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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH PROBLEM

Nature of the Problem

It appears quite evident that today's teachers are becoming increasingly involved in the negotiations process. This involvement is advocated by the so-called "professional" group and the "union" group. Each group has contributed significantly to conditions which have caused headlines and captions such as the following:

"THE N.E.A. WINS A VICTORY"
"BOARD RECOGNIZES THE A.F.T." 
"CITY TEACHERS STAGE WALKOUT"
"TEACHERS STRIKE LOOKS LARGE"

The caption on an article appearing in the Columbus Dispatch on Monday, February 9, read: "TEACHERS START BOYCOTT." In this case, 1400 members of the Fort Wayne Teachers Association did not return to their assignments and the rival Fort Wayne Teachers Council, American Federation of Labor--Congress of Industrial Organizations, had to take their responsibilities. The boycott group, affiliated with the Indiana State Teachers Association, originally sought sole bargaining rights on salaries and working conditions.¹

¹Columbus Dispatch, February 9, 1967.
This same article noted that Central High School's Principal, H. Paul Spuller, sent pupils home. Some of the unanswered questions are—

1. Was Mr. Spuller a member of the Fort Wayne Teachers Association, affiliated with the Indiana State Teachers Association, and therefore committed to going home after dismissing the pupils?

2. Was Mr. Spuller, as a member of the Fort Wayne Teachers Council (Principal's unit) AFL-CIO, committed to helping this organization serve the needs of the remainder of the city's 37,000 pupils?

3. Or, was Mr. Spuller serving as an instrument of the Superintendent, in effect an agent of the school trustees, or in something of an indeterminate position because his role had never been adequately defined?

These same questions can be posed concerning the role of the Ohio Elementary School Principal...posed to some because they have been directly involved in such actions, and posed to others to determine an attitudinal dimension on issues related to the principal's role in negotiations.

At the present time, the National Education Association--Department of Elementary School Principals and its state affiliated organization, Ohio Education Association--Department of Elementary School Principals do not have their positions concerning the elementary school principal's role in the negotiations process in writing.

The teachers' associations, whether they are as such, or include administrators and call themselves education associations, follow the National Education Association's guidelines on negotiations. The local chapters of the American Federation of Teachers--Congress of Industrial Organizations follow the labor-oriented practices called "collective bargaining" in the private sector and use the same
terminology to identify negotiations in the public sector. Members of the National Education Association and their state affiliated education associations call a similar process "professional negotiations." Both terms, "collective bargaining" and "professional negotiations," have provided a basis for coining other terminology which has been used in the public sector and the private sector to identify the negotiations process.

The National School Boards Association and its state-affiliated Ohio School Boards Association clearly defined its position relative to the executive officer of the board of education, the superintendent of schools. The National School Boards Association's policy is as follows:  

School boards, subject to the requirements of applicable law, should refrain from compromise agreements based on negotiation or collective bargaining, and should not resort to mediation or arbitration, nor yield to threats of reprisal on all matters affecting local public schools, including the welfare of all personnel. They should also resist by all lawful means the enactment of laws which would compel them to surrender any part of their responsibility.

The Ohio School Boards Association's policy appears to be more cognizant of the negotiations process and the role the superintendent must assume as the executive officer of the board of education under Ohio law. Their policy is as follows:

It is recommended that the superintendent or his designated representative negotiate on behalf of the board with the

teachers and submit periodic reports and recommendations to the board, leaving the board free to hear appeals and make final determinations. 3

It is reasonably safe to say, then, that negotiations is recognized in a hierarchical form from the public to the teachers, with the exception of the school principal. Stuart Openlander recognizes the fact that the Ohio Elementary School Principal is about five years behind the Superintendent. Just five short years ago, according to him, the superintendent did not have his role clearly defined. He feels that boards of education are moving too slowly in determining the principal's role in negotiation...and sooner or later, will be forced into defining this role in relation to their role, the superintendent's role, and in working relationships with the teaching staff. 4

Historical Sequence

It will not be the purpose of the writer to name the first, give dates, and pinpoint locations, in the evolutionary process of an entity known today as the elementary school principalship. It is the purpose of the writer, however, to help the reader see this evolutionary process in terms of understanding the role of the elementary principal, and to lay a foundation for the reader to better understand the


4Stuart Openlander, Superintendent of the Parma Schools, served as conference speaker at the opening session of the co-sponsored School Management Institute—Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals Conference on "The Principal and Negotiations," at Stouffers Inn on March 10, 1967.
elementary principal's precarious position as it relates to the negotiations process.

The elementary school principalship has had a metamorphic cycle in its relatively short history. Originally, teachers taught and shared other school responsibilities. As schools grew in size, from the concept of the one room school to the multi-roomed units of today, one teacher was asked to relieve the other teachers from some of these "other" responsibilities. This teacher became known as the "head" teacher, and later, as the "principal" teacher. In the beginning, the principal teacher taught and conducted the affairs of the building. Due to an increase in problems as a result of societal forces, and specific developments in school organization, the position became full-time.

After the position became recognized, it assumed a line-status position. This status brought the elementary principalship close to the superintendent and near the mid-point of the metamorphic cycle.

Later, when the position once again increased in proportions as a result of increased learnings about the educative process, specialization was introduced. These specialists in curriculum, pupil personnel services, etc., usually served several schools and worked out of the central office. In many cases, they were directly responsible to the superintendent. This new relationship caused many elementary school principals to feel some status loss and to feel that their role image had been affected. These factors had a tendency to cause the elementary principal to view his status as being something less than it
had been in relation to the superintendent and, as a result, the principal felt closer once again to the role of the teacher.

Today's elementary school principal is, once again, faced with a situation that seemingly will affect his role image. This situation is the part he will play in the negotiations process. His role in this process will affect the metamorphic cycle by once again causing him to either align himself with teachers, or will remove some of his felt status loss due to specialization and put him once more next to the superintendent in a line-staff hierarchy and on the side of "management." If his position is not well-defined as a result of legislative enactment, board policy, or from holding membership in an organization, his role will be a fluctuating one...he will be an indeterminate.

Professional-Unionism Confrontation Over the Negotiations Issue

The labor approach of the union has always encouraged the rank and file of labor to meet with management for the purposes of discussing salary, welfare, and conditions of work. This approach has achieved results for many American Federation of Teachers affiliated teacher groups. These results, plus many other causal factors and considerations, produced in the professional groups teacher-sponsored activity that was, and still is, labeled by such terms as "teacher militancy."

As a result of cooperative action on the local, state, and national level, between boards of education and teacher groups and among the hierarchical levels in both the union and in the professional organizations, negotiations has gained recognition.

As early as 1962, when the National Education Association's first resolution on professional negotiations was passed, this
organization recognized the need to be as aware of teacher concerns as the American Federation of Teachers. Each year since this first resolution, the National Education Association has continually strengthened its position on negotiation.

The activity in the area of negotiation on the part of both groups has been instrumental in forcing some states to enact legislation. The first statewide professional negotiation law in the nation was signed by the governor of Washington on March 20, 1965. Since then other states such as California, Connecticut, and Oregon have passed mandatory negotiation laws specifically for teachers. Ohio gave legislation in this area consideration during the 160th General Assembly, and schoolmen are predicting its successful passage in the current session (1967) of the legislature.

Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Wisconsin are the states which thus far have grouped teachers under new or existing labor laws. These laws are, by necessity, different from the laws which lean toward professionalism, inasmuch as they are modified collective bargaining laws.5

The National Education Association's policy on negotiation is that "all certificated staff should be regarded as members of the negotiation unit." This policy differs from the American Federation of Teachers' policy which is that "only those persons who are certificated

---

5Ronald O. Daly, Salary Consultant, Office of Professional Development and Welfare, N.E.A., gives some of the characteristics of each of the mandatory state laws in the October, 1966, issue of the N.E.A. Journal, in an article entitled, "New Directions for Professional Negotiations."
Personnel and employed on the basis of the classroom teacher's salary guide be a part of the bargaining unit."

The other two related approaches to negotiation come from the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association. The American Association of School Administrators would have the superintendent serve in what could be construed as a neutral capacity while the National School Boards Association's position is opposed to both "collective negotiations" and "professional negotiations."

Review of Related Research

Negotiations until recently have been confined to the private sector. The writer's search of the literature uncovered many in-depth studies, articles, and dissertations in the areas of "arbitration," "mediation," "collective negotiations," "collective bargaining," and procedural concerns for both labor and management in the private sector.

In the public sector, the literature is not as complete or comprehensive, since it has only been in these recent years that public groups have become concerned with negotiations. This point may be more aptly demonstrated by citing one example of listed bibliography where, of ninety-seven references listed, the only empirical studies cited were two unpublished dissertations.7


The writer found, as did Stephens, that the vast amount of literature which treats the concept of negotiations is hortative in nature.  

The literature on negotiations in the public sector (education) treats negotiations from two points of view: one is the so-called "union" point of view, and the other is the so-called "professional" point of view.

A further elaboration on a "point of view" is the increase in the number of articles in the house organ of the National Education Association, the N.E.A. Journal, during the calendar year, 1966. The "union" point of view is also being promoted in many labor-oriented publications, procedural manuals, and illustrative pamphlets.

Although the bulk of material on negotiations comes from those organizations and agencies expressing these two pronounced points of view, other organizations related in nature to these two (NEA and AFT) are being heard.

---


9This listing encompasses only the major or feature articles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Title of Article</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Unionism Versus Professionalism in Teaching</td>
<td>Richard D. Batchelder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Principals and Professional Negotiations</td>
<td>William G. Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>N.E.A.-A.T.A. Unification</td>
<td>Walter N. Ridley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>New Directions for Professional Negotiation</td>
<td>Ronald O. Daly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Professional Negotiation for Improving Education</td>
<td>Cecil J. Hannan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10These materials are readily obtainable from the American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago 11, Illinois.
One of the most productive sources for substantiating the need for research in the area of negotiations and its implication for the principal's role was a survey conducted by Luvern L. Cunningham, Director of the Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago.

Cunningham invited three graduate students to help him collect and prepare some data to be presented in a Seminar on Professional Negotiation in Public Education which was co-sponsored by the National Education Association and Graduate School of Education at the University of Chicago.¹¹

The interview team conducted interviews with principals and other administrators in Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. The results of this survey on an interview basis caused the summation of their findings to make use of such words as: we felt, we suspect, and it appears. In the seven areas of speculation or tentative conclusions about the impact of teacher collective activity on the principalship, it became clear that much work in this area needs to be done to give the principalship the stability that is needed to work effectively and efficiently with his staff, on one hand, and his superintendent and board of education on the other. This stabilization would come from:

1. the provisions that are made for genuine, legitimate participation of principals in negotiations.

¹¹A paper was presented by Cunningham on August 3, 1966, entitled "Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," as a result of the efforts of Bernard Watson, Staff Associate, and the other two graduate students, Thomas McGuire and Richard Smock, who were second year fellows in a special training program supported by a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health.
2. recognition of the intensification of activity involving a larger number of power groups which reflect the increase in specialization of work.

3. understanding the sustained and increased tension that exists currently between bureaucratic and/or legalistic authority and professional authority.

4. inclusion of substantial work in superior-subordinate relationships in complex social organizations as part of preparation programs for administrative posts in education, especially the principalship and superintendent level positions.

5. collecting, organizing, and disseminating research findings on the impact of collective action on the school itself, its productivity, and the relationship among those who hold occupational membership.

6. assessing the needs to be made of which administrative skills, conceptual, human, or technical, offer the greater advantage for the school principal.

7. exploration to determine the effect of teaching experience on administrator socialization.

Charles Perry and Wesley Wildman concluded from their recent survey of collective activity in education that (1) collective action on the part of employees in education is growing, (2) that school administration will have an increasing rather than decreasing set of responsibilities concerning collective behavior, and (3) that the
ultimate impact of collective activities on school systems is not known. 12

Perry and Wildman in an article appearing in the January, 1966, issue of Phi Delta Kappan commented to the effect that it is the principal who stands to lose freedom when negotiations include certain areas of administrative discretion. 13

It became very clear to the writer, as he was reviewing the literature, that the elementary principal's position in negotiations is nebulous and precarious. As far as his involvement in teachers' negotiations is concerned he has three choices: (1) to align himself with the teachers; (2) to assume a management position and play an administrative role; or (3) to attempt to be neutral and consider the process with a degree of objectivity.

Cunningham sums up the situation pretty well when he says, "It is clear that changes are the order of the day in the principalship; new challenges are present; and the future of the position appears to be anything but dull and uninteresting."

Statement of the Problem

The so-called "teacher militancy," societal conditions, and other forces have been instrumental in bringing about change in administrative concept and the role of the elementary school principal. One


of these major changes, the role of the elementary school principal in negotiations, has not been defined. The problem, then, becomes one of determining by random sampling how the elementary school principals perceive their role in negotiations: what perceptions they hold in common; where they differ; why they differ; and, how these interpretations can be utilized to effect stabilization of role.

Research Problem for Investigation

The writer is hopeful that the terse statement of the problem will help the reader see the broad implications for role stabilization. The role as viewed in the literature is expressed in terms related to the general administrative concept of task areas as projected by Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer.14

Although the source cited and many other sources attempt to relate the principal's role to certain concrete affirmations, another dimension must be examined. This dimension is the attitudinal dimension, or the role as it is perceived by the elementary principal. This area of study is especially pertinent as it relates to the principal's role in negotiations.

The principal's perception of his nebulous role is undoubtedly influenced by many factors. Goslin believes that a large part of an individual's behavior is determined by the characteristics of the various positions he occupies in the groups to which he belongs.15 On

14Roald Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Education Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1962).

this basis, then, an elementary principal may view his role image according to his relationship with the superintendent and the board of education, his staff, and his own particular membership affiliations.

If the principal perceives his role in relation to the superintendent and the board of education, he may tend to view this position as a management position. On the other hand, he may consider himself a teacher--trained, certificated, and practiced--and view the negotiation process from the perspective of a classroom teacher. Those principals between these extreme positions could be called "indeterminates" and, undoubtedly, perceive their role according to such variables as the already mentioned membership affiliations, age, experiences (position assignments and work in negotiations), amount of remuneration, type of school system, degree of autonomy, training level, etc. It is precisely these positions and their extremes which pose problems in role perception in the area of negotiations and give rise to a possible source of conflict.

The investigation was conducted by the writer. The cooperation of the Ohio Education Association was solicited for the benefits offered to the writer in an undertaking of such magnitude.

The availability of names and addresses in the eight divisions of the Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals, coupled with the necessary collation of materials and mailing techniques of the O.E.A., offered the writer the advantage of conserving time and having available facilities at his disposal, Since the Ohio Education Association does not have a distinct research division with a budgeted
account, the writer shared the cost of mailing and other incidental expenses. This resulting cooperation will serve the association and the writer. The association will have the findings of the research available for use in promoting the objectives of the organization, and the writer will be able to determine the level of significance on the following null hypotheses (H₀) at the 5 per cent level.

There will be no significant statistical relationship:
1. Between the principal's age and his attitude toward negotiations.
2. Between the principal's academic attainment and his attitude toward negotiations.
3. Between the principal's remuneration and his attitude toward negotiations.
4. Between the principal's employment in a city, exempted village, or local district, and his attitude toward negotiations.
5. Between a principal's membership affiliation and his attitude toward negotiations.

These null hypotheses will be accepted or rejected after an analysis of the research sample relative to the attitudes of the principal in responding to "issue statements" with "position-oriented" responses (see Chapter II for a complete description of these terms).

Objectives of the Research

The conflicts which arise due to perceptions of role image in the negotiations process are primarily attitudinal in nature. These
attitudinal dimensions must be researched if this presumed nebulous position in negotiations is to gain any stability in the principal's perception of his own role and contribute any definiteness to this position in general.

The writer hopes that, through these research findings, elementary school principals will be able to see what perceptions they have in common and where they differ. It would further be the hope of the writer that these findings would produce interpretations that could be utilized to effect those degrees of stabilization necessary for establishing good internal working relationships, guidance in elementary principalship preparation and certification programs, and considerations for on-the-job training programs.

Limitations of the Study

The role of the elementary school principal as it relates to a precise function or degree of proficiency has never been fully established nor can it be, since every elementary principalship is unique unto itself. Commonality of elements has been determined by the researchers through role perception studies, time allotment surveys, etc.¹⁶

This research study is not intended to be an all-inclusive study of the elementary school principal's role in negotiations, but rather, a test of the null hypotheses, which may open the door of inquiry.

This study is an attempt by means of a random sampling to check the perceptions of Ohio elementary school principals and to determine if a significant relationship exists between these perceptions and selected variables.

Implications of the Study

A test of the stated null hypotheses may cause principals to come to some agreements concerning their role in negotiations. These agreements tend to open up membership in teachers' associations so that the elementary principal will be recognized as a teacher under law with full rights and privileges accorded him through membership. Teachers' associations may become local education associations for this purpose.17

Boards of education, by virtue of the fact that the elementary principal is not recognized in negotiations, may form policy either to include him with teachers, exclude him as the American Association of School Administrators recommends for the administrator, or treat principals either individually or collectively in negotiations.

The principals' own professional group (The Department of Elementary School Principals--Ohio Education Association) may recognize the principals' seemingly untenable position and produce a set of guidelines for negotiation that is palatable to the majority of elementary school principals. As an outward growth of such action, the principals' group on the national level (The Department of Elementary School

17The Upper Arlington Teachers Association through constitutional change now admit the elementary principals to membership. The newly-formed Upper Arlington Education Association gives all certificated persons full rights and privileges of membership. Prior to the 1966-1967 school year, principals were able to join, if they elected to do so, but were not accorded certain rights, such as the right to vote.
Principals--National Education Association) may use the Ohio model for implementing its work in other states.

Overview of the Study

The study is organized in the following manner:

Chapter I. The reader is exposed to the rudiments of the problem; given additional background to the understanding of the problem; helped to see the problem relative to the current literature; made aware of the objectives and limitations of the study; and led into the implications of the study with a terse review of conclusions.

Chapter II. The reader is made aware of the research approach used; presented the process by which the instrument was developed; provided a basis for the research study by describing the universe of the study and the sample procedure; given a definition of the terms used throughout the study; and provided with a background concerning the data--dissemination, organization of returns, processing, and the techniques used for analysis.

Chapter III. The reader is presented with the tabulated results of the data; the tabulations of the personal, factual, perceived, and situational variables, and the statistical treatment of these variables as they are correlated with the respondents' attitudinal responses.

Chapter IV. The reader is guided through an interpretation of the writer's research findings. These findings are assessed in terms of variable selection, perceptual reflections, and attitudinal variances.
Chapter V. A summary of the research process used in the study; recommendations concerning this process; conclusions derived from an analysis of the data gathered in this process; and recommendations for further study and about the future of negotiations as it relates to the role of the Ohio Elementary School Principal.

Conclusion

The purpose, then, of this study is to provide some insightful thinking into the principal's role in the negotiation process.

If this role could be established as it relates to the principal's over-all function, other role patterns would have a greater degree of specificity. Relationships of principals to boards of education, superintendents, and teachers, would tend to give the elementary principalship a degree of stability.

This stability within the organizational pattern will serve as guidelines for the elementary school principal to work toward fulfilling the major objective of negotiations—that of providing the best possible educational program for boys and girls.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH APPROACH AND INSTRUMENTATION

Introduction of Research Approach

The writer's search of the literature failed to produce any in-depth studies of the elementary school principal and his role or relationship to negotiations. Hopkins, in a recent Ph.D. dissertation, describes the literature to be hortative in nature. His search produced treatises on the implications of negotiations on the role of the superintendent, board of education, and the teachers' association, but not on the role of the elementary school principal. He found, as did the writer, articles suggesting and dealing with strategies, procedural manuals, and numerous illustrative pamphlets from both the National Education Association and The American Federation of Teachers.

This impressive amount of material, the numbers of persons becoming involved in negotiations, and the number of seminars, conferences, and study-groups formed recently leads the writer to believe that the Ohio Elementary School Principal is indeed in a neglected and precarious position.

The principals' own professional groups (National Education Association--Department of Elementary School Principals and the Ohio Education Association--Department of Elementary School Principals) are vitally concerned with having this role defined.

It has become apparent that the principal must assume some responsibility for defining his own role, or assuredly other groups will define this role, and their definition may not be in accordance with his thinking, which seemingly would contribute to the current conflict.

The writer worked closely with the Ohio Education Association in this study. The Ohio Education Association was in a position to be of immeasurable help to the writer since it is the sponsoring organization for the Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals. The Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals serves over two thousand principals. This service is accorded principals working in each of the eight different membership districts.

A normative survey questionnaire was distributed to elementary school principals in the state. This questionnaire attempted to treat the multi-dimensional problem by having the respondent indicate and react to the two divisions of the questionnaire.

The first division, Part I, asked the respondent to indicate such personal, factual, perceived, and situational data items as: sex, age, training, salary, contract (type and kind), type of school system (legal categorization), number of elementary teachers and pupils in the principal's unit, prior experience and membership affiliation, how the principal perceives his situation in relation to a degree of
autonomy from central office, and his current status relative to nego-
tiations.

The second division, Part II, asked the respondent to react to
issue questions. The bases for the issue alternatives were rooted in
adopted policies and procedures of the two organizations attempting to
be recognized by the board of education as the district's "bargaining"
or "negotiating" unit. These two pronounced positions are evident
("professional" and "union") since the American Federation of Teachers
states in its constitution that its first objective is "to cooperate
to the fullest extent with the labor movement and to work for a pro-
gressive labor philosophy; to awaken in all teachers a labor conscious-
ness and a sense of solidarity with labor." The labor approach sees
foremen and other middle-management as "management" and excludes them
from negotiations with the rank and file of labor. Therefore, princi-
pals, supervisors, and superintendents are considered management as
related to education and are also excluded, unless their salary is tied
to teachers. The other alternative that is open to them for bargaining
rights, if their salary is not tied to teachers' salary scheduling, is
to form a separate bargaining unit.

On the other hand, the National Education Association believes
that all certificated persons should be included in negotiations. A
few years ago, the superintendent had difficulty seeing himself in the
all-inclusive negotiation position of the National Education Associa-
tion and approached his own affiliate, the American Association of
School Administrators for role clarification. As a result, guidelines
were developed in 1963 giving the superintendent a sense of direction
in performing a dualistic role with respect to giving leadership to the
board of education on one hand and the teachers' group on the other.2

The elementary principal's position, as yet, has not been
determined. Perhaps part of this role determination will come from
the principals themselves as a result of such work as the writer pro-
poses. Without a doubt, the principals are in possession of attitudes
which could and likely should, have a significant bearing on determin-
ing this role.

The writer proposes to elicit these attitudes on vital issues.
This attitudinal information will be examined with respect to the
respondent's personal and factual background. Hopefully, these atti-
dudinal patterns with regards to the concrete data will yield informa-
tion that can be used as a basis for defining the role of the eleme-
tary school principal in negotiations.

The Universe of the Study

The majority of statisticians are agreed that the universe is
the population. Those statisticians differing from the premise differ
as a result of interpreting the universe as being of like kind or the
infinite population. For the purposes of this study, the infinite pop-
ulation has been reduced to finite terms since only the elementary
school principals in the state of Ohio were considered the population.

2School Administrators View Professional Negotiations, AASA, 1966. This 56 page publication is the more recent. The 1963 document, developed by the Executive Committee and the Staff, is a lengthy policy statement entitled Role, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff.
The population (N) is the number of elementary schools in the state of Ohio (N=3107) being served by a principal-teacher.

The sample (n) was selected on the basis of arranging the addresses of all the elementary buildings in zip code order. A random number was selected and each tenth address was reproduced until a total sample of three hundred addresses was selected. There were 3,107 public elementary schools in 1966-1967; therefore, the random sampling technique produced a sample (n=300) which was a 9.65% sampling of the universe.

The sample represents the principals working in each of the Ohio Education Association's membership districts. There are eight geographical representations.

Design of the Study

The design of the study consisted of the following phases:

(1) The creation and development of a questionnaire to determine the respondent's personal background.

(2) The creation and development of a questionnaire to determine the respondent's factual situation.

(3) The creation and development of a questionnaire to determine the respondent's perception of his position in relation to the degree of autonomy that exists in his position.

(4) The creation and development of a questionnaire to determine the respondent's situation in relation to various negotiations considerations.
(5) The creation and development of a questionnaire to determine the respondent's attitude toward issues concerning negotiations by selecting a position-oriented response.

(6) After the questionnaire was developed, a panel of judges was formed to rule on the validity of the instrument.

(7) After validity was established, the instrument was reviewed, numbered, and statistical treatment was discussed by one member of the staff at the Research Center at The Ohio State University with the chief statistician.

(8) A cover letter was developed and attached to the questionnaire which was sent to the principals in the eight geographical districts on a random basis as determined by a statistical table of numbers.

Definition of Terms

The following terms to be used in the research are defined for the strict purpose of the research which will be carried on as a part of this project:

**PRINCIPAL**.................................a full-time, certificated, person assigned the responsibility of an educational unit and holding membership in the Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals.

**NEGOTIATIONS**.........................parties deal with each other openly and fairly in an attempt to come to an agreement. Neither party is compelled to agree or required to make a concession.
PROFESSIONAL respondents reflecting the position of the National Education Association, the state affiliation—Ohio Education Association, and the locally affiliated teachers' association.

UNION respondents reflecting the position of The American Federation of Teachers, or exhibiting a strict management attitude.

INDETERMINATE a respondent leaning toward both the professional and the union view or in conflict with both positions.

TEACHERS ASSOCIATION an affiliation of classroom teachers, either admitting or denying membership to the principal, and tied organizationally to the Ohio Education Association.

LOCAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION an affiliation of educators, broader in context usually admitting principals to membership, and tied organizationally to the Ohio Education Association.

Instrumentation

Origination. After reviewing the literature on negotiations, discussing this vital topic with lay persons, members of boards of education, superintendents, other principals, and attending seminars and conferences, the writer was able to determine that the perceptions of the elementary school principal's role in negotiations seemed to be positioned on a continuum from what could be construed as an Ohio Education Association position to what could be construed as an American Federation of Teachers position on some of the major issues. Some persons who also perceived this continuum tended to view either position as an "extreme" position on some of these major issues. This view prompted the writer to project a compromise, or a mid-point position. In many cases, those persons viewing this position as a choice between polarities tended to choose this position as being favorable. For the
purpose of this study, the writer elected to call these principals indeterminates.

It was precisely this range of perceptual attitudes that prompted the writer to give thought to the development of an instrument that would cause the respondent to decide an issue in terms of tending toward the Ohio Education Association's position, a mid-range position, or the American Federation of Teachers' position.

Development.--After determining the basic issues according to brochures, pamphlets, handbooks, and articles written by persons representing these two major positions, the writer developed twenty issues giving the respondent a choice of the three alternatives, "professional," "indeterminate," and "union." These twenty issues were reduced to eight by the writer and his adviser after ruling out:

1. Issues that presumed the respondent to know the National School Board's position.
2. Issues that presumed the respondent to know the Ohio School Board's position.
3. Issues that presumed the respondent to know the American Association of School Administrators' position.
4. Issues that yielded interpretative information concerning the Ohio Education Association's position which might influence the respondent's response.
5. Issues that yielded interpretative information concerning the American Federation of Teachers' position which might influence the respondent's response.
6. Issues that presumed the respondent to know the provisions of the Wagner Act.

7. Issues that presumed the respondent to know the provisions of the Ferguson Act.

8. Issues that presumed the respondent to know impending legislation in the Ohio Legislature.

9. Issues that presumed the respondent to know the legislative enactments of other states.

10. Issues that presumed the respondent to know the difference between the National Education Association's Level I, II, and III Agreements.

11. Issues that presumed the respondent to know technical and academic considerations in the current literature.

12. Issues that were judged to be irrelevant.

13. Issues that were judged to be unrealistic.

14. Issues that were judged unacceptable as a result of poor choice of position-oriented responses, faulty and misinterpretative wording, or, in some respects, that duplicated another issue.

The writer held the eight issues constant and developed a listing of thirty issues. As a result of many of the already cited reasons for eliminating issues, the listing was reduced to twenty-one.

It was deemed wise at this point to consider three additional approaches which would tend to increase the effectiveness of the
instrument and yield informational patterns which would help the writer interpret the data. These inclusions were:

1. Develop a set of variables to be treated statistically with the issue responses.

2. Develop a simple checklist to establish the respondent's perceived degree of autonomy from the central office.

3. Develop a series of questions which the respondent could answer with a "yes" or "no" response.

This instrument was taken to the Ohio Education Association's director of research for additional refinement. As a result, additional variables were added and the sample conditions were set.

Description.--The instrument was divided into two parts. Part I asked the respondent to check items of a personal, factual, perceived, and situational nature. The personal items included determining the respondent's sex, age, training, salary, contractual obligation, and prior experience. The factual items concerned the respondent's school system, number of buildings, elementary teachers, pupils, and the geographical location. The perceptual items were an attempt to determine the extent (by means of a scale) to which elementary principals:

1. Recruited their own teachers.

2. Assigned teachers to grade levels.

3. Developed curriculum.

4. Developed policy for the district.

5. Organized special classes.

6. Arranged pupil transportation.
7. Had a building budget.
8. Were involved in the budget-making process for the district.

The questions of a situational nature required a simple "yes" or "no" answer. The respondent's responses to the following questions were felt to be vital to the study:

1. Does your district have a written negotiations instrument?
2. Were you involved in writing this instrument?
3. Does your district have a grievance procedure?
4. Are you involved in any way?
5. Do the principals have a separate bargaining unit?
6. Is your salary tied to the teachers' salary schedule?

Part II was a series of statements with position-oriented responses. The respondent was asked, even though the issue seemed unrelated to his personal situation, to check the response which best reflected his own personal preference as an elementary school principal. The issue statements were designed to elicit as many attitudes as possible. In order to accomplish this task, each issue was concerned with another phase of negotiations.

The selected issues cover a wide range of perceptions. These perceptions were selected because they cover the major phases of negotiations. The first phase, that of being recognized, includes issues relative to the principal as either a member or as a non-member of a teachers' group. In this study, the teacher's group refers to an organized group of teachers sponsored by or affiliated with either the Ohio Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers.
If the teachers' group is Ohio Education Association affiliated, it may take two forms: the teachers' association and the local education association. The teachers' association may or may not include elementary principals. If it does, the principal is either given full membership privileges or denied certain membership rights (voting, serving as an officer, or excluded in negotiations). On the other hand, the local education association is so-named because it is usually broader in context than the teachers' association. Although some education associations do restrict memberships, the more common practice is to broaden the sphere of membership to include principals, supervisors, nurses, and specialists.

The American Federation of Teachers permits principal membership if the principal is tied to the teachers' salary schedule; otherwise, the principals, in the past, had to organize their own group for negotiating purposes. Since the American Federation of Teachers' last assembly, principals can not organize under their auspices. Those groups that were formed will continue to be recognized but no new groups will be formed.

Another phase of negotiations is determining what is negotiable. Many boards of education are extremely reluctant to acknowledge the fact that anything is negotiable. They feel an intrusion in this area is an attempt to relieve them of their vested rights and powers under law.

Other issues attempt to gain perceptions as to the principal's role in grievance and impasse procedure. The remainder of the issues assess the principal's reflective attitude toward pressures—
pressures from the board of education, the teachers' association, and the local power structure.

The position-oriented responses in Part II gave the respondent an opportunity to react to the issue only. The position he could take, "professional," "indeterminate," or "union," was not disclosed. The writer felt that the respondent would tend to select the issue position that more nearly reflects his attitude if these positions were not known. If they were known, the writer felt strongly that the respondents might decide the issue based on how they felt they ought to respond as opposed to reflecting an attitudinal dimension.

Validation.—Although the reader was oriented to the preliminary validation techniques in the section under Development, the writer will enumerate additional steps toward validation. The first step was to obtain the names and addresses of individuals to serve on a panel of judges. These persons were contacted by mail, on the phone, and personally by the writer. From the original list of twelve names, nine were elected: three represented the Ohio Education Association, three represented the American Federation of Teachers, and the other three examined the questionnaire from the standpoint of an indeterminate.

As a result, the twenty-one issues were reduced to eleven with a majority agreement among the judges. Those issues that were deleted were judged unworthy according to many of the reasons cited in the section under Development, on page 27.

The validation technique met with the thinking of the writer's adviser, the chief of the Ohio Education Association's research
division, and the statistician on the staff of the Research Center at
The Ohio State University.

The Research Questionnaire

The research questionnaire as it was produced in its final form
appears on the following pages. The component parts of the question-
aire are:

1. **The Cover Letter** - This letter was composed by the writer
   and transferred to a piece of the writer's school station-
   ery. This "mock up" was reproduced on an electro-stencil.
   The writer used the electro-stencil to make enough cover
   letters for the sample.

2. **Part I** - This part was typed on a regular stencil and not
   treated in any special manner. The purpose of this part
   was to obtain the respondent's personal, factual, per-
   ceived, and situational responses. Those responses were
   treated as variables.

3. **Part II** - This part was typed on a regular stencil and not
   treated in any special manner. The purpose of this part
   was to obtain the respondent's position-oriented response
   to an issue situation. Those responses reflect the atti-
   tude of the respondent and were measured against the
   variables to reflect informational patterns.

The Sampling

After validation of the instrument, the writer proceeded with
confidence. The first step was to re-cut the questionnaire on stencil.
Dear Fellow Principal:

The purpose of this letter is two-fold. The first and foremost consideration is the urgency of principals to become involved in helping to define their role in negotiations. It has become very apparent to me during my twelve years as an elementary school principal that principals must assume some responsibility for defining their roles, or assuredly other individuals or groups will define this role. Unfortunately, these definitions do not always coincide with our own thinking and, as a consequence, another contribution is made to conflict.

Secondly, in order to make a contribution in this respect, I have proposed a dissertation study that would solicit principal attitudes relative to negotiations. These attitudes will be measured against the principal's personal and factual data.

These determined informational patterns will not be shelved upon completion of the study but will be disseminated on the state and national level. It would be my hope that our contributions would provide a basis for developing guidelines or a framework within which we could work compatibly with boards of education, superintendents, and teacher groups.

The few minutes you contribute now to the completion of the enclosed questionnaire may save yourself and others much time and effort in the future. Your cooperation as a member of the research sample is earnestly solicited and will be very much appreciated. The urgency of the situation can not be minimized - please respond immediately.

Sincerely,

Lewis D. McPeek
**PART I**

This questionnaire has been designed to transfer the information from the instrument to key punch cards with facility. These cards will be fed to the computer and the data will be interpreted according to a numbered system. Therefore, please ignore numbers 1, 2, 3, and check the appropriate boxes from 4 through 12:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Sex**  
1 [ ] Male  
2 [ ] Female

5. **Age**  
1 [ ] Under 30  
2 [ ] Under 40  
3 [ ] Under 50  
4 [ ] Under 60

6. **Training**  
1 [ ] BA  
2 [ ] MA  
3 [ ] Specialist  
4 [ ] Doctorate

7. **Salary**  
1 [ ] Under $6,000  
2 [ ] Under $9,000  
3 [ ] Under $12,000  
4 [ ] Under $15,000

8. **Contract (term)**  
1 [ ] 9½ months  
2 [ ] 10 months  
3 [ ] 10½ months  
4 [ ] 11 months  
5 [ ] 11½ months

9. **Contract (length, issued for)**  
1 [ ] 1 year  
2 [ ] 2 years  
3 [ ] 3 years  
4 [ ] 3 years or more

10. **School (system)**  
1 [ ] City  
2 [ ] Exempted Village (building)  
3 [ ] County (local)  
4 [ ] Parochial

11. **School (building)**  
1 [ ] K-6  
2 [ ] 1-6  
3 [ ] K-8  
4 [ ] 1-8

12. **OEA Geographical District**  
1 [ ] NE  
2 [ ] C  
3 [ ] SW  
4 [ ] NW  
5 [ ] W  
6 [ ] EC  
7 [ ] SE  
8 [ ] E
Please respond to the following data items by inserting the correct figures. The box sequence, reading from right to left, is unit, tens, hundreds, and thousands digit. Insert one figure in each needed numbered box.

**School System:**
- Number of Elementary Schools: 
  - 13 14 15

- Number of Elementary Teachers: 
  - 16 17 18 19

**Your Unit:**
- Number of Pupils: 
  - 20 21 22 23

- Number of Teachers: 
  - 24 25

**Your Experience:**
- Number of years in Private Employment: 
  - 28 26 27 3

- and check affiliation: 
  - Union Non-Union Non-Affiliated

- Number of years as a teacher and check affiliation: 
  - 31 29 30 3

- OEA AFT Non-Affiliated

- Number of years as an administrator and check affiliation: 
  - 34 32 33 3

- OEA AFT Non-Affiliated

As a principal, I operate as follows: (Check appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a principal, I operate as follows:</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 Recruit own teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Assign teachers to grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Develop curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Develop policy for district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Organize special classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Arrange pupil transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Have own building budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Am involved in budget-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process for district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
43 1 □ Yes  Does your district have a written negotiations instrument?
   2 □ No

44 1 □ Yes  Were you personally involved in developing this instrument?
   2 □ No

45 1 □ Yes  Does your district have a grievance procedure?
   2 □ No

46 1 □ Yes  Are you involved with the grievance procedure in any way?
   2 □ No

47 1 □ Yes  Do the principals have a separate bargaining unit?
   2 □ No

48 1 □ Yes  Is your salary tied to the teacher's salary schedule?
   2 □ No

PART II

(PLEASE NOTE: Even though some of the following may seem unrelated to your own situation as it now exists, please check that response which best reflects your own personal preference as an elementary school principal)

Issue 1  The negotiation issue is a major concern of the local education association. The principal, as a member, should

   □ (1) be willing to discuss negotiations and/or support the education association.

   □ (2) decide that certain issues split his loyalties and attempt to remain neutral.

   □ (3) realize that he is management and exclude himself from discussing negotiations.

Issue 2  The teaching staff through their professional organization of which the principal is not a member, is planning to take measures which heretofore have not been taken such as calling for investigations, hiring an attorney, etc. Should you

   □ (1) alert the superintendent.

   □ (2) remain silent since you have divided loyalties.

   □ (3) encourage the teachers in such activity.
Issue 3  The teachers' group has submitted a grievance procedure to the board of education which indicates that the aggrieved should seek redress from the principal first before proceeding to the next step. As a principal, should you

(1) interpret this procedure as being compatible with the dual role concept of being responsible to the teachers and to the board of education.

(2) interpret this procedure as reflecting a desire to work out problems within the group before going on to top management.

(3) interpret this procedure as a clear indication of dividing principals from teachers and in effect puts principals on the management team.

Issue 4  Since the school system does not have an A.F.T. Chapter, the superintendent has announced that the board of education is willing to recognize the local teacher's association in negotiations. For the first year, they want to negotiate on salary only. As a member of the association and tied to the teacher's salary schedule, should the principal

(1) act in an advisory capacity to the teacher's association and the board of education.

(2) be excluded from negotiations.

(3) be included in negotiations.

Issue 5  The local teachers association recently changed its constitution to permit principal membership by calling itself the local education association. Realizing that the teachers' group is after additional support, should the principal

(1) withhold his membership.

(2) join the local education association with full rights and privileges of membership.

(3) join but withhold his vote or not serve on such committees as salary and welfare.

Issue 6  Although the negotiations instrument recognizes the organized "teaching staff" or "certificated persons," the principal should

(1) include himself in all recognized forms of negotiations.

(2) remove himself from being involved.

(3) recognize himself and the responsibilities of his position above the staff concerns.
Issue 7  Since the negotiations instrument considers such items as class size, length of the school day, etc., negotiable, should the principal
____ (1) consider himself an administrator and not involve himself in negotiations.
____ (2) act as a liaison person between staff and superintendent.
____ (3) function as a staff member and involve himself in negotiations.

Issue 8  The board of education feels the superintendent is too teacher-oriented and not really advising them in their best interests. They are suggesting meeting and taking other measures to win the principal's loyalty. As a principal, should you
____ (1) encourage such activity.
____ (2) discourage such activity.
____ (3) attempt to satisfy their demands but still back the superintendent.

Issue 9  Even though these formal groups (NEA and AFT) are powerful, the affiliated groups within these structures sometimes evidence weakness. Should you support the
____ (1) organization that shows the most potential and proceed to cultivate this potential.
____ (2) formal AFT even though some of the affiliated groups are weak.
____ (3) formal NEA even though some of the affiliated groups are weak.

Issue 10  The ultimate weapon in the event of a total impasse needs careful consideration. Should principals
____ (1) encourage both the NEA and AFT to seek other solutions.
____ (2) endorse sanctions.
____ (3) endorse strikes.
Issue 11 An administrative preparation program's dualism emphasizes the principal's responsibility to the teachers and pupils on one hand, and his responsibilities to the superintendent and board of education on the other. As far as negotiations are concerned, a principal should have

(1) a well-founded background in curriculum and in the role of the instructional leader - something less in law, finance, and other phases of the administrative process.

(2) a well-founded background in management and administration - curriculum methodology, etc., can be handled by the specialist.

(3) more insight into the duality of the role.

Issue 12 The newly-appointed principal is soon faced with making a difficult decision. In the same mailing is a request from the president of the board of education to serve on a board committee, and a request from the president of the education association to serve on an association committee, during the negotiations period. As a principal should you

(1) accept the education associations request and so advise the board.

(2) turn down both requests to keep in a "neutral" position.

(3) accept the boards request and so advise the education association.

Issue 13 A member of the power structure is desirous of knowing whether you stand categorically with teachers, or the superintendent and board of education in negotiations. Should you

(1) indicate that the students are your major concern - not teachers or superintendent.

(2) inform this person that you stand firmly behind the teachers.

(3) inform this person that as a school administrator and part of the management team you have an obligation to the superintendent and board of education.

Item 14 Please feel free to turn this questionnaire over and make any comments or pertinent remarks concerning the questionnaire itself or the negotiation process.

Again, thank you very much...please mail immediately.
These stencils were used to run enough questionnaires to be distributed to the sample. These loose pages, along with a cover letter, were taken to the Ohio Education Association's Headquarters.

The mailing room received this material and proceeded to perform all the operations necessary for such an undertaking. These operations included the following:

1. By heat transfer, the names and addresses of the sample were transferred to a nine by twelve (9 x 12) envelope.

2. By collation, the six pages of the questionnaire and the cover letter were brought together, fastened, and made ready to be inserted into the large envelope.

3. By printing, the writer's return address was placed on the large envelope and on enough number ten (No. 10) envelopes to cover the sampling returns.

4. By adding postage, the large envelopes were made ready to convey all the inserted material and the smaller envelopes were made ready to carry the returned questionnaires.

5. By stuffing, the large envelope containing the cover letter, questionnaire, and the return envelope were made ready for mailing.

The writer and members of the Ohio Education Association's staff were in complete agreement on several points:

1. The Ohio Education Association should not be identified in the mailing process.

2. All mailing should be first-class.

3. The material would appear better if not folded.
4. The writer should identify himself as a member of the population being sampled.

5. All returns should be mailed directly to the writer.

It was felt that identification had both positive and negative effects on a sample. The members of the staff at the Ohio Education Association felt that the influence of the association might affect the returns or the respondent's reflective attitude. The writer, in the cover letter, identified himself as being a member of the population for twelve years. This action was felt to be desirable since the identification would not influence the respondent's attitude toward negotiations but could possibly enhance the possibility of having a better return.

Collection of the Data

Although the mailing phase of questionnaire dissemination according to acceptable sampling technique was accomplished by cooperating with the Ohio Education Association, the returns were not handled by this organization. The lack of necessary data-processing equipment caused the writer to make arrangements with the Research Center at The Ohio State University for this service.

In order to facilitate the work of the writer and the center, the questionnaires were properly numbered before forwarding them to the center for processing. These properly-numbered questionnaires were designed so the key-punch operators could take the data directly from the questionnaire and transfer it to the key-punch cards. An identification number was inserted on the questionnaire in the open blocks 1,
2, and 3. This identification number was a serial identification number for computer purposes only.

After one hundred forty-four returns were received, the writer tabulated the respondents' geographical areas, the number of teachers responsible to the respondent, and the number of pupils for whom the respondent was responsible. These figures were cross-tabulated with the legal type of school system—city, exempted village, and county (local) and were judged to give the sample validation. The percentage data in Table I show the sample to be valid on the basis of type of school district and size of the school as measured by teachers and enrollment within each type. (Also see Appendix B.)

The validation of the sample caused the writer to proceed with confidence. An additional eighteen questionnaires were received and added to the original one hundred forty-four for a grand total of one hundred fifty-eight questionnaires received from the sample. These were taken to the Computer Center in The Research Center at The Ohio State University for key-punching and data processing.

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Per Cent of Schools</th>
<th>Per Cent of Pupils</th>
<th>Per Cent of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the Data

The set of instructions (Appendix C) given to the staff members of the Research Center at The Ohio State University enabled them to program the computer to produce information vital to the study. This information was returned to the writer in the form of a "print-off."

This print-off gave the writer considerable data treatment from which to study, choose selected variable tabulations, and statistically examine the attitudes of the respondents relative to selected variables. The writer's treatment of these data is fully explained in Chapter III and Chapter IV.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Introduction to the Chapter

The writer's approach to presenting the data in a comprehensive manner was selected in order that the reader might see the logical and sequential stages of data presentation necessary for the writer to be able to accept or reject the stated null hypotheses. The writer shall begin with receiving the questionnaires, then present the background data of the sample, and continue to build on this information by exposing the reader to the frequency distribution of the major variables used in the study. Finally, the statistics of the study are introduced.

As the data are being presented, the reader is urged to note certain comments by the writer and the respondents. These comments are not meant to be fully interpretative since the interpretation of the data will be presented in Chapter IV. The writer is hopeful, however, that these comments as well as the presented data will generate hypotheses for subsequent testing. This concept is not original with the writer. It is merely an attempt to promote additional research in negotiations...it is lacking with respect to all the involved parties and issues.
Background Data on the Sample and Procedures

After the questionnaires started coming in, the writer began a process of examining each one closely for errors, omissions, etc., and either assigned a computer number in serial order or put the returned questionnaire aside to be counted as a no-response questionnaire. When the writer had 144 questionnaires in his possession, he performed basic computations and asked the director of research at the Ohio Education Association for an opinion concerning the validity of the sample. (See Table 1 and Appendix B.)

After receiving a favorable opinion concerning validity of sample, the writer added an additional 14 questionnaires and recomputed the sample validation figures. The 158 received questionnaires were taken to the Computer Center in the Research Center at The Ohio State University to determine frequency distribution, results of cross tabulation, and to be given statistical treatment.

Table 2 treats the 26 questionnaires counted as no-response questionnaires. The writer felt fortunate to keep the number reduced as a result of having enough verifiable variables to be able to cross check the respondent in the State Education Directory. For example, if the respondent checked sex as female but failed to indicate the number of elementary schools and the number of elementary teachers in her school system, the writer simply noted the postmark (written on the face of each questionnaire as the envelope was opened), determined the geographical district and the type of school system, and proceeded to check the school listing in the State Education Directory for a female principal reporting "X" number of pupils and "X" number of teachers in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respondent did not check sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respondent did not check age (females).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respondent did not check length of contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Respondent did not check grade level designation in building organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respondent did not check geographical district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respondent did not indicate the number of elementary schools and elementary teachers in the school system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respondent check two or more responses to the issue statements in Part II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respondent did not check a response on several issue statements in Part II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respondent changed the wording of the issue or the issue statement before checking in Part II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respondent indicated a refusal to participate in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respondent did not consider himself an elementary principal: therefore, felt his response would not be valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respondent mailed the questionnaire after the returns had been taken to the Computer Center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 26
her particular unit. When located, the writer simply tabulated the number of elementary schools and number of elementary teachers in the respondent's school system and entered these figures in the correct numbered response blocks. The questionnaire was then considered a valid response questionnaire. Unfortunately, for one or more reasons, the writer was unable to verify some of the questionnaires without exercising an element of guess. If the guess was wrong, the study's validity would be affected. The writer deemed the risk too great and was satisfied to inform the reader of the no-response pattern in Table 2.

If the 158 usable questionnaires and the 26 no-response questionnaires were combined for a total of 184 respondents from a mailing of 300 questionnaires, the figure would represent an achieved sample of 6.13 per cent (a 61 per cent return). The 158 questionnaires, resulting in an achieved sample of 5.26 per cent (a 52 per cent return), pleased the writer in view of the fact that Travers states:¹

The central difficulty in all direct-mail techniques is that the percentage of returns is small. A questionnaire of some interest to the recipient may be expected to show only a 20 per cent return, even when conditions are favorable. If no-respondents are contacted a second and third time, the return may be increased to 30 per cent. Only rarely does it reach 40 per cent.

Whether or not one agrees with Travers or disagrees with him, the writer hopes that the reader will see the difficulty in obtaining an extremely high percentage of returns from any direct-mail technique.

Limitations of Sample Technique

The writer was very pleased with the percentage of returns on the first mailing. Since the sample was held to be a valid sample based on 144 returns (see Appendix B), follow-up procedures and additional mailings were not deemed necessary. If one views the lack of second and third mailings as a limitation, then, according to Travers, the writer might have increased the return by 10 per cent, if the returns were only at the 20 per cent level.\(^2\)

Another limitation might have been the direct-mail questionnaire sponsored by the Ohio Education Association three weeks prior to the writer's questionnaire. Although the questionnaire was not limited to the area of negotiations, the variables concerning sex, age, salary, etc., were a part of the questionnaire and the writer's efforts might have been construed by a few recipients as a double effort endeavor.

Although most recipients of a questionnaire are prone to point out the undesirability of the researcher's timing, the writer will admit that the work schedule of the elementary school principal is heavier in the fall and spring. Forwarding a questionnaire in early May might have had a minimum limiting effect.

The Universe of the Study

Table 3 considers the positions that make up the universe. These positions are illustrated in relation to the type of school system and the employment status.

\(^2\)Ibid.
Table 3 illustrates the responsibility of the positions that make up the universe in relation to the number of buildings, pupils in attendance, and number of certificated teachers according to type of school system.

Table 4 illustrates the responsibility of the positions that make up the universe in relation to the number of buildings, pupils in attendance, and number of certificated teachers according to type of school system.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Per Cent of Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Per Cent of Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2486</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Buildings</th>
<th>Number of Pupils in Attendance</th>
<th>Number of Certificated Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>870,731</td>
<td>29,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>72,062</td>
<td>2,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>558,469</td>
<td>18,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,107</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,501,262</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,810</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the state of Ohio has 3107 elementary schools with presumably a principal-teacher in charge of each unit, only 2589 individuals acknowledge this responsibility on state reports. This leads the writer to believe that many full-time principals have the responsibility of two or more buildings. These figures also lead the writer to believe that many persons, although designated principal by the board of education, are teaching full-time and as a result list themselves as a teacher for accounting purposes.

Validation of Sample in Relation to Universe

As the writer indicated in Chapter II, the sample was selected on the basis of the 3107 elementary school addresses arrayed by zip code. Using a randomly selected number, every tenth address was chosen up to 300. This figure produced a sample of 9.65%. Based on the number of full-time and part-time principals, the writer's 184 returned questionnaires represents a 71 per cent return. The usable 158 questionnaires represents a 61 per cent return based on the same figure. If the 300 sample figure were the basis for computation, the return would be 61 per cent for the total returned questionnaires and 52 per cent for the usable 158 returns. Table 5 portrays the number of respondents in relation to necessary inclusions for validation purposes (Table 2 was based on 144 returns--Table 5 includes the additional 14 usable returns).

The frequency distribution of the variables produced very interesting data. As already indicated, the writer received 158 usable returns: 140 respondents were male and 18 were female. The total return represents an achieved sample of 5.26% from the possible 9.65% sample.
TABLE 5

PER CENT OF SAMPLE IN RELATION TO STATE,
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS, PUPILS, AND
TEACHERS ACCORDING TO TYPE OF
SCHOOL SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Per Cent of Schools</th>
<th>Per Cent of Pupils</th>
<th>Per Cent of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Introduction of the Major Variables

The sex pattern of the respondents is a complete reversal of that which existed forty years ago. At that time, the majority of elementary principalships were teaching-principals. These positions were held predominately by women, many of whom did not possess a degree. Today the majority of elementary principalships are full-time positions held by men who possess proper certification.

A publication entitled By Their Bootstraps was published by the Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals in 1954. This publication was a booklet summarizing a statewide survey of elementary school principals. This survey produced figures that indicated 66 per cent of Ohio's elementary school principals were male. Five years later, in a follow-up study, the percentage of males had increased to 70 per cent. The writer's study indicates that almost 90 per cent of the elementary principals are male.

Table 6 shows the age range of the respondents by interval using percentage figures according to sex. It is interesting to note
that there were no females in the 20 - 29 age interval which indicates
the possibility that the trend of male dominance is likely to continue.

TABLE 6
GROUP AGE DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE
FOR POPULATION OF 158 OHIO ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Interval</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency of x</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>Male 140 Female 18</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>2.9 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>Male 136 Female 17</td>
<td>29 13</td>
<td>20.7 72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>Male 107 Female 4</td>
<td>36 2</td>
<td>25.7 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>Male 71 Female 2</td>
<td>57 2</td>
<td>40.7 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>Male 14 Female .</td>
<td>14 .</td>
<td>10.0 .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140 18</td>
<td>100.0 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data suggest that males may achieve the principalship
before age 30, but the possibility of appointment increases after this
age. This leads the writer to believe that appointment to an elemen-
tary principalship presupposes certain conditions that would tend to
cause one to be over 30 years of age. These conditions are: private
employment before, during, or after leaving college; having met a
service obligation or currently doing so; teaching at least three years
to meet certification requirements; and, taking a year's leave of ab-
sence to obtain a master's degree or to pursue a re-training program
from some other teaching field to elementary education.

On the other end of the age range (those over sixty), the
relatively few respondents could indicate the favorable conditions for
early retirement (age fifty-five under the present retirement laws if the principal or teacher has at least 25 years of service, or age 60 if the principal or teacher has at least 5 years of service). Another vital influence connected with retirement, and possibly contributing to the scarcity of elementary principals over 60, is the base retirement calculation factor. This factor is the average salary for the best or last five years of service. To increase this factor, some elementary principals frequently accept other positions internally as a result of wanting to be relieved of administrative pressures. Some principals simply request reassignment to the classroom.

**TABLE 7**

GROUP TRAINING DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE FOR POPULATION OF 158 OHIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Interval</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency cf</th>
<th>Frequency of x f</th>
<th>Percentage P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 above presents the level of training and percentage for the population by sex. The respondent's level of training as a variable presents a pattern that parallels the sex variable. Just as females were in the majority over males a few years ago, the number of
persons holding a bachelor's degree far outnumbered the persons with
master's degrees. Today the master's degree seems to be the necessary
academic rank to meet certification and employment criteria for elemen-
tary principals.

In 1954, 52 per cent of Ohio's elementary school principals had
master's degrees. In 1959, this percentage figure had risen to 61 per
cent. The writer's study produced a percentage figure of 82 per cent.

Table 8 presents the total expenditures and average salary of
all Ohio Elementary School Principals by type of school system during
the 1966-1967 school year.

TABLE 8

TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND AVERAGE SALARY OF ALL
OHIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN CITY,
VILLAGE, AND LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS DURING
THE 1966-1967 SCHOOL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Total Salary Expenditure</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>$16,178,335</td>
<td>$10390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>957,070</td>
<td>9202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>$7,274,192</td>
<td>8817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>$24,409,597</td>
<td>$9818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 on the following page concerns the salary distribution
and percentage figures by sex for the study's population. Inflation
and inflationary trends in salary has had its impact on the elementary
principal's remuneration. More than 16 per cent of the respondents
reported a salary over $12,000 but less than $14,999. Exactly 50 per
cent of the respondents reported a salary over $9,000 but less than
$11,999. In other words, over two-thirds of the respondents report salaries greater than $9,000.

The number of respondents indicating a salary of less than $6,000 leads the writer to suspect that these principals are teaching principals. The data, as a factor in the principal's role perception in negotiations, which will be presented later, support the fact that these principals are from the southeastern part of Ohio.

**TABLE 9**

GROUP SALARY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE  
FOR POPULATION OF 158 OHIO ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Class Interval $</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency cf</th>
<th>Frequency of x f</th>
<th>Percentage P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>140 18</td>
<td>22 4</td>
<td>15.7 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000 - 11,999</td>
<td>118 14</td>
<td>69 10</td>
<td>49.3 55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 8,999</td>
<td>49 4</td>
<td>42 3</td>
<td>30.0 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5,999</td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>5.0 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140 18</td>
<td>100.0 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was interesting to note from "Bootstraps" in 1954, that 19 per cent of Ohio's elementary school principals were receiving over $5,000 for 10 months. Five years later the percentage had risen to 87 with over one-third of the state's elementary principals receiving more than $7,000. Today the $5,000 salary figure is not even considered and the $7,000 figure for one-third of the state's elementary school principals has doubled.
The contract term is dictated in many school districts by the districts' participation in the state foundation program. A principal's contract term is determined by the number of teacher units responsible to the principal and this factor plays a part in determining extended service. In the additional aid districts, the length of the principal's contract is determined solely by the superintendent's recommendations to the board of education. Table 10, on the following page, indicates the frequency count and percentage figures for the elementary principals by sex in relation to the term of employment contract.

The current trend of offering personnel fringe benefits has stimulated boards of education to offer contracts for more than the basic one year period. Table 11, on the following page, indicates the frequency distribution and percentage for the population by sex in relation to the length of contract.

The Statistics of the Study

The statistics of the study were selected in accordance with descriptive measures. These fundamental descriptive measures indicate summary, variation, position, and association. In general they tell one of four things: (1) where concentrated, (2) how scattered, (3) what relative position, and (4) how two characteristics are associated. A terse review of these descriptive measures follows:

1. **Summary measures** are the averages or measures of central tendency of a characteristic in a group and tell where

---

### TABLE 10

**GROUP TERM OF EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT AND PERCENTAGE FOR POPULATION OF 158 OHIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS BY SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of Contract Interval</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency of x</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf c f f P</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 1/2 Months</td>
<td>140 18</td>
<td>4 2</td>
<td>2.9 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Months</td>
<td>136 16</td>
<td>23 2</td>
<td>16.4 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1/2 Months</td>
<td>113 14</td>
<td>17 1</td>
<td>12.1 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Months</td>
<td>96 13</td>
<td>74 8</td>
<td>52.8 44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 1/2 Months</td>
<td>22 2</td>
<td>22 5</td>
<td>15.7 27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140 18</td>
<td>99.9 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11

**GROUP LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT AND PERCENTAGE FOR POPULATION OF 158 OHIO ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS BY SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Contract Interval</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency of x</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf c f f P</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
<td>Male Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years - or more</td>
<td>140 18</td>
<td>16 4</td>
<td>11.4 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>124 14</td>
<td>23 1</td>
<td>16.4 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>101 13</td>
<td>29 2</td>
<td>20.7 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>72 11</td>
<td>72 11</td>
<td>51.4 61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140 18</td>
<td>99.9 99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the characteristic is concentrated. Although there are
three of them (mean, median, and mode), the writer elected
to use the mean. The formula for the mean is as follows—

\[ M = \frac{\sum X}{N} \]

\[ \sum = "\text{sum of}\]

\[ X = \text{stands for a score or other measure}\]

\[ N = \text{the number of measures in the series}\]

2. Variation measures are the indicators of dispersion and
tell how scattered the characteristic is within a group.
These measures include the range, standard deviations, and
variance. The writer used the range measure.

3. Position measures are the indicators of the relative posi-
tion that particular observations hold within the larger
distribution. These measures include cumulative frequen-
cies, proportions, percentages, quartiles, and percentiles.
The writer elected to use cumulative frequencies and per-
centages. The cumulative frequencies in Tables six through
eleven were included since the writer did not make use of
the mean. If the reader elects, by the statistical ap-
proach called "coding," the coded deviation from the
"guessed mean" can determine \( fd \) (frequency times deviation)
as a result of including the \( cf \) (cumulative frequency).
The writer elected to use percentages in these tables
instead of the more involved statistical process, but felt
obligated to provide the reader with the necessary computa-
tions to go beyond the writer's determinations.
4. **Association measures** are the indicators of the relationship, or lack of it, between two or more characteristics of the same group of individuals. There are many association measures. The writer elected to use the chi-square. According to Garrett, the chi-square test represents a useful method of comparing experimentally obtained results with those to be expected theoretically on some hypothesis. The following is the formula for the $\chi^2$ (chi-square) test of the null hypothesis:

$$
\chi^2 = \sum \left[ \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} \right]
$$

where:
- $f_o$ = frequency of occurrence of observed or experimentally determined facts
- $f_e$ = expected frequency of occurrence on some hypothesis.

The differences between observed and expected frequencies are squared and divided by the expected number in each case, and the sum of these quotients is $\chi^2$. The more closely the observed results approximate to the expected, the smaller the chi-square and the closer the agreement between observed data and the hypothesis being tested. Contrariwise, the larger the chi-square the greater the probability of real divergence of experimentally observed from expected results.

---

To evaluate the chi-square, one must calculate the degrees of freedom. The formula for this concept is:

\[ df = (r-1)(c-1) \]

\( r \) = rows
\( c \) = columns

After knowing the chi-square reading and determining the degrees of freedom, the writer was able to interpret a \( P \) (probability) table that Garrett had adapted from R. A. Fisher's *Statistical Method for Research Workers*. This reading determined the significance level of the writer's chi-square when selected variables were measured against the respondent's attitude or opinion in responding to Issues one through thirteen.

**Concluding Statements**

Much of the material in Chapter III was based on methodology and procedural aspects of data consideration. By presenting this background, the major variables, and the statistics used in the study, the writer has laid the basis for the interpretation of the data in Chapter IV.

Chapter IV treats selected major variables by measuring them against how the respondent perceives his degree of autonomy from the central office; how he answers questions of fact; and, how he responds to validated position-oriented statements in resolving stated issues.
INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

Introduction to the Chapter

The interpretation of the data in Chapter IV is facilitated by presenting the data in the form of charts, graphs, and tables. The presentation of data in Chapter III used such relationship devices as frequencies, cumulative frequencies, and percentages. At the conclusion of Chapter III, the reader was oriented to the statistical approach used in Chapter IV. This approach includes such measures as the chi-square and means to depict the measures of non-proportionality in determining significance from probability tables.

Perceived Degree of Autonomy

The respondent's perceived degree of autonomy from the central office accomplished two purposes for the writer: (1) to determine the nature of the autonomous situation as perceived, and (2) to determine the extent or degree of perceptivity. Unfortunately, the writer was not able to locate related research that would enable him to have a basis on which to treat these findings for statistical significance. The remarks and inferences are strictly subjective and based on the writer's twelve years of experience in the elementary principalship.
It would be the writer's hope that the primitiveness of this section would provide another researcher with a basis on which refinement could be statistically validated at some time in the future.

Graph I, on the following page, is a portrayal of the findings concerning the recruitment of teachers for the elementary school principals. The negotiability of recruitment is frequently discussed by principals. Many feel that autonomy in recruitment will up-grade their staffs by having the principal seek out those individuals who are competent, appear to be adaptable, and flexible enough to work within the confines of set policy and procedure and still evidence creativity. On the other hand, some elementary school principals believe that recruitment of teachers is the responsibility of the superintendent of schools and any move contrariwise is violating his prerogative. In view of the feelings of elementary school principals concerning involvement in the recruitment of teachers as being advisable, it is interesting to note that this practice is limited. This item could become a negotiable item in terms of recruiting teachers with or without experience, type of teaching certificate (temporary or basic four year provisional), sex, age, and a host of other considerations.

Graph 2, on the following page, concerns the principal's perception of his autonomy in assigning teachers to grade levels. In the past, the majority of elementary school principals made teacher assignments to rooms but not to grade levels. That is: a principal assigned a given teacher to any room that accommodates a given grade level but the assignment of that particular teacher to a particular grade level was made at the central office. The graph depicts a situation that
GRAPH 1

RESEARCH GROUP'S SCALED RESPONSE TO
THE PERCEIVED DEGREE OF AUTONOMY
IN RECRUITMENT OF OWN TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Always (1.0)</th>
<th>Frequently (2.0)</th>
<th>Seldom (3.0)</th>
<th>Never (4.0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.13

GRAPH 2

RESEARCH GROUP'S SCALED RESPONSE TO
THE PERCEIVED DEGREE OF AUTONOMY
IN ASSIGNING TEACHERS
TO A GRADE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Always (1.0)</th>
<th>Frequently (2.0)</th>
<th>Seldom (3.0)</th>
<th>Never (4.0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.33
involves the principal in grade level assignments...perhaps a trend for negotiations is in the offing. As many elementary principals will attest, the mere granting of a teaching certificate to teach in grades one through eight does not guarantee that the employed person will have the necessary competencies to be placed too far from her grade level interest. In the writer's opinion, too many positions are filled simply because the superintendent has a vacancy and the person being interviewed wants a job. This arrangement usually is not compatible with what the principal hopes to do or accomplish in his unit and what the person hopes to do or achieve in job satisfaction...both lose.

Graph 3, on the following page, is interesting from a different point of view. In this graph 6.3 per cent of the sample indicated that they "never" had a degree of autonomy in developing curriculum. This implies that they do not have the freedom to work with or get involved in curricular activity. Could it be possible that these principals have the services of curriculum specialists and a conflict in role perception or relationships exist? Or, in the view of some, might the possibility exist that the elementary principalship will someday become a building manager's position and here is one supporting indication?

Graph 4, on the following page, depicts the existing situation as one might expect to find. That is: the range is from what might be construed as an authoritative leadership pattern on the part of the superintendent and board of education by "never" involving principals in developing policy for the school district to the few principals who are actually involved to the extent that they reported "always." The majority of principals (M = 2.73) are "seldom" or "never" involved.
GRAPH 3
RESEARCH GROUP'S SCALED RESPONSE TO
THE PERCEIVED DEGREE OF AUTONOMY
IN DEVELOPING CURRICULUM

Mean = 2.53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH 4
RESEARCH GROUP'S SCALED RESPONSE TO
THE PERCEIVED DEGREE OF AUTONOMY
IN DEVELOPING POLICY
FOR THE DISTRICT

Mean = 2.73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 5, on the following page, reflects the perception of the elementary principal in his degree of autonomy in organizing special classes. The 24.1 per cent who reported "never" appears to be a little high. Perhaps this condition is attributable to the specialists who are being attracted to the larger school systems and given the responsibility of organizing special classes. Such classes in many school systems draw pupils from the entire school district as opposed to forming a given class within a particular school and drawing pupils from what could be construed as a "neighborhood."

Graph 6, on the following page, indicates a higher percentage of elementary principals perceiving their role as "always" in arranging transportation for their pupils than the writer had expected. Normally this function has been the responsibility of a person in the central office. Since the writer meant school bus transportation, the possibility exists that the respondent misinterpreted the question because many elementary principals do work with car-pools, taxis for the physically handicapped, etc. If the respondent did not misinterpret the question, then, perhaps, the new bus law, while creating such positions as Director of Transportation in some school systems, has involved the elementary principal to a greater extent in arranging pupil transportation.
GRAPHS 5 and 6

RESEARCH GROUP'S SCALED RESPONSE TO THE PERCEIVED DEGREE OF AUTONOMY IN ORGANIZING SPECIAL CLASSES

Mean = 2.78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 7, on the following page, shows respondents perceiving a degree of autonomy in having their own building budget well over the writer's expectation. This accumulative 50 per cent (respondents who checked "always," "frequently," and "seldom") is indicative of a significant trend in the writer's opinion. This perceived budget autonomy can be questioned. That is; what is the nature of the so-called "budget" and to what degree is the principal involved in record-keeping, etc.

Graph 8, on the following page, is one step removed from the building budget question portrayed in Graph 7. Some principals hope for involvement in determining budget considerations for the district with respect to ultimately having an independent budget for their building. Other principals see the strategy as working for a building budget with the hope that eventually they will be brought together to help plan the budget for all buildings. As a result, these principals would hope to attain an even greater involvement in the budget-making process for the school district. At the present time very few principals are "always" involved and the majority are "never" involved.
GRAPH 7

RESEARCH GROUP'S SCALED RESPONSE TO
THE PERCEIVED DEGREE OF AUTONOMY
IN HAVING OWN BUILDING BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Always 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>Frequently 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>Seldom 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>Never 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.79

GRAPH 8

RESEARCH GROUP'S SCALED RESPONSE TO THE
INVOLVEMENT IN THE BUDGET-MAKING
PROCESS FOR THE DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Always 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>Frequently 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>Seldom 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>Never 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.26
Questions of Fact and Relatedness to Negotiations

The "yes" or "no" responses to questions are depicted in Chart 1 through Chart 6. Each of the six questions will be treated according to the type of school system and the respondent's Ohio Education Association's geographical district.

The statistics used in this section are the percentages of the "yes" and "no" responses as they relate to the question by type of school system and geographical district. The chi-square for school systems was not computable due to the absence of parochial respondents. The chi-square for the geographical district was computable and will be reported in footnote form. These footnotes will simply indicate the chi-square reading of the table. The degrees of freedom will be reported, also. These two computations will enable the reader to refer to a chi-square probability table for an exact determination of the significance level. The writer shall give the exact reading when the level of significance has reached the 0.05 level or achieves a higher level. Also, the reader's attention will be called to certain relationships which should not be overlooked simply because the relationship did not reach the writer's 0.05 level of significance. These relationships are statistically significant and do offer the reader a basis on which to develop comparisons in additional research for future considerations.

The writer elected to present as much information in the same location as possible. To do this, the writer used the designation of "chart" and included the question being asked of the respondent. The statistical footnoting of each chart is in lieu of a presented
statistical table which would cause the reader to refer back to the
table or ahead of the material to seek the statistical relationship.

Chart 1 clearly indicates that the majority of city systems
have developed a written negotiations instrument. The locals have
recognized the need and are meeting it. The exempted village school
systems are lagging in this respect. Of course, the questions only
concerned whether the district had a written negotiations instrument,
not what kind, type, or if it meets the National Education Associa-
tion's criteria for a Level 1, II, or III Agreement.

CHART 1

QUESTION ANALYSIS BY TYPE OF SCHOOL
SYSTEM AND GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Question (43) ... Does your district have a written negotiations instrument?</th>
<th>Percentage N=158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School System:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio Education Association's</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographical District:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Chi-square for geographical district was 12.19281 with 7df.
CHART 2
QUESTION ANALYSIS BY TYPE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM AND GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRICT

| The Question (44)...Were you personally involved in developing this instrument? | Percentage N=158 |
|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No |
| School System: | | |
| City | 12.2 | 87.8 |
| Village | 100.0 | |
| Local | 13.1 | 86.9 |
| Ohio Education Association's Geographical District:* | | |
| NE | 6.0 | 94.0 |
| C | 16.6 | 83.3 |
| SW | 15.0 | 85.0 |
| NW | 12.5 | 87.5 |
| W | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| EC | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| SE | 8.3 | 91.6 |
| E | 25.0 | 75.0 |

*aChi-square for geographical district was 4.91009 with 7df.

According to the Ohio Education Association's geographical listing, the sample did not produce a single respondent reporting that the western district had a written negotiations instrument. In the writer's opinion, this is a sampling error and should be treated as such by the reader.

Chart 2 concerns the respondent's response to the question of his involvement in developing this instrument. It follows quite naturally that if the respondent answered "no" when asked if his district had a written negotiations instrument, he could not answer the question concerning his involvement in developing the written instrument in
Chart 2 with a "yes." Therefore, the "yes" answers in Chart 2 are very significant with one exception. This exception will be treated when the geographical area receives comment.

It is obvious, by type of school district, that only a minimum number of elementary principals were actually involved in developing a negotiations instrument.

As far as the Ohio Education Association's geographical district is concerned, the writer expected the northeastern district to show a high representation of principal involvement since the principals in that district acknowledged by a high percentage (62 per cent) that the district had a written negotiations instrument. To the contrary, the district's representative percentage was only 6 per cent.

The respondents in the western district reported that 50 per cent were involved personally in the developing of the written negotiations instrument. However, in Chart 1, all respondents reported that their district did not have a written negotiations instrument. The writer would judge this part of the question as an error in the sample.

Chart 3, on the following page, reports the findings in relation to the grievance procedure by type of school system and the Ohio Education Association's geographical district. The representative figures are particularly significant if one interprets the grievance procedure as part of an advanced negotiation's agreement. If, however, the grievance procedure is a separate instrument interpreted by some as a device for keeping communications open and giving "gripes" a hearing, the figures are not very significant, in the writer's opinion.
The Question (45)... Does your district have a grievance procedure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System:</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio Education Association's Geographical District:</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aChi-square for geographical district was 21.48404 with 7df. These figures indicate significance at the 0.01 level.

Apparently, in Chart 4, the respondent interpreted the question concerning his involvement with the grievance procedure as being involved with the accepted written negotiation's instrument. In the writer's opinion, the elementary principal is usually involved in the grievance procedure either directly or indirectly.

The percentage figures in Chart 5 concerning the principals having a separate bargaining unit are misleading. The 33.3 per cent "yes" response from the exempted village schools represents an unweighted calculated figure based on a few respondents. The same is
The Question (46)...Are you involved with the grievance procedure in any way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System:</th>
<th>Percentage N=158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ohio Education Association's Geographical District:
  NE                   | 36.7 | 63.3 |
  C                    | 16.6 | 83.3 |
  SW                   | 60.0 | 40.0 |
  NW                   | 20.8 | 79.1 |
  W                    | 33.3 | 66.6 |
  EC                   | 20.0 | 80.0 |
  SE                   | 33.3 | 66.6 |
  E                    | 37.5 | 62.5 |

*aChi-square for geographical district was 13.10136 with 7df.

true for the 33.3 per cent "yes" response from the Ohio Education Association's Western geographical district.

Chart 6 concerning the principal's salary schedule and its relationship to the teachers' salary schedule was not too revealing. One point of significance is the 72 per cent "yes" response from the northeastern district as being a lower figure in terms of number of respondents and compared to the 30 per cent "yes" response concerning a separate bargaining unit in Chart 5. In other words, the higher the relationship to a separate bargaining unit the lower the relationship of being tied to a teachers' salary schedule.
CHART 5

QUESTION ANALYSIS BY TYPE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM AND GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Question (47) ... Do the principals have a separate bargaining unit?</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School System:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio Education Association's Geographical District:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aChi-square for geographical district was 10.30769 with 7df.*
CHART 6

QUESTION ANALYSIS BY TYPE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM AND GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Question (48) ... Is your salary tied to the teachers' salary schedule?</th>
<th>Percentage N=158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Education Association's Geographical District:³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³Chi-square for geographical district was 15.29669 with 7 df. These figures indicate significance at the 0.05 level.

The Issues and Responses

The Issues.—The issues came from the current literature, topics for discussion at meetings of elementary school principals, workshops, and many other kinds of in-service education meetings. The eleven validated issues used in the questionnaire represent those that withstood a rigid delimiting process and were judged appropriate for eliciting an attitudinal response relative to negotiations.

The section on Instrumentation in Chapter II, under Development, describes the delimiting process in detail and informs the reader
that issues concerning the respondent's knowledge of the law, positions of various organizations, technical and academic considerations, and those judged to be irrelevant or unrealistic were not used.

The eleven issues for the respondent's consideration were designed to solicit attitudes on different aspects of negotiations. The remaining two issues, for a total of thirteen, were designed to reflect an attitude under extreme pressure. These two particular issues were not validated.

The Responses.--The respondent was asked to select one of three responses that best reflects his personal preference. The three responses were validated by a panel of judges representing the Ohio Education Association, the indeterminate position, and the American Federation of Teachers.

Pertinent Comments.--Before the issues and the response are examined, the writer would like to point out that issues are never adequately portrayed in just a few sentences. Most issues are simply divergent points of view and a particular point of view can change with the adoption of a policy statement, a law, or other given considerations. Issues are never distinctly polarized as to "this or that," or from "black to white."

It was precisely these considerations that posed certain problems for the judges. As one judge commented, "It is very difficult to say that this is the position of an 80,000 member organization." The writer realizes the judges' position and appreciates the precariousness of such a position. Therefore, in the graphs to follow, the writer will use the words "tend to O.E.A., Indeterminate, and A.F.T. position."
The same kind of situation existed for the respondent to a lesser degree. In many cases the respondent was hesitant to check a response (even though he was not aware of the writer's intent as to the identification of a position-oriented statement) and would finally check a response but write a note or add a thought. In several cases the alteration was so severe the writer was forced to call the questionnaire a no-response questionnaire.

Graph 9, on the following page, depicts the principal's willingness to support the local education association, in discussing negotiations, by a heavy majority of 71.5 per cent. Those principals feeling that they should remain neutral were a low of 7.6 per cent. The remaining 20.9 per cent principals view their role as one in management and would exclude themselves from discussing negotiations.

At this point the writer would like to expose the reader to the respondent's personal comments. These pertinent comments will be treated as each issue is being presented. The number before the comment is the number of the questionnaire used for computer identification.

002 "I feel the principal must declare himself to one side or the other. You can never remain neutral. You must remain on the side of the superintendent. You are a principal are a very important person in negotiations. Do not allow a teachers' organization to push you around or bypass you, stand up even if you have to stand alone. You are a principal because you are an effective leader. Lead-do-not-follow. A principal in the coming days and years will be in a very hard to handle situation. Be careful and work for the best and results of the students in your district and hope for the better. Teachers will find out they are teachers and not people to run the schools."

038 "While I consider the principal as part of the management team, I do not feel that every or even most questions
GRAPH 9

AN ATTITUDINAL DIMENSION EXPRESSED BY THE SELECTION OF A POSITION-ORIENTED STATEMENT (ISSUE 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEND TO O.E.A. POSITION</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>N=158</th>
<th>M=1.43</th>
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</thead>
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<td></td>
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have to be dichotomized so that I am either with management or with the teachers; nor do I find it especially helpful to say the 'Hell' with everybody else I am for the children. I think the principal agrees with or argues with everybody and anybody as the situation dictates, or as his own perceptions and philosophies allow."

Table 12 indicated significance on the Ohio Education Association's geographical district at the 0.02 level. The training, and salary of the respondents did not show any appreciable significance. The age of the respondents, according to the chi-square table gives some indication that the writer's 0.05 level of significance on the null-hypothesis was almost attained.

**TABLE 12**

RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 1 IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>10.33277</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2.78761</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>6.04940</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>26.94304</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 10 relates to the principal as a non-member of the teachers' association. As a non-member, and discovering that the members of the teachers' association were giving thought to having an investigation, hiring an attorney, etc., the principal was asked if he would alert the superintendent, remain silent, or encourage the teachers in such activities. The results were that he would tend to
Graph 10

An attitudinal dimension expressed by the selection of a position-oriented statement (Issue 2)
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encourage the teachers by a mere 8.9 per cent. Those remaining silent were 15.2 per cent. The large majority of principals (75.9 per cent) reported that they would alert the superintendent.

When the issues and responses were developed the feeling was that if such were taking place in the teachers' association, the principal as a non-member would indicate management tendencies by alerting the superintendent. This action then poses a good question. Would the principal show tendencies to the teachers if he discovered that the board was planning some drastic, strategic action?

One respondent made the following comment concerning this issue:

122 "For this reason I did not join the local association."

Table 13 revealed no statistical significance in relation to the principals' age, training, salary, or geographical district and how they reacted to the issue.

**TABLE 13**

**RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 2**

**IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION**

**AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

**FOR SELECTED VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.12886</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1.06677</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>2.43182</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>15.03460</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 11 indicates that the majority of principals (62.7 per cent) believe that the principal should be the first person consulted in a grievance procedure. This procedure indicates to them that an effort is being made to resolve problems within the group before going on to top management. Those who view this procedure as being compatible with the dual role (responsible to the teachers and to the board of education) were 25.3 per cent. Only 12 per cent of the respondents viewed this procedure as a clear indication of dividing principals from teachers or putting the principal in the "boss" role.

Table 14 did not reveal any statistical significance to the way the principal perceived his role in this issue in relation to the selected variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>6.32178</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2.97120</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>3.49631</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>17.61003</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issue 4, Graph 12, concerns the principal, as a member of the teachers' association and tied to the teachers' salary schedule, in negotiating for teachers' salaries. The majority (60.1 per cent)
AN ATTITUINAL DIMENSION EXPRESSED BY THE SELECTION OF A POSITION-ORIENTED STATEMENT (ISSUE 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Tend to</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>TO A.F.T. POSITION</td>
<td>10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>TO INDETERMINATE POSITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>TO O.E.A. POSITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 158
M = 1.49
### AN ATTITUINAL DIMENSION EXPRESSED BY THE SELECTION OF A POSITION-ORIENTED STATEMENT (ISSUE 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEND TO</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>O.E.A. POSITION</td>
<td>10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE POSITION</td>
<td>N=158 M=1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>A.F.T. POSITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thought they ought to be included in negotiations while 10.1 per cent thought they ought to be excluded. The remaining 29.7 per cent thought they ought to act in an advisory capacity to both the teachers' association and the board of education.

Two respondents commented as follows:

054  "I believe that in practice an organization which is designed to represent both teachers and administrators does not function effectively for either. Principals are an extending hand of the superintendent and the board of education.

In my opinion, elementary principals will need to develop their own negotiating group and/or join with other administrators in the system as a negotiating group. There are too many problems which cannot be shared by teachers and administrators. These same problems that cannot be shared are too vital to the elementary principal to be ignored completely."

083  "Your posing 'The Lady or the Tiger' question is the crux of the problem. I really don't know what position should be taken. In our city situation the principals have joined with teachers and supervisors in a joint salary committee. Our background here is teacher support and cooperation.

In smaller situations I can see the urgent need to consider the problem of Supt. - Bd. of Ed. orientation. We are not subject in our city situation to the same pressures (or board politics) that the small district principal would have to live with."

Table 15 indicates little significance to this perceived situation in relation to the age, training, salary, and geographical variables. The only interesting relationship is that salary is the major concern of the issue; yet, salary as a variable only achieved a level of significance between the 0.50 and 0.70 per cent levels on the P table.
Graph 13 indicates how the principals perceive their role in relation to supporting a teachers' association when it changes its constitution to admit principals to membership for additional support. The majority (67.1 per cent) would be in favor of joining with full rights and privileges of membership. Those who would join but withhold their vote or not serve on such committees as salary and welfare (23.4 per cent) and those who would withhold membership (9.5 per cent) are in the minority.

One respondent commented as follows:

"I am most interested in this problem. Presently our group of principals is struggling with the problem of who is going to negotiate for us. At first we voted to stay in the teachers' association. The last vote taken showed that some of us have changed our minds and now we are on our own. The one thing we know is that we are in the middle and we'll probably be there for a long time. I would appreciate receiving any preliminary data which you would produce."

Table 16 indicates a significant relationship between the issue and the respondent's age and geographical area. Significance at the
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An attitudinal dimension expressed by the selection of a position-oriented statement (Issue 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>Tend to O.E.A. position</th>
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</thead>
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<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 16

**RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 5 IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR SELECTED VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16.58765</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>6.29428</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>12.52725</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>28.05241</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.01 level was achieved in relation to age. This leads the writer to believe that age includes the disproportionate militant; those who "join" for the sake of joining; and joining because one has become more "professional" as the years go by just as others have become more pessimistic or "sour." In all likelihood, with the trends in negotiating procedures, the principal feels a definite need to keep close to the teachers and their thinking. By joining, they not only accomplish this need but do become a part of an effective working force in negotiations.

The Ohio Education Association's geographical district had a significance level of 0.02 in relation to the issue. This significance level is the result of many teachers' associations refusing membership to principals. As a result, these principals have formed their own principals' group under the auspices of the Ohio Education Association and The American Federation of Teachers. The trend or movement is especially prevalent in the Ohio Education Association's northeast geographical district...the Cleveland Principals' Group sponsored by the
American Federation of Labor is a good example as far as that particular organization is concerned. Principals would much rather be a part of a sponsored teachers' group than to be put in a position of forming their own particular group as evidenced by a 61.7 per cent response favoring such action.

When the negotiations instrument acknowledges the "certificated persons" or the "teaching staff," the majority (53.2 per cent) of principals consider themselves as part of the recognized group. The indeterminate (36.7 per cent) recognizes himself and the responsibilities of his position above the staff concerns. Those who would remove themselves from being involved (10.1 per cent) evidently consider their personal being, security, or the position something other than the categories recognized in the issue. Therefore, the writer feels that these persons do feel they are management and tend to remain aloof from being recognized by the board in negotiations. (See Graph 14.)

As noted on Table 17, the age variable was significant at the 0.02 level. Apparently, then, the principals do consider themselves members of "the teaching staff" or "certificated" persons and hopefully gain recognition from the board of education in negotiations whether they are or are not actual members of the local teachers' group. The remaining variables, training, salary, and the geographical district were not statistically significant when measured against the issue.

Issue 17 concerned the principals' perceived role in relation to the inclusion of such items as class size and length of the school day, in the negotiations instrument.
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TABLE 17
RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 6
IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION
AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16.45181</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>6.15334</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>3.22521</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>17.50379</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of principals tended to the indeterminate position (49.4 per cent). They indicated that they should act as a liaison person between the board of education and the teachers. The minority group (12.6 per cent) felt they were administrators and should not involve themselves in negotiations. The writer would suspect that these minority principals are agreeable to negotiations but feel such items as listed and other related items are not negotiable. Apparently they feel that an administrator needs to dictate certain conditions of work and these conditions must be maintained. The remainder of the principals (38.0 per cent) felt that the principal must function as a member of the staff and involve himself in negotiations concerning these items. (See Graph 15 on the following page.)

Two respondents commented on this issue as follows:

078 "Having been a teacher for 29 years - a teaching principal for eight, I find it hard to separate myself from thinking basically as a teacher; consequently, my thinking is prejudiced."
AN ATTITUDBINAL DIMENSION EXPRESSED BY THE SELECTION OF A POSITION-ORIENTED STATEMENT (ISSUE 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>TEND TO O.E.A. POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>TEND TO INDETERMINATE POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>TEND TO A.F.T. POSITION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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"Not negotiable items,"

Table 18 indicates that a significant statistical relationship between the issue and the variables does not exist.

**TABLE 18**

**RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 7 IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR SELECTED VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4.10831</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>9.13097</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>4.31586</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>16.04388</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 16 considers the attitude of the principal when he is put in a position of extending certain loyalties. That is: (1) whether to be loyal to a superintendent who is too teacher-oriented, in the estimation of the board of education, or (2) whether to extend his influence and ability to the board of education so the board will be adequately advised. Those who would discourage such activity on the part of the board of education are in the majority (51.9 per cent). Those who would encourage such activity are in the minority (4.4 per cent). The remaining principals (43.7 per cent) are the indeterminates. They would attempt to satisfy the demands of the board of education and still back the superintendent. The writer wonders what the response would have been had the issue stated that the superintendent was too
Graph 16

An attitudinal dimension expressed by the selection of a position-oriented statement (Issue 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
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</thead>
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</table>
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board-oriented and the teachers were wondering if the principals were backing him or with them, categorically speaking. It is apparent to the writer that no one wants to be disloyal. Most principals and teachers will permit a situation to become intolerable before speaking out.

One respondent made the following comment:

"Many questions, it seems to me, will be answered depending on the type of Superintendent a principal is working under and type of community and board of education you are working under."

The considered variables in relation to the stated issue, Table 19, did not show statistical significance.

Issue 9 could be interpreted as another loyalty issue although it was not the original intent of the writer when it was formulated. The issue, Graph 17, reflects the attitude of principals in backing an organization regardless of the perceptivity of the principal with respect to observing its strengths and weaknesses. Even though principals recognize the strength of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, the majority of principals will back a particular organization in spite of the weaknesses evidenced in affiliated groups. Principals (69.6 per cent) indicated they would support the National Education Association. Only one respondent (.6 of 1 per cent) indicated that he would support the American Federation of Teachers. The remaining principals (29.7 per cent) indicated that they would back the organization that shows the most potential and proceed to cultivate this potential. This is an interesting observation when one considers that the vast majority of elementary school principals
AN ATTITUINAL DIMENSION EXPRESSED BY THE SELECTION
OF A POSITION-ORIENTED STATEMENT (ISSUE 9)
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TABLE 19
RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 8
IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION
AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-Square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.75813</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>9.83764</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>8.79534</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>11.04321</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are either members of the National Education Association or its state affiliated Ohio Education Association.

In view of this fact, there are, apparently, many principals who would be willing to support the American Federation of Teachers on a membership basis if they could. However, they cannot so must support the organization in other ways. It is also apparent that some principals would support any other organization that offers them a program that meets with their expectation.

Three respondents made the following comments:

093 'Work to guide and strengthen. Since the principal has NO bargaining power, he must be part of the teachers group. (Or be a second class citizen.) However, the teachers must realize his job is to carry out the eventual Bd. of Ed. policy, whatever it is. He is interested in teacher welfare but the education of the children is his primary interest.

The principal should help guide the teacher assn. in professional channels with everyone remembering the children first.
TABLE 20
RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 9
IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION
AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-Square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.57514</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>4.99903</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>8.15978</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>17.43768</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BdS. of Ed. have brought this situation upon themselves by ignoring the needs of the children and teachers!

BdS. of Ed. are obsolete, and should become citizens advisory boards. They should lose all their powers and the schools should become state supported, 100%.

"Unions, especially A.F.T., are 'OUT'!"

"I have belonged to both and what has either done."

The variables, listed in Table 20, were not statistically significant when measured against the issue.

The information obtained from Issue 10, portrayed in Graph 18, was a complete surprise to the writer. When the principals were asked if they should endorse sanctions, or strikes, or encourage both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers to seek another weapon in the event of total impasse, the results were startling. Only 2.5 per cent of the principals endorsed strikes, 18.4 per cent endorsed sanctions, and 79.1 per cent agreed that each organization should seek other solutions to total impasse. This implies that
Graph 18

An attitudinal dimension expressed by the selection of a position-oriented statement (issue 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Tend to O.E.A. position</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Tend to indeterminate position</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Tend to A.F.T. position</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 158
M = 1.84
the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers may have the teacher members in accord with their selection of an ultimate weapon but the majority of principal members are opposed. This finding will not pose a problem for the American Federation of Teachers but could, in time, present some internal problems for the National Education Association and the Ohio Education Association since they have both teacher groups and principal groups in their membership.

Two respondents made the following comments:

041 "I do not believe in 'striking' in any phase of the process. We are not in that type of a job or profession and it is not professional to do so. I would quit before I would ever picket a school or carry a sign up and down in front of a building. There are other ways.

The welfare of the pupils comes first, then my teachers, then the board and superintendent, in that order.

Teaching is different—it is a dedication and those who don't think so should get out if all they think about is money.

We have a strong O.D.E.S.P. and we should conduct our own affairs as to what our job calls for and deal with our problems on our own level.

Too many 'outside influences' are causing this unrest—the old game of divide and conquer. That is why the world is in the shape it is now."

143 "The action taken depends on the situation. As intelligent and thinking beings, we do not want to be bound by more rules that must be followed in the event of an impasse. It is too easy to fall back on the ultimate weapon, even though this may be eventually necessary. Our goal is the education of the children."

The writer was pleased that the respondent (041) used the words "in any phase of the process." These words indicate that this respondent is aware of the fact that strikes and sanctions are not always used
as the "ultimate" weapon. They frequently occur as a test of strength or an exertion of power even after concessions are made in good-faith negotiating sessions. The true ultimate weapon according to many authorities is compulsory arbitration.

As indicated in Table 21, the selected variables were not statistically significant when measured against the issue.

**TABLE 21**

RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 10 IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>7.42800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2.65798</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>4.37567</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>12.66298</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 19 was revealing in the sense that the majority of principals (53.2 per cent) would like to see administrative preparation programs emphasize the duality of the elementary school principal's role. The minority of principals (8.2 per cent) felt that administrative preparation programs should emphasize background in management and administration...something less in curriculum and other areas since these things can be handled by a specialist. The remaining 38.6 per cent would like to see the elementary school principal have a well-founded background in curriculum and in the role of the instructional
AN ATTITUINAL DIMENSION EXPRESSED BY THE SELECTION OF A POSITION-ORIENTED STATEMENT (ISSUE 11)
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leader...something less in law, finance, and other phases of the administrative process.

Table 22 indicates that the selected variables were not statistically significant when measured against the issue. The training variable was measured at the 0.10 level of significance but was not cited since the writer is testing the null hypotheses at the .05 level of significance.

**TABLE 22**

**RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 11**
**IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR SELECTED VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.54544</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>9.59642</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>9.61347</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>14.81169</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unvalidated Issues.—Even though Issues 12 and 13 were not validated they made interesting data. Issue 12 caused the principal to perceive a course of action if, in the same mailing, came requests from the board of education and the teachers' association to represent each respective group during the negotiation period. Faced with this issue, the principal was given the choice of accepting one and refusing the other in each case or turning down both requests. The majority (49.4 per cent) decided in favor of the board of education. The
GRAPH 20

AN ATTITUINAL DIMENSION EXPRESSED BY THE SELECTION OF A POSITION-ORIENTED STATEMENT (ISSUE 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEND TO</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>TEACHERS AND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NEUTRAL OR INDETERMINATE POSITION</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>SUPERINTENDENT OR BOARD'S POSITION</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=158
M=2.30
TABLE 23
RESEARCH GROUP COMPARISON ON ISSUE 12
IN TERMS OF CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION
AND PER CENT LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>8.53203</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>5.76830</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>11.04711</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>17.94678</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

minority (19.6 per cent) decided in favor of the teachers' association. The remaining 31 per cent decided to remain neutral or become an indeterminate by refusing both requests.

This issue seemed to be one that posed some problems for the respondents since, apparently, they could visualize themselves being faced with this type of situation and realized that they would have to make a difficult decision. Respondents 099 and 143 wrote the word "WOW" to describe their first impression of the issue. Three respondents commented. They are as follows:

028 "I would have to write a book to explain the reasons for my choice."

099 "Regardless of answers given (at any one time), schools presently must function cooperatively between teachers and principals. If principals are not responsive to teacher needs and problems, teachers have only one way to go--up. Although Supt. may help, up usually dead ends, quickly, with the Bd. of Ed.

143 "As a first year principal, I feel an empathy to both sides of the negotiating question. I am a past local
association president, also. I realize that you are trying to determine if the principal considers himself (bluntly) labor or management. I hope the results are inconclusive. The job of educating children is a team effort. The principals must of necessity by on both teams. He cannot actively support either side in negotiations, even though he may hold strong feelings."

It was interesting to note on Table 23 that the chi-square for the salary variable was 11.04711. This reading indicates significance at the 0.10 level. To be statistically significant at the 0.05 level the reading would have to have been 12.592 with 6df. This indicates that salary and a request from the board of education have a higher statistical relationship than when compared with other variables and other issues.

Issue 13 once again put the principal under extreme pressure for a concrete response. This issue concerned a member of the power structure approaching the elementary principal and asking categorically if the principal stood firmly behind his teachers or the superintendent and board of education in negotiations. The respondent's third choice was the indeterminate or neutral role by responding to the member of the power structure that students were his major concern—not teachers or the superintendent and board of education. It was interesting to note that the majority of principals chose the indeterminate role (53.2 per cent). The minority group tended to be teacher-oriented (10.1 per cent) and the remainder of the group (36.7 per cent) elected to be management-oriented and back the superintendent and board of education.

Two respondents made specific comments. These are as follows:

015 "I would rather not be for sale."
AN ATTITUINAL DIMENSION EXPRESSED BY THE SELECTION
OF A POSITION-ORIENTED STATEMENT (ISSUE 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEND TO TEACHERS AND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION</th>
<th>N=158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEND TO NEUTRAL OR INDETERMINATE POSITION</th>
<th>N=158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEND TO SUPERINTENDENT OR BOARD'S POSITION</th>
<th>N=158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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"I would have to write another book to explain the reasons for my choice."

Table 24 shows little statistical relationship in regards to the variables, age training, salary, and geographical districts. None of the variables was statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

**TABLE 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-square (of table)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>% Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.59404</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>5.13858</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>4.84846</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEA District</td>
<td>9.10045</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concluding Remarks

As one reviews Graphs 1 through 8, indicating how the respondent perceives his position relative to performing certain functions, it becomes evident that a great deal of divergence exists. It soon becomes obvious that the elementary school principal has been placed in the school "to run the building." If one wants to know more than this generalization a discussion of duties and responsibilities ensues.

Unfortunately, the elementary principalship is different from building to building. It is different because it is perceived differently. A superintendent with six elementary schools, for example, will perceive each elementary principalship differently. This perception is
due to many different factors such as the school's location, its size, number of teachers on staff, pupils served, the special area facilities including library, gym, cafeteria, and auditorium, etc. Even in the same elementary school that has had three elementary principals in the past six years, the staff will not be hesitant to say they were very different each from the other. They were different in two respects: personality and position perceptivity. Fortunately, the principalships do have certain elements of commonality.

It is precisely these commonalities that the writer is attempting to identify. Common sense would tell us that a principal has a building, some teachers, and pupils for which and for whom he is responsible. If he were asked who receives first consideration in negotiations, he would undoubtedly indicate that the pupils are his major concern. To another question, he would indicate the teachers, and to still another he would answer superintendent, or the board of education, or the community. In other words, he answers the question as he perceives the situation.

In this respect, then, perhaps studies should determine what the principals perceive their position to be or entail and then proceed to determine the relationship between the perceived position and negotiations. Just because a group of respondents check "always" or "never," since that is the way they operate, doesn't mean that this is desirable or undesirable until such determinations have been made. Therefore, the writer's objective analysis in perceived degree of autonomy was really based on the respondent's subjective judgment.
Although the role of the elementary school principal has been examined as he perceives it, the fact remains that his perceived degree of autonomy from the central office holds implications for negotiations. These implications do not mean that the elementary school principal will be consulted on the cooperative adoption of policy; this is the prerogative of the local board of education. Neither does it mean the cooperative administration of policy since this is the function of the superintendent and his staff, except in a team approach when the superintendent is willing to delegate authority.

Negotiations, for the elementary school principal, simply means to be included in on policy formation which develops into written agreements. To have this position or be represented in such procedures, the elementary school principal has two alternatives. He can either function with a group of other principals or he can function with a group of teachers. Rarely, and only under certain conditions, is he able to function as an individual. If he is to function with a group of teachers, he will need to seek membership in their organization. These organizations are usually of two types: (1) an association of teachers either admitting or denying principals to membership, and (2) an association which is broader in context and admits all school personnel (usually only the certificated).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research study was prompted by the writer's awareness of the problems that confront the elementary school principal in negotiations. The solutions to these problems become especially difficult since every principal is unique—unique as an individual and as a professional person. The writer's concern is the identification of the elementary school principal as a professional person in a role relative to negotiations.

The complexity of this identification is due to many attitudes, factors, and forces exerting an influence on the elementary school principal. His role is perceived differently by different teachers, superintendents, boards of education, and citizens' groups. It, therefore, becomes necessary for an elementary school principal to perceive his role with respect to all these individual and group attitudes, factors, and forces if he is to function effectively in a particular situation. This perceptive technique is especially vital in the area of his performance in negotiations.

It was the contention of the writer that, with all the differences in role perception, certain elements are common to all. This contention, specifically applied to the elementary school principals' group by a developed instrument, sought this commonality of elements.
It was the writer's hope that these isolated and specially treated elements of commonality would provide a basis on which the elementary school principals themselves could build a role in negotiations that would be compatible with current thought and provide this group with acceptable guidelines.

Procedural Status Summary

In order that the elementary school principal could have this vital information, the writer proposed a study that was seemingly welcomed by: the principal's own professional association, The Ohio Education Association's Department of Elementary School Principals; the union, The Ohio Federation of Teachers; and others with whom the writer has an association at conferences, seminars, and other inservice training sessions concerning negotiations.

As was mentioned in the introductory remarks in this chapter, how other groups perceive the role of the elementary school principal in negotiations is important. However, for the purpose of this study, these groups were not given primary consideration. Primary consideration was given to the elementary school principals as a group.

An instrument was developed, validated by a panel of judges, and disseminated to the population selected by random sampling technique. The instrument itself was divided into two parts: Part I established variables of a personal, factual, and perceived nature; and, Part II was a series of issues with position-oriented responses to be checked by the respondent.

The sample was validated by a proportional relationship based on percentage figures of state and sample by geographical area, number
of pupils, and number of teachers responsible to the respondent. The random sampling technique was applied to the Ohio Education Association's mailing list of elementary schools. From the 3107 elementary schools, the selected mailing represented a 9.65% sample. The 158 usable returns represented an achieved sample of 5.26%. The figure 3107, as being the total number of elementary schools in the state of Ohio, is also the figure the State Department of Education uses for statistical purposes. This figure is obtained from the elementary principals' reports housed in the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education in the State Department of Education at the State Office Building. The actual number of full and part-time principals as determined by the State Department of Education's Computer Center is 2586. The State Department of Education's Department of Certification is unable to make any distinctions between persons holding valid principal certificates and those persons who consider themselves principal with proper certification. The member principals of the Ohio Education Association's Department of Elementary School Principals is well over 2000.

The validated sample questionnaires were serially numbered and taken to the Computer Center in the Research Center at The Ohio State University. The information from the questionnaires was key punched on data cards and made ready for processing by the computer. The returned parameter cards and the print-off were the basis for the writer's findings presented in Chapters III and IV.
Procedural Status Conclusions

The writer is cognizant of the benefits by working as an independent researcher and by seeking the services of individuals and agencies. Very few persons can claim distinction as an independent researcher or claim that their particular piece of research has not been influenced by the judgment or bias of others. In the writer's case, the acknowledgments on p. ii indicate the nature and extent of the influence.

By soliciting the thinking, help, and service of others, the writer profited immeasurably. On the other hand, when one does seek out individuals and agencies for the constructive skills they can bring to a piece of research, one must expect and make allowances for different kinds of delays. In the writer's case, the computer was shut down for periodic maintenance after running partial parameter cards. In essence, what was originally a three hour key punch process and a few minutes of computer time became an investment of fourteen days. If the writer had maintained a greater degree of independence, the process and investment of time could have been reduced considerably.

When one uses a technique such as the descriptive-survey, the researcher must obtain as much information as possible on the first mailing or distribution. It is extremely difficult to obtain additional information, or even the original information, later. The writer feels that his response had elements of positive indications and negative indications concerning the development of the questionnaire. On the positive side, the questionnaire was well-arranged, had an element of simplicity, and was diversified. Well-arranged refers to the perfect
alignment of response blocks to facilitate the key punch operation. This procedure produced a vivid eye-span pattern for responding and tabulating. The element of simplicity refers to the directions, the variable range or interval, and the respondent's ability to use only checks and numbers for responding. Diversified refers to the limited number of items in each parameter cell: nine items with two to eight intervals to be checked, seven items using numbers instead of checks in responding, eight items using checks on a scale (four point - always, frequently, seldom, and never), six items to be checked "yes" or "no", and thirteen items requesting a checked position-statement in relation to a given issue.

Several respondents were complimentary concerning the selection of the study and the questionnaire itself. These comments are as follows:

006 "This is a very thought provoking questionnaire."

060 "The questions are excellent but the selection and number of answers are too few and severely limited."

115 "I admire the purpose of your study."

116 "You have prepared an excellent questionnaire. The principal's role should definitely be that of good administration."

121 "Some of my answers were the "best" of the choice listed, but not what I might really want to do. We ought to have a workshop on this."

The negative responses or constructive criticism, depending on interpretation, are as follows:

017 "Part II, Items 1 through 14 - by checking only one choice on the aforementioned items, in some instances, was very uncomfortable. Several items could have had better choices than those listed."
"You must realize that some of the answers marked are misleading as there may be other (and possibly better) answers to these situations."

"Some of your questions were very difficult to answer without further discussion."

The negative indications on the part of the writer were determined as a result of omissions, errors, etc. The researcher was naive enough to believe that questions concerning numbers of buildings in the school system, numbers of teachers in the school system, and other similar kinds of questions could be answered quite readily by the respondent. Apparently these kinds of facts are not committed to memory by many elementary school principals, especially those elementary principals in the larger school systems.

Procedural Status Recommendations

The writer was not fully aware of the fact that during the process of determining the variables, he was in essence coding the returns. It was the writer's good fortune to be able to determine the respondent by the way the variables were checked. This determination was made by cross-checking these variables against the State Educational Directory. By doing this, the number of usable returns was increased significantly. A process similar to the one used by the writer would greatly aid one researching the secondary principals, boards of education, and other persons, groups, and agencies who are statistically treated or verified in a composite manner.

The writer would urge researchers to make use of data tabulation sheets. In the majority of situations this procedure may be viewed as a needless, additional step. However, had the writer used
these sheets much time could have been saved and the expense of the key punch operation would have been reduced significantly. Also, the writer feels that raw data tabulations do portray patterns and relationships which may be overlooked while attempting to ferret out the significant computations needed to be able to accept or reject the null hypotheses.

Although the writer did not make provisions for specific identification, many respondents identified themselves. This identification was intentional in several instances and probably unintentional in others.

Several respondents specifically requested a summation of the writer's findings. The writer is making the reader aware of one in particular since it has implications for other researchers:

115 "If the results and/or your recommendations are not made known to school executives, they will be worthless. We lack a principals organization here despite our size and professional attitudes towards state and national principals' associations.

I feel that the elementary principal's dual role needs definition badly because we are never "fish or fowl" or as your questions lead, sometime become both. (An equally frustrating position.) Having filled out several questionnaires each of which promised to send results but never did, I won't be surprised if I never hear from you. I do think that abstracts of your work could be made available through Ohio DESP if your efforts are recognized by them. They too, could send extra copies for central administrators where I feel there is a need. Good luck to you."

Those respondents who took the time and trouble to identify themselves, and requested some follow-up data, will be sent a specially prepared summation of the writer's findings.
Data Analysis Summary

The variables used in the questionnaire consisted of personal data items, factual data items, and perceptual data items. The personal data items were sex, age, experience, training, salary, and contractual status. The factual data items included the type of school system, the Ohio Education Association's geographical membership district, number of elementary schools and number of elementary teachers in the respondent's unit or building, questions concerning the district's negotiations instrument, grievance procedure, principal's bargaining unit, and if the principal's salary was tied to the teachers' salary schedule. The perceptual items concerned eight areas which may appear in an elementary school principal's job description and which may have implications for negotiations. The other perceived data items were the issues with their validated position-oriented responses.

There were 140 male respondents and 18 female respondents. Fourteen were under 30 years of age and 5 were over 60 with the majority (59) between 30 and 39 years of age. These persons reported that only 20 were at the B.A. level of training, 130 (the majority) at the M.A. level, 7 reported having the specialist degree, and 1 reported holding a doctorate. Eight reported salaries of less than $6,000. The majority (79) reported making over $9,000 but less than $12,000. Twenty-six reported that their salary was more than $12,000 but less than $15,000. The majority (82) reported working on a 10 month contract which was a yearly contract.

On the scaled eight items which may be on the principal's job description and areas in which he perceives his task as "always,"
"frequently," "seldom," and "never," only 4 indicated that they always recruited their own teachers; 37 checked frequently, 51 checked seldom, and 66 reported that they never recruit their own teachers. The respondents were almost equally divided on assigning teachers to a grade level and the smallest group (27) reported never. The way the respondents perceived their task in developing curriculum was unusual, in the writer's opinion. Seventeen reported always, 94 frequently, 37 seldom, and 10 reported never. When asked to check their involvement in making policy for the district, 11 reported always, 52 checked frequently, 63 checked seldom, and 32 reported never. When asked to check his participation in organizing special classes, 12 respondents checked always, 45 checked frequently, 62 checked seldom, and 38 checked never. Apparently elementary principals are still not their own transportation coordinators but the trend is in that direction according to the way the respondents checked their perception in arranging pupil transportation: 12 checked always, 11 checked frequently, 38 checked seldom, and 97 checked never. When asked about having his own building budget the respondent indicated the following: 44 checked always, 23 checked frequently, 13 checked seldom, and 78 checked never. When asked a question, which to a degree is related, concerning his involvement in the budget-making process for the district, 13 respondents checked always, 23 checked frequently, 31 checked seldom, and 91 checked never.

The factual questions concerning the negotiations instrument, the grievance procedure, the bargaining unit, and if the principal's
salary was tied to the teachers' salary schedule yielded the following information:

1. 82 respondents answered "yes" and 76 answered "no" when asked if their district had a written negotiations instrument.

2. 19 respondents answered "yes" and 138 answered "no" when asked if they were personally involved in developing the instrument.

3. 96 respondents answered "yes" and 62 answered "no" when asked if their district had a grievance procedure.

4. 50 respondents answered "yes" and 106 answered "no" when asked if they were involved in the grievance procedure in any way.

5. 27 respondents answered "yes" and 131 answered "no" when asked if the principals had a separate bargaining unit.

6. 130 respondents answered "yes" and 28 answered "no" when asked if their salary was tied to the teachers' salary schedule.

There were 11 validated issues and 2 unvalidated. Considering only the validated issues, the respondents checked a total of 853 responses which tended to the Ohio Education Association's position. The indeterminate position received checks on 550 responses which tended to the neutral. The American Federation of Teachers' position received 264 checked responses by respondents tending to their position.
On the two unvalidated issues, the respondents cast 47 checks for the response that tended to favor the teachers and teachers' association. The indeterminate or neutral position received 133 checks. Those respondents tending to the superintendent, board of education, or management-oriented response cast 136 checks.

The summary of the data in relation to the issues indicate the following:

1. Principals are willing to be involved in negotiations.
2. Principals demonstrate a greater identification with the superintendent and board of education than they do with the teachers or teachers' group.
3. Principals would like to be a member of the teachers' association or the local education association.
4. Principals are willing to back the National Education Association.
5. Principals would encourage both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers to seek solutions other than sanctions and strikes in the event of a total impasse.

Data Analysis Conclusions

The data indicate that the elementary school principalship is held predominately by males. These males are achieving a lower mean age as a group continually. However, very few males are able to obtain an elementary principalship before age 30. In the writer's opinion, this seemingly late entry age is due to such factors as private employment, service obligations, and certification requirements. On the
other end of the age range one is able to determine that very few elementary principals are over sixty years of age. In the writer's opinion the lack of longevity is a result of early deaths, principals' early retirement (age 55 with 25 years of service and age 60 with at least 5 years), principals seeking other kinds of educational positions, and a number who go into business for themselves or into private employment.

According to the data, today's elementary school principal holds a master's degree, with many holding the specialist degree, and a few having earned the doctorate. Most elementary principals earn over $10,000 and a few are reporting salaries over $15,000 per year. The majority of elementary principals work on a 10 month contract for a one year term. The writer could not discern a trend to increase the term of the contract but was able to determine that the length of the contract (2, 3, and more than 3 years) is trending upwards. Almost 50 per cent of the respondents reported holding more than the one year contract.

In attempting to discern areas of the principal's responsibility with the possibilities of negotiability, the writer would like to refer the reader to the graphs on pages 64, 66, 68, and 70. These graphs, presented with the writer's comments on page 62, provide the basis for the writer's following observations:

1. More principals are becoming involved in the recruitment of their own teachers.

2. Fewer principals are involved in developing curriculum.
3. More principals are becoming involved in policy-making for the school district.
4. More principals are becoming involved in organizing special classes.
5. More principals are becoming involved in arranging pupil transportation.
6. More principals are becoming involved in the budget-making process for the district.

These observed changes have come about, in the writer's opinion, since "Bootstraps" and the 1959 Profiles.

The data revealed the following with reference to the principal and his relationship to various, important aspects of negotiations:

1. The majority of principals are employed in districts that do have a written negotiations instrument.
2. Very few principals are actually involved in developing the negotiations instrument.
3. The majority of principals are employed in districts that do have a grievance procedure.
4. The majority of principals feel they are not involved in the grievance procedure in any way.
5. The majority of principals do not have a separate bargaining unit.
6. The majority of principals reported that their salary is tied to the teachers' salary schedule.

In view of the way principals perceived their areas of responsibility, answered questions of fact, and perceived the position-oriented
statements to issues, certain discrepancies or conflicting points of view emerged. These considerations are as follows:

1. Although the principal perceives himself as the instructional leader, he is reporting, in the writer's opinion, less authority or responsibility in the area of curriculum development.

2. Although the principal perceives himself as a supporter of the teachers and teachers' association with full rights of membership, his identification is perceived as being with the superintendent and board of education and not with teachers and teachers' groups.

3. Although the majority of principals feel that they are not involved in the grievance procedure in any way, the majority feel that the aggrieved should see the principal before going to top management (Superintendent, Director of Personnel, etc.).

Although the 0.05 or higher level of significance was attained with reference to two charts, each chart contained a different question. In view of this fact, plus the fact that the study contained six charts, the writer did not feel enough evidence existed to claim that the membership district actually achieved statistical significance to the extent the writer should reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant statistical relationship between the principal's membership affiliation and his attitude toward negotiations.
The 0.05 or higher level of significance was attained for the membership district and age on Issue 5. A 0.02 level of significance was attained for the membership district in Issue 1. Age, in Issue 6, was significant at the 0.02 level. In view of the fact that there were eleven issues with validated position-oriented responses, and only one issue attained a level of statistical significance on two variables and only two issues attained a level of statistical significance on only one variable each, the writer felt the lack of evidence as to statistical significance should be cause for accepting these particular null hypotheses. Therefore, the writer must accept the study's following null hypotheses:

There is no significant statistical relationship—

1. Between the principal's age and his attitude toward negotiations.
2. Between the principal's academic attainment and his attitude toward negotiations.
3. Between the principal's remuneration and his attitude toward negotiations.
4. Between the principal's employment in a city, exempted village, or local district and his attitude toward negotiations.
5. Between a principal's membership affiliation and his attitude toward negotiations.

Data Analysis Recommendation

From the conclusions reached as a result of this research study, it seems evident that negotiations are a vital concern of the
elementary school principal. This concern is evident in his relationship to teachers, the superintendent of schools, the board of education, and the public. Basically, this study attempted to discern the elementary school principal's role in negotiations as he perceives it. His perception of this role may be radically different from others (individually or collectively) in terms of how this role is perceived. By determining how this role is perceived and examining the commonality of elements, the foundation may be laid for building guidelines that would help clarify the role of the elementary school principal in negotiations. Therefore, the writer would submit that the following recommendations concerning perception studies are in order:

Using the citizenry, boards of education, superintendents, and teachers, studies should be made with respect to determining elements of commonality and differences as they relate to the elementary school principal's role in negotiations.

These studies combined with interpretative writings by esteemed colleagues and influential education writers could form the basis in the literature for further enlightening experiments and experiences. These recorded experiments, experiences, and studies combine to form the basis for the writer's recommendation:

Workshop themes, organizational discussion, and other inservice techniques should lend themselves to an examination of findings, capitalizing on acceptable practices, and lay the groundwork for further examination of the role of the elementary school principal in negotiations.
By properly disseminating the information, findings, and emphasizing the commonality of elements, principals would be able to gain a degree of consensus as far as their role in negotiations is concerned. Without a doubt, this consensus would evolve as standard or acceptable practice. After being assured that the stability of these acceptable practices have benefits for all elementary principals, the writer would make the following recommendation:

**Generalizations on the role the elementary school principal is to play in negotiations should be formulated on the national level.**

In other words, after principals are given the opportunity to help define their own role in negotiations, their experiences and the literature should have made it quite clear that certain generalizations or over-riding principles can be adopted on the national level by such agencies as the U. S. Office of Education, the National Education Association, or the elementary principals' own national organization—the National Education Association's Department of Elementary School Principals.

The overriding generalizations on the national level could go a long way in helping elementary school principals to consolidate their efforts, or influence them through unification of position expectancies. Even with the strength of national unification, role definition built on generalizations would be totally inadequate. In striving for adequacy, or a more specific set of circumstances on which to build role competencies, the writer would make the following recommendation:

**Specific recommendations on the role of the elementary school principal in negotiations should be formulated on the state level,**
There are a number of reasons for recommendation number four. The basic reasoning lies near the fact that education is a function of the state. In this respect the elementary principal in Ohio must adhere to and conform with the existing laws of the state. This means that the legislature can enact legislation that determines his role. If the legislature has not enacted legislation concerning his role in negotiations, the state department of education could be instrumental in helping to determine this role by working with the universities to set up required course work in negotiations for certification, for example.

The principals' own professional organization, the Ohio Education Association's Department of Elementary School Principals, could be instrumental in helping to define this role on the state level by being specific.

This specificity could come about by making use of such techniques as adopting more rigid membership standards and developing guidelines for the role of the elementary school principal in negotiations.

Respondent's Written Comments

The writer, at the end of the questionnaire, indicated to the respondent that he could turn the questionnaire over and write any additional comments or pertinent remarks concerning the questionnaire itself or negotiations that he would care to make. Many did and the writer shared these with the reader as the data were being presented.
Some of the respondents did not specifically address themselves to
or identify a particular issue. These comments are as follows:

006 "It is most difficult to answer objectively such items
as are subjective and which might be greatly altered by
the types of persons serving as superintendent, board
members and general attitude of staff. I would do what
I believe to be right, not supporting teachers if they
were wrong even if I were one."

026 "There is a general assumption that the teachers and
administrators are out to get the other. This is not a
sound nor realistic assumption. The purpose of educa-
tion is to develop children into good citizens. Teachers,
Principals, Supervisors, Administrators, and Board members
are all working to this same end. We do not accomplish
this by setting up lines of combat. A greater understand-
ing and an atmosphere of cooperation will accomplish more
and maintain the morale at a higher level. When ever we
draw the line of a battle morale drops.

We must not lose sight of our product. What can we do
to improve it so as they become adults they will not need
to be threatened into supporting education."

032 "The principal is appointed by the Supt. and board of
education to supervise, organize and manage the staff,
curriculum, bldg., etc., and therefore is responsible to
and must be loyal to his superiors. On the other hand
the principal is obligated to assist his staff in any
way he can to make their job efficient, effective and
enjoyable. If this takes place there should be no need
for negotiations. The primary reason for existing or
desirable negotiations seems to be for salary increases.
It is my opinion that unionization, striking and negotia-
tion by pressure is not becoming of a person who considers
himself a professional. However, if negotiations are
established to improve our teaching profession per as
they could prove very valuable to both teachers and the
administrator or brd. of education. Not only could
salary and welfare be improved for teachers, but higher
standards could be established to obtain better qualified
teachers. Many studies have shown that salary is not
first on the list in importance as desirable by teachers
for a particular job.

My opinion is that a more equitable method of taxation
and more equitable and ample support on the part of the
state is desirable and we as educators should all put on
the pressure to obtain this goal. Direct our attack not
upon the local citizen, but upon the governor and legislature. The OEA needs more support from its members."

113 "The modern principal is in "no man's land"—must be separate from teachers' group. Must organize and negotiate, and update his profession as an administrator."

155 "Best of luck on your dissertation. As important as this issue is becoming I will be very interested in seeing the results. It would be interesting to do a follow-up study with this same questionnaire five years from now."

Once again it becomes obvious to the writer that any undertaking to bring together these divergent points of view is no small task. The writer felt extremely fortunate in having so many favorable comments concerning what he was attempting to do. As the reader has already noted, some of the comments were not too favorable. The writer decided to utilize all the comments rather than attempt to use only those that supported certain contentions.

As the writer began to formulate his thoughts concerning exactly what he would say in relation to making an interpretative review of the respondents' comments, he noticed once again the first three sentences of the first respondent (002 on page 80): "I feel the principal must declare himself on one side or the other. You cannot remain neutral. You must remain on the side of the superintendent."

In other words, we must have a basis on which to build if we are going to solve the problem. It really doesn't make any difference as to which base as long as it is this one. This kind of reasoning is precisely the reason for having difficulty in defining the role of the elementary school principal in negotiations.
From the respondents' comments, the writer would assume the following:

1. The pupils are the first consideration in negotiations.
2. Whether or not the principal aligns himself with the teachers or the superintendent to accomplish consideration of pupils depends on how the principal perceives the teachers and/or superintendent.
3. Pressure from all sources for his support is to be ignored unless that particular pressure force can guarantee that the pupils will benefit.
4. Rather than to receive pressure from any given source, the respondents would like to see unification and teamwork in negotiations.

Writer's Concluding Commentary

This study enabled the writer to accomplish the major objectives of his task and at the same time provided him with other profitable experiences. Among these experiences were the personal contacts necessary for the completion of the study. These contacts included members of the staff at the Ohio Education Association, members of the Ohio Federation of Teachers, and members of the staff in the computer center at The Ohio State University. From this relationship the writer was able to make certain assumptions, especially in relation to the Ohio Education Association and the Ohio Federation of Teachers, concerning their points of view. These tentative conclusions are as follows:

1. The Ohio Education Association would tend to agree with the findings concerning the use of sanctions. The
association feels that there must be a better weapon in the event of total impasse. The problem they face is determining what is a better weapon.

2. The Ohio Federation of Teachers would tend to agree with the findings concerning the use of strikes. They too, feel that there must be a better weapon in the event of total impasse. The problem they face is determining what is a better weapon.

3. The Ohio Education Association would agree that the sanction is a harsh measure but not as harsh as the strike.

4. The Ohio Federation of Teachers would agree that the strike is a harsh measure but not as harsh as the sanction.

5. The Ohio Education Association endorses both teacher groups and principal groups.

6. The Ohio Federation of Teachers endorses both teacher groups and principal groups that have already been formed. They will not charter any more principal groups.

7. The Ohio Education Association considers the principal as a teacher in some circumstances and as management in others.

8. The Ohio Federation of Teachers considers the principals as management.

9. The Ohio Education Association considers its members as "professionals."
10. The Ohio Federation of Teachers considers its members as "professionals."

11. The total fees for belonging to the National Education Association and its affiliated departments, the Ohio Education Association and its affiliated departments, and the local association are determined by the number of organizations and departments one wants to join.

12. The total fees for joining the union are a set amount which is determined by the members at the local level. A portion is sent to promote national activity, a portion is sent to support state activity, and the remainder is retained at the local level.

The dualism of role mentioned in the study, and determined by some of the respondents, is an interesting concept. Any time a person is put in a position of responsibility, he is responsible for those with whom he works and responsible to those who put him in that position. In the principalship, the teachers look to the principal for leadership and the superintendent looks to him for leadership. Pressure from the top and the bottom will cause a principal to exert himself. As soon as he responds he puts himself in a position or receiving criticism from either or both sides. Each side demands his loyalty and support...what is he to do! It is at this time that he has to perceive the significance of the situation in relation to a multitude of factors.

This is not only a problem for the elementary principal but the secondary school principal as well. This group is also in the "middle."
The Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals is holding its
ninth annual summer conference at The Ohio State University on June 27-
29. This group has extended an invitation to the elementary school
principals to attend the conference on June 28 and 29. On these two
days the sessions will be directed toward the problems of negotiations.
The Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals is to be commended
for their action.

The writer has specifically avoided mentioning the high school
principal in this study for he felt that certain problems, in the area
of negotiations that were examined, were peculiar to the elementary
principalship. There are, however, common concerns and presumably
common identifiable elements. At the present time, the major contro-
versy concerning Senate Bill 30 centers about the needs of principals.
Undoubtedly, the secondary and elementary principals will be considered
as like entities in the eyes of the legislators and legislature in the
resolution of the conflict concerning Senate Bill 30.

It was interesting to note in the May-June issue of the D.E.S.P.
Line, an information bulletin sent to all members of the Ohio Depart-
ment of Elementary School Principals, that one of the writer's concerns
is being given consideration by the Ohio Education Association. Senate
Bill 330, sponsored by Senators Walter Powell and Oliver Ocasek, will
seek legislation to require the assignment of properly certificated per-
sons to principalships. If this can be accomplished, it will be neces-
sary to amend Section 3319.02 of the Revised Code to read as follows:

A properly certificated principal for each high school, 
junior high school and elementary school in the district. 
An elementary school principal may be appointed principal
for more than one elementary school. A high school
The Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals' Executive Board has authorized the appointment of a new committee whose function will be to appraise and evaluate the Ohio Department of Elementary Principals. Perhaps this group's findings will be in keeping with the writer's recommendations whether or not legislation is passed. That is: (1) that a designated principal be responsible for the unit; (2) that this designated principal possess proper certification; and (3) that guidelines on the state level be considered for the role of the elementary school principal in negotiations.

If basic guidelines were developed concerning the principal's role in negotiations, the remainder of the perceptual task would not be so great. The principals could take a giant step in fulfilling the major objective of negotiations—that of providing the best possible educational program for boys and girls.
APPENDIX A

PANEL OF JUDGES

The following persons were asked to function as a panel of judges for determining the validation of the position-statements to be checked by the respondents in response to the stated issue in Part II of the questionnaire:

Ohio Education Association

Dr. Robert E. Miner
Director of Research
The Association
213 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Charles R. Hilston
Coordinator--Elementary and Secondary Principals
The Association
213 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. B. I. Griffith
Director of Professional Relations
The Association
213 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Indeterminate Position

Dr. Paul T. Hill
Superintendent, Kenston Local Schools
Bank Building
Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022

Mr. John G. Herner
Principal, Tremont Elementary School
The Upper Arlington City Schools
2900 Tremont Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221
Dr. George Eley  
College of Education  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland

The Ohio Federation of Teachers

Mr. Stanton Bloom  
Representative—Ohio Federation of Teachers  
16 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Carl Benedetti  
President, Columbus Chapter of the Ohio Federation of Teachers  
Columbus South High School  
1160 Ann Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43206

Mr. L. Barrett Smith  
President, Cleveland Principals' Unit—Ohio Federation of Teachers  
Cleveland Collenwood School  
15210 St. Clair Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44110
APPENDIX B

TITLE OF STUDY: THE OHIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEIVED ROLE IN NEGOTIATIONS: A COMPARISON OF ATTITUDINAL DIMENSIONS

STUDENT: Lewis D. McPeek

DATE: May 22, 1967

PURPOSE: Validation of Sample

MATERIAL SUBMITTED: The Distribution Range of the Sample Based on 144 Returns

NATURE OF SUBMITTED MATERIAL: Geographical Area, Type of School System, Number of Respondents by Area and School System, and Respondents' Responsibility (pupils and teachers)

SUBMITTED TO: Dr. Robert Miner
Distribution Range of the Sample

(Computer variables 10, 12, 20-23, 24-25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical District</th>
<th>Kind of System</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Respondent's Responsibility:</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13044</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exempted Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County (local)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9675</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11816</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exempted Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County (local)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4042</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7760</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exempted Village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County (local)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3622</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6205</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exempted Village</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County (local)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4691</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Exempted Village</td>
<td>County (local)</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2486</td>
<td>2542</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2542</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2922</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1443</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4211</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28937</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46177</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempted Village</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4211</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (local)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28937</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>79325</td>
<td>2807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Lewis D. McPeek, Principal  
Barrington Road School  
1780 Barrington Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43221

Dear Mr. McPeek:

The addresses of all elementary school buildings were arrayed in zip code order. A random number was selected and each tenth address was reproduced until a total sample of 300 addresses were selected.

There were 3,107 public elementary schools in 1966-67; therefore, the random sampling produced a 9.65% sample of the universe.

Based on 144 returns tabulated, a 4.6% sample was achieved. How representative was the sample returned? The percentage data below shows the sample to be valid on the basis of type of school district, size of school as measured by teachers and enrollment within type, and slightly skewed toward the central, southwestern and northwestern areas of the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Per Cent of Schools State</th>
<th>Per Cent of Schools Sample</th>
<th>Per Cent of Pupils State</th>
<th>Per Cent of Pupils Sample</th>
<th>Per Cent of Teachers State</th>
<th>Per Cent of Teachers Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Per Cent of Pupils State</th>
<th>Per Cent of Pupils Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.E.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The prime purpose of the study is to examine attitudes of principals related to professional negotiations, and the measure of per cent of teachers demonstrates the validity of the sample.

I would suggest, however, some weighting of the responses from Western or a recalculation of percentages if additional returns are received.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Miner
Director of Research

REM: jw
APPENDIX C

Instructions Prepared for Use of the
Research Center at The Ohio State University

Project: Doctoral Dissertation: The Ohio Elementary School Principals' Perceived Role in Negotiations--A Comparison of Attitudinal Dimensions

Student: Lewis Duane McPeek, Jr.
2505 Wickliffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221 Ph. 488-3859

Date: June 1, 1967 Adviser: W. Frederick Staub
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The attached questionnaire has been designed to determine the following:

1. **Frequency and summation** (Part I and II - all items)

2. **Cross tabulation**

   - Variable 5: (Part II - all issues)
   - Variable 6: (Part II - all issues)
   - Variable 7: (Part II - all issues)
   - Variable 10: (Part II - all issues)
   - Variable 12: (4,5,6,7,8,9,10)
   - Variable 28: (Part II - all issues)
   - Variable 31: (Part II - all issues)
   - Variable 34: (Part II - all issues)
   - Variable 43: (Issues 1,6)
   - Variable 44: (Issues 1,6)
   - Variable 45: (Issue 3)
   - Variable 46: (Issue 3)
   - Variable 47: (Issue 2,5)
   - Variable 48: (Issue 4)

3. **Frequency valued and scaled**

   Variables 35-42: treated separately as discussed

4. **Part II**

   Issues 1 through 11 are validated issues with position-oriented responses. Listed is the validated response pattern:

   - **Issue 1**
     1. The respondent's check indicates that he tends to the OEA position.
     2. The respondent's check indicates that he tends to the indeterminate position.
     3. The respondent's check indicates that he tends to the union position.

   (for all succeeding issues see pattern of number 1)

   - **Issue 2**
     1. AFT
     2. Indeterminate
     3. OEA

   - **Issue 3**
     1. Indeterminate
     2. OEA
     3. AFT
1 Indeterminate

**Issue 4**
2 AFT
3 OEA

**Issue 5**
1 AFT
2 OEA
3 Indeterminate

**Issue 6**
1 OEA
2 AFT
3 Indeterminate

**Issue 7**
1 AFT
2 Indeterminate
3 OEA

**Issue 8**
1 AFT
2 OEA
3 Indeterminate

**Issue 9**
1 Indeterminate
2 AFT
3 OEA

**Issue 10**
1 Indeterminate
2 OEA
3 AFT

**Issue 11**
1 OEA
2 AFT
3 Indeterminate

**Issues 12 and 13** are not validated but do reflect the respondents' attitude in relation to making a choice concerning his position. The response pattern is as follows:

1 association, teachers

**Issue 12**
2 neutral, indeterminate
3 superintendent, board

1 neutral, indeterminate

**Issue 13**
2 teacher oriented
3 management oriented

The issue responses in Part II can be correlated with the variables in Part I or treated statistically (Chi-square was mentioned) in any manner that helps the writer
accept or reject the null hypotheses, produces informational patterns significant to the study, or generates hypotheses for future consideration. The writer's null hypotheses ($H_0$) at the five per cent level--

There will be no significant statistical relationship:

1. Between the principal's age and his attitude toward negotiations.
2. Between the principal's academic attainment and his attitude toward negotiations.
3. Between the principal's remuneration and his attitude toward negotiations.
4. Between the principal's employment in a city, exempted village, or local district, and his attitude toward negotiations.
5. Between a principal's membership affiliation and his attitude toward negotiation.

5. Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio's Elementary Education</th>
<th>Number of Buildings</th>
<th>Number of Pupils in Attendance</th>
<th>Number of Certified Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>870,731</td>
<td>29,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>-72,062</td>
<td>2,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>558,469</td>
<td>18,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>1,501,262</td>
<td>50,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sample was 9.65% of the universe (300 questionnaires—over 3000 addresses).

Sample achieved was 5.26% (158 returns).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Per Cent of Schools</th>
<th>Per Cent of Pupils</th>
<th>Per Cent of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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