational expert should be chosen
by the principals..... ☐

5. serve in some other manner (please specify) _____

BEFORE YOU TURN THIS PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM (1 thru 4)

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES COVERING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Evaluation of teachers
2. Teacher transfers between buildings

SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT:

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations? (check one)..... ☐ **yes**
☐ **no**
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?. ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THIS PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF
EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES
GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Teachers Salaries

SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT:

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations? (check one)..... ☐ yes
☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?..... ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this
issue..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the
principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THIS PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE
FOR EACH ITEM.

Previously you were asked to respond to four different teachers' - board of education collective negotiations situations, from your point of view. Now these same situations are presented again, and you are asked to indicate HOW YOU THINK HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS will respond to these situations.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. The Size of Classes
2. The Length of the School Day
3. Scheduling of Staff Meetings

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION: "SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT....."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?. ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THIS PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES COVERING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Courses of Study
2. Selection of Textbooks
3. Teaching Procedures

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION.. "SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?..... ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert, chosen by the high school principals: (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THE PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Evaluation of Teachers
2. Teacher Transfers between Buildings

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?. ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the high school principals: (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THIS PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

1

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Teachers' Salaries

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration? ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor? (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert, chosen by the high school principals? (check one)
 - a. to present the views of the high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THIS PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

Now consider these situations, indicating How You Think Superintendents will respond.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Courses of Study
2. Selection of Textbooks
3. Teaching Procedures

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK SUPERINTENDENTS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration? ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert, chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THE PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. The Size of Classes
2. The Length of the School Day
3. Scheduling of Staff Meetings

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK SUPERINTENDENTS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT..."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?..... ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the high school principals? (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THE PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Evaluation of Teachers
2. Teacher Transfers between Buildings

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK SUPERINTENDENTS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ **yes**
(check one) ☐ **no**
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?..... ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY? ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert, chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THE PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Teachers' Salaries

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK SUPERINTENDENTS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?.. ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THE PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

Now consider these situations, indicating How You Think Board of Education Members Will Respond.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Courses of Study
2. Selection of Textbooks
3. Teaching Procedures

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?. ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY? ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert, chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the high school principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THE PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ABOVE ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. The Size of Classes
2. The Length of the School Day
3. Scheduling of Staff Meetings

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?.. ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY? ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert, chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the high school principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THE PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Evaluation of Teachers
2. Teacher Transfers between Buildings

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?.. ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert, chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

BEFORE YOU TURN THE PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

SITUATION: IN A CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE TEACHERS' AND BOARD OF EDUCATION BARGAINING TEAMS MEET TO NEGOTIATE POLICIES GOVERNING SUCH THINGS AS:

1. Teachers Salaries

INDICATE: HOW YOU THINK BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS WILL RESPOND TO THE QUESTION..."SHOULD A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THAT SCHOOL DISTRICT...."

1. be involved, somehow, in these negotiations?..... ☐ yes
(check one) ☐ no
2. serve as a negotiator (check one)
 - a. for the teachers, chosen by the teachers?..... ☐
 - b. for the board of education, chosen by the administration?..... ☐
 - c. for neither side?..... ☐
3. serve as an advisor (check one)
 - a. to the teachers ONLY?..... ☐
 - b. to the board of education ONLY?..... ☐
 - c. to BOTH the teachers and board of education?..... ☐
 - d. to neither side?..... ☐
4. serve as an educational expert chosen by the high school principals (check one)
 - a. to present the views of high school principals on this issue?..... ☐
 - b. no such educational expert should be chosen by the high school principals..... ☐
5. serve in some other manner (please specify)

WHEN YOU FINISH THIS PAGE, BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE CHECKED ONE CHOICE IN EACH ITEM.

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

<u>Directory:</u>	<u>Pages</u>
28-33 Principals correlated by district size, age, educational preparation, years a high school principal, years an educator, and negotiations involvement	147-58
34-37 Board members correlated by district size, years as board members, age, and union composite	159-66
38-45 Teachers correlated by district size, years as educators, educational preparation, age, sex, union composite, organizationalism, and negotiator experience	167-82

APPENDIX B

TABLE 28

PRINCIPAL RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH DISTRICT SIZE

(28:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues				Curricular Issues				Evaluative Issues				Teacher-Salary Issues			
		Yes	No			Yes	No			Yes	No			Yes	No		
Small		3	0			3	0			3	0			3	0		
Medium		7	0			7	0			6	1			4	3		
Large		6	1			7	0			6	1			5	2		
χ^2	df=2	NS				NS				NS				NS			
(28:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues				Curricular Issues				Evaluative Issues				Teacher-Salary Issues			
		Tchr Only	Bd Only	No		Tchr Only	Bd Only	No		Tchr Only	Bd Only	No		Tchr Only	Bd Only	No	
Small		0	0	3		0	0	3		0	0	3		0	0	3	
Medium		0	2	5		0	2	5		0	3	4		0	0	7	
Large		0	2	5		0	3	4		0	4	3		0	1	6	
χ^2	df=2	NS				NS				NS				NS			

APPENDIX B, TABLE 28 (continued)

(28:3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																	
		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues									
		Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd								
		Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No				
Small		0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
Medium		0	1	6	0	0	1	6	0	0	2	5	0	0	1	3	3
Large		0	0	7	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	5	2
χ^2	df=2	NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		df=4	3.886		

(28:4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
		Small		Medium		Large			
		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Medium		5	2	5	2	5	2	2	5
Large		7	0	7	0	7	0	5	2
χ^2	df=2	NS	5.355	NS	5.355	NS	5.355	NS	2.856

APPENDIX B
TABLE 29

PRINCIPAL RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE

(29:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
50 or Under	10	1	11	0	10	1	7	4	
Over 50	6	0	6	0	5	1	5	1	
χ^2 df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS 0.726		

(29:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
	Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
50 or Under	0	2	9	0	4	7	0	4	7
Over 50	0	2	4	0	1	5	0	3	3
χ^2 df=1	NS		0.495		NS		0.726		NS

APPENDIX B, TABLE 29 (continued)

(29:3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																		
			Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues									
			Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd								
			Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No				
50 or Under			0	1	10	0	0	2	9	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	6	5
Over 50			0	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	5	0
χ^2	df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		5.058		df=2

(29:4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
50 or Under		9		2		9		2		9		2	
Over 50		4		2		4		2		4		2	
χ^2	df=1	NS		0.495		NS		0.495		NS		0.495	
										NS		1.431	

APPENDIX B
TABLE 30

PRINCIPAL RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

(30.1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Less Than A Specialist Degree		12	1	13	0	11	2	9	4
At Least A Specialist Degree		4	0	4	0	4	0	3	1
χ^2	df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS	

(30.2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?											
		Tchr Only		Bd Only		No		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
		0	3	10	0	4	9	0	5	8	0
Less Than A Specialist Degree		0	3	10	0	4	9	0	5	8	0
At Least A Specialist Degree		0	1	3	0	1	3	0	2	2	0
χ^2	df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS		0.168	
NS											

APPENDIX B, TABLE 30 (continued)

(30:3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?													
		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues					
		Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd		
		Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No
Less Than A Specialist Degree		0	0	13	0	0	1	12	0	0	1	12	0
At Least A Specialist Degree		0	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	3	0
χ^2	df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		df=2 1.236	

(30:4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?													
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		9	4	4	9	4	9	4	4	9	4	6	7
Less Than A Specialist Degree		9	4	4	9	4	9	4	4	9	6	7	
At Least A Specialist Degree		4	0	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	2	2	
χ^2	df=1	NS		1.609		NS		1.609		NS		NS	

APPENDIX B
TABLE 31
PRINCIPAL RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AS A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

(31:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?												
	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues					
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		Yes	No	
Under 6	4	1	5	0	4	1	2	3				
6-15	7	0	7	0	7	0	7	0				
Over 15	5	0	5	0	4	1	3	2				
χ^2 df=2	NS		NS		NS		NS 5.440					

(31:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?												
	Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only			Tchr Only		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No				
Under 6	0	1	4	0	3	2	0	2	3	0	0	5
6-15	0	2	5	0	2	5	0	3	4	0	1	6
Over 15	0	1	4	0	0	5	0	2	3	0	0	5
χ^2 df=2	NS		NS 4.339		NS		NS			NS		

APPENDIX B, TABLE 31 (continued)

(31.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Tchr Bd Only	No	Tchr Bd Only	No	Tchr Bd Only	No	Tchr Bd Only	No
Under 6		0	0	5	0	0	1	4	0
6-15		0	1	6	0	0	1	6	0
Over 15		0	0	5	0	0	0	5	0
χ^2	df=2	NS		NS		NS		NS	
								df=3	
								5.652	

(31.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Tchr Bd Only	No	Tchr Bd Only	No	Tchr Bd Only	No	Tchr Bd Only	No
Under 6		4	1	4	1	4	1	1	4
6-15		6	1	6	1	6	1	5	2
Over 15		3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3
χ^2	df=2	NS		NS		NS		NS	
								3.238	

APPENDIX B

TABLE 32

PRINCIPAL RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AN EDUCATOR

(32.1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																
χ^2		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues								
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No							
	Under 16	6	1	7	0	6	1	5	2							
	16 or More	10	0	10	0	9	1	7	3							
	df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS								
(32.2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																
χ^2		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only				
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No					
	Under 16	0	2	5	0	4	3	0	4	3	0	0	7			
	16 or More	0	2	8	0	1	9	0	3	7	0	1	9			
	df=1	NS		0.168		NS		4.408		NS		1.252		NS		0.744

APPENDIX B, TABLE 32 (continued)

(32.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																	
		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues									
		Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Only	Both				
		Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both				
	Under 16	0	1	6	0	0	2	5	0	0	1	6	0	0	4	3	
	16 or More	0	0	10	0	0	0	10	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	7	2
χ^2	df=1	NS		1.518		NS		3.238		NS		NS		NS		df=2 1.537	

(32.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?													
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Under 16	16 or More	Under 16	16 or More	Under 16	16 or More	Under 16	16 or More	Under 16	16 or More	Under 16	16 or More
	Under 16	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	3	4		
	16 or More	7	3	7	3	7	3	7	3	5	5		
χ^2	df=1	NS		0.565		NS		0.565		NS		NS 0.084	

APPENDIX B
TABLE 33

PRINCIPAL RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH NEGOTIATIONS INVOLVEMENT

(33:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes		10	0	10	0	9	1	8	2
No		6	1	7	0	6	1	4	3
χ^2	df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS	
								1.036	
(33:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes		0	3	0	3	0	5	0	1
No		0	1	0	2	0	5	0	0
χ^2	df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS	
								0.744	

APPENDIX B, TABLE 33 (continued)

(33 3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?													
		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues					
		Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No				
Yes		0	1	9	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	7	2
No		0	0	7	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	7	0
χ^2		NS		NS		NS		1.587		NS		df=2 1.537	
df=1													
(33 4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?													
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Issues		Issues		Issues		Issues		Issues			
Yes		7	3	7	3	7	3	7	3	5	5	5	5
No		8	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	3	4	4	4
χ^2		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS		NS	
df=1												0.084	

APPENDIX B
TABLE 34

BOARD MEMBER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH DISTRICT SIZE

(34.1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Small		15	1	17	0	16	1	6	11
		36	9	42	3	42	3	15	30
Medium		10	4	11	3	12	2	3	11
		NS	2.582	NS	5.077	NS	0.974	NS	0.840
χ^2	df=2								

(34.2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Small		0	7	10	1	9	7	0	4
		1	13	31	1	19	25	0	9
Medium		0	4	10	0	6	8	0	0
		NS	1.562	NS	1.961	NS	0.125	NS	df=2
χ^2	df=4								3.815

APPENDIX B, TABLE 34 (continued)

(34.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																	
		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues									
		Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No						
		Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	No					
Small		0	10	5	2	0	7	10	0	0	9	8	0	9	1	7	
Medium		1	20	20	4	0	17	22	6	0	21	19	4	0	10	4	30
Large		0	8	3	3	0	5	7	2	0	5	8	1	0	1	2	11
χ^2	df=4	NS	df=6	4.656	NS	2.622	NS	2.484	NS	2.484	NS	9.214					

(34.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No
		Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both
Small		14	3	14	3	14	3	9	8
Medium		32	11	30	14	28	16	19	25
Large		9	5	11	3	11	3	3	11
χ^2	df=2	NS	1.314	NS	1.501	NS	2.591	NS	3.294

APPENDIX B, TABLE 35 (continued)

(35.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																													
Administrative Issues			Curricular Issues			Evaluative Issues			Teacher-Salary Issues																				
Tchr	Bd	No	Tchr	Bd	No	Tchr	Bd	No	Tchr	Bd	No																		
Only			Both			Only			Both																				
Under 6			1	19	18	4	0	14	24	4	0	16	23	3	0	10	6	26											
6 or More			0	19	10	5	0	15	15	4	0	19	12	2	0	10	1	22											
χ^2	df=2		NS			df=3			2.583			NS			1.284			NS			2.876			NS			2.866		

(35.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																		
			Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
Under 6			29		13		30		12		28		13		19		22	
6 or More			26		6		25		8		25		9		12		22	
χ^2	df=1		NS		1.417		NS		0.177		NS		0.246		NS		0.935	

APPENDIX B
TABLE 36
BOARD MEMBERS RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH AGE

(36.1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues				Curricular Issues				Evaluative Issues				Teacher-Salary Issues			
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Only	Bd	Only	No	Only	Bd	Only	No	Only	Bd	Only	No	Only	Bd	Only	No
Under 40		12	4	2	10	13	1	1	13	1	1	4	10				
40 or Over		49	12	12	37	57	5	5	57	5	20	42					
χ^2	df=1	NS		0.218		NS		0.013		NS		0.013		NS		0.072	

(36.2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues				Curricular Issues				Evaluative Issues				Teacher-Salary Issues			
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Only	Bd	Only	No	Only	Bd	Only	No	Only	Bd	Only	No	Only	Bd	Only	No
Under 40		0	4	10	14	0	6	8	14	0	9	5	13	0	1	13	
40 or Over		1	20	41	62	2	28	32	60	0	35	26	49	0	12	49	
χ^2	df=2,1,1	NS		0.323		NS		0.532		NS		0.224		NS		1.247	

APPENDIX B, TABLE 36 (continued)

(36.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues										
		Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd									
		Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both									
	Under 40	0	6	7	1	0	4	8	2	0	4	9	1	0	2	2	10	
	40 or Over	1	32	21	8	0	25	31	6	0	31	26	4	0	18	5	38	
χ^2	df=2	NS		df=3		1.527		NS		0.757		NS		2.359		NS		1.590

(36.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?															
		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No			
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Under 40		10	4	11	3	12	2	9	5						
40 or Over		45	15	44	17	41	20	22	39						
χ^2	df=1	NS		0.076		NS		0.242		NS		1.880		NS	3.740

APPENDIX B

TABLE 37

BOARD MEMBER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH UNION COMPOSITE

(37.1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?

	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Low	53	10	61	3	60	4	22	42
High	8	4	9	3	10	2	2	10
χ^2	NS		.05		NS		NS	
	df=1		5.734		1.508		1.467	

(37.2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?

	Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Low	1	22	41	2	31	31	0	23
High	0	2	10	0	3	9	0	4
χ^2	NS		NS		NS		NS	
	df=2,1,1		1.750		2.970		3.781	
							NS	
							0.808	

APPENDIX B, TABLE 37 (continued)

(37.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																
		Administrative Issues				Curricular Issues				Evaluative Issues				Teacher-Salary Issues		
		Tchr	Bd	No		Tchr	Bd	No		Tchr	Bd	No		Tchr	Bd	No
		Only	Both			Only	Both			Only	Both			Only	Both	
Low		1	31	25	7	0	24	35	5	0	31	30	3	0	19	7
High		0	7	3	2	0	5	4	3	0	4	5	2	0	1	0
χ^2	df=2	NS	df=3	1.208		NS	3.780			NS	2.861			NS	4.843	

(37.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Low		45	17	46	18	43	20	28	35
High		10	2	9	2	10	2	3	9
χ^2	df=1	NS	0.609	NS	0.475	NS	1.106	NS	1.572

APPENDIX B

TABLE 38

TEACHER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH DISTRICT SIZE

(38.1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Small		75	7	77	4	80	1	35	47
Medium		245	34	251	30	267	15	98	181
Large		220	62	226	58	252	32	78	205
χ^2	df=2	.001	13.922	.001	17.549	.01	12.445	.02	7.845

(38.2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
			No		No		No		No		No		No
Small		13	1	67	26	3	52	19	20	41	13	2	67
Medium		49	16	213	75	21	185	83	41	154	22	8	251
Large		52	32	197	63	34	184	71	55	155	33	9	240
χ^2	df=4	.02	12.637	NS	8.848	NS	5.822	NS	5.195	NS	5.195	NS	5.195

APPENDIX B, TABLE 38 (continued)

(38.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd
		Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both
		No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Small		9	0	68	5	2	1	74	4
Medium		20	12	208	41	24	9	219	30
Large		19	22	193	49	19	21	193	50
χ^2	df=6	.01	17.333	.001	25.941	.05	14.599	NS	12.044
(38.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Small		59	21	58	22	63	17	33	48
Medium		199	72	184	89	199	75	94	180
Large		199	77	190	88	208	73	100	180
χ^2	df=2	NS	0.157	NS	0.749	NS	1.207	NS	1.127

APPENDIX B

TABLE 39

TEACHER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH YEARS AN EDUCATOR

(39:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Under 6		234	36	223	48	254	17	96	174
6-15		209	45	229	28	241	17	78	178
16 or Over		97	21	102	15	104	13	37	80
χ^2	df=2	NS		NS		NS		NS	
		2.276		5.255		3.135		1.634	

(39:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Under 6		49	19	202	68	23	178	72	48	148	30	10	231
6-15		46	20	186	62	24	170	62	45	148	29	4	223
16 or Over		19	10	88	34	11	72	39	23	53	9	5	103
χ^2	df=4	NS		0.516		NS		1.200		NS		5.057	
		NS		0.516		NS		1.200		NS		5.057	
		NS		0.516		NS		1.200		NS		5.057	
		NS		0.516		NS		1.200		NS		5.057	
		NS		0.516		NS		1.200		NS		5.057	

APPENDIX B, TABLE 39 (continued)

(39.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Tchr	Bd	No	Only	Both	No	Tchr	Bd
		Only	Only	Both	No	Only	Both	Only	Both
Under 6		18	9	215	29	17	12	200	41
6-15		24	17	175	41	21	14	196	27
16 or More		6	8	79	24	7	5	90	15
χ^2		.05		14.476		NS		3.588	
df=6						NS		2.617	
								NS	
								5.573	

(39.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Under 6		193	73	168	98	194	74	92	176
6-15		184	61	179	70	188	63	86	165
16 or More		80	35	85	30	88	27	49	66
χ^2		NS		1.264		.05		6.410	
df=2						NS		0.845	
								NS	
								2.830	

APPENDIX B

TABLE 40

TEACHER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

	(40:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?					
	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Less Than A Masters Degree	341	57	338	63	376	26
At Least A Masters Degree	192	45	210	27	216	21
χ^2	NS		NS		NS	
df=1					1.253	
					NS	
					0.260	

	(40:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?					
	Tchr Bd		Tchr Bd		Tchr Bd	
	Only	No	Only	No	Only	No
Less Than A Masters Degree	72	27	301	99	36	264
At Least A Masters Degree	40	21	171	64	21	151
χ^2	NS		1.119		NS	
df=2					0.418	
					NS	
					0.137	
					NS	
					1.666	

APPENDIX B, TABLE 40 (continued)

(40:3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																
	Administrative Issues				Curricular Issues				Evaluative Issues				Teacher-Salary Issues			
	Tchr		Bd		Tchr		Bd		Tchr		Bd		Tchr		Bd	
	Only	Both	No		Only	Both	No		Only	Both	No		Only	Both	No	
Less Than A Masters Degree	31	20	297	53	25	22	295	59	108	70	219	0	11	13	123	252
At Least A Masters Degree	17	14	165	41	19	9	184	25	63	44	127	1	8	12	73	144
χ^2	NS		2.390		NS		3.852		NS		1.829		NS		1.560	

(40:4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Less Than A Masters Degree		281	109	255	135	288	107	288	107	133	261	133	261
At Least A Masters Degree		171	58	172	61	176	56	176	56	89	144	89	144
χ^2	df=1	NS		0.503		.05		4.813		NS		0.661	
										NS		1.263	

APPENDIX B, TABLE 41 (continued)

(41.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?																	
Administrative Issues			Curricular Issues			Evaluative Issues			Teacher-Salary Issues								
Tchr	Bd	No	Only	Both	No	Tchr	Bd	No	Only	Both	No	Tchr	Bd	No	Only	Both	No
Under 30	22	7	225	28	22	9	208	43	21	20	215	27	9	6	90	178	
	16	25	162	43	16	18	184	28	15	37	168	25	8	16	69	152	
Over 45	10	2	78	22	7	4	89	12	13	4	80	11	2	3	40	65	
χ^2	.001		29.708		NS		7.903		.01		18.083		NS		9.488		
df=6																	

(41.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
Under 30		200	78	172	107	207	73	90	191								
30-45		170	64	169	66	171	69	88	152								
Over 45		83	27	85	26	88	21	48	61								
χ^2	df=2	NS		0.497		.01		10.600		NS		3.518		NS		5.029	

APPENDIX B

TABLE 42

TEACHER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH SEX

(42.1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
	Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Women	221	31	219	35	238	16	84	168	
Men	316	70	332	55	358	30	126	261	
χ^2 df-1	.05	3.893	NS	0.024	NS	0.474	NS	0.042	

(42.2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
	Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Women	50	15	186	73	15	165	86	38	127
Men	64	34	286	90	42	253	87	77	219
χ^2 df-2	NS	2.527	.05	6.037	.01	10.674	NS	0.581	

APPENDIX B, TABLE 42 (continued)

(42:3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No	Tchr Bd	No
Women		13	3	202	35	13	7	200	34
				Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both
Men		35	30	264	59	32	23	283	49
χ^2	df=3	.001	18.960	NS	6.200	NS	4.998	NS	6.618

(42:4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Women		175	70	159	91	179	70	79	168
Men		278	99	268	108	287	94	146	237
χ^2	df=1	NS	0.401	.05	4.081	NS	0.926	NS	2.463

APPENDIX B

TABLE 43

TEACHER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH UNION COMPOSITE

(43.1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Low		450	78	452	79	495	37	176	353
	High	90	25	102	13	104	11	35	80
χ^2	df=1	NS		NS		NS		NS	
		3.407		0.988		0.938		0.345	
(43.2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?									
		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Low		96	35	137	38	144	86	57	12
	High	18	14	27	20	29	30	11	7
χ^2	df=2	NS		.01		NS		NS	
		4.319		11.966		5.987		4.891	

APPENDIX B, TABLE 43 (continued)

(4.3.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues									
		Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd	Tchr	Bd								
		Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both	Only	Both								
Low		42	19	397	73	41	21	400	69	45	42	391	49	17	17	171	324
High		6	15	72	22	4	10	86	15	4	20	76	15	2	8	30	75
χ^2	df=3	.001		20.800		NS		6.874		.01		14.026		NS		5.523	

(4.3.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?													
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Low		367	146	348	169	385	135	188	333				
High		90	24	84	30	85	30	39	75				
χ^2	df=1	NS	2.590	NS	1.757	NS	0.001	NS	0.143				

APPENDIX B

TABLE 44

TEACHER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH ORGANIZATIONALISM

(44:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
High		130	26	138	17	144	11	56	99
Low		410	77	416	75	455	37	155	334
χ^2	df=1	NS 0.064		NS 1.790		NS 0.031		NS 1.049	

(44:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Tchr Only		Bd Only	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
High		17	10	128	39	12	104	34	28	91	13	5	138
Low		97	39	349	125	46	317	139	88	259	55	14	420
χ^2	df=2	.05 7.546		NS 0.426		NS 2.564		NS 1.090					

APPENDIX B, TABLE 44 (continued)

(44.3) Should High School Principals Be Advisers In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Administrative Issues		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Tchr	Bd	No	Only	Both	No	Tchr	Bd
		Only	Both	No	Only	Both	No	Only	Both
High		13	7	114	22	10	6	125	14
Low		35	27	355	73	35	25	361	70
χ^2	df=3	NS	0.518	NS	3.710	NS	5.482	NS	7.782

(44.4) Should High School Principals Be Educational Experts In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
High		121	30	120	32	122	31	66	87
Low		336	140	312	167	348	134	161	321
χ^2	df=1	.05	5.284	.01	10.194	NS	3.432	.05	4.792

APPENDIX B

TABLE 45

TEACHER RESPONSES CORRELATED WITH TEACHER-NEGOTIATOR EXPERIENCE

(45:1) Should High School Principals Be Involved In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Curricular Issues		Evaluative Issues		Teacher-Salary Issues	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes		69	15	79	5	78	6
No		464	87	469	85	514	41
χ^2	df=1	NS	0.231	.05	5.308	NS	0.006
						26	58
						182	370
						NS	0.135

(45:2) Should High School Principals Be Negotiators In Teacher-Board Negotiations?		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Both		Tchr Only		Bd Only		Both	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes		10	5	68	18	7	59	16	15	33	5	4	75
No		103	44	403	145	50	357	153	101	293	63	15	476
χ^2	df=2	NS	2.892	NS	1.054	NS	3.386	NS	3.386	NS	3.139	NS	3.139

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Allen, Roy B. and Schmid, John (eds.). Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.
- American Association of School Administrators. School Administrators View Professional Negotiations. Washington D.C.: The American Association of School Administrators, 1966.
- _____. The Right Principal for the Right School. Washington D.C.: The American Association of School Administrators, 1967.
- Brookover, Wilbur B. and Gottlieb, David. A Sociology of Education. New York: American Book Company, 1964.
- Doherty, Robert E. and Oberer, Walter E. Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1967.
- Elam, Stanley M., Lieberman, Myron, and Moskow, Michael H. Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.
- Epstein, Benjamin. The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations between Teachers and School Boards. Washington D.C.: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965.
- Goode, William J. and Hatt, Paul K. Methods of Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.
- Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Halpin, Andrew W. (ed.). Administrative Theory in Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Hartley, Eugene L. and Hartley, Ruth E. Fundamentals of Social Psychology. New York: Alfred H. Knopf, 1961.
- Jenkins, David H. and Blackman, Charles A. Antecedents and Effects of Administrative Behavior. Columbus, Ohio: University Press, Ohio State University, 1956.

- Kahn, Robert L., et al. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley and Company, Inc., 1964.
- Lieberman, Myron. The Future of Public Education. Chicago: Phoenix Books, University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Lieberman, Myron and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.
- Linzey, Gardner (ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.
- March, James G. (ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. Social Psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1950.
- Parsons, Talcott, Blau, P. M., and Scott, W. R. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward. Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Stinnett, T. M., Kleinmann, Jack H., and Ware, Martha L. Professional Negotiation in Public Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Summerer, Kenneth. Agreements Negotiated between Boards of Education and Teachers under Michigan Public Law Act 379 of 1965. East Lansing: Metropolitan Educational Research Association, Michigan State University, 1966.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- Adams, Charles S. "A Building Principal Views Collective Negotiations," Educators' Negotiating Service, Washington D.C., April, 1967.
- Biddle, Bruce J., Rosencranz, Howard A., and Rankin, Earl F. "Positional Differences in Teacher Role," Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher, Social Psychology Laboratory, III, University of Missouri, June, 1961.
- Bidwell, Charles E. "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX:1, Sept., 1955.

- Carr, William G. "The Principal's Role in Professional Negotiations," National Association of Secondary Principals' Bulletin, April, 1966.
- Cronin, Joseph H. "School Boards and Principals - Before and After Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX:3, November, 1967.
- DeBruin, Hendrik C. "Professional Negotiations in School Administration," Education, LXXXVII, November, 1966.
- Dykes, Archie R. "The Emergent Role of Administrators and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships," Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration, edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.
- Epstein, Benjamin. "Why Principals Want to Negotiate for Themselves," The Nations Schools, LXXVIII:4, October, 1966.
- Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process," Administrative Theory in Education, edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Getzels, Jacob W. and Guba, E. G. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in a Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXIX, September, 1955.
- Jackson, Toby. "Some Variables in Role Conflict Analysis," Social Forces, XXX:3, March, 1952.
- Jacobs, Jan W. "Leader Behavior of the Secondary School Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October, 1965.
- Olson, Allen Dale. "The Principal and Professional Negotiations," The National Elementary School Principal, April, 1967.
- "Professional Negotiations: Growth and Prospects," Education Digest, April, 1967.
- "Role of the Principal in Collective Negotiations: The Michigan Experience," Educators' Negotiating Service, February, 1967.
- Sarbin, Theodore R. "Role Theory," Handbook of Social Psychology, edited by Gardner Linzey. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.
- Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," American Sociological Review, XVIII:4, August, 1953.
- "Should Administrators Have Negotiating Rights? Representation for Management Remains an Issue," Educators' Negotiating Service, July, 1967.

- Smith, Evart E. "The Effects of Clear and Unclear Role Expectations on Group Productivity and Defensiveness," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LV, May, 1957.
- Solby, Bruno. "The Role Concept in Job Adjustment," Sociometry, VII, February, 1944.
- Tompkins, Ellsworth (ed.). "Rights and Responsibilities of Principals," National Association of Secondary School Principals' Newsletter, XIV:5, May-June, 1967.
- Watson, Bernard C. "The Principal: Forgotten Man in Negotiations," Administrators' Notebook, XV:2, October, 1966.
- Wildman, Wesley A. and Perry, Charles R. "A Survey of Collective Activity among Public School Teachers," Educational Administration Quarterly, II, Spring, 1966.
- _____. "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII, January, 1966.
- Wilhelms, Fred T. "The Principalship on the Spot," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, November, 1967.
- Winstead, Philip C. and Hurlburt, Allan S. "Agreement on Principal's Role," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, September, 1967.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Birdsell, Donald F. "A Study of the Status of Professional Negotiations in Selected Schools in Twelve Midwestern States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Iowa, 1965.
- Block, Ralph. "Research on the Make-up of the Board of Education Negotiating Team." A Study Currently Underway for Dr. Herbert Rudman, Department of Education, Michigan State University.
- Boss, LaVerne H. "Role Expectations Held for the Intermediate School District Superintendent in Michigan." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, Michigan State University, 1963.
- Cave, David R. "A Critical Study of the Leader Behavior of School Administrators in Conflict with Teachers' Unions." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. "Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal." A Paper Presented at the Conference on Professional Negotiations in Public Education, Chicago, August, 1966.

- Doyle, Louis A. "A Study of the Expectations Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members, and Parents Have of the Elementary Teachers' Roles." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, Michigan State University, 1956.
- Garver, George C. "A Study of the Relationship between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Public School Principals in Oakland County, Michigan, Concerning Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Kruger, Daniel H. "The Teacher in the Decision Making Process." An Address before the Detroit School Administrators' Workshop, August, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
- McKee, Charles A. "A Study of the Role of the Engineering Manager and His Continuing Education Requirements." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Morgan, Stanley R., Jr. "The Public School Principalship: Role Expectations Held by Relevant Groups." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Utah, 1965.
- Radebaugh, Byron F. "Democratic Values and Collective Negotiations' Agreements." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Toledo, 1966.
- Romano, Michael J. "The Principal Views the Impact of Collective Bargaining." An Address delivered at the Chicago Principals' Club Education Conference, March, 1967.
- Scott, Walter W. "A Study of Preparation Programs in School Administration as Affected by Collective Negotiations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, Michigan State University, 1966.
- Wildman, Wesley A. "Teacher Expectations for School Boards." A Paper presented at the Cubberly Conference, Stanford University, July, 1966.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03175 6723