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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem

What is the role of the local school administrator at the state level of decision making in a program for improvement of educational opportunities for boys and girls? Is his role simply to "administer" a program established by other political forces of the state, i.e., legislators, tax lobbyists, etc., or is it to be one of those forces which formulate and execute the program of adequate educational opportunities? Is he to become involved in the decision-making process at the state level? If so, to what degree and with whom?

Of all the activities by which a school administrator may take part in making decisions of policy at the state level, which are possible for the typical school administrator in Ohio? To say it another way, at what point on a continuum of involvement in the state-level decision making does the school administrator operate?

Such questions have been plaguing the school administrator since tax-supported schools were first coupled with the establishment of the position of superintendent of schools. The school administrator has been in a precarious position of leadership in that he has had to assist the community and the state to assess
the educational needs of the state and then to add his influence to that of other political leaders, i.e., health departments, police departments, etc., to secure adequate funds and facilities. This dual role, which is desirable operationally, lacks clarity. The two roles of assessing the educational needs and of translating the same into costs and facilities, with the final endorsement and the securing of the program being left to power leaders of the state, generate the implicit assumption that the schoolman does not participate in the actual decision making but rather appeals to that decision-making power for favorable legislation. The manner in which and the degree to which he can and should be instrumental in affecting decision making at the state level are unresolved. In fact, the role of the school administrator in state-level politics is obscure.

It is the premise of this study that the involvement of the educational administrator in state-level decision making is a function of two factors: his self-perceptions of his role and the perceptions of other persons who surround his position. If it were possible for him to secure an accurate reading of the perceptions of others who observe him, he could evaluate his own performance in terms of those perceptions. The summary of these perceptions, if they were attainable and accessible to the schoolmen, would form a profile of existing perceptions of their behavior and thus could produce a known atmosphere and climate of attitudes toward his involvement in the state-level decision making. Illustrative
queries which could then be resolved are these: (1) Is the superin­
tendent of schools now doing those activities which his school
district expects of him? (2) Is there uniformity in the expectation
of his role as reflected by others? (3) Does any discrepancy exist
between a "real" and an "ideal" role of the superintendent as
perceived by each group? and (4) How does the superintendent per­
ceive himself in both a "real" and an "ideal" role of participation?

Study in the ever-growing field of "politics" in education
has the possibility of becoming more descriptive in a systematic
endeavor to define, describe, and classify the nature of phenomena
in the political arena. Also, additional empirical investigations
will lead to a more adequate conceptualization of educational politics
thereby establishing a theoretical framework by which the various
elements of the political scientists' concern can be structured.
The studies are imperative to testing hypotheses to define the nature
of political processes and relationships. Also, they will isolate
the unique patterns and characteristics involved in the description
of political phenomena. A basic problem in which the educational
administrator has much to learn from the political scientist is the
area of governmental and educational relationships. This is the case
because the problems of decision making within the educational
enterprise are political decisions involving (1) the consequences
of different governmental structures and their processes upon
education, (2) the employment of power over educational institutions,
(3) the allocation of scarce social resources to the proper maintenance
of the educational enterprise, and (4) the effects of the interrelationships of different levels of governmental control over educational decision making.\(^1\)

Finally, in completing the backdrop against which the role of the educational administrator in the educational policy decision making is defined, the direction of influence must be recognized. Campbell's paradigm,\(^2\) which succinctly depicts the process of educational policy making, has the utmost relevance at this point. He illustrates the decision filtering through successive steps of refinement and implementation by proceeding from national recognition, through precedent movements and state political actions, to being imposed upon the local educational institution. It is the intent of this paper to view critically the step of "state political actions" in exploring the extent to which the school administrator is or is not involved in decision making at the state level.

The vehicle for studying is perception.

In the application of a perceptual approach to this problem, whether or not the perceptions constitute reality in either the "is" or the "ought" dimensions is not germane. The basic assumption is—all behavior is founded in the perceptions of the actor. Therefore, if the study is to discover, define, and describe political


behaviors of the school administrator, it shall be concerned with perceptions of that behavior.

In order to study the self-perceptions of the schoolman and his behavior as perceived by others, it is necessary to study the schoolman in his habitat.

The remainder of this chapter will present a definition of relevant terms, a listing of basic assumptions, and a statement of postulates drawn from those assumptions. The postulates then generate the hypotheses.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Behavior—the manner of acting in a given situation.

2. Board of education—the official body of persons who are charged with the responsibility of operating a school system. They are directly responsible to the people.

3. Coalition—a combination of two or more interest groups into a more inclusive group in order to express a common interest. Generally formed to more effectively exert pressure upon a body of government.

4. Committee hearing—the process by which representatives of the legislature listen to the pro and con of interest groups on legislation which has been introduced but not acted upon.

5. Community—a subgroup having many of the characteristics of society, but on a smaller scale, and with less extensive and coordinated common interests.

6. Constituency—the people who are represented by a public official and who are served by a public official.

7. Decision making—formulating judgments which affect a course of action.

8. Distribution of prestige—the assignment of social position or status in public esteem.

9. Dominate—to occupy a power position in relation to others in the social group.

10. Government—a functioning of the state. As an objective entity, it refers to the individuals who are charged with the responsibility of carrying out state action.

11. Grass roots—the condition of interest in an issue at the citizen level.

12. Group—two or more people between whom there is an established pattern of psychological interaction; it is recognized as an entity, by its own members, and usually by others, because of its particular type of collective behavior.
13. Influential person—one who is capable of exercising a control over other persons but in the context of the informal person-to-person or person-to-group control.

14. Interest group—a *group* as defined herein with the addition of a commonalty of purpose.

15. Issue—unresolved conflict of interests.

16. Lobby—persons who conduct activities aimed at influencing public officials and especially members of a legislative body on legislation and other policy decisions.

17. Non-certificated personnel—employees of public school systems who are not required to demonstrate a given degree of formal schooling as evidenced by a document issued by the institution.

18. People—a designation of a public.

19. Perception—that set of knowledge and experience which each respondent brings to the point of decision relating to the elements of the study.

20. Political *blocks*—used interchangeably with *coalition*.

21. Political leadership—the act of exercising influence over groups of people in the activities surrounding the control of policy.

22. Politics—the contest which develops around the control of policy.

23. Political party—either the Democratic or Republican party.

24. Political structure—the network of associations and communications which surround the control of policy.

25. Policy making—decision making which concerns itself with the establishment of statements of the ways of behaving.

26. Potential leader—one whose position is such that acts of others could be affected.

27. Power—the ability or authority to dominate men, coerce and control them, obtain their obedience, interfere with their freedom, and compel their action in particular ways.

28. Prestige—social position or status in public esteem, attained by the social recognition one receives in his associations.

29. Resources—those elements of the community which are essential to the full and complete operation of the enterprise.
30. **Role**—the function or expected behavior of an individual in a group, usually defined by the group or the culture.

31. **School**—a social unit devoted specifically to the process of education.

32. **Schoolmen**—all persons who are identified as members of the educational profession; i.e., teachers, administrators, board members, plus higher education personnel.

33. **Social class**—a stratum in society composed of groups of families of equal standing.

34. **Social group relationship**—the social group requires for its existence a durable contact between persons out of which continuous interaction may arise, a consciousness of sufficient likeness or common interest to establish some degree of identification of each with the group and some structure recognized by the members as essential to achieve its continued existence as an entity.

35. **Society**—a group of human beings cooperating in the pursuit of several of their major interests, invariably including self-maintenance and self-perpetuation. It is basic, large-scale human group.

36. **Status system**—those elements of behavior which assign social standing or prestige or a person in his group or of the group in the community.

37. **The administration**—refers to the governor of the state and those influentials who surround him. Usually others who also hold public office.

38. **Wealth**—all material objects that have economic utility.
ASSUMPTIONS

About individuals

1. Every individual has a self-concept.

2. Social perceptions of the individual are effective in developing one's self-concept.

3. It is impossible to separate one's "pure" self from the "objective" situation in which one participates.

4. Every individual is the result of his total experiences.

5. The "objective" situation is a creation of the individual's perceptions.

About social groups

1. In a given social-group relationship, someone tends to dominate.

2. Either a person or a group can be a dominator of social relationships.

3. A leader of a social group must represent the status and value systems of the group being led.

4. There exists in the society as a whole a latent interest in education.

5. There is an unequal distribution of power (social) in any community.

6. Social groups compete for limited resources in any community and state.

7. Resources are not limitless in any community or state.

About schoolman

1. Schoolmen are potential leaders in community politics.
2. The school superintendent is directly responsible to the board of education, and the board of education is responsible to the public.

3. Schoolmen represent the values and interests of their boards of education.

4. Schoolmen avoid participation in state-level, public-policy decisions.

**About social power**

1. Power is evidenced in any group of persons.

2. Power is evidenced in any group of groups.

3. Political leadership is not an independent force, but rather a resultant of forces.

4. There is a reciprocal relation between the power of the superintendent and the power of the board of education in terms of political leadership.

5. Social power may be manifest in either of two forms: (1) withholding of privileges, or (2) granting of rewards.

6. Some persons or groups will rule; some persons or groups will be ruled.

7. Politics is practiced by anyone who engages in activities which are designed to affect public-policy decisions.

**About government**

1. Government is the authority established to settle disputes and to distribute many kinds of advantages and disadvantages within the particular group involved, be it a small community or a state.

2. Only those problems which cannot be settled (or are not settled) by people themselves reach the government for decision.

3. Since government by an impartial set of decision makers is a myth, the parties involved in the conflicts which reach the legislative level are likely to try to influence the decision in their own favor.
4. An acceptable definition of government is "the implementation of the preferences of people into public policy."

5. The school as an institution, created by the state, is, therefore, a subdivision of the state and a subdivision of government.

6. Our whole governmental structure is made up of people who owe their positions to others—appointed officers as well as elected governmental officials.

7. Our government considers the interests of those who helped elect its members.

8. Those who elect the office-holder can command the attention of the office-holder.
POSTULATES

1. In general, the school board assumes responsibility for the basic decisions involved in managing the affairs of the district. In particular, it assumes responsibility for major school policy.

2. Schools are in direct competition with other governmental agencies for the resources, both human and natural, for its support and operation.

3. Schoolmen are capable of participating in the communications lines which exist between the community politics and the state-level politics.

4. Schoolmen who are organized and possess a high degree of expertise in state-level politics demonstrate effective leadership in securing the necessary support for general aid to education.

5. A leadership role is assigned to the schoolmen in each community by that community in terms of the values of the citizenry.

6. An individual behaves in terms of his social perceptions.

7. The task which an individual performs, that is, the job or assignment, will constitute the environment with which his perceptions must interact.

8. The environment is not in its "pure" state, but rather the environment is the combination of time, space, and perceptions of the individual.

9. The social perceptions of a baseball player, a minister, a soldier, and a teacher may be expected to be less than identical.

10. The concern of an individual with a public-policy decision may be measured in terms of number of persons affected, the way the person is affected, the size of the reward, the range of values involved, the intensity of feeling, and how binding the decision is on their lives.
HYPOTHESES

1. The board of education's perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from its perceptions of his behavior.

2. The teacher's perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his behavior.

3. The layman's (editor) perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his behavior.

4. The legislator's perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his behavior.

5. The non-certificated staff member's perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his behavior.

6. The superintendent's perceptions of the role that he should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his own behavior.
The background of the problem

The makers of public policy—and their goals and ideologies—are strangely unidentified to the American public.\(^3\) Governmental decision making, whether it be the federal or the state level, is not simply a voting process enjoyed by the electorate that many suppose.

In America, as in most of the world, power rests ultimately and increasingly with the national and the state government.\(^4\) It is to the state government that this study turns its attention, although it is fully recognized that the state is not a discrete level of government or policy making, unaffected by governmental levels above and below it. How our laws and regulations which compose what we call public policy are made is of critical importance to all of us who are subject to those laws. \(^5\) The social structure of the United States (and of the state of Ohio) is composed of numerous independent status-power pyramids—based largely upon occupation.

While every individual could be classified on some sort of scale as to political, economic, or social power, power to affect public policy rests mainly upon his relationship to a major group or an organization.

---


\(^4\) Ibid., 2.

\(^5\) Ibid., 1.
Stated propositionally, in any society there are both "positive and negative demands on government." Demands are present to lower taxes, to increase welfare benefits, to go to war, and to press for peace. However, these demands are not very likely to carry much weight if expressed by only a few citizens. To carry weight in making demands, individuals must represent, or be represented by, significant groups of people who can exercise political power.

"The major formally organized groups within business and the professions, labor, agriculture, and public school teaching, and the major informally organized groups, such as the intellectuals, the civil and military bureaucracies (the latter allied with veterans organizations), compose, with the Negroes, the major makers of public policy. All except the Negroes and the veterans are occupational groups."^7

Occupational factors coupled with economic factors become a powerful influence in the determination of public policy. "Occupation has become the major tie that binds people together into common economic interest groups."^8 It is through the commonalty of occupation that common ideologies and styles of consumption are expressed. Also, such commonalty finds expression in the


^7Ibid.

^8Ibid., 2.
promotion of group interests and in the fulfillment of individual
goals.

Similarly, schoolmen manifest common goals and similar
individual interests. They also practice common techniques to
obtain their goals. Regardless of the district in which a superin­
tendent is employed, he will be more like fellow administrators
than unlike them. True, some would be more richly endowed with
money and luxurious surroundings than others; but, essentially,
all schoolmen are alike. Other groups associated with education
demonstrate corresponding similarities.

From the similarities of intra-group characteristics arise
the inevitable dissimilarities between and among groups. Further­
more, continual conflict of interests grows into group combat,
which is best described by Earl Latham:

What may be called public policy is actually the
equilibrium reached in the group struggle at any
given moment, and it represents a balance which the
contending factions or groups constantly strive to
weigh in their favor. . . . The legislature referees
the group struggle, ratifies the victories of the
successful coalitions, and records the terms of the
surrenders, compromises, and the conquests in the
form of statutes. 9

While it is of utmost importance to recognize the policy-
making role of dominant economic groups (business, military), it is
also important to recognize the characteristics of the legislators.

9Earl Latham, "The Group Basis of Politics: Notes for a
Theory," in Heinz Eulau, Samuel J. Eldersveld, and Morris Janowitz
(eds.), Political Behavior (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe,
1956), p. 239.
They are more than pure reflections of the principal groups which helped to elect them. They are "... dependent upon key groups for their election and there is considerable implicit 'buying' and 'selling' or reciprocal support in the political market place."\textsuperscript{10} This inevitable bargaining process in a representative government runs counter to one sentiment in our national character—that public officials should stand uncompromisingly for what is "right" regardless of the consequences. "The fact that public officials rarely adopt such a pose, but rather are negotiators and compromisers, has contributed to a degradation of their character in American humor."\textsuperscript{11} However, the legislator must preserve through his decisions that delicate balance which exists between the desires of interest groups and that which is best for the public welfare.

Educators have long desired to protect the education enterprise from the inevitable bargaining and the perpetual conflict of political decision making. The rationale is not entirely clear, for all political decision making is not negative, dishonest, and against education. There is a difference between emphasizing "politics" for better schools and emphasizing "bipartisan politics" for better schools. In the former, politics connotes the activities which surround educational decisions, whereas the latter denotes party affiliation and dedication to a party program.

\textsuperscript{10} Monsen, 3.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
According to Cahill and Hencley, there is emerging from the profession of educational administration a newly conceived field of "community politics." It assists in expanding and clarifying the setting and the process so closely associated with the operation of our public schools. School administrators are awakening from political isolationism into a new and fresh context of influence—the realm of political participation in community decision making as it affects the public schools. There is not only increased sensitivity to all influences associated with the decision-making process, there is also an increase of interest in political involvement.

While the literature reports the new era as "community politics," the notion can be extended to denote state-level decision making. The public-school arena is no longer circumscribed by the boundaries of the given community in which an issue is pending; rather, the field of battle is the state-wide political structure.

The schoolman's limited involvement in politics has become his naivete. A case in point is the finding of Bailey in which the inadequate knowledge of politics was a factor preventing educators from providing effective leadership in obtaining state financial support for schools in the northeastern states. That politics has been neglected in the field of education is easily documented. If

12Robert S. Cahill and Stephen P. Hencley (eds), The Politics of Education in the Local Community (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1964), chap. i.

the neglect is a result of a conscious de-emphasis upon political control of schools is not known; but it is apparent that where the educational leader and his staff have opinions about educational policies and take action accordingly, public education in that school district is involved in politics. An axiomatic expression is evident—one must suspect that public education is by its very nature political and those who are involved in its management are politicians anytime they seek a decision by the political process.

By what avenues shall the schoolman enter into the realm of the political decision making? What is the structure of politics? At what point does the administrator become an integral element of the political process? How does he participate in the establishment of goals which are sought by his own interest group? How does he engage in combat with the other interest groups? Monypenny, in discussing the problem of educational, policy decision making observes:

For the political scientist, any policy-making structure may be viewed as having three related elements. One is the formal structure itself as one finds it set out in law and practice. Another element is constituted by the groups in the population which have an interest in the policies which are determined through that structure. A third element is the goals which are sought by groups in the population and by their representatives in the policy-making structure.14

---

The process of decision making, according to Monypenny, appears to come about through an interplay between those holding the official power and those representing the plurality of organized goal-seeking groups. It is a safe assumption that this bargaining is true at both the state and the federal level of policy making in addition to that which abounds in every community. At the state level, the governor is seen as the key person for the bargaining which takes place between the spokesmen for various organized interest groups. As bills progress through the legislative machine, they enter a process of bargaining in which the official decision makers and the representatives of powerful organized interest groups are the chief participants. This study is directed to this process of bargaining in the making of public-policy decisions at the state level.

The setting

To appreciate the full complexity of the forces and the powers to which a decision maker on public policy at the state level must react, one must of necessity consider the setting in which the participants are forced to operate in behalf of their interest groups. Most states possess a constitution under which the state legislature is charged with the responsibility of establishing and


16 The PEP Bill of Ohio in 1965 is an example of such bargaining.
maintaining a system of free public schools. The Ohio Constitution states it thus:

Provision shall be made by law for the organization, administration and control of the public school system of the state supported by public funds.

Constitutional and statutory language, court interpretations, and long practice make it clear that the legislature of each state is the "big school board." Although such an arrangement is viewed with dismay by many state legislatures, as exemplified by their inaction on school bills, the basic decisions regarding education can be made in no other place. Of course, state boards of education and other commissions can do much to screen, modify, and improve the proposed legislation; but, in the final analysis, only the legislature can decide basic policy questions. Even though the state legislature has plenary power in making basic educational policy, this power is exercised in the welter of forces, i.e., welfare, unemployment, mental health, which constitute American society. In reality, the legislature is the arena within which each social force makes its best case and wields every influence at its disposal.

Since the work of the legislature is done through a committee structure, the education committee of the Senate and the House


18 Ohio, Constitution, Art. 6, sec. 3.

19 Campbell, op. cit., p. 54.
become crucial legislative bodies in education decisions. However, these committees do not deliberate in a sterile environment. Consequently, they are buffeted about by every interest group in the state, each group attempting to win the favor of the committee.

By what route does a group or an individual become instrumental in influencing the state legislature into actions considered favorable toward education? Any realistic appraisal of the controls, as well as of the contest, must consider not only the arena in which the issue is contested, but also the actors who attempt to capture the stage. This study is attempting to identify the roles of those actors through a perceptual approach.

Review of the literature

While literature on the specific problem of the role of the school administrator in state-level politics is conspicuous by its absence, the literature which is discussed below has generated the identification of the problem.

Even though the literature is silent on this specific topic, many studies of excellent repute have been executed in the field of power structures both in the local community and in the agencies of the state. However, there is a dearth of research on the application of such phenomenon as it relates to the behavior of the school administrator. Particularly, there exists a void in both the empirical and the theoretical explanations of his behavior either as a consequence of the power structure or as an initiator of action in the power structure. Sociologists have become active in the research
of power structures and in the conceptualizations and the explanations concerning such social power. Similarly, the political scientist has entered the domain of educational policy decision making. Nevertheless, the work of these two groups has not sufficiently overlapped so that the role of the educator in the social power structure can be clearly described. Educational politics is virtually a no-man's land holding little interest for anyone except the educator.

This review of the literature illustrates the dichotomy in the methodologies used and the resulting positions in the explanation and the conceptualization of social power.

Contemporary approaches to the study of social power have followed the lead of Floyd Hunter's publication of *Community Power Structure*. Since its publication in 1953, there have been a number of major studies conducted in many regions of the United States by such authorities as Agger, Belknap, D'Antonio and

---


Most of these writers used the reputational technique employed by Hunter. Banfield, Dahl, and Freeman used the decision-analysis technique recommended by Dahl in his noted study of New Haven. Their studies failed to support the monolithic, economic dominant model proposed by Hunter and others. Instead, their findings supported a fragmented pluralism.

Out of the discrepancies which were revealed by the preceding studies has come an intensive debate over the appropriate method for


30 Linton C. Freeman et al., Local Community Leadership (Syracuse: University College of Syracuse University, 1960).
studies social power. Dahl, Kaufman, Polsby, and Wolfinger have been vocal critics of the reputational technique popularized by Hunter. The decision-analysis technique has not been without attack. Strong criticism has been voiced by such persons as Anton, Janowitz, and Price. Hunter has been supported in the reputational approach by D'Antonio, Agger, and Schulze and Blumberg. Synthesizing the strengths and weaknesses of both the contemporary


and the past approaches to the study of social power are the writings of Bell,^41 Fisher,^42 and Rossi.\[^{43}\]

Kimbrough,\[^{44}\] a middle-of-the-roader, suggests the concept of a continuum of power in which variations of monopolistic, competitive, and pluralistic models of power structure may be located.

Campbell,\[^{45}\] in his review of research findings concerning the multiple variables influencing administrative behavior, pointed to the need to research community value patterns, power structure variables, and the effect of both covert and overt behavior upon administrative behavior. In discussing control over educational behavior, he stated, "Community control is exercised by a handful of influential people who seem, for the most part, to be willingly accorded their positions of influence by their fellow citizens."

---


Kimbrough,\textsuperscript{46} by his own declaration, has found through his research in the studies completed in Florida that the school administrator's understanding of power politics has ranged from a lack of political know-how in several instances to a few instances in which the superintendent was himself an important policy leader in the power structure.

Studies, such as those by Hanson,\textsuperscript{47} demonstrate that knowledge of community power structure is very useful in predicting the successful passage of projects which stimulate much interest in a community. Such prediction studies have served to validate the importance of the concepts of community power structure for educational leaders.

Particularly relevant to the study of social power and its characteristics as exemplified in community power structure investigations is the application of a conceptual system with analytic utility. Newcomb\textsuperscript{48} presents an "analytic system" with which he attempts to describe some of the conditions and consequences of communications among humans. While not restricted to one's behavioral patterns in political activities, the system does accommodate and assimilate

\textsuperscript{46}Ralph B. Kimbrough, \textit{Informal County Leadership Structure and Controls Affecting Educational Policy Decision-Making}. (The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Cooperative Research Project Number 1324. 1964. p. 4.

\textsuperscript{47}Robert C. Hanson, "Predicting a Community Decision: A Test of the Miller-Form Theory," \textit{American Sociological Review}, XXX (October, 1959), 662-71.

those conditions and sets of interactions among and between persons and groups which lead to extensive and complete communication. Snygg and Combs agree with Newcomb in underscoring communications as a conceptualization of the relationships between and among participants in a common culture. Moreover, the common denominator of perceptions, that is, social perceptions, makes communications possible. Likewise, differences in perceptions create a condition of impossible communications. Easton writing in A Framework for Political Analysis probes into the commitments undertaken if political life is viewed as a system of behavior.

It is the intent of this study to pursue the "system" approach using social perceptions of actors as indices of the interrelationships between and among schoolmen (the influencer) and the legislators (the influencee). The dynamics and equilibrium of the "system" is explored and defined in operational terms.


RATIONALE FOR PERCEPTIONAL ANALYSIS

Every one of us every minute of our waking lives is constantly and continuously perceiving. Whatever else we may be doing—attending classes; talking, reading, or playing—we are also perceiving. We are constantly perceiving simply because it is an inseparable and necessary part of everything we do.

There are three features of perception which deserve special attention with respect to human perception. First, the facts of perception always present themselves through concrete individuals dealing with concrete situations. They can be studied only in terms of the transactions in which they can be observed. Second, within such transactions, perceiving is always done by a particular person from his own unique position in space and time and with his own combination of experiences and needs. Perception always enters into the transaction from the unique personal behavior center of the perceiving individual. And, third, within the particular transaction and operating from his own personal behavioral center, each of us, through perceiving, creates for himself his own psychological environment by attributing certain aspects of his own experience to an environment which he believes exists independent of the
experience. This characteristic of perception we can label externalization.\(^5\)

In man, perceiving is not only an inseparable part of all waking activity, but, even more important, perceiving never occurs independent of some other activity. That is, it is impossible for a perception to appear in its "pure" state; rather, perceptions may be studied only as part of the situation in which they operate.

"Neither a perception nor an object—as-perceived exists independent of the total life situation of which both perception and object are a part. It is meaningless to speak of either as existing apart from the situation in which it is encountered. The word, transaction, is used to label such a situation. The word, transaction, carries the double implication (1) that all parts of the situation enter into it as active participants, and (2) that they owe their very existence as encountered in the situation to this fact of active participation and do not appear as already existing entities merely interacting with each other without affecting their own identity."\(^5\)

The term, transaction, is used here to differentiate it from interaction.

This point of view is dissimilar to our common-sense view of things. Our tendency is to view objects and people around us as discrete entities existing in their own right and quite independent


\(^5\) Ibid., p. 3.
of our transactions with them. It is one thing for this common-sense view to serve our daily activities, but quite another to satisfy the scientific understanding essential to complete full development of the thesis. A simple analogy will illustrate the inadequacy of the common-sense view. Consider the problem as that of understanding a hockey goalie fully and in all his complexity. It is obvious that the goalie does not exist independent of the other players. Certainly there could not be a goalie without other players, any more than there could be other players without a goalie. But even now the picture is incomplete for, to study the goalie completely, we need not only other players, but a rink, two teams, fans, and the rules of the game. Our goalie, as we see him in this complex transaction, simply does not exist anywhere else independent of the transaction. The goalie is what he is because of the hockey game in which he participates; and, in turn, the hockey game itself is what it is because of the goalie. Each one owes its existence to the fact of active participation with and through the other. If we change either one, we change the other.53

Perception is unique in that no single transaction can be said to exist in its own right. Just as there are a limitless number of transactions available for participation of an actor, there are as many possible points from which the transaction can be entered into as there are participants. Each participant observes and acts from his own personal behavioral center.

53 Ibid., p. 4.
Perceiving is always an activity by a unique participant from his unique position, providing him with his own unique world of experience. To the extent that two persons' positions overlap, including not only their orientations in time and space, but also their interests and purposes, they will tend to have common perceptions and common experiences.54

It is the thesis of this study that just as the goalie becomes a goalie only during his participation in the particular situation being surrounded and acted upon by the stimuli of the game, so the citizen as he participated in his social activities, including activities of government, is also that citizen because of the total transaction in which he finds himself. Furthermore, a school administrator's political behavior is guided by similar processes of perception and his concurrent translation into action. Stating the thesis simply: The role of the school administrator in state-level politics will be that role so defined by the unique social perceptions of both the administrator and the persons who surround him; that is, those who participate in the transaction.

54 Ibid.
CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Essentially, the problem is one of describing the behavior of the local superintendent of schools in terms of the perceptions of others. His behavior, as observed, will be classified on two dimensions— the "actual" and the "ideal"— which will be descriptive in behavioral terms. He will also classify his own behavior thereby providing a set of perceptions against which those of others may be compared. The question to be resolved is whether or not his perceived behaviors differ significantly from the perceptions of others and/or if the others are significantly different from one another.

Three major variables are present: (1) the perceptual base, (2) the perception-holder, and (3) political "behavior."

First, perceptions are assumed to be that set of attitudes and beliefs which one brings to a decision situation. As one perceives, one behaves. Actually, the study is concerned with a functional relationship. The term, "functional," is used to denote a relationship in which a true dependency among elements is expressed— not the expression of a simple cause and effect linkage; rather the resultant of a great complexity of interactions. Such a functional expression becomes manifest in the interactions, transactions, at
the point in which the school administrator operationally confronts the intricate mechanism of government. Whether or not he does confront government in education and with what set of attitudes, ideals, and goals about that relationship is a question of utmost relevance. Any intervening variables which may account for erratic or unpredictable behavior are not forgotten, only held in abeyance so that the resultant forces may be studied. These resultant forces are identified as "perceptions," since by definition perceptions represent a composite of interactions of subject with his environment. Thus, the identification of perceptions is the crux of the research design. Perceptions are considered as that set of knowledge and experience and the interactions between the two which the subject brings to the point of his decision making.

Second, perceptions do not exist in a "free" state; rather they are held by someone. It is, therefore, necessary to identify persons both near to and distant from the administrator who are likely to perceive him in significant ways. In this case it is not only desirable to select others who are near, that is, work with him, but also to select persons who are removed but in position to be knowledgeable about him. In the former, the board member, the teacher, and the non-certificated personnel were utilized. For the latter, legislators and editors were identified as persons knowledgeable about educational politics.

Third, political behaviors are descriptions of those activities in which one would engage to affect decision making at the state
level. It is assumed that each of the perception-holders can identify either actual or desired behavior of the school administrator as he becomes involved in politics. It requires a very short logical step then to say—those descriptive behaviors selected by each group would be indicative of the perceptions held by them. Behavior selected and perceptions held are then synonymous.

An instrument designed to identify these perceptions must have capabilities in discriminating the following:

Perceptions, by groups of actors, of...

a. the setting in which educational decisions are made.

b. a definition of "politics."

c. the origins of education issues at the state level.

d. the process of resolution of education issues after they reach the legislature.

e. the "real" role of the school administrator in state-level politics versus his "ideal" role in state-level politics.

The description of the instrument development follows.

Development of the instrument

Phase one of the developmental process was the identification of the extremes of exemplified behavior of practicing school administrators in terms of their involvement in educational decision making at the state level. Several reputable educators in Ohio were questioned for the purpose of soliciting the names of school administrators who, in their judgment, constituted men of action. Also,
the names of those administrators who, in the judgment of those queried, did not demonstrate any significant degree of involvement in educational decision making at the state level were obtained. Three administrators were selected as the interview subjects, each representative of maximum participation, medium participation, and no participation in education decision making at the state level, respectively.

Phase two of the developmental process was that of defining the "research unit." The unit shall be the head school administrator and those persons who surround him, both within education institution and outside the institution extending through the community to the legislature. Those persons included in the unit are—a given school administrator and the following persons selected from his school district: a board member, a teacher, a non-certificated employee, the editor of the local newspaper, and the legislative representative of that district—all of whom are viewing the same superintendent and his school district.

Phase three of the developmental process in constructing the instrument was the interviewing of those persons selected in phase one; namely, an administrator with high frequency and intensity of participation, an administrator with only average frequency and intensity of participation, and an administrator who displays no political activity at all. These three levels of participation were essential to the identification of activities which would define the upper and lower limits, as well as establish that a continuum of
activity is a reality. An interview guide (Appendix A) was developed from a comprehensive survey of the professional literature on public policy making. Three "units" were interviewed using the guide. Upon the completion of each interview, the guide was refined and the questions rephrased to guarantee maximum data from the interview situation. Opportunities were available to respondents who felt a need to deviate from the guide questions. The responses, while representing corresponding elements in the question, were refined and categorized for inclusion of those elements not anticipated. From the interviewing of three "units" and the distillation of the total responses into key concepts came a listing of the elements essential to the definition of the role of the school administrator in state-level politics and a listing of those behaviors perceived by the respondents to be demonstrated by the administrator. At this point, the "Real" and the "Ideal" scale materialized.

**Formulating the questionnaire**

The data collected from the open-ended interviews, using the interview guide, was then translated into two sets of statements; one representing statements of the ideal role of the school administrator in state-level politics, and the other representing descriptive statements of the observed behavior of the school administrator in state-level politics. In addition, a set of statements were included (pp. 1 and 2 of Questionnaire) to ascertain the underlying concepts the respondent used as a base for reacting to the two sets of statements.
Validating the questionnaire

The jury-opinion technique was used in validation of the questionnaire. This is an extension of the logical validation which is expressed in Chapter I of this study, except that in this case the confirmation of the logic is secured from a group of persons who would be considered expert in the field within which the questionnaire applies. The jury involved was: Dr. Stephen Bailey, Syracuse University; Dr. Raymond E. Callahan, Washington University; Dr. Roald Campbell, University of Chicago; Dr. Keith Goldhammer, University of Oregon; Dr. Stephen Henley, University of Illinois; Dr. Ralph Kimbrough, University of Florida; and Dr. C. J. Salisbury, University of Virginia. Let the record show the gratitude of this writer to each of the jury members for their assistance in this study.

The jury was asked to react to the Questionnaire in the following terms: (Appendix B)

1. Format of the QUESTIONNAIRE

2. Validity of the items in identification of political activities.

3. Using the three sheets marked "SCORE KEY" (Appendix E), ascertain the appropriateness of the three divisions of Legislative, Professional, and Constituent.

4. Any comments which, in your opinion, would improve the quality of the study.

In summary, the jury did validate the instrument. Only limited apprehension was expressed about the utility of the first two pages, which were designed to establish the theoretical base
from which the respondent reacted. Those two pages were retained in the instrument.

**Administrating the questionnaire**

All confidences were secured. The questionnaire was mailed directly to the respondent with an accompanying set of directions (Appendix C) which were designed to maximize security. One exception to this procedure was with the selection of the non-certificated employee. Because a published list of those employees was not available through legitimate channels, i.e., state department records, retirement files, employee certification records, etc., the superintendent of schools was asked to select the non-certificated employee in his school district. The limitation to the guarantee against bias is recognized; but, under the circumstances, the procedure is viewed as legitimate. All other respondents were chosen on a random-number basis with coding of the questionnaire to assure identification of the returns and to develop mailing lists for the follow-up. A follow-up mailing was executed with acceptable results. After a period of one week from the follow-up mailing, a second mailing or reminder was administered. The total number of questionnaires returned was 280.

**Interpretation of the data**

The construction of the questionnaire is in accord with the elements of the appropriate statistical treatment. Significant relationships among the groups, on an item basis, were developed
by using the non-parametric chi square. The hypotheses were confirmed when supported by the research data. Conclusions, implications, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER III

THE SAMPLE

The rationale for the specific sampling procedure of this study centers upon the accepted purposes of a sampling procedure in general. That is, sampling is an essential part of all scientific procedures. This is not only true in the social sciences, but also in the physical-science field, where the researcher is forced to sample from a universe of possible observations rather than believing that one observation provides an absolute and immutable truth. Every observation is only a sample of all possible observations which could be made. The number of such observations required as the basis for generalization depends upon the number of controls possible, thus maybe fewer in the physical than in the social sciences; but all experiments are nevertheless samples from a larger universe of possible experimental situations.

Since the total universe of school districts in the state of Ohio could not be utilized with the resources available to this researcher, it was legitimate to sample that universe. However, it was not only a step to reduce the number of cases; but it was also a

---

step to assure the reliability and the validity of the sample in such a way as to preserve the identity of the total universe.

The sample drawn in this instance confronts and satisfies two basic criteria of sampling; namely, (1) representativeness and (2) adequacy. Implicit in these terms is the careful and tedious delimitation of the universe to be sampled, as well as the delineation of the observations which are to constitute the sample. In either instance, the definitions of universe and observation must, substantively, coincide. Valid relationships of the two definitions, i.e., universe and observation, do exist.

Hence, the definition of the universe is first applied. Not only is it necessary to define the universe, but it is also necessary to define the "units" (observations) to be employed as physical expressions of that universe. On this basis a sample, in this case a stratified sample, could be drawn from all units of the total universe.

The universe

Adhering to the utility of the term, "universe," as used in statistical analysis, an acceptable definition can be recognized as being "the term . . . to cover the total population from which any sample is drawn or which it is supposed to represent. . . ."2

On the basis of the above definition, the universe from which observations are to be made shall be construed only as those

subdivisions of the state government of the State of Ohio which are statutorily defined as school districts.

3311.02. City school district defined. (GC 4830-1)

The territory within the corporate limits of each city, excluding the territory detached therefrom for school purposes and including the territory attached thereto for school purposes, constitutes a city school district.

3311.03. Local school district defined. (GC 4830-2)

Each school district, other than a city school district, exempted village school district, county school district, joint high school district, or joint vocational school district, in existence on September 16, 1943, shall be known as a 'local school district' and shall continue to be known as a 'local school district' until it has lost its identity as a separate school district or has acquired a different styling as provided by law. All school districts created after September 16, 1943, other than city school districts, exempted village school districts, county school districts, or joint vocational school districts, shall be known as 'local school districts.'

3311.04. Exempted village school district defined. (GC 4830-3)

Each school district known as an exempted village school district on September 16, 1943, shall be known as an 'exempted village school district' and shall continue to be known as an 'exempted village school district' until it has lost its identity as a separate school district or has acquired a different styling as provided by law.\(^3\)

Although the laws of Ohio provide for other types of school districts, i.e., county school districts and joint vocational school districts, in addition to those mentioned above, this study restricts itself to the three districts under the labels of city, exempted

village, and local school district. These districts more accurately contain the elements of school districts under the intent of this study and meaning of the hypotheses so ascribed. Each district contains the following: (1) a superintendent, (2) teachers, (3) board of education members, (4) non-certificated personnel, (5) state legislative representatives, and (6) a newspaper of general circulation in the district.

Stratification of the universe

The State Department of Education of Ohio lists the public schools of the State by the following types and numbers respectively: city school districts, 159; exempted village school districts, 62; and local school districts, 557. Since each type of district reflects to a moderate degree the size of the community involved with the school district (exceptions are recognized in those instances where the local district is larger in geographic area and in population than a small city district), it is assumed that a stratification of districts by the guidelines of school district type does not do violence to the assumption that the larger the school, the larger the population involved. Stratification on such a basis provides for representativeness of the population in the sample.

Drawing the sample

The aforementioned stratification of the universe established through school district classification is coupled with the sampling procedure called stratified sampling. The sample—specific school
districts—is drawn from each stratum in proportion to the contribution which that stratum makes to the total universe. Substantively, such a sample withstands the crucial test of freedom from bias. Since the definition of a school district in the state of Ohio excludes criteria other than size of population of cities, villages, or other territories, the drawn sample reflects and is representative of the universe. Because the school district exists, it contains those components which are defined as the "observations" of this study. The observations are executed with the legitimate assumptions that all public school districts (1) employ a superintendent of schools, (2) employ teachers as defined by statutes, (3) elect board of education members, (4) employ non-certificated personnel, (5) are represented in the state legislature through representatives, and (6) are served by a newspaper of general circulation in the district.

Selecting the subsample

From each category of subjects, i.e., superintendent, board member, teacher, non-certificated person, legislator, and newspaper education editor, for each district drawn from the total universe, subsubjects or "observations" are drawn. For the selection of subjects, a table of random numbers is utilized.4

Sample size

"An optimum sample . . . is one which fulfills the require-
ments of efficiency, representativeness, reliability, and flexibility."5

It is the desire of this researcher to obey to the fullest extent
possible these characteristics. However, it is recognized that
optimum requisites are at best obtainable only rarely; and, therefore,
a delimitation upon the requirements imposed upon the sample is exe-
cuted, not at the exclusion of the requirements, but in recognition of
the limitations. Sample size is, therefore, established through the
following considerations.

Homogeneity of the universe

The universe from which the sample is drawn is by definition
" . . . those subdivisions of the state government which are statu-
torily defined as school districts" (page 43 of this study). The
universe, per se, does not necessarily possess a large degree of
similarity among the subsamples with respect to the particular
characteristic being studied, i.e., perceptions of the role of the
school administrator in state-level politics. Although it is
legitimate to assume that, in fact, heterogeneity is an accurate
characteristic of the total universe, it does not automatically
follow that heterogeneity is a characteristic of the subsample.
One discernible limitation to the homogeneity of the subsample is
recognized—the characteristic being studied, i.e., perceptions,

5Parten, p. 293.
may not be related to the variable by which the population is stratified. This may or may not be true. On the basis of the interviewing during the construction of the instrument, it appears defensible to declare that limited variability is found empirically to exist within each subgroup. Limited variability translates as homogeneity.

Representativeness

"The more homogeneous the population, the smaller the sample needed for the required reliability. Thus, we may ordinarily expect that a smaller sample will suffice when stratification is employed instead of unrestricted random selection. This is because the effect of stratification is to resolve the relatively heterogeneous total into a number of individually homogeneous subsamples. The more heterogeneous the population, the greater the possible saving of cases through stratification."^6

Stratified sampling is applied to this study. From each category of subjects, i.e., superintendents, teachers, etc., a sample was drawn to represent that group in the total population. Representativeness was assured, since the research "unit" encompassed, by definition, a sample of each category for each of the districts drawn from the universe.

^6Parten, pp. 300-301.
**Statistical treatment**

In the analysis of the data, it is unrealistic to make the assumptions which are required for parametric statistics. Thus, the data was treated with a non-parametric statistical analysis. The usual parametric technique for testing whether several independent samples have come from the same population is the one-way analysis of variance or F test. The assumptions associated with the statistical model underlying the F test are that the observations are independently drawn from normally distributed populations, all of which have the same variance. The measurement requirement of the F test is that the research must achieve at least interval measurement of the variable involved.7

The measurement of perceptions falls short of the interval scaling by definition; there is also a desire to avoid the restrictive assumptions of the F test and, thus, to increase the generality of the findings. Also, the non-parametric tests permit data which are inherently only classificatory or in ranks to be examined for significance.

The $x^2$ test for $k$ independent samples is employed in the analysis of this data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analysis of the data is presented in terms of percentage of responses where applicable. The base for the data is the number of returns received from a mailing of questionnaires in accord with the sample described elsewhere.¹ Percents are used to interpret the data because of the inherent quality of ease of comparison. In this manner, each group may be compared to the total and to other groups in corresponding categories. Each table carries both the actual number of responses and the percent for that response. This format is used except in those instances where it will be so noted.

The general format of the analysis is consistent with the format of the questionnaire (Appendix D), beginning with the background material and moving to the end of the section describing the nature of the "political climate" in Ohio. This section constitutes the material presenting the perceptual base from which the respondent draws his concerns and observations for his reaction to the second section of the questionnaire dealing specifically with perceptions of the "actual" and "ideal" role of the school administrator in state-level politics. The final section, including both the "actual"

¹Sample consisted of 58 superintendents; 45 board members, 59 teachers, 31 non-certificated personnel, 44 legislators, and 43 editors.
and the "ideal" role, receives a statistical treatment other than the frequency distribution utilized for the background material. The "actual" and "ideal" role shall be tested for significance of differences in perceptions among the groups who constitute the subsample. The $x^2$ test for non-parametric statistics is the test applied. Significance will be noted in the discussion which accompanies the tables; and, in addition, a summary of findings is presented at the conclusion of this chapter.

**Background data**

Table 1 depicts the frequency distribution of the responses, by groups, in defining the term, "politics." All groups, with the slightly lesser exception of the legislator, perceive the term, "politics," as being "... practiced by anyone who engages in activities which are designed to affect public-policy decisions." A note of interest here is the apparent inconsistency of the legislator, with less than half of them indicating this item as their definition. The inconsistency stands out in bold relief if projected against the very consistent interview findings from which the questionnaire was constructed. Those legislators interviewed were atypical in these terms. Item "a" is a very weak second as a working definition. Table 1 illustrates that, while all the items met with limited utility for most groups, the respondents selected a definition with a broad base, thereby indicating that "politics" is not a narrow, quasi-concept, but rather an operational term for conceptualizing about human behavior.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of &quot;Politics&quot;</th>
<th>Group&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Politics is a function of government; not an organization of government.</td>
<td>12.1 15.6 8.5 16.1 15.9 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Politics has to do with one's participation in government.</td>
<td>12.1 6.7 10.2 9.7 9.1 18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Politics is a way of influencing persons or groups who hold a public office.</td>
<td>1.72 2.2 10.2 12.9 0 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Politics is limited to all activities engaged in by the politicians of the two-party system.</td>
<td>0 4 2 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Politics is practiced by anyone who engages in activities which are designed to affect public-policy decisions.</td>
<td>43 29 38 18 20 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Each group is assigned a number, i.e., superintendents, 1; board members, 2; teachers, 3; non-certificated personnel, 4; legislators, 5; and editors, 6; sample size consisted of 58, 45, 59, 31, 44, and 43, respectively.
One factor in correctly assessing the background from which the respondents perceive the role of the administrator was the identification of the source of education issues as they became visible at the state level. Table 2 presents the frequency distribution for the groups. Item \( \text{c} \) was first choice as the source of educational issues. All groups, with the editors leading and the superintendents and the teachers following close behind, perceived lobbying as the most plausible source of issues reaching the legislature. Since most teachers and superintendents are members of the Ohio Education Association and National Education Association, it is likely that both these groups would perceive lobbying as a natural approach to bringing issues to the attention of the legislature. Also, the editors, no doubt saturated with news releases and articles designed to promote the interests of the professional association, sensed that, typically, issues must be promoted through lobbying activities; at least schoolmen must mobilize the influence of their profession if they wish to be heard at the state level. In item \( \text{b} \), the board member and the non-certificated staff member view the legislator, who is a member of the education committee, as a source of issues, but only as a secondary source. Ranking third is the legislator, regardless of membership on the education committee. It is interesting to note that on item \( \text{e} \) not one board member perceived the "administration" as a source of education issues. Although only slightly discernible to the other groups, the "administration" was seen as a remote possibility. At this point, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. A legislator of either political party no matter whether or not the legislator is a member of a legislative committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A legislator of either political party who is a member of the legislative Education Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. An educational lobby group (either lay or professional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. An influential individual of the state; sometimes an industrial leader; sometimes an economist; and other times other influential persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. &quot;The Administration&quot;; that is, the present Governor's political staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each group is assigned a number, i.e., superintendents, 1; board members, 2; teachers, 3; non-certificated personnel, 4; legislators, 5; and editors, 6; sample size consisted of 58, 45, 59, 31, 44, and 43, respectively.
political naivete becomes visible. Professional literature supports the concept of the existence of an "administrative" program. Schoolmen are not sure.

Once the issues become visible at the legislative level, many avenues are available to the legislators for resolution of the issues. Table 3 presents the continuum of methods being used in state legislatures and the frequency with which each group selected a specific method. In item "a" is demonstrated an overwhelming commitment to the function of the committee hearing. Of most interest and impact is the observation that the legislator, the one who operates and presides at such hearings, selected this item by the smallest percentage. The board member stands strong, with a pronounced position of 95.6 percent choosing this method of resolution. Item "c" further illustrates the faith of the groups in the participation of the superintendent in policy making. Again, the board member is strongest in this item. Teachers, too, see the superintendent as a participant in the legislative mechanism of decision making.

Responses to item "a," Table 4, while not a majority in all cases, do point with clarity to the subscription of the groups to the stratification theory in the explanation of social power. Item "b" received a much smaller percent of responses, indicating a degree of interest in the pluralist theory of social power. Legislators, surprisingly, indicated lowest percentage in item "a," while the superintendents' perceptions of the exercise of social power were decidedly in favor of the stratification theory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Resolving Educational Issues</th>
<th>Group&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Committee hearings are a crucial function in decision making in that it provides for both sides of the issue to be heard.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Committee hearings are just a front—most hearings have no effect upon the final decision made by the legislature.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Educational committees frequently contact superintendents of schools to act as resource persons on educational issues.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Committees must, by party allegiance, fulfill the &quot;administration&quot; program no matter what is revealed in the hearings.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Legislatures could function just as effectively if there were no committee hearings at all.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Each group is assigned a number, i.e., superintendents, 1; board members, 2; teachers, 3; non-certificated personnel, 4; legislators, 5; and editors, 6; sample size consisted of 58, 45, 59, 31, 44, and 43, respectively.
TABLE 4. Number and percent of responses, by groups, indicating true statements about the state political climate in Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Political Climate</th>
<th>Group&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong> A relatively small group of persons (probably 100 or less), actually dictate</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most state-level decisions no matter what the issue; i.e., education, welfare, business.</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> The small group of persons who actually dictate or control state-level decisions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change in membership each time a new issue is to be considered.</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong> Wealth is the most important single determinant of political power.</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> A relatively small group of persons (probably 100 or less), actually dictate most state-level decisions no matter what the issue; i.e., education, welfare, business.
f. Educators (superintendents, teachers) are members of the influential groups in Ohio on educational issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Generally, for educators to obtain advantages for education, they must work through other influential in the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>49</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h. The issue under consideration by the legislature determines the persons who are influential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Most educational issues begin at the grassroots level and move to the legislature through established channels of government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j. The legislature does not formulate issues for change but rather resolves conflicting decisions of differing interest groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Each group is assigned a number, i.e., superintendents, 1; board members, 2; teachers, 3; non-certificated personnel, 4; legislators, 5; and editors, 6; sample size consisted of 58, 45, 59, 31, 44, and 43, respectively.
Of the three items on political power, i.e., "c," "d," and "e," it is interesting to note that teachers perceive wealth as the most important single determinant of political power. Teachers also view prestige, to a lesser degree, in much the same way as do superintendents; and social class was hardly discernible as a factor. Neither the legislator nor the editor recognized social class as a factor.

Board members, non-certificated staff members, and the legislators perceived the superintendent as an influential in state-level politics as evidenced in item "f." The superintendent and the teacher, to similar degrees, registered approximately half the percent of responses indicating the superintendent is an influential. This discrepancy bears further investigation. Whether or not the professional preparation programs are instrumental in instilling such perceptions, or whether actual experience has taught the two groups of their ineffectiveness, it is interesting to conjecture.

A discrepancy is evident in the inspection of the responses for item "f" and item "g." It is hardly conceivable that one could be an influential while simultaneously being forced to work through other influentials to obtain advantages for education as defined in item "g."

The composite responses of the groups to item "i" would suggest more than a casual belief in the grassroots approach to political involvement. If this be true, then the Ohio Education Association and the National Education Association are not following the desires of its membership. These two groups habitually formulate
proposals at the association level and then strive to arouse interest at the grassroots level. Item "j" depicts the legislature as resolving conflicting decisions, rather than formulating proposals.

Section four of the questionnaire solicits responses from the five groups who surround the superintendent, as described and defined in the research design, in terms of two check lists. The first column (1) describes an activity which the observed superintendent actually does to influence decisions which are made at the state level and affects education in the state of Ohio. The other column (2) describes activities which the superintendent and the other five groups of respondents perceive to be desirable or "ideal." The respondent was given the opportunity to select from either column or from both simultaneously.

Through the above procedure, the study is investigating the significance of difference, as stated in the hypotheses. All groups will be observing the superintendent; and it is those differences in perceptions, measured on both dimensions, i.e., "actual" and "ideal," which are the focus of this exploratory analysis.

All the items in section four of the questionnaire contribute to the formulation of three "Political Involvement" Axes. A few of the items contributed to more than one axis, simply because of their position on a political involvement continuum (Appendix E). The three axes are "Constituent," "Legislative," and "Professional." The Constituent Axis will be discussed first.
The constituent continuum

Items comprising this scale are descriptive of those activities which most closely approximate the kind of involvement the superintendent of schools would experience with his public. While these statements are not exclusively applicable to the relationship he would have with his public, they are indicative of both the degree and the intensity of involvement in becoming a formidable force in state-level decision making for education issues.

Chi square has been applied to the data secured from the Constituency Scale, and these data are presented.

The superintendent

The self-perceptions of the superintendent were found to be statistically different from the perceptions of the other groups in very unique ways. For example, he viewed himself as a dynamic force in influencing public policy decisions through the accepting of committee appointments in local professional and non-professional groups for study of state-level politics. No doubt, he implies his leadership role in state-level decisions by becoming active in committee work through which the influence reaches the legislators. In Table 4, however, they indicated a majority of responses under the stratification theory of social power. It is ill-advised to think a stratified power stratum could be influenced through committee work, for implicit in the stratification theory is a closed power group which will strive for its own welfare even at the expense of the public welfare. It is important to note that the
superintendents were the groups of significant difference in regard to this item.

In addition, the superintendent viewed himself as encouraging his constituents to become actively involved in state-level politics in the manner in which he is behaving. Significance in the positive direction, that is, marked by an observed frequency greater than the expected frequency, was characteristic of his role perceptions. Statistical significance appeared only in the "actual" perceptions, however, leaving one to assume that no difference exists between groups in the "ideal" dimension of the involvement, but rather that a difference exists in whether or not the superintendent is now doing such an activity. The superintendent believes so. He declares that educational lobbies are the source of educational issues confronting the legislature (Table 2), a natural course of events for becoming influential is the contribution of knowledge and data to the lobbying groups through committees for the study of state-level issues. A consistency is evident here.

The teacher

The teacher perceives education issues originating with educational lobby groups (Table 2); the resolution of conflicts of issues being confronted in the committee hearings (Table 3); and a general lack of belief that the superintendent is an influential in state-level, public policy decisions (Table 4). Again, consideration must be afforded to the fact that the teacher's perceptions are significantly different from the other groups only in terms of
the "ideal." The teacher more positively asserted the necessity for a superintendent to obtain petitions from his constituency concerning an education issue to present to his legislature. It is difficult to distinguish between the intent to supplement the efforts of the education lobbyists and the desire for the superintendent to become a force through his constituency. Both the superintendent and teacher (Table 4) perceive the superintendent to be an influential in educational issues at the state level to a lesser degree than do the other groups. Teachers depicted no other vehicle for the combining of the efforts of the superintendent of schools and his constituency. This could be ascribed to either an intense feeling on the part of the teacher that petitions are an acceptable and effective vehicle of influence or a lack of political expertise. The professional groups with which the majority of teachers are affiliated also use such tactics for influence. Exposure to this manner of operation over one's professional lifetime will leave a pronounced effect. The Professional Axis will extend this cursory over-view of the professional and his relationship with the public.

The legislator

Time-honored concepts of the legislator's role in the formation of public policy fail to account in full for the findings of this study. Statistically significant findings, in the negative direction, are evident. The legislator presents a difference from the other groups in his perceptions of the role of the superintendent. He lends lesser credence to a sincere operative manner for schoolmen
than do the other groups. In both the "actual" and "ideal" realm, his difference is pronounced in the negative direction. A valid conclusion is that his concerns for the sincerity of a matter has little to do with the effectiveness and dispatch with which the issue is resolved. Sincerity and "rightness" have little in common. Also, in confrontation of the legislator with endorsements of pending issues by reputable civic groups, the legislator assigns less credit to this approach. As was voiced in the initial interview with legislators, they perceive the endorsing activity as being diametrically opposed to the grassroots concept. The frequency of responses to this item by each group underscores the differences in perceptions of the worth of endorsements and their accompanying flow of communications. The legislator is significantly different on both the "actual" and "ideal," in a negative direction, on the frequency of responses to the superintendent's rallying his community and constituents to a formal expression of their views concerning needed legislation. Two alternative explanations are plausible; either the legislators, as a group, wish to avoid concentrated pressure from the masses, or their political expertise invalidates any enthusiasm they might feel for grassroots expression. In Table 4, he displays less faith in the committee-hearing function than do the other groups, while simultaneously contending that most public policy decisions are dictated by a relatively small group of influential persons. This circumstance warrants a conclusion that the
legislator is less enchanted with the democratic process of problem solving. While he has a firm commitment to conflict resolution in public policy decision, there exists a less than adequate assumption that the public can genuinely participate in the decision-making process.

The legislative continuum

The legislative continuum presents those activities which best describe the involvement process between the superintendent of schools and his own legislator; that is, the representative of his school district. Both the literature and the interviews provided content for the accurate description of the interaction in the decision-making process. This is not to say this continuum is discrete, for an underlying assumption is the recognition of the complexity of the political process. For the purpose of analysis, however, the conceptualization of the continuum has utility.

As could be expected, a majority of significant findings are in the legislative continuum—both on the "actual" and "ideal" axis.

The sequence of analysis shall continue to be through the groups from superintendent to editor.

The superintendent

Four items on the section four of the questionnaire illustrate the naivete of the superintendents in Ohio. On the four items, "b," "f," "l," and "s," the significant difference for the schoolmen was
in the positive direction, with them responding more often on these items than the expected frequency in the $X^2$. In these terms, they stood out in bold relief against the expectations of the other groups. The self-perceptions permitted them to engage in a bit of aggrandizement. They see themselves pursuing the interaction process between schoolmen and legislator from the endorsing of candidates who are sympathetic toward education for election to office at the state level, to knowing the legislator on a personal basis and presenting the educational concerns to him in person. The significance of the significance is that only the schoolmen viewed the schoolmen in this capacity. It is possible the returns are only representative of those superintendents who do behave in such a manner; but, even so, if this were the "actual" behavior, it should have been visible to the other groups. Whether or not the individual behavior differs from that of group action will be pursued in the discussion to follow on the Professional Involvement Axis. It must be remembered that this analysis is appropriate only to the "actual" axis of the interaction dimension. No significant difference appeared in the perceptions of the other groups to serve as a guide for future action; and, in the absence of same on the "ideal" dimension, the superintendent is left to act on his own perceptions.

The board member

Item **h** met the test for significance in the "actual" column. Not only were the perceptions of the board member
significantly different from the other groups, but they were in the negative direction. The board member responded less to the item than was the expected frequency of the $X^2$. The close operational relationship between the board member and the schoolmen, both recognizing educational needs and mutual problem solving, breeds a likeness of attitude and a similarity of desired ends. From such a base, the board member is not likely to perceive the schoolmen as being demanding and unyielding in his relationships with legislators. The typical board member would enjoy a powerful and influential superintendent of schools—one who could negotiate with state-level personnel.

Diametrically opposite to the board member’s view is that of the legislator. In contrast, the legislator does perceive the superintendent of schools as being unwilling to accept anything less than his total educational proposal. Working relationships among legislators, board members, and superintendents are impaired when compromise is absent from the bargaining table. Witness the process and the fate of the recent Issue I in Ohio. A blind insistence upon the ends of the issue by the schoolmen interceded in a more cooperative working relationship between the parties involved. While board members (Table 1) accept the definition of “politics” as an activity which is designed to affect public policy decisions and recognize the legitimate role of the educational lobby, they do attribute greatest credence to committee hearings as a crucial function in decision making (Table 3).
The teacher

In direct rebuff to the superintendent's insistence upon his knowing the legislator on a personal basis and presenting the educational concerns in person to the legislator, the teacher is significantly different from the other groups on the "actual" axis in a negative fashion. If the superintendent is genuinely involved with the legislator, the visibility is concealed from the teacher. Much more significance is attached to the teacher's perceptions of the superintendent's negative operation. The teacher, more than anyone else, perceives the schoolmen as attempting to place legislators in a defensive position by requesting their presence at a large, open, public meeting (item "i," actual). The tone of this type of meeting is usually negative, anti-legislator in nature. Expecting the teacher to perceive the schoolmen in any other way would be, at best, unrealistic; at worst, an indictment of past professional aspirations and methodology. In Ohio a political activity gaining in popularity is the county-oriented weekly meetings between schoolmen and the representatives, but only during the weeks in which the legislature is in session. At other times, schoolmen and legislators practice a mutual disregard for educational problems. As one legislator so succinctly stated it, "The adrenalin simply isn't running." The teacher, sensing such conflict and being identified with the schoolmen, heartily endorses those tactics which strengthen the position of the schoolmen while holding the defense against the legislative rule of education.
Another tactic employed on the "ideal" axis by the teacher in affecting public policy in education is the perception of the superintendent's desire and capability to endorse candidates who are sympathetic toward education for legislative office. This category was significantly different in a positive direction for the teacher. Even the superintendent did not respond in a significant way to this item.

The non-certificated personnel

The non-certificated personnel, that is, custodian, cook, and bus driver, were significantly different from the other groups in agreeing with the legislator by saying the superintendent is demanding and unyielding in his relationships with legislators. Identification of the source of this perception is difficult, for, while the non-certificated personnel indicate their dismay with the superintendent's actions, they, the non-certificated personnel, are striving toward an association for themselves which will have as one of its ends the force of voice and influence for favorable legislation in terms of salaries, working conditions, and fringe benefits. Reading of this position wavers between an indictment against the schoolmen to a jealous selfishness within the non-certificated group. Selfishness is defined in terms of benefit for them in exchange for a loss to the schoolmen.

The legislator

Counter to the superintendent's insistence upon the authenticity of his activity of writing to his representative and
expressing suggestions for action on legislative bills which have been introduced, the legislator (item "b," ideal) is significantly different from the group in his perceptions of the ideal role for the schoolmen in this regard. The legislator responded with less frequency than expected in the $X^2$—significantly less. Pitting this response against the legislator's reluctance to recognize educational lobbies as a source of educational issues (Table 2), coupled with his disenchantment with the crucial purposes of the committee hearing (Table 3), two alternative explanations of the source and resolution of educational issues present themselves. (1) The legislator rejects the direct personal involvement of the schoolmen in public policy decision making; or (2) another independent source of issues is accessible to him. Extension of these two ideas converge in what is commonly called "the administration." Even while the force and effect of the administration is common knowledge at the legislature, item "w," actual, was found to be significant in the positive direction by the legislators. The insistence upon the seeking out schoolmen, superintendents as resource persons to translate, identify, and interpret educational needs becomes nothing more nor less than a facade. While such a resolution of conflicting statements are irreducible to quantitative items on an absolute scale, the authenticity of the phenomenon is more than non-existent.
The editor consistently demonstrated statistical significance in the "ideal" axis of the questionnaire. Items "b," "k," and "l" illustrate the negative direction of the difference inherent in the $X^2$.

The editor, in agreement with the legislator, indicated the ideal role of the superintendent not be one of letter writing. Again, whether the editor wishes to contain the schoolmen in their own professional enclosure or he is less convinced of the utility of letter writing is difficult to determine. Nonetheless, if both the legislator and the editor, representative of the public mind, view such an activity with such disdain, the schoolmen would do well to pursue the diagnosis and analysis.

Significantly more than all other groups, the editors were convinced of the futility and negativeness of quietly fighting legislators who do not come up to the expectations of the schoolmen in support of education bills. To the dismay of legislators and to the chagrin of the educator, several cases of open hostility between the professional people and the lawmakers are a matter of record in Ohio. (This paper shall not identify them, for they are of public knowledge at this date.) The editor's distaste for warfare on educational issues was interestingly countered by an overwhelming number of superintendents who endorsed the activity. Board members also joined in the contentious attitude.
Participation in the selection of candidates for state-level, public office by schoolmen, particularly superintendents, was viewed with scorn by the editors. Easily discernible in the political matrix of decision making are the manifestations of an ideology opposing the rule of society by the professional. Recent focus upon the professional role in governmental, public policy decision making was generated with the Midwest Conference of Governors. At that Conference, in reply to Commissioner of Education Harold Howe, II, following his presentation of the role and activities of the Compact for Education, the governors were unanimous in voicing the attitude—(paraphrased) . . . the politician will decide the ends and the means of public education, not the professional educator.

The editor reflects such a commitment to the public rule of the educational system and, therefore, rejects the participation by the schoolmen in the selection of those persons who act for the public.

The professional continuum

The professional continuum is a scale on which are expressed those activities most descriptive of the behavior of the schoolman as an individual or as a member of a group. Also, the assumption is that these activities are characteristic of effective behavior in confronting educational decision making at the state level. The treatment of the data in this section shall begin with the superintendent and extend through the editor, concurrently analyzing both the "actual" and the "ideal" findings.
The superintendent

Significantly enough, the superintendent was different from the other groups in the study on the "actual" dimension only. Here we find again a self-satisfied, self-glorified superintendent who views his own behavior as being most effective and with heavy import while being oblivious to that which surrounds him. Specifically, he tends to act in a self-appointed manner when dealing and communicating with the other groups who play an equally important part in the total decision-making process. Item "c" of the questionnaire points in a penetrating fashion to such a conclusion. While the superintendents saw themselves significantly more often accepting committee appointments in local professional and nonprofessional groups for study of state-level issues, the responses of all the other groups, except the teachers, indicated a frequency much less than expected in the $X^2$ analysis. One may only conjecture to explain the differences on the "actual" dimension in an activity which has high visibility. This situation would suggest there is visibility of the activity but that the seeing is limited to persons who are farther away from the superintendent than is the position of teacher. Also, one is left to differentiate between actually holding positions in committee assignments and just a willingness to hold such positions.

A less visible activity and one in which the superintendent also perceived his activity at a high level was item "1"; endorses candidates who are sympathetic toward education for election to
office at state level. Communities do exist where to engage in such an activity would jeopardize the position of the superintendent, and logical extension of this consideration lends credence to a belief, on the part of the superintendent, in low frequency of involvement in this manner. However, danger cannot be held as a prime criterion, for withdrawing from a legitimate behavior for progress in all phases of American society come at a cost and a sacrifice to someone. It is not suggested that a foolhardy attitude will suffice for intellectual evaluation of the administrative arena, but that an element of courage and straightforwardness is required.

The teacher

Teachers rated significantly different from the other groups in their perception and appraisal of the degree to which the "ideal" superintendent would engage in the endorsement of candidates, who are sympathetic toward education, for election to office at the state level. The above discussion addressed itself to the limitations placed upon the superintendent in fulfilling his basic desire to endorse candidates. With very little alteration, the teacher can be epitomized as one in like circumstances; feeling the pressure of the forces brought to them by legislators and other public officials who are not sympathetic toward education and a professional allegiance to the associations to which they belong, compel them to strike out to change the balance of power in policy making at the state level. It is suggested that a vehicle which
lends itself to such action is the superintendent, as perceived by the teacher. Until recently, the teachers have not possessed the fortitude to stand in a position to verbalize the concept of political involvement. Teacher unions of all types have been a formidable force in conceiving a role for the teacher in affecting the broad policy base under which he works.

Teachers, in perceiving the ideal superintendent as one who is active in the endorsement of candidates, also insist on the superintendent's being well informed on the state political scene, including those issues which are not directly education related—a cry for informed leadership. The level of significance of this finding (item "v," ideal) is at .05. It will be those associations demonstrating an informed leadership and a fearless approach to problem solving which will capture the allegiance and loyalty of the teaching profession. Whether or not the superintendent is a part of this movement is largely left to his professional competency and his political expertise.

The non-certificated personnel

On only one item of the professional axis (item "y," actual) did the non-certificated personnel demonstrate a level of significance (.05 level). Without detracting from the prestige of the school-service position, no doubt the absence of professional educational training does stimulate the perception of professional and political adequacy on the part of the professional staff. The item, "understands the political machine of the parties and
uses it to advantage for educational opportunities for boys and girls," implied, among other activities, those behaviors which are visible to the lay public. P. T. A. meetings, trips to the legislative committee hearings, and local public meetings entertaining pending legislative bills are indicative of an active involvement in the politics of education. Generally, the custodian, the cafeteria worker, and others do not participate in the activities delegated to the professional administrator of school systems. Standing from afar, the non-certificated personnel do perceive the superintendent as understanding and utilizing the political process.

The legislator

The legislator appears more often in a significant degree on the Professional Political Involvement Axis. His perceptions will be discussed first from the "actual" scale, followed by the "ideal" perception scale.

Item "e" on the "actual" scale states that the superintendent becomes articulate on school matters on a state-wide basis in addition to his firsthand knowledge of local conditions. The legislator rejects this contention, and therein lies his difference from the other groups. While the other groups, according to the $X^2$ test, responded consistently higher than the expected frequency, the legislator's difference was due to his under-responding on this item. Taken at face value, the legislator is saying that the superintendent does not actually become articulate on school matters on a state-wide basis. The latter portion of the item, representing a
base for the question, implies that he, the superintendent, does have a firsthand knowledge of local conditions. Responses on item "w," actual, of the Legislative Involvement Axis would collaborate the present finding. Many times during the interviewing sessions in the early developmental stages of the questionnaire, legislators voiced their seeking the superintendent as a resource person to translate, identify, and interpret educational needs on the local scene. But the legislator did not, on either scale or involvement axis, depict this behavior as an "ideal" activity. The typical attitude of the legislator is that there is no one more articulate on the local educational matters than would be the superintendent. However, there is indicated an appreciable degree of loss of faith as the issues move to the state-wide basis. Inherent in this position is the strong recommendation for schoolmen to become more knowledgeable at the state level. Criticisms were frequent during the interviews of the schoolmen who followed only the professional policies and statements being enunciated by the associations, OEA—NEA. Charges were leveled at the superintendent for being led in a position where he should be leading.

Legislators also perceived little evidence that the superintendent participated in even a limited fashion in the endorsement of candidates who are sympathetic toward education. In fact, a typical response from the legislator, reflected in the response to item "l," was ". . . this is my third term in the house of representatives in spite of the OEA."
Two other items reflected the charge of political naivete for the superintendent of schools, item \( v \) and \( y \) on the actual scale, the former charging a narrowness of interest and concern which is demanded continually of the legislator and the latter a lack of understanding of the political process.

On item \( z \), ideal, the legislator's perceptions were significantly different from those of the other groups. They were significant in a negative direction, that is, their difference was due to a lesser frequency than expected on the \( X^2 \). Response to the item indicates an interest in such a venture, but the interest level is below that of the other groups. Throughout the study, the legislator has expounded upon the virtues of cooperative planning of long-range educational projects. In this item, however, there is a pronounced reluctance to begin such an undertaking.

Perhaps the experiences of the recent Issue I in Ohio has taught its lesson well. Reliable information on the conflict between the schoolmen and legislators on the bill confirms a conflict of more than disagreement. It grew into warlike proportions. It was a drawing of battle lines which the legislator is uninterested in repeating in the future.
The hypotheses state that each group which surrounds the superintendent of schools and observes him in his operation in affecting state-level, policy decision making, possesses unique sets of perceptions about his behavior. An underlying assumption is that "one behaves as one perceives it advisable to behave."

Throughout the analysis of the data (Table 5), it has been the intent to demonstrate the significances between groups on each item presented in the questionnaire. From the analysis and conclusions drawn at the item-analysis level, it is the plan to further generalize, within the limits of the data, to the behaviors of the groups. The plan provides for development of a pattern of explanation of the perceptions of "actual" behavior against the "ideal" behavior perceptions and resulting generalizations. Trends and directions will be noted where appropriate. The sequence of presentation is confirmation of the hypotheses and description of the unique perceptions of the group. After these will be a discussion of implications for educational administration, and the recommendation of appropriate steps in educational administration to more effectively accommodate the uniqueness of the group. Finally, unresolved questions are presented at the closing of the chapter.
TABLE 5. Items of significant differences (.05 level) on "actual" and "ideal" scale by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Item&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-L</td>
<td>-L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  a. Acts in a most sincere manner in promoting issues for schools and children.

  b. Writes letters to his representatives, expressing suggestions for action on legislative bills which have been introduced.

  c. Accepts committee appointments in local professional and nonprofessional groups for study of state-level issues.

  d. Forms political "blocks" with fellow-administrators in an effort to influence legislators.

  e. Becomes articulate on school matters on a state-wide basis in addition to his first-hand knowledge of local conditions.

  f. Knows the legislator on a personal basis and presents the educational concerns in person to the legislator.

  g. Forms coalitions with other political interest groups; i.e., Farm Bureau, labor groups, etc.

  h. Is demanding and unyielding in his relationships with legislators. That is, he will not accept less than the full loaf.

  i. Attempts to put legislator in defensive position by requesting his presence at a large, open, public meeting.

  j. Phones the legislator to discuss pending legislation in terms of his own school district.
TABLE 5. Continued.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Quietly fights people who do not come up to his expectations in support of education bills (particularly legislators).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Endorses candidates who are sympathetic toward education for election to office at state level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Solicits endorsement of pending issues by reputable civic groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Aligns himself with either the Republican or Democratic Party to win favor and prestige for a proposed educational issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>Cooperates in long-range educational planning with the other forces in the state; i.e., industrialists, economic trends, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>Obtains petitions from his constituency concerning an education issue to present to his legislature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>Promotes a sit-in in the legislature on the day of an important decision to impress the legislators with the intensity of feeling connected to the bill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>Displays no political activity at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>Writes personal letters to legislators, expressing his views and concerns on pending legislation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>Rallies his community and constituents to a formal expression of their views concerning needed legislation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.</td>
<td>Meets cooperatively with legislators, business leaders, political boss-men, and others to share in the formulation and drafting of new legislation for the coming session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Studies and keeps well informed on the state political scene, including those issues which are not directly education related.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+L</td>
<td>w. Sought by legislators as a resource person to translate, identify, and interpret educational needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x. Becomes a candidate for a state-level office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-LN</td>
<td>y. Understands the political machine of the parties and uses it to advantage for educational opportunities for boys and girls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-E</td>
<td>z. Promotes the establishment of an advisory council of educational persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-L</td>
<td>aa. Becomes involved in the bipartisan politics at the committeemen level to influence the state administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+S</td>
<td>bb. Encourages his constituents to become actively involved in state-level politics in the same way he is doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Group designation is: S, Superintendent; B, Board Member; T, Teacher; N, Non-certificated; L, Legislator; and E, Editor.

b. These items are identical with section four, questionnaire.
Hypothesis number one

The board of education's perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from its perceptions of his behavior.

The hypothesis is confirmed.

While a significance was demonstrated on the "actual" scale dealing with the observed behavior of the superintendent, the perceptions of the board member were not significantly different from the "ideal" perceptions of the other groups on any other item. He was unique in his perceptions of the "actual" behavior and was more aligned with the contention of the superintendent which rejects the connotation of the demanding and unyielding relationship with legislators. The board member perceived the superintendent as not being so demanding, and the implication is that the converse is true; the board member attributes a cooperative attitude to the behavior of the superintendent.

The board member is supportive of the role now being played by the administrators and views persistent demands as a vehicle for obtaining educational goals. Relentless drive and pressure are the key elements in the political involvement of the board member in state-level politics.

Hypothesis number two

The teacher's perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his behavior.
The hypothesis is confirmed.

On the "actual" scale, the teacher is complimentary to the superintendent. The teacher attributes to him (1) a personal acquaintance with the legislator and (2) the presentation of educational concerns in person to the legislator. This is consistent with the superintendent's self-perceptions on this matter. Teachers believe an effective approach to influencing the legislator is through an administrator who is fortified with a broad knowledge base of political issues (political expertise) and who can then rally the citizens through their petitions.

Teachers believe it is desirable to place legislators on the defensive for their decisions, particularly those on education issues. Also, ideally, they believe the administrator should become instrumental in the endorsement of candidates for the legislature.

Hypothesis number three

The layman's (editor) perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his behavior.

The hypothesis is confirmed.

For the purpose of this hypothesis, the term, "layman," is translated to be "editor" of the newspaper in general circulation in the school district of the superintendent used in the research unit. It was the intent of the study to solicit not only a lay perception of the superintendent's behavior, but preferably
a more knowledgeable perception. The role of editor brings one into more continuous contact with schoolmen and school issues.

The editor demonstrated no significant difference from the other groups on the "actual" scale. However, on the "ideal" scale, the editor was not only significantly different on items but on the number of items. A description of that difference follows.

The editor's perceptions of the behavior of school administrators on the "real" scale of political involvement are not unlike the perceptions of all other groups.

However, the editors were significantly different on the "ideal" scale. They perceived the schoolmen as naive in terms of understanding the political machine and unwilling or unable to endorse candidates for the legislature. In addition, even the letter writing and committee assignments so strongly contended by the schoolmen are refuted by the editors.

**Hypothesis number four**

The legislator's perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his behavior.

The hypothesis is confirmed.

On the "real" dimension of perceptions, the legislator viewed the schoolman as ineffective in his involvement of state-level politics. In fact, the administrator was rated as being very demanding in his pursuit of education issues but standing alone in doing it. A general lack of problem insight, understanding of the
political process, and translation of educational problems to the citizenry are the chief characteristics of school administrators. In spite of his ineptness, however, the administrator is sought by the legislators for translation of proposed state action into local effects.

"Ideally" the legislator has little interest in the administrator's (1) presenting genuine endorsement of issues by civic groups, (2) rallying community groups to a formal expression of their views of needed or pending legislation, (3) promoting a cooperative study approach to state-level decisions.

Although research data does not support such a statement, it appears axiomatic that legislators wish to be left alone with their political machine and political expertise. For them to say anything else would infer endorsement of the present methodology used by educators to affect state-level decisions.

The major significance of the legislator's differing perceptions lies in their position of power. The legislator may assume a sanctimonious attitude; it is the educator who must affect a change if one is desired.

**Hypothesis number five**

The non-certificated staff member's perception of the role that the superintendent should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his behavior.

The hypothesis is confirmed.
The non-certificated personnel, i.e., custodian, cook, and bus driver, were significantly different from the other groups in terms of their agreement with the legislators. Both groups perceived the schoolmen as demanding and unyielding in their relationships with legislators. There is one difference—the legislator was not in favor of such an arrangement, while the non-certificated personnel viewed it as a natural outcome of the political machine. In this respect, they were in full accord with the administrator in viewing the proper approach to a legislator as being one which is strong, aggressive, and persistent. The activities of the non-certificated personnel within their own organization would confirm this attitude.

The administrator was viewed, on the "actual" scale, in a very complimentary fashion in the reactions to statements which illustrated the visibility of political behavior. P. T. A. meetings, trips to the legislature, and local public meetings involving state political issues reaffirmed in concert, for the service personnel, the activity of the schoolman. In the perceptions of the non-professional staff members, these activities are translated into a genuine political expertise.

Hypothesis number six

The superintendent's perceptions of the role that he should play in state-level politics differs significantly from his perceptions of his own behavior.

The hypothesis is confirmed.
On the "ideal" scales of the questionnaire, the superintendents did not demonstrate a significant difference in their perceptions when compared to the other groups.

A generalization is in order for the perceptions of the schoolmen. They consistently view themselves as possessing a high level of political expertise and practicing a high level of political involvement. On the "actual" scale, they ranked themselves as accepting committee appointment of local professional and nonprofessional groups for study of state-level issues, both writing to and speaking to the legislator in person to present the educational concerns of their district and the State, and active in the endorsement of candidates who are sympathetic toward education for election to the legislature. In addition, the schoolmen insist upon their encouraging their constituents to become actively involved in state-level politics in the same way they are doing.
IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Hypothesis number one

The implication of this significance on the part of the board member is the crucial element of human relations, coupled with a clear and undisputable knowledge of the political process as practiced by the legislature. Political science has a fundamental contribution to make to this problem area for public school administrators. The administrator must bring to the public-school political scene a conceptualization of the forces impinging upon the issue. The close parallel between public-school administration and public administration must be recognized and assimilated into the operational behavior of the superintendent. The distribution of material rewards will be in direct proportion to the types of political decision making employed in the resolution of the education issue.

Since the resolution of education issues deals primarily with the distribution of material rewards, bargaining plays an ever-increasing role in moving toward an equitable solution as viewed by both the board member and the legislator. Bargaining is a relationship in which leaders react with leaders. Leaders have many resources that they can bring to bear in their interactions with others, and they are highly informed about events and issues impinging upon themselves and those they represent. Contrary to
popular public opinion, non-leaders are uninformed and uninterested in the majority of public issues.

Recommendation

Accepting the premise of uninformed and uninterested non-leaders, and being fully apprised of their ineffectiveness, a logical direction to travel professionally is toward an informed membership. School board associations must accept a responsibility in this direction and demonstrate a commitment to it by improving communication between the leadership and the membership of the associations. Routine periodical articles are not enough. A comprehensive analysis of current events in the politics of education must be translated with an unashamed enthusiasm so as to denote a quality of commitment and spirit of public interest never before witnessed. In Conant's conceptualization, the educational enterprise must become involved in meaningful dialogue with the elected officials and the lay public.

Hypothesis number two

Ideally, the teacher places the superintendent in a crucial role of professional spokesman. From endorsing candidates who are sympathetic toward education for election to the legislature to open attack on legislators through placing the legislator in a defensive position by requesting his presence at a large, open, public meeting, the teacher assigns the leadership role in educational politics to the superintendent. It is difficult to reconcile this
attitude with the current impetus being given to teacher negotiation at the local level. Although primarily a local concern for the teachers now, the teacher's drive toward more and more representation in policy making will inevitably shift to the state level. Retained in the "ideal" perceptions of the teacher are two activities which do not reflect the trend toward more teacher participation in policy formulation. The superintendent is asked to study and keep well informed on the state political scene, including those issues which are not directly education related. He is also asked to obtain petitions from his constituency concerning an education issue to present to his legislator. It is evident the teacher continues to perceive the superintendent to be the educational leader in defiance of the current demand to the contrary. While more teacher associations are excluding the superintendent from participation in policy decision making with the local board, the teacher of Ohio wishes to retain him in his leadership capacity.

Recommendation

Leadership positions are held to be legitimate when they are generally accepted by those being ruled. It is the demand for general acceptance on the part of the lay public, as well as the professional staff, that forces the position of the superintendent of schools into the need for introspection. If, and when, the superintendency is recognized and accepted as a legitimate institutional position, further study is required to ascertain the integrative or the non-integrative character of the institution. The
final analysis of such an investigation will assist in crystallizing the concept of leadership which is in strong contention now; i.e., the board of education versus teacher as the policy maker of the educational institution.

**Hypothesis number three**

The editor, perhaps because he is most remote from the activity of the superintendent, generally perceived the schoolman as being less active than the other groups viewed him. The editor repeated the charge being levied by the legislator—the schoolmen are politically naive and politically inactive. The schoolman is perceived as not being a letter-writing individual who attempts to sell his point of view on new or pending legislation. Also, the superintendent is rated low on the involvement scale on accepting committee appointments in local professional and nonprofessional groups for study of state-level issues and low on the endorsement of candidates who are sympathetic toward education. In fact, the schoolmen are viewed as simply inactive. The most striking indictment of all schoolmen is the charge of not understanding the political machine of the parties and not using it to advantage for educational opportunities for boys and girls.

Translating these statements into implications, the schoolmen find themselves as recipients of penetrating indictments. The differences between the perceptions of the groups surrounding the schoolmen as they behave in their administrative capacities are more visible at this point. Against the common perceptions of the
superintendent, the teacher, and the board member, who insist the schoolmen possess a high degree of political expertise, the editor is charging the converse to be true.

The inconsistency of these two sets of perceptions is not conducive to a cooperative relationship of state-wide study of educational needs. A split of this kind in fundamental ideology and of appropriate process for resolution of issue conflicts generates an ineffectiveness which is inexcusable.

Recommendation

The schoolmen, for survival, if for no other reason, must fill the void between their operation of the institution of society and the behavior of editors, mass media controllers, in their translation of the schoolmen's behavior to the lay public. The sets of conflicting perceptions are the crux of the misunderstandings of institutional operation, and a common denominator of understanding must be developed. This is not to say a commonalty of interests or goals, but only a ground which is suitable for mutual understanding and cooperative long-range planning for the public welfare, not the glorification of the education profession.

Interest differences between groups must be issue based and not be quiet in-fighting which has persisted in the past in Ohio. Some of the conflicts of interests have broken out into the newspaper on a highly personalized basis. Issues must be resolved with the force they warrant. A genuine interest, sincere interaction, while not the only factors, must prevail in the relationships
among the contesting groups in education issues. The labor groups call it "good faith bargaining."

**Hypothesis number four**

On the "actual" scale of political involvement, the legislator differs in his perceptions in the negative direction. He thinks "sincerity of purpose" has little to do with the political effectiveness of the superintendent. The soft-spoken education profession would like for the political world also to be soft spoken, but such is not the case. The schoolmen make very little attempt to contact their legislators by letter writing, and even fewer contact them personally.

An inconsistency is present between two of the items of the legislator's perceptions. In "w" he is saying the schoolmen are sought by legislators as resource persons to translate, identify, and interpret educational needs; in "e" the schoolmen are perceived as less than knowledgeable on school matters on a state-wide basis, in addition to their firsthand knowledge of local conditions. The contention that they are knowledgeable about local, but not state-wide, conditions could resolve the discrepancy; but such an assumption is not warranted from the data.

Solicitation by schoolmen of endorsements of pending issues by reputable civic groups are frowned upon by the legislator. While superficially the statement leads one to view the legislator as undemocratic, in-depth analysis will prove to the contrary. The legislator, and this was borne out in the interviews, is fearful of
group endorsement of professional proposals for legislation. Most
education issues do not originate at the grassroots level, but
rather they are formulated by the professional association and
then presented to the membership and lay communities for approval.
The expressed fear has been manifest in other political arenas.
Item "t" reflects the fear that the superintendent does not rally
his community and constituents to a formal expression of their
views, but that instead he rallies them to an expression of his
views.

Complete naivete of the schoolmen is charged in studying
and keeping well informed on the state political scene, including
those issues which are not directly education related.

The legislator, on the "ideal" scale, is positive concerning
interest in the establishment of an advisory council of educa-
tional persons who could represent the profession. There is intense
interest in hearing a unified voice from the schoolmen.

Recommendation

The establishment of an advisory council comprised of persons
who would be representative of all professional interests in the
State seems appropriate. The present PEP organization is approaching
such unity of goals and the means to the ends. A comprehensive
study of the concepts of legitimacy for leaders is essential if the
council is to find expression of the educational interests of the
state of Ohio. Full expression implies a listener; a listener
implies a commonalty of understanding between the groups involved.
The intent of the council would not be an interest group armed with the force of its membership as much as it would be a study group armed with the force of expertise in state government and public administration concepts with which to address the legislator on his own field. There would be no reason to expect that newly formed organizations, such as SOERG in Middletown, dedicated to research in education could not engage this topic. Total research in the politics of education would be appropriate subject matter for study.

Hypothesis number five

Identification of the source of this perception is difficult. Without detracting from the prestige of the school-service positions, no doubt the absence of professional educational training on their part does stimulate the perception of professional and political adequacy on the part of the professional staff.

While the non-certificated personnel indicate their dismay with the superintendent's actions, they are striving toward an association for themselves which will have as one of its ends the force of voice and the influence for favorable legislation in terms of salaries, working conditions, and fringe benefits. Their behaviors are consistent with the layman's time-honored concept of politics—ask, ask, and ask again when the legislators refuse to hear the requests of the public.
Recommendation

The physical proximity of the non-certificated personnel to the administrator should and can become an advantageous relationship. Whether or not the service personnel understand and are articulate about education issues will depend upon the manner in which the administrator conveys the concerns of the profession. It is not suggested that only professional concerns are relevant, but that the non-certificated personnel be aided in their interpretation of education issues. They are generally citizens who have a deep concern for the welfare of the youth of the community and for the economic and moral welfare of the community at large.

Before any significant degree of progress can be achieved in the involvement of the service personnel into professional politics, it is imperative to develop a vehicle to achieve these ends. Such a vehicle is no more and no less than a cooperative approach to the solution of professional problems. Cooperation means a full and complete trust with mutual respect between the schoolmen and the service personnel. Each has information and authority to bring to the resolution of problems. The service personnel representing the lay public, generally a parental interest as well, can evaluate education proposals from such a vantage point. The professional is in position to translate the lay desires into legal and educational language thereby permitting the voice of the public to be heard. Of course, the assumption here is one of political
expertise for the schoolman. Such an element is critical and crucial if any proposal is to be more than mere verbiage.

Hypothesis number six

The perceptions of the administrator coincide with the perceptions of others in the profession. However, there does exist a significance of difference on this dimension in terms of the legislator and the editor. More items were significant on these two groups in defining the ideal role than for any of the others. It is clear that perceptions are unlike for the professional groups and the lay groups. Small differences existed within and among the groups, but only those indicated on Table 5 were of statistical significance at the .05 level.

The implication is that differences of goals and the means to achieve them will be expected to be found when defined by each group. Educational issues enter the conflict arena—the legislature—with these inherent differences. It is the task of the professional educator to enter into the decision-making process at a point on the involvement axis which will permit congruence of views and expressions of the issue. Many issues fail to be resolved due to the initial differences in the definition of the problem at the state level. Too often, the professional educator has gone to the legislature with divided opinion with regard to the desired resolution of the issue; and the voice of the profession grew too weak too soon for lack of adequate statement of the issue. A consensus
of the statement must be obtained before entering into the process at the state level.

An advisory council for the study of educational issues should be developed to cope with the adequate and accurate statement of the problems of education on a state-wide basis. Consensus is the key—factions of the profession cannot speak for the profession. This is not to imply that only the profession could speak through the council, but that, when the council did speak, it would be on behalf of all interest groups of education. Conflicting forces, i.e., tax lobbyists, highway interests, could identify and evaluate the political impact of the council's recommendation. New York State has such a structure, and the legislature in New York has never mustered enough strength to disregard the study group.

The point is—the schoolmen are active in their professional attempt to influence the legislator, but they are insulated from the political arena with their own naivete. The schoolmen are not being heard outside their professional domain; therefore, the total impact of their influence is unfelt by those making public policy decisions. In other words, the schoolmen are not participating in the state-level decision making. Their activities are only a self-energizing cycle which ends at its beginning. The political arena remains unchanged and unaffected by them.
Recommendation

If the schoolmen are to ever enter into the decision-making process at the state level, the cycle of self-energizing must be broken. The profession must not continue to feed upon its own self-perceptions, but rather it must include in an ever-widening circle, spiraling upward on the involvement axis, the perceptions of other groups with which the schoolmen must engage in dialogue. Schoolmen must not be the same after an engagement with the political arena, and the difference must be in terms of new and fresh concepts of the political process. Formal administrative training could be of help. More enrichment of administrators in their political behavior is possible through changes in the present selection process for school administrators. The need is urgent for persons entering the administrative level of the profession to bring with them a broad base of understandings of local politics and civic activities which are at the very base of the democratic process of decision making. The technical process of study and analysis can be taught, but not the "feel" for politics.
UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS

1. What resources are available to educational leaders for the purpose of bargaining with the legislators?

Bargaining involves the resolution of differences between leaders who possess a high interest, high information level with regard to the issue, with a utilitarian attitude. Position issues are generally involved; that is, at what level shall the educational foundation program support the schools of the state, will there be a minimum salary. Such questions, because of their concreteness, are largely defined and decided at the legislative level between the legislators, who are political leaders, and the leaders of the education profession.

Contrary to "discussion," which involves the interaction of non-leaders, "bargaining" implies an exchange of rewards among the leaders. What shall the education profession offer on the exchange table? The profession must examine the reward system of politics and make fundamental decisions on this basis.

2. What are the characteristics of the educational profession in terms of political involvement?

Given the known interactions and the resulting complexities of behaviors when values, beliefs, and attitudes interplay, much professional analysis is required to accurately state the desires
of the profession. Discussion, which is often the sole activity of professional workshop, is characterized by attitudes of value-expressive and ego-defensive. Leaders, on the other hand, are more concerned and steer their behavior in attitudes of utility and knowledge; utility to accomplish an end; knowledge to change the rules of politics, if necessary, to remain in leadership position.

3. How do superintendents of schools develop their preference structures in relation to the kinds of policies that should pertain to education?

Reconciling one's personal preferences against the trends of the times, the demands of political expediency, and pure opposing concepts of how education should be, is a crucial decision for administrators. Somewhere in the matrix of the problem of what position to take in regard to education against the opposing forces, the administrator must identify those groups who are playing the game and the rules by which the game is played. Also, knowledge of the rules and how the system achieves its goals will assist in changing the rules which will also change the party to whom preferences will be granted. It is a problem of what is desirable versus what is obtainable.

4. What is the nature of the conflict-resolution process that culminates in policy?

An in-depth study of the psychology of decision making has applicability at this point. What beliefs, attitudes, interests, orientations, and reward systems are instrumental in provoking political involvement for what kind of individuals. If schoolmen
are more alike than different, is it possible that these same qualities also limit the engagements in political warfare that one can enter?

5. How are value structures accommodated in pledging allegiance to political issues?

An ever-present problem in large group work is the finding of a common value structure which will provide group gain without sacrifice of individual values. It is inevitable to a limited degree, but wholesale relinquishing of one's personal value system is not so inevitable. Value structures have a degree of similarity in the kind of individual who selects the education profession.

6. What criteria shall be the base for recruitment and selection of administrators who are capable of effective operation in the present political structure?

Are there reward systems which the profession could adopt in order to become more attractive to a new kind of personality? The present system of administrators, being a teacher-who-has-been-promoted, must yield to more fundamental criteria of personal effectiveness—a psychoanalytic approach may be fruitful.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What connotation do you assign to "politics"?
   a. Influence
      . . . is school recipient or participant?
   b. Bipartisan
      . . . should schoolmen become involved? actively? how limited?
   c. Inter-meshing of politics, economics, etc.
      . . . limit concern to education
   d. Other . . .

2. What has led you to this rationale?
   a. Experience (personal or group)
   b. Observer (outside the acts) not a participant
   c. Participant
   d. Conceptual tools or principles?
3. How do you describe the decision making of educational policy?

If "politics" is defined as the contest which surrounds the decision-making activities in education.

a. Stratified?

Is there a hierarchy?
Where is the genuine influence? Is it fixed or fluid? in membership
What are interest groups? Who are they in Ohio?
How basic are the conflicts among the interest groups?

b. Pluralistic

(1) Nothing categorical may be assumed about power.
(2) Is there more than one pattern to the influentials in the state?
(3) The influence groups may vary in membership with issues?
(4) What is the basis for coalitions in educational decision making? Issue? Other?
(5) Do you see overt activity as a valid indication of involvement?

If not, what does constitute involvement of the educator in state-level decision making? Illustrate with examples of activities.

How does the educator actually behave?
What activities are most prevalent?
How do you rate these in effectiveness?

Which activities characterize the superintendent who is behaving in the most appropriate manner as you see it?
4. As you see it, what are the greatest deterrents to the involvement of the superintendent in the state-level, educational, decision-making process?
Dear Panel Member:

Enclosed you will find several documents pertaining to my study which is tentatively titled "The Role of the School Administrator in State-Level Politics." The basic premise of the study is that an individual's behavior reflects his perceptions of the world about him. In particular, the premise states that the behavior of the school administrator as he becomes involved in the educational policy making at the state level is a manifestation of his social perceptions and, consequently, his role in the activities which surround him.

The enclosed QUESTIONNAIRE is attempting to identify the perceptions of significant others; namely, a board member, a teacher, a non-certificated employee, the editor of the local paper, and a legislator. The research unit for the study is comprised of the aforementioned persons all being from the same school district and judging the same superintendent. In this way, discrepancies among the perceptions of all these persons should become visible. (See enclosed list of hypotheses.)

Please react to the QUESTIONNAIRE in the following terms:

1. Format of the QUESTIONNAIRE.

2. Validity of the items in identification of political activities.

3. Using the three sheets marked "SCORE KEY," ascertain the appropriateness of the three divisions of Legislative, Professional, and Constituent.

4. Any comments which, in your opinion, would improve the quality of the study.
You will note that a deadline of May 15 is requested. I would appreciate your returning the instrument to me by that time even if you feel you cannot give it all the attention required.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in the study, for I realize how busy you are. I shall be pleased to forward a copy of the findings to you upon the completion of the study.

Sincerely,

Eldon Wiley
3700 Stahlheber Road
Hamilton, Ohio
Dear Respondent:

The enclosed questionnaire is for the purpose of identifying perceptions about the ways a school administrator becomes involved in educational decision making at the state level.

Each section of the questionnaire has its own specific directions, and these must be noted carefully.

Your responses to each section must be given in terms of how you see your superintendent acting in each case. Since other persons in your school system will also be filling out the same questionnaire, every single questionnaire is vitally important to the end results. Your answers will be tied in with four other persons, and each one is needed to make any conclusions about your district and other districts in the state of Ohio.

There are no right or wrong answers; it is important to the passage of educational issues that you follow the directions exactly.

Although the questionnaire looks lengthy, it will require only 10 to 15 minutes to complete it.

No persons, school districts, or communities will be divulged. All replies will be treated statistically.

Your cooperation and kind assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Eldon Wiley
3700 Stahlheber Road
Hamilton, Ohio
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Select one best answer below which best describes your definition of the term, "politics." Place an (x) in front of your answer.

____ a. Politics is a function of government; not an organization of government.

____ b. Politics has to do with one's participation in government.

____ c. Politics is a way of influencing persons or groups who hold a public office.

____ d. Politics is limited to all activities engaged in by the politicians of the two-party system.

____ e. Politics is practiced by anyone who engages in activities which are designed to affect public-policy decisions.

THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS AT THE STATE LEVEL

Directions: Select one answer below which best answers the following question:

"When educational issues are first recognized by the legislature, one could safely generalize that the issues have originated with . . . ."

____ a. A legislator of either political party no matter whether or not the legislator is a member of a legislative committee.

____ b. A legislator of either political party who is a member of the legislative Education Committee.

____ c. An educational lobby group (either lay or professional).
d. An influential individual of the state; sometimes an industrial leader; sometimes an economist; and other times other influential persons.

e. "The Administration"; that is, the present governor's political staff.

Directions: Check below all statements which you feel are true concerning how an educational issue is resolved after it has come to the attention of the legislature.

a. Committee hearings are a crucial function in decision making in that it provides for both sides of the issue to be heard.

b. Committee hearings are just a front—most hearings have no effect upon the final decision made by the legislature.

c. Educational committees frequently contact superintendents of schools to act as resource persons on educational issues.

d. Committees must, by party allegiance, fulfill the "administration" program no matter what is revealed in the hearings.

e. Legislatures could function just as effectively if there were no committee hearings at all.

Directions: Check all statements below which generally represent true statements about the state political climate in Ohio.

a. A relatively small group of persons (probably 100 or less), actually dictate most state-level decisions no matter what the issue; i.e., education, welfare, business.

b. The small group of persons who actually dictate or control state-level decisions change in membership each time a new issue is to be considered.

c. Wealth is the most important single determinant of political power.

d. Prestige of the persons concerned with the issue is the most important single determinant of political power.

e. Social class of the persons concerned with the issue is the most important single determinant of political power.
f. Educators (superintendents, teachers) are members of the influential groups in Ohio on educational issues.

g. Generally, for educators to obtain advantages for education, they must work through other influential in the state.

h. The issue under consideration by the legislature determines the persons who are influential.

i. Most educational issues begin at the grassroots level and move to the legislature through established channels of government.

j. The legislature does not formulate issues for change, but rather resolves conflicting decisions of differing interest groups.

Directions: Each statement below has appeared at least one time in the professional literature concerning decision making at the state level. In Column (1), place an (X) if the statement describes an activity which your superintendent actually does to influence decisions which are made at the state level and affect education in the state of Ohio.

Place an (X) in Column (2) if the statement describes an activity which you feel an ideal superintendent would do to affect educational decision making at the state level. The two Xs need not agree with each other.

(1) (2)

a. Acts in a most sincere manner in promoting issues for schools and children.

b. Writes letters to his representatives, expressing suggestions for action on legislative bills which have been introduced.

c. Accepts committee appointments in local professional and nonprofessional groups for study of state-level issues.

d. Forms political "blocks" with fellow-administrators in an effort to influence legislators.
e. Becomes articulate on school matters on a statewide basis in addition to his firsthand knowledge of local conditions.

f. Knows the legislator on a personal basis and presents the educational concerns in person to the legislator.

g. Forms coalitions with other political interest groups; i.e., Farm Bureau, labor groups, etc.

h. Is demanding and unyielding in his relationships with legislators. That is, he will not accept less than the full loaf.

i. Attempts to put legislator in defensive position by requesting his presence at a large, open, public meeting.

j. Phones the legislator to discuss pending legislation in terms of his own school district.

k. Quietly fights people who do not come up to his expectations in support of education bills (particularly legislators).

l. Endorses candidates who are sympathetic toward education for election to office at state level.

m. Solicits endorsement of pending issues by reputable civic groups.

n. Aligns himself with either the Republican or Democratic Party to win favor and prestige for a proposed educational issue.

o. Cooperates in long-range educational planning with the other forces in the state; i.e., industrialists, economic trends, etc.

p. Obtains petitions from his constituency concerning an education issue to present to his legislature.

q. Promotes a sit-in in the legislature on the day of an important decision to impress the legislators with the intensity of feeling connected to the bill.

r. Displays no political activity at all.

s. Writes personal letters to legislators, expressing his views and concerns on pending legislation.
t. Rallies his community and constituents to a formal expression of their views concerning needed legislation.

u. Meets cooperatively with legislators, business leaders, political boss-men, and others to share in the formulation and drafting of new legislation for the coming session.

v. Studies and keeps well informed on the state political scene, including those issues which are not directly education related.

w. Sought by legislators as a resource person to translate, identify, and interpret educational needs.

x. Becomes a candidate for a state-level office.

y. Understands the political machine of the parties and uses it to advantage for educational opportunities for boys and girls.

z. Promotes the establishment of an advisory council of educational persons.

aa. Becomes involved in the bipartisan politics at the committeemen level to influence the state administration.

bb. Encourages his constituents to become actively involved in state-level politics in the same way he is doing.
CONSTITUENT SCORE KEY*

q. promotes a sit-in in the legislature on the day of an important decision to impress the legislators with the intensity of feeling connected to the bill.

p. obtains petitions from his constituency concerning an education issue to present to his legislators.

g. forms coalitions with other political interest groups; i.e., Farm Bureau, labor groups, etc.

m. solicits endorsement of pending issues by reputable civic groups.

t. rallies his community and constituents to a formal expression of their views concerning needed legislation.

bb. encourages his constituents to become actively involved in state-level politics in the same way he is doing.

c. accepts committee appointments in local professional and nonprofessional groups for study of state-level issues.

u. meets cooperatively with legislators, business leaders, political boss-men, and others to share in the formulation and drafting of new legislation for the coming session.

a. acts in a most sincere manner in promoting issues for schools and children.

*The lettered items are taken from the Questionnaire.
APPENDIX E

LEGISLATIVE SCORE KEY*

w. sought by legislators as a resource person to translate, identify, and interpret educational needs.

f. knows the legislator on a personal basis and presents the educational concerns in person to the legislator.

j. phones the legislator to discuss pending legislation in terms of own school district.

h. is demanding and unyielding in his relationships with legislators; that is, he will not accept less than the full loaf.

i. attempts to put legislator in defensive position by requesting his presence at large, open, public meeting.

s & b. writes letters to his representatives expressing suggestions for action on legislative bills which have been introduced.

l. endorses candidates who are sympathetic toward education for election to office at state level.

n. aligns himself with either the Republican or Democratic Party to win favor and prestige for a proposed educational issue.

k. quietly fights people who do not come up to his expectation in support of educational bills (particularly legislators).
s. writes personal letters to legislators expressing his views and concerns on pending legislation.

*The lettered items are taken from the Questionnaire.*
APPENDIX E

PROFESSIONAL SCORE KEY*

x. becomes a candidate for a state-level office.

d. forms political "blocks" with fellow-administrators in an effort to influence legislators.

z. promotes the establishment of an advisory council of educational persons.

y. understands the political machine of the parties and uses it to advantage for educational opportunities for boys and girls.

c. accepts committee appointments in local professional and nonprofessional groups for study of state-level issues.

o. cooperates in long-range educational planning with the other forces in the state; i.e., industrialists, economic trends, etc.

u. meets cooperatively with legislators, business leaders, political boss-men, and others to share in the formulation and drafting of new legislation for the coming session.

aa. becomes involved in the bipartisan politics at the committeemen level to influence the state "administration."

l. endorses candidates who are sympathetic toward education for election to office at state level.
| -L | +T | v. studies and keeps well informed on the state political scene, including those issues which are not directly education related.  
| -L |
| e. becomes articulate on school matters on a state-wide basis in addition to his first-hand knowledge of local conditions.  
| r. displays no political activity at all.  

*The lettered items are taken from the Questionnaire.*
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