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<td>Dissonance Felt by Principals on a Scale 1-5 for Teaching Staff Expressed as a Mean Score</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Dissonance Felt by Principals on a Scale 1-5 for Administrators Expressed as a Mean Score</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Dissonance Felt by Principals on a Scale 1-5 for Parents Expressed as a Mean Score</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Dissonance Felt by Principals on a Scale 1-5 for Superintendents Expressed as a Mean Score</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Between Discomfort Ratings and Dissonance Scores for Each Category of Personnel</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction and Historical Perspective

Professional negotiation and collective bargaining are terms that are generally used to denote a process that has been taking place in the public sector, and specifically education, for the past three decades. Only within the last fifteen years, however, has the concept begun to direct the process of educational policy development and decision making within the public school setting with any degree of importance. For the past five years the educational arena and its public has seen an increasing amount of sophistication and progress to the bargaining procedure.

There are abundant evidences that indicate a growing restlessness among school personnel following World War II. This restlessness seems to have been caused by several social/educational factors: "... the more aggressive teacher, the more democratic administrator, the more open school system, the more affluent economy, and the more activist society."¹ These factors have surely contributed to the institutionalization known to education as the process of collective bargaining and negotiation. The steadily increasing assessment of the bargaining process has been demonstrated by the continued burst of demands by school employees for a greater voice in school policy development, decision making, and participatory involvement in all phases of instructional and non-instructional functions. These
"demands" have generally been referred to as teacher militancy, which in many locales of the American educational scene caught school administrators and boards of education unprepared; unprepared to regulate and administer school district policies developed by a process that was generally unfamiliar in the education setting. Local boards of education and their administrators have, for the most part, a better understanding now of this process and are beginning to accept the realism and magnitude of this new direction.

Historically, the concept of collective bargaining by organized groups dates back to nineteenth-century America. According to Schofield², "the first recorded affiliation of a teacher group with organized labor occurred in 1902 in San Antonio," even though organized labor and education organizations were very much separated. Previous to 1935 and the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, several items of legislation can be cited as significant milestones which aided in the foundation for collective bargaining as it exists today. These legislative events are listed and described in chronological order:

1. **1890**, The Sherman Anti-Trust Laws which prohibited combination of a number of units in the form of a trust.

2. **1914**, The Clayton Act which removed the unions from the umbrella of the Anti-Trust Laws.

3. **1916**, Eight local AFT (educational) organizations were chartered by the AFL.

4. **1932**, The Norris-LaGuardia Act in which the power of the courts was removed from decisions regarding union activities.
5. **1933**, The National Industrial Recovery Act provided direct endorsement of collective bargaining to the private sector.

6. **1935**, The National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act) guaranteed for the first time in the law and as a policy of society, the right of workers in the private sector to the collective action process.

7. **1940's**, Following World War II employees in the public sector began to press for the right of collective action which included a series of strikes by teachers.

8. **1946**, In this year, the Norwalk, Connecticut, Board of Education and the Norwalk Teachers' Association entered into what is believed to be the first collective negotiations agreement obtained for and by teachers in the country.

9. **1947**, The Taft-Hartley Act (Labor Management Relations Act) balanced the list of unfair employer practices with a list of unfair union practices, such as illegal strikes and closed shop agreements.

10. **1948-70**, During this twenty-two year span there were 110 strikes recorded in the public and private schools throughout the United States.

11. **1951**, The Norwalk agreement was upheld by the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors.
12. **1959**, The Landrum-Griffin Act grew out of the Senate investigation of improper activities in unions, including denial of rights to union members and racketeering, coercion, and violence.


14. **Present**, Today all but a very few states have collective bargaining legislation governing the right of public employees to bargain with employers. Several states have statutes authorizing work stoppages for a limited number of reasons.

The bargaining process has accounted for a marked change in the working relationships for both teachers and administrators involved in public education. Board members, and specifically school administrators, can ill-afford to be in the precarious position of applying traditional and/or outdated practices to these rapidly changing management circumstances. School boards and administrators must reassess and redesign leadership roles encompassed in the function of personnel management. To some extent the board and the superintendent have delineated their respective role in the bargaining process. The principal's involvement, however, in the various roles of the bargaining process as a member of the board's team and the possible conflict that is felt has not yet been studied satisfactorily.
Background of the Problem

In August, 1969, the writer was appointed principal of a junior high school in a medium-sized city school district. Two weeks following the appointment, the district superintendent and his assistant approached the writer and discussed the possibility of serving as the "chief spokesman" for the board's bargaining team. The consideration of such an assignment led the writer to deal with conflict and subsequent feelings of discomfort associated with the dual role that would be created by the assignment. After much thought about the pros and cons of the conflicting roles the writer declined the assignment. The decision to refuse the assignment as the board's "chief spokesman" came as a result of the discomfort felt about the possible negative effects that a dual role as building principal and "chief spokesman" might have on the administrative/staff relationships within the building.

Discomfort can be felt by a principal when he is requested to consider his allegiance to the bargaining process as well as his position as a building principal. The fact that superintendents expect, and often times demand, that the principal fully align himself with management philosophy and methods leaves the principal in conflict with the many considerations of the leadership role that he must play with the teaching staff. If, by the same token, the principal feels he must first pledge allegiance to the staff, the students and what is best for the educational program, he will probably associate discomfort with his expected role as a member of the management team.
Statement of the Problem

It was the writer's contention that school administrators in general, and specifically superintendents, can provide more meaningful relationships among administrative personnel if they recognize that an assignment of a building principal to a bargaining role on the board's team will probably create some feelings of discomfort on the principal's part. Because these feelings exist, the principal's chances of success with staff, students, other administrators, the superintendent, and community might very well be diminished.

To some extent the board and superintendent have delineated their respective roles in the bargaining process. The principal's involvement, however, and the possible conflict that is created by the various roles in the bargaining process, have not yet been studied satisfactorily. The very fact that the principalship as a middle management position places this person in a position which creates frustration about allegiance, feelings, and behavior. The writer developed the following questions to help define the direction of the study:

1. If the principal opts for total allegiance to management, will it be accomplished at the expense of successful administrative/staff relations?
2. Does a strong commitment to staff and positive staff relations cause the principal a concern and possible conflict with the role that must be played as a member of both the management and the board's bargaining team?
3. Will principals experience even greater concerns if they are associated in some way with the board's bargaining team?

4. Can a principal accept both the role of bargaining team member and building administrator and not be subject to any conflict or discomfort as a result of serving both roles?

The nature of this study, especially that aspect which deals with the principal's affect or feelings associated with the bargaining role, lends itself well to Festinger's Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. The writer has investigated several hypotheses that relate to Festinger's theoretical base. More specifically, the writer will study the feelings that principals experience as a result of the bargaining role assignment and the subsequent behaviors used to eliminate or reduce any felt dissonance.

This information will be collected in a face-to-face interview with forty principals. In addition, the writer will collect demographic data, data on bargaining team membership, data with reference to the selection of the principal on the team, and strike and impasse information through a questionnaire mailed to superintendents in Ohio and the interview held with principals. These types of data will be used to compare across region, type of school district, and wealth of school district. Frequency distributions will be constructed and tabulated for each profile and demographic type of question. In some instances, statistical analysis will be applied to determine both
representativeness of the sample to the state profile and to determine correlations between data.

The Superintendent's Questionnaire provided general data about a school district's procedures currently being used by a board of education in formal collective bargaining. This questionnaire was used for the first phase of the study and gathered, in part, data to be used for the second phase of data collection. In addition to asking general information, the questionnaire requested individual respondents to list the names of those principals that were involved in collective bargaining procedures for the board of education.

The individual questions included in the Superintendent's Questionnaire were compiled for three major reasons. The first was to gather information that would add to the "trend" data compiled in periodicals and studies over the past twenty years. Questions #1 and #2 deal directly at gathering data that indicate the latest trend in Ohio regarding formal bargaining and the principal's involvement.

The second rationale for including questions in the Superintendent's Questionnaire was to assist the writer with framing the sample of forty principal participants. Questions #8, #9 and #10 provided information about wealthy and non-wealthy types of districts and specific names of principals involved currently in the bargaining process at the local district level.

The third reason to include certain questions was to provide the writer information that would provide the state-wide data that
would hopefully show implications and relationships to the theoretical base of cognitive dissonance. An explanation of the Theory of Cognitive Dissonance is outlined extensively later in Chapter I. The Questions included in the questionnaire are Questions #3, #4, #6 and #7.

In addition to the above rationale for the construction of the Superintendent's Questionnaire, the Ohio School Boards Association had requested that some of the questions be included so that they could update data for the State of Ohio. These include Questions #1, #2 and #5.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be tested:

Hypothesis #1

Public school principals assigned to the board of education's bargaining team will experience feelings of discomfort (dissonance).

Hypothesis #2

Principals that experience feelings of dissonance from their assignment to the bargaining team will initiate behavior changes or changes in beliefs in order to reduce or eliminate any felt discomfort.

Hypothesis #3

Principals, unable to satisfactorily reduce or eliminate their feelings of dissonance, will be less successful in cultivating and maintaining positive relationships with students, parents, staff, administrative colleagues, and the superintendent.

Hypothesis #4

When dissonance is felt, the principal, in addition to attempting to reduce or eliminate the discomfort, will also try to avoid situations and/or information that would likely increase the discomfort.
Hypothesis #5

The degree (magnitude) of dissonance felt by the principal, as a result of the bargaining team assignment, will be increased if the alternatives (elements) considered are more nearly equal in attractiveness.

Hypothesis #6

The degree (magnitude) of dissonance felt by the principal, as a result of the bargaining team assignment, will be decreased if the alternatives (elements) considered are more unequal in attractiveness.

Theoretical Base

The writer selected the theoretical base as proposed by Festinger upon which to relate the study. The theory is described as the "Theory of Cognitive Dissonance." Festinger's theory simply states and is related to the idea that "an individual strives toward consistency within himself." The author proposes "that dissonance . . . is the existence of non-fitting relations among cognitions"; that is to say that cognitive dissonance can be seen as a condition which leads to an activity or effort oriented toward reducing a feeling of discomfort—dissonance. The basic hypotheses which Festinger states are as follows:

1. The existence of dissonance, being psychologically uncomfortable, will motivate the person to try to reduce the dissonance and achieve consonance.

2. When dissonance is present, in addition to trying to reduce it, the person will actively avoid situations and information that would likely increase the dissonance.
Dissonance occurs in almost all situations on a daily basis as new events happen or new information is known by a person which creates a momentary discomfort with existing knowledge, opinion or cognition concerning some behavior. A cognition is considered any knowledge, opinion or belief about the environment or about one's self.

Reduction of dissonance is a basic process in humans and can be accomplished in several ways. For example, if a cigarette smoker has learned that smoking is dissonant with the cognition that he continues to smoke. He might attempt to reduce the occurrence of dissonance in this example by either simply changing the cognition that smoking is bad for his health or he can reduce his dissonance by making the decision to stop smoking.

Festinger's theory describes that all knowledge, information or beliefs that a person experiences are known as "elements of cognition." These "elements" correspond, for the most part, with what a person actually does or feels, or what actually exists within the environment. Cognitive elements have either irrelevant, dissonant or consonant relationships. If two cognitive elements do not relate in any way or do not have anything to do with one another, then they are considered irrelevant to one another. If two elements do not fit together, they are considered as dissonant. Examples of dissonant elements would include the element that this same person, knowing he is in debt, went and purchased a new automobile. These two elements do not fit together or follow in a logical sequence. Two elements
are considered in a consonant relationship if one element follows from the other.

Brehm⁷ points out that "the amount of dissonance associated with a given cognition is a function of the importance of that cognition and the one with which it is dissonant. In general, a person may reduce dissonance by decreasing the number and/or importance of dissonant compared to consonant elements." Festinger⁸ points out that "all dissonant relations . . . are not of equal magnitude." The magnitude of dissonance, states Brehm⁹, "is also a function of the ratio of dissonant to consonant cognitions, where each cognitive element is weighted for its importance to the person. As the number and/or importance of dissonant cognitives increases, relative to the number and/or importance of consonant cognitives, the magnitude of dissonance increases." The reverse of Brehm's statement would describe the decrease in the magnitude of dissonance. For example, if a person gives ten cents to a beggar, knowing full well that the beggar is not really in need, the dissonance that exists between these two elements is rather weak as neither of the two cognitive elements is important to the person involved. Festinger¹⁰ summarizes his discussion concerning the magnitude of dissonance as follows:

1. "If two cognitive elements are relevant, the relation between them is either dissonant or consonant.

2. The magnitude of the dissonance (or consonance) increases as the importance or value of the elements increases.
3. The total amount of dissonance that exists between two clusters of cognitive elements is a function of the weighted proportion of all relevant relations between the two clusters that are dissonant."

The presence of dissonance will give rise to pressures to reduce or eliminate the dissonance. The strength of the pressures, states Festinger\textsuperscript{11}, "to reduce the dissonance is a function of the magnitude of the dissonance." Therefore, the greater the dissonance, the greater the action or effort to reduce the dissonance and the greater the effort to avoid situations or information that would increase the dissonance.

Festinger points out that there are three basic ways to eliminate or reduce dissonance. These include: (1) changing a behavioral cognitive element, (2) changing an environmental cognitive element, and (3) adding new cognitive elements. First, an example of a behavioral cognitive element change would be to change the action or feeling which the behavioral element represents. Secondly, a change in the environmental cognitive element could be accomplished by changing the physical environment, if possible. This is not as easily accomplished as making a change in the social environment. And finally, dissonance may be reduced or eliminated when new cognitive elements, such as a new opinion, or new information or belief, are gathered by a person as new cognitive elements.

Festinger\textsuperscript{12} also discusses the fact that some persons avoid dissonant relations and states that "under certain circumstances there are also strong and important tendencies to avoid increases in dissonance
or to avoid the occurrence of dissonance altogether." In addition, the person who fears dissonance may also lead to a reluctance to commit oneself behaviorally. Thus a person who buys a new car and is fearful of dissonance occurring, may immediately announce his conviction that he did the wrong thing.

The core of the theory of dissonance is stated by Festinger as follows:

1. "There may exist dissonant or 'non-fitting' relations among cognitive elements.
2. The existence of dissonance gives rise to pressures to reduce the dissonance and to avoid increases in dissonance.
3. Manifestations of the operation of these pressures include behavior changes, changes of cognition, and circumspect exposure to new information and new opinions."

Although the theory is "simple," states Festinger, it has widespread implications and applications to a variety of situations. In order to illustrate how the theory works, the writer will use a personal experience as an example. This example illustrates how dissonance may be aroused and reduced when a person makes a choice between two or more alternatives.

In August, 1969, the writer was appointed to the position of junior high school principal in a medium-sized city school district in Ohio. The board of education had appointed a new superintendent only a month prior. This superintendent, therefore, was not only unfamiliar to the writer but to other professional staff as well. After being on
the job only one week the writer was approached by the superintendent and his assistant and was requested to serve as "chief spokesman" for the board's bargaining team.

Not wanting to make a hurried decision, the writer requested time to consider the request. At the time of the first discussion the writer's primary concern was that the new role would require additional responsibilities and time to the already existing general assignment as principal. Prior to any final decision the superintendent made arrangements for the writer to attend a School Management Institute on Professional Negotiations.

Careful consideration was given to the request, and two alternatives were clarified. The first alternative would be that the writer willingly accept the additional responsibility as the board's "chief spokesman," and the second, that the bargaining role be declined. During the process of considering the two alternatives, the writer thought about those good (consonant elements) points and the bad (dissonant elements) points. A consideration of both good and bad points brought the writer to the decision to select the second alternative and, subsequently, declined the assignment as the "chief spokesman" for the board's team. The decision was based primarily on feelings regarding the position of principal and the importance of a positive relationship with staff. It was felt that if the bargaining role was accepted as well, the positive staff relationship might be jeopardized thus rendering the writer less effective as a building administrator. The decision brought a negative reaction from the superintendent,
manifested in his statement that "you put teachers ahead of your career."

Considering the example, what can be assessed about it in terms of Festinger's Theory of Cognitive Dissonance? During the process of reaching a decision regarding the alternatives, many cognitive elements were considered. These elements constituted the many considerations (pros and cons) that, in the final analysis, related to the writer's decision that could be lived with. There were good and bad points to each alternative. Some of the cognitives (acceptable and unacceptable elements) considered were consonant with what the writer thought was the best alternative. A consonant element, in this example, would be the importance of a positive relationship between the principal and his staff. Some cognitions were dissonant in nature. For example, how would the superintendent relate once the writer had declined the offer of assignment to the bargaining role? Both consonant and dissonant elements were weighed before a final decision was reached. As a result of the final decision, the writer experienced some dissonance consequence.

Brehm\textsuperscript{14} states, "the amount of dissonance experienced by the person depends on the ratio of dissonant to consonant elements, where each element is weighed according to its importance to him." Therefore, if the only dissonant element was that the superintendent would be negative as a result of the decision, one which really didn't bother the writer too much, then little dissonance would have been created. It could also be that a positive relationship with the superintendent was considered very important. If this be the case,
then a great deal of dissonance would have been created. In summation, the magnitude of the dissonance experienced will depend directly on the number and/or importance of dissonant cognitions relative to the number and/or importance of consonant cognitions.

The following statements may be made from the above example:

a) With the attractiveness of the chosen alternative held constant, the greater the attractiveness of the rejected alternative, the greater the magnitude of dissonance.

b) With the relative attractiveness of two alternatives held constant, the more attractive they both are, the greater the magnitude of dissonance.

c) With the attractiveness of two alternatives held constant the greater the amount of cognitive overlap (qualities in common) between them, the less the magnitude of dissonance.

Returning to the example in which the writer decided on Alternative Number Two, several possibilities (strategies for reducing dissonance are illustrated. In general, the writer might have reduced the number and/or importance of dissonant relative to consonant cognitive elements, or the writer might have tried to reduce the general importance of all of the relevant elements. What this means specifically is that to eliminate or reduce the importance of a dissonant element, such as realizing that a positive staff relationship was much more important than the relationship that might now be created with the superintendent as a result of deciding on Alternative Number Two.
At the same time, the writer might have to increase the number and/or importance of cognitions that are consonant with the decision to select Alternative Number Two, such as the fact that success as a principal was much more important to overall success in an administrative career.

Thirdly, the writer might have tried to eliminate dissonant cognitions and added consonant cognitions by trying to convince other people that the selection of Alternative Number Two was a much sounder position to be in, thereby gaining social support for the decision. And finally, the writer might have gone so far as to resign the position of principal and move to another job and community. This decision might leave behind all of the dissonant cognitions and consequences that came as a result of the situation.

The nature of the study, especially that aspect which deals with the principal's affect or feelings regarding a controversial and newly-created role, lends itself well to Festinger's theoretical concepts. The author's theoretical concept of dissonance relates directly to the process of decision making and, therefore, has many implications for this study. There are many theoretical concepts attached to the theory, not all of which the writer needs to utilize. Festinger's theory offers the writer a theoretical base for the intended study.

Importance of the Study

Collective bargaining, as it is presently emerging, has some very important implications for teacher/administrator relationships. The
outcome of the educational process will be a result of these relationships. The principal has both daily contact and communication with teaching staff and also direct responsibility to the superintendent for the day-to-day operation of the building. The principal, therefore, finds himself in a unique management position, concern for staff relations, and a commitment to support higher level management.

A thorough study of the feelings and subsequent behavior(s) of principals assigned a bargaining role on the board's team in addition to their assignment as a building principal may provide superintendents, other central office administrators, and boards of education with some insight about these assignments to the bargaining process. Many principals, as a result of the assignment, will not be able to develop a positive relationship with staff, parents, administrators, students, and others.

The hypotheses proposed by the writer for this study are closely drawn from Festinger's Theory of Cognitive Dissonance and, therefore, if supported by this investigation, will lend support to Festinger's theoretical base.

**Summary**

This chapter on The Problem has described the overall project to be studied. More specifically, this chapter has provided an introduction and historical perspective of collective bargaining in the public sector including the background of the problem, a statement of
the problem, several research objectives or hypotheses, a description of the study's theoretical base and the importance of the study. In addition the writer has included a lengthy background discussion in order to denote the purpose of the study.

The remainder of the study will be composed of four chapters. Chapter II will contain a review of the related literature, Chapter III will outline the specific methodology to be used, Chapter IV presents the data findings and Chapter V reports the analysis and recommendations.
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CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

A review of the related references to collective bargaining was found to be quite extensive since the early 1960's. The association of collective negotiations or bargaining and the public school principal over the past two decades have related primarily to the principal's role in the process of negotiation. It appears quite evident from the abundance of literature available that this topic is of major interest to the education profession especially in the past several years. A close look at the various articles found in the literature further clarifies some of the reasons why the role question is not completely resolved. Because of the large number of articles addressed to this subject, the writer has included a representative sample and discussion of only a cross section of the references and research studies that span a period of the past twenty years.

The literature reviewed indicates that the role of the principal in collective negotiations, has progressed from the role of no involvement or participation to one of full participation as a member of the board's bargaining team. This new administrative approach to formal organized bargaining with the local board for recognition and working conditions has only been effective for the past five years. Much of the recent literature deals primarily with the new effort on
the part of middle management administration (principals and supervisors) and leaves little doubt that this is the trend of things to come.

While a considerable amount has been written about the principal's role and the issue of collective negotiations the writer was not able to find any references which were directly relevant to this study. The writer will present a review of the literature associated with these aforementioned topics in three separate sections. First, the writer will include a section on the role of the principal in collective negotiations within the public school setting. Secondly, the current status regarding the effort of administrators (principals) and supervisors to organize their own ranks for the purpose of formally negotiating with boards of education will be discussed. Much of the other literature on the subject of collective negotiations deals with the subject from a general standpoint other than with relation to the principal. Thirdly, the writer will include a section reporting several studies that have been conducted relevant to the topic of the principal's role.

Role of the Principal

Hatch, in discussing the principal's role, starts with the statement "What must be kept in mind is that his (principal) role in negotiations would be related to and grow out of the role that he performs in the school system."\(^1\) This question of "overall" role definition is dealt with from several sources. Edwards supports Hatch's continuum by stating "... first a clarification of his total role
must be determined." Is it instructional leader or other role definition? "This difference between theory and practice," states Edwards, "is the primary reason why the principal's role in negotiations remains unsettled."

Hollister states that "the authority-accountability made of group interaction is becoming less acceptable while the participatory, direct confrontation mode is in." He further states that "after all isn't it American education that teaches these very same processes of participation as essential to democracy?" Stone reveals that "teachers and administrators working cooperatively for the good of students are rapidly being supplanted by the adversarial relationships of labor and management inherent in the bargaining process." Smith states that "some assert . . . the principal should be completely removed from the process, that his participation will reduce his effectiveness as an instructional leader. Others feel that the principal's involvement . . . will tend to lower faculty morale and will have a negative impact on the organizational of the school."

The suggestions that the primary role of the principal as instructional leader has implications for the negotiations process as it applies to the middle management position. "Because of the importance of the principal's role as the instructional leader," states Edward, "alienation of the principal by teachers reduces his effectiveness and thus jeopardizes the whole educational enterprise."

The implication, therefore, is one of harmony and open communication between the principal and his staff. If the principal is
involved directly with negotiations on the one hand, such as a member of the board's bargaining team, and attempting to communicate about instructional matters with the teachers (opposing side) in his/her building, surely his effectiveness becomes somewhat questionable. This is one of the prime reasons that the writer developed the current study.

For these reasons just mentioned, there are those that use the rationale for justifying the principal's role in negotiations on the "side" of the teachers. King states: "From the limited feedback we have gained, evidence shows that most often the principal is in accord with the objectives teachers seek and should be able to support these when their actions are compatible with the best interests of the educational program." 10

The National Education Association has consistently, at least until recently, suggested that principals can function within the local, state, and national association without conflict and defers the matter of including or excluding principals from membership in the local education (teacher) association as a matter of local option. The writer personally enjoyed the privilege of membership in a local education association in a medium-sized city school district (8,000 students) while at the same time serving as a junior high school principal. This was as recent as 1972.

The suggestion for having the principal align himself with the teachers' "side" during negotiations is illustrated by the case of
Randolf (Connecticut) Teachers Association as reported by Cronin. The RTA argued that "the association (RTA) should not only represent the teachers but also the building principals and other supervisors. Teachers felt that they and the principal shared the same professional concerns that could not be separated."\(^{11}\) King offers a set of arguments for including the principal as a part of the teachers' team. He outlines five arguments:

"1. Administrative and faculty concerns cannot rationally be separated.

2. A common sense approach to problems avoids coercion.

3. The process democratizes and actually strengthens administrative authority.

4. Both principals and teachers are agents of the board of education.

5. Involving principals will ensure that their major needs will be considered."\(^{12}\)

King's and Cronin's solution to the principals' dilemma of role placement in the process of negotiations as presented has some strong arguments for the late 60's to early 70's. These arguments provide a rationale and can be summarized as, (1) the importance of deferring the overall role of the principal in the educational setting, (2) the importance of holding to a minimum amount of conflict between the principal and his staff as they work together to improve the educational setting for children, and (3) allowing for an atmosphere of open and unrestrained communications between the principal and his staff.
While the scope of the literature regarding the principal's role and involvement with the process of collective bargaining presents the continuum from non-involvement to that of total involvement, there was a period of time during the early to mid-seventies when both the teachers and the top administration did not include the principal in fact or philosophy. They were in a no-man's land and not certain what their involvement should be. Neill states, "Principals are directly involved as members of district bargaining teams in a distinct minority of cases. Moreover it seems that top management opposes their inclusion at this level." On the other hand Hatch states that "principals in greater numbers are serving on school boards' teams and principals are more aggressively asking to be consulted on issues affecting school operation. "It is most important," he suggests, "that his expertise be used in the bargaining process." 

Another probable solution to the clarification of the principal's role in negotiations, and one that seems most natural, is the alignment of middle management as part of the board's team. Lieberman, addressing a group of administrators stated that "The principal and other middle management personnel must be considered in the negotiations' procedures and agreements—their ideas and feedback must be considered." The implication here suggests that the principal's role must be closely tied to that of the management team.

Another position supporting the principal's role with the management team concept is made by Shannon. He states, ". . . it follows
that the principal must be made an indispensable part of the management team's activities in developing and maintaining posture toward collective negotiations." His rationale stems from the position that the principal is the "key" to the successful administration of the agreements with teachers at the building level. In addition he feels that the principal and superintendent share a common identity of interests through the process as a school district management team.

Hatch reports that middle management in Salt Lake City, Utah, has one elementary and one secondary principal on the board's team. The principals serving on the team have felt that their positions in the school were not jeopardized by serving in this capacity. "Many such situations exist with little or no problems perceived by the management team concept. "Unfortunately," states Donavan, "It has become the duty of the principal to run the school according to the (negotiated) contract, which means that he must program and make determinations about the operation of the school on the basis of needs of the pupils." In essence, he is stating that the position of the principal is often times formed by many influences. The board of education, the central administration, and even the position of the teaching staff can dictate or force middle management or take a stand or perform a role of which they may be unsure of or uncomfortable.

Before leaving the topic of the management team concept as referenced by Hatch and Donovan, some mention should be made about the positions of the various professional administrative association
at both state and national levels. The American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Secondary School Administrators, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals all have policy statements regarding the principal's role in the negotiations process. While they do not state exactly the same concepts, they do follow the same general philosophy with regard to the importance of the management team concept. On the state level, for example, the Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators believes that school principals should be aligned with management for collective negotiations and should further serve in some direct role on the board's bargaining team, either as a member of or an advisor to the board's team.

A third and final role possibility should be at least mentioned for consideration even though it is not widely accepted by middle management. This role would divorce the principal from both "sides of the table." The implication being that he (the principal) would neither serve on the management team nor the teacher's organization for concerns dealing directly with negotiations. Bass supports this role by stating, "I'm suggesting that a principal be allowed to stay where his role of local school leader naturally places him, smack in the middle." By not being forced to form an allegiance with either side during negotiations, principals can probably avoid conflict with teachers and possibly the board of education. They may therefore, be able to maintain faith and trust from both sides.

Strengthening his argument, Bass states "By the nature of their job,
principals are closer to administrators and to teachers than either group is to each other, and principals know the policies and goals of the school board and the needs and aspiration of teachers."\(^{20}\)

While the role and involvement question has traversed the continuum from teacher association to the board's bargaining team, this has not been accomplished without the principal being concerned about his effectiveness with his staff. Templeton has indicated that, "Traditionally the principal has performed the role of being the representative of the board and superintendent to the teachers and the spokesman of the teachers to the board and superintendent. Consequently, the principal has maintained membership in two organizational families and acted as a communication link and part of the decision flow in the organization. Collective bargaining has affected this function of the principalship."\(^{21}\) Part of the writer's concern with this study is the contention that principals' involvement in the bargaining process will have some effect on those involved in the process. This rationale has some merit especially when reduction or elimination of conflict might be a reality between a principal, the instructional leader, and his staff.

Administrative organizations have and will continue to set guidelines for the management roles to be served throughout the negotiations process. The final outcome in philosophy regarding the appropriate role of the principal may need to take place before a more final position is reached. In large systems, e.g., Akron,
Canton, Cleveland, Cincinnati, etc., the professional administrative organization recommends that the principals and other middle management personnel form their own negotiating team and bargain directly with the board of education. This newest of positions may well cause additional concern as to the principal's role and position in the collective negotiations process. More will be said about this new development in the next section of the chapter.

Principals Organize for Bargaining

According to some of the literature, principals have been forced to organize themselves to bargain with the local board of education because they have not been included in the negotiations process between the board and the teachers. This dilemma will briefly be mentioned but is included only so as to capture the total scope of the role discussion.

Borca states, "The sense that their (principals') authority has been eroded through teacher negotiations has been one of the major motivating factors in the movement to form separate bargaining units."22 "There is very little doubt," states Smith, "that an increasing number of principals are interested in forming administrator negotiating units."23 He feels that this process would increase the impact of middle management administrators in policy development and decision making. Cooper reports "the emergence of collective bargaining specifically for middle managers in education, however, signals that these administrators feel top management no longer protects their
interest and that membership in teacher unions would not benefit them.\textsuperscript{24} Cooper presents data (listed below) that illustrate what was taking place in administrator unions by eight major states in 1975.

### Distribution of Administrator Unions by Major States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Districts</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Administrator Unions</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts with Unions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>587 (605)*</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>998</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Officially, New Jersey has 605 school districts, but only 587 have functioning school boards. The lower figure, 578, was used in the calculations.

"It is apparent that laws and practice in education will lead school administrators in increasing numbers to form coalitions of supervisory personnel and to negotiate contracts collectively." It is further felt that "the more active the teachers, the more likely the administrators are to collectivize."\textsuperscript{26}

### Selected Research Studies

The writer has selected several in-depth research projects to report from the literature that have some implications for the writer's own research project. These projects reported were selected from at least eight that were reviewed in the literature.
A doctoral dissertation written by Bardall in 1976 deals with the analysis of the role of a sample of Ohio public school principals by ascertaining the perceptions of this role by principals, superintendents and heads of teacher organizations. The author selected the following research questions for analysis:

1. What is the current participation of principals in the collective negotiation process?

2. What are the perceptions of principals, superintendents and heads of teacher organizations regarding the principals' most effective role in the negotiations process?

3. What effect, if any, does involvement in collective negotiations have on the leadership role of the principal?

The study indicates that public school principals in Ohio are actively involved in collective negotiations as part of the management-team and, in addition, participate as members of the board's bargaining team at the table in negotiations with teachers. There is clear evidence from the study that principals in Ohio are not members of the teachers negotiating unit. In addition, the study reports that there is widespread agreement among principals, teachers and superintendents that the leadership role of the principal is being altered as a result of the principal's involvement in the negotiation process. "While Ohio school principals," states Bardall, "see themselves distinctly on the side of management so far as collective negotiations are concerned, and believe along with the superintendents that the need of teachers will be better met if they are on that side, the
principals also agree (70 percent) that they should form their own negotiating unit and bargain with the board of education."  

Several implications are apparent for the writer's study. However, one significant point that the author concludes is that, "There is strong evidence to indicate that teachers feel that principals should play a neutral role in negotiations, neither being involved with the board team nor participating in the teacher's union." The implication rests with the teachers' perception of neutrality. The teachers must perceive, as the writer does, that some sort of conflict is created or exists when the principal becomes involved in the process of negotiations on the board's side.

Another study was conducted in 1972 that investigated how teachers, superintendents and principals perceive the role of the principal in the negotiations process. Urich included school districts within Indiana and Michigan in order to compare data from a state which has a collective negotiation law (Michigan) with one that does not (Indiana).

The specific question investigated in this study was: Are there differences in perceptions and attitudes concerning the role of the principal in collective negotiations associated with the following variables:

1. teachers, superintendents and principals,
2. rural, urban and central city districts and,
3. existence of statewide collective negotiations statutes?
The study clearly indicates that the person’s position in the school system was the most significant variable in determining the role in collective negotiations. It appears that the state and size of the school district, which the participants were from, had less of an effect on their beliefs. "The study also reveals," states Ulrich, "a behavior pattern of teachers that denies the principal from having an important role in collective negotiations while superintendents are anxious to align the principal on the side of the school board and function as a member of the management team."31

The third study reviewed was a doctoral dissertation conducted by Skinner in 1974. The purpose of this investigation is outlined in the following problem statement:

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceived role of the principal in collective negotiations as viewed by elementary and secondary teachers, elementary and secondary principals, superintendents and school board members in Florida.32

The author ascertained the various perceptions through the use of an instrument comprised of three scales of seven items each. These three scales were represented as follows:

1. Management Model Scale
   - principal represented the superintendent and school board in negotiations.

2. Neutral Model Scale
   - principal is a resource person for both sides or stays out of negotiations.

3. Collaborative Model Scale
   - teachers and principals negotiate jointly with the school board.
Conclusions drawn from this study are listed as follows:

1. Educators with different employment responsibilities have different perceptions of the principal's role in negotiations.

2. Educators with similar job responsibilities, in different areas of the state, have similar perceptions of the principal's role in negotiations.

3. Superintendents have formulated the strongest opinions of the role of the principal in negotiations as indicated by generally more extreme scores than characterized the other employment categories.

4. Instructional level (i.e., elementary and secondary) has no significant effect on the perceptions of teachers or principals concerning the principal's role in negotiations.

The author of the study delineates three implications from his research. One of these has importance to this writer's research, namely, "superintendents may need to initiate communication with subordinates and school board members to bring their perceptions of the principal's role into close agreement."³³

The fourth and final study that this writer reviewed was completed by Triken in 1973 as a doctoral dissertation. It was selected for review since some of the findings with regard to the principal's role and involvement are in contrast to the earlier investigation reported by Bardall, 1976. The purpose of the study was "to delineate the position of the school principal as an entity in collective negotiations as perceived by principals who have had experience in the negotiations process."³⁴

The participants in the study were school principals from seven states all having collective bargaining statutes in effect prior to
1966. The study instrument was a questionnare designed to elicit perceptions of actual and ideal practices in twelve general areas developed from the purposes of the study. The major findings are listed as follows:

"1. Principals were most often represented by the same association that represented the teachers, which was the local education association.

2. Principals are not commonly included as participants on the negotiating team, but ideally desired to participate.

3. Principal's salaries were most often tied to a teacher salary schedule and have remained proportional to that schedule.

4. The majority of the principals preferred to be represented by a principals association. Strong support was also indicated for the administrative team concept.

5. Principals do perceive that they are included in the negotiations process to a statistically significant level.

6. The majority of the management rights clauses in the contract were either specifically stated management rights clauses or broadly stated clauses with limiting phrases, both of which are relatively strong rights clauses, according to criteria suggested in a Killingsworth paper.

7. Principals perceived that they have experienced a loss of management rights, but ideally projected no change or an increase in management rights. No relationship was found between the strength of the management rights clauses and the perceptions of principals to management rights.

8. The majority of the grievance procedures examined were similar in five areas: grievance definition, written grievances, association screening committee, statute of limitations, and definite time limits."
Some of the findings of this study are surprising in that they contrast many of the circumstances with regard to the principal's level and sophistication of involvement in the negotiations process on the board's team, at least in Ohio.

The writer reviewed a number of the references reporting labor negotiations from the private sector and was unable to find any literature or studies that related the middle management supervisor with the principal found in the public sector. What few articles that did discuss middle management supervisors, none dealt with the role of middle management in the collective negotiations process as it related to the affect felt by those individuals involved in the process.

Summary

The related literature indicates that much has been written over the past twenty years about the principal and collective negotiations. By far, the majority of the references and research investigations have dealt with the principal's role and position in the negotiation process. The literature indicates that the principal's role has changed considerably since the early 1960's from one of little or no involvement in the process to one of unionizing middle management so as to improve their status and position by bargaining directly with the board of education.

Several research studies were cited and discussed that had implications for the writer's investigation. These implications
related directly to the perceptions that teachers had of the principal's
role and involvement in the formal process of collective negotiations.

This chapter presented a review of the related literature.

Chapter III will discuss the procedure followed in conducting the study.
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CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This study is both descriptive and analytical in nature, designed to test several hypotheses derived from Festinger's (1957) Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. The theory helps to support the writer's contention that public school principals, when assigned some role with the process of collective bargaining as a member of the board's team, will experience some dissonance and feelings of discomfort as a result of the assignment. The purpose of the study's design, to collect data by means of a general questionnaire and personal in-depth interviews, allowed the writer to better determine the affect that principals experienced and the subsequent strategies or behaviors they used to reduce their dissonant feelings.

This section presents a discussion of the population and sampling process, the development of Superintendent's Questionnaire and Principal's Interview Schedule, and the procedures used in data collection. In addition, the methods of data analysis are described.

Selection of the Population/Sample

All public school superintendents in Ohio from both City and Local (county) school districts were surveyed by questionnaire. Other types of school districts, such as Exempted Village and Joint Vocational Schools (JVS), were not included for purposes of this study. The purpose of the Superintendent's Questionnaire was to gather
information regarding the status of the school district board in
the formal process of collective bargaining and the involvement of
both elementary and secondary school principals and the various types
of roles that they may be serving on the board of education's bargain-
ing team. To initiate and encourage superintendents to respond to
the questionnaire, a letter of endorsement written by David B.
Martin, Executive Vice President, Ohio School Boards Association, was
mailed to 566 school districts in February, 1981. The questionnaire,
letter of instructions, and the letter of endorsement are included as
Appendixes A, B, and C.

In order to pilot test and survey instrument, the questionnaire
was mailed to nine central office administrators. The administrators
were asked to answer each question and make any written comments about
those items that needed change or clarification. The pilot test pro-
cEDURE was conducted by mail in December, 1980, and included persons
currently serving as superintendents, central office administrators,
and principals. The test procedure attempted to lend validity to the
instrument and also assist the writer in identifying any problems that
exist in the content.

The sample phase of the study was designed to draw a stratified
random sample of principals that represents the population and inter-
view that sample of participants using a structured interview schedule.
Each principal listed on the respondent questionnaire will be strati-
fied according to region, type of district and wealth. In order for
principals to be included in the actual population they must meet the following criteria:

1. Principals currently employed by a City or Local school district.

2. Principals who have served the board's bargaining team in at least one of the following roles:
   a. chief spokesman
   b. team member
   c. advisor to the team

3. Principals assigned to the board's bargaining team were selected for the assignment by one of the following:
   a. volunteered
   b. volunteered after request of superintendent
   c. appointed by the superintendent
   d. appointed by the board of education
   e. appointed by other central office administrator

The actual population included only those principals reported by respondents as serving in some capacity with the board's bargaining team. This population did not include those districts reporting principals' participation when respondents fail to list the names of principals participating.

Each school district that responded having principals that meet the above criteria were stratified into one of the five Ohio School Boards Association Regions. The five regional designations include:
(1) Northwest Region comprising twenty counties, (2) Northeast Region comprising nineteen counties, (3) Southwest Region comprising seventeen counties, (4) Central Region comprising fourteen counties, and (5) South-east Region comprising seventeen counties. It must be noted that the regional distribution represented a disproportionate allocation of districts throughout the regions. Regions are geographic designation and, therefore, include a no set number of school districts.

Respondent districts reporting that they do not involve principals in the bargaining process and those respondent districts not listing the names of principals involved were not included in the actual population of principals from which the representative sample was drawn. These districts were excluded from consideration during the sampling process.

From the total actual population of principals compiled from the respondent questionnaires the writer drew a stratified random sample of forty individuals. The individuals included in the sample served as the basis for data collection. These data were collected through individual in-depth interviews. The Sample Matrix was composed of eight cells for each of the five regional designations. Each region was composed of four principals from a City district and four principals from a Local district. Each of the types of districts described was further represented by (1) two principals from wealthy districts, and (2) two principals from non-wealthy districts.

The variable of wealth is defined by a school district's per pupil expenditure. For purposes of this study the writer used two reports published on per pupil expenditure for the 1978-79 school year. These reports were prepared by the Ohio Public Expenditure Council and the
Ohio Department of Education. Each report reflects the per pupil expenditure by City, Exempted Village, Local, and JVS district for a period beginning July 1, 1978, and ending June 30, 1979. Information on Exempted Village and JVS districts was not used for purposes of this study.

A wealthy City school district is defined as one that expended $1,450 and more per pupil during the 1978-79 school year, while a non-wealthy City district is defined as having expended $1,449 or less during the same period of time. A wealthy Local school district is defined as one that expended $1,150 and more per pupil during the 1978-79 school year, while a non-wealthy Local district is defined as having expended $1,149 or less during the same period of time.

The stratified random sample of principals was drawn for each of the five regions by a method developed to select principals randomly from the regional listing. The sampling process was accomplished approximately seven weeks from the date that the original 566 Superintendent's Questionnaires were mailed.

The writer mailed a follow-up letter and another copy of the questionnaire to all of those superintendents not responding within three weeks from the date of the original mailing. It was decided that if at the end of the seven weeks, the percentage of responses was less than 70 percent, the writer would mail one additional follow-up letter and then hold off the sampling procedure for two more weeks. The writer received responses from 92 percent of questionnaires mailed within the seven weeks.
The stratified random sample was made for each region through the use of a Table of Random Numbers. When selecting the principals from each district, if the district had only one principal listed this principal was taken. If the district selected had two or more principals listed, then the writer drew numbers from a hat in order to select the principal for the sample matrix. The sample in each region included four principals from both City and Local school districts and was further even divided into wealthy and non-wealthy, two for each school district.

The final sample (N = 40) of potential participants was initially contacted by letter (Appendix F) with an explanation as to why and how they were selected for the sample with a brief explanation as to the purpose of the study. The letter also requested the potential participant to agree to actively participate in the interview phase of the study. The writer then made a follow-up telephone call to each potential participant within seven days from the date the letter was mailed. The purpose of the phone call was to talk personally to the potential participant so as to further clarify the study and to get the individual to agree to participate in a face-to-face interview. At the time the call was made, the writer tentatively scheduled a date, time, and place for the participant interview. Interviews with the forty participants were scheduled and completed during April and May 1981. All forty potential participants selected in the stratified sample agreed to participate in the interview.
Variables Considered

The stratified random sample was constructed with three independent variables in mind. These variables are: (1) Region, (2) Type of School District, and (3) Wealth of District. The variable of Region includes the five geographical areas of the state that were described earlier in this chapter. The five Regions provided for some comparability once data were collected and analyzed. The second variable, Type of School District, includes only two of the five kinds of school districts in the state, those being City and Local. Both City and Local types were selected since they are by far the greatest in number and most common type found in the State of Ohio. Finally, the variable of Wealth of District is included. This variable defines the amount of dollars that a district has to spend on the basis of per pupil expenditure. This factor varies from school district to school district and will depend both on taxable property (total valuation) and student enrollment.

Instrument Construction and Composition

Superintendent's Questionnaire

A ten-item questionnaire, designed to elicit information about composition of a local school board's bargaining team, was mailed to all superintendents of City and Local (county) school districts. The questionnaire (Appendix A) was composed of a single sheet of paper designed to be answered quickly by the district superintendent or central office administrator. The Ohio School Boards Association printed and mailed the 566 questionnaires and provided return postage for those districts responding. The questionnaires were mailed during the last week in February 1981.
At the end of a three-week response period in mid-March 1981, a follow-up letter (Appendix D) and questionnaire were mailed to the district superintendents not responding. The purpose of the Superintendent's Questionnaire was to gather specific information about a school district's involvement in the process of collective bargaining and, more specifically, the role(s) that principals may be involved in with the board of education's bargaining team. The questionnaire contains items that will define various roles and, in addition, provides for the respondent to list the names of those principals that have been involved with the bargaining process.

If a respondent chose not to divulge the name(s) of a principal or principals involved with the bargaining team or if a respondent district did not have principals involved with the bargaining team, the district was not included in the five-region population stratification.

**Principal's Interview Schedule**

Since data from principals were collected through the use of the interview technique, the writer developed a comprehensive interview schedule. This interview schedule or questionnaire (see Appendix E) was used in a face-to-face interview with the sample of forty principals that agreed to take an active part in the research project.

The individual questions included in the interview schedule were designed to answer each of the research objectives or stated hypotheses. The six hypotheses written are associated with Festinger's (1957) Theory of Cognitive Dissonance.
Follow-up Letter to Superintendents

A follow-up letter (see Appendix D) dated March 23, 1981, was mailed to all superintendents who had not responded by March 20, 1981. Enclosed with the follow-up letter was a copy of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. The superintendents were again provided with a stamped envelope for return of the questionnaire. The return envelope was addressed to the writer's home address instead of the Ohio School Boards Association. This was done so that the writer could separate the original responses from those that were received as a result of the follow-up.

In order for the Superintendent's Questionnaire to be used in the sampling process for selecting principals they had to be received by the writer not later than April 10, 1981. Questionnaires received after this date were included in the data tabulation and analysis; however, they could not provide names for the principal's sampling. Questionnaires were received as late as July 1981. The writer is pleased to report that 92 percent of the Superintendent's Questionnaires were returned and tabulated. This percentage of return was much greater than expected.

Schedule of Participant Interview

As earlier indicated, a sample of forty potential participants was randomly selected for in-depth interviews. These interviews were conducted by the writer. A follow-up phone call was made to sample participants in order to encourage their agreement to participate and to tentatively schedule a date, time, and place for the interview. The writer traveled throughout the five regions of the state conducting the
interviews with those individuals selected in the sample. At least a one-hour period of time was arranged for administering the Principal's Interview Schedule. Since the forty sample principals were located in all geographical areas of Ohio, the writer scheduled and conducted the interviews by region. This procedure was used to reduce both travel time and expenses.

Collection and Analysis of Data

The data for this study were collected in two phases. In Phase I both general and specific data were collected through the use of a ten-item questionnaire mailed to all City and Local superintendents in the State of Ohio. This questionnaire is entitled Superintendent's Questionnaire on Collective Bargaining (see Appendix A). These data constitute part of the primary dependent variables.

The data collected in Phase I provided information about the administration's and the board of education's involvement in the process of collective bargaining with the teacher employee group. In addition, responses provided the writer with the names of individual principals that were serving in some role with the board's bargaining team.

Phase II data were collected during a structured interview with a stratified sample of forty principals. The Principal's Interview Schedule (Appendix E) constituted the balance of the primary dependent variables for the study. The interview schedule was comprised of thirty-one open and closed questions that were administered to the sample of forty principals by the writer on site in each participant's school district.
The primary independent variables in the study are: (1) region of the state, (2) type of school district (City or Local), and (3) factor of wealth. These variables were used to analyze data collected through the questionnaire by showing comparisons, percentage of frequency, and other statistical analysis.

Data from Superintendent's Questionnaire

The Superintendent's Questionnaire comprises ten questions that provided data for the following general areas:

1. existence of formal bargaining team.
2. principals' participation on the bargaining team.
3. methods for selecting principal for the bargaining team.
4. specific role of the principal on the bargaining team.
5. information about impasse and strikes.
6. information on student enrollment and wealth of district.
7. names of principals having been or currently involved with the bargaining team.

An explanation as to how the collected data will be analyzed for each of the ten questions from the Superintendent's Questionnaire follows.
Question #1

Responses were tabulated. Both the Yes and No responses were arranged in a table to show the percentage distribution of those responding districts having and those not having a formal bargaining team. These data are shown for the state and, in addition, are displayed by the dimensions of region, type of school district, and wealth of district with percentages calculated for each.

The matrix below illustrates the format described above. Each region is comprised of eight cells with a total $N=40$.

Question #2

Responses were tabulated to show both the frequency by state and the frequency by each of the three independent variables. For those respondents answering Yes to the question, an additional dimension of school year was added to the analysis format described in Question #1. Those districts responding No about the principals' involvement were tabulated along with the Yes responses and shown as a percentage for region, type of district, and wealth of district with percentage calculations being made for each.

Question #3

These responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format for Question #1. Percentages were also calculated on the basis of volunteered and appointed. The writer compared the responses of the forty principals with those responses to the same question asked district superintendents in order to compare the match. A Chi-Squared Goodness of Fit test was used to check the representativeness of the responses of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of District</td>
<td>City Local</td>
<td>City Local</td>
<td>City Local</td>
<td>City Local</td>
<td>City Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>N=40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the forty principals with those overall responses by the superintendents in the state.

Question #4

Responses were tabulated according to the format described in Question #1 with the added dimensions of each of the three school years and the types of participants. Percentages were calculated for each school year and arranged by state data and variables of region, type of district and wealth of district.

Question #5

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1. The writer presented information from the responses of the forty principals with those responses to the same question asked district superintendents in order to compare the match. A Chi-Squared Goodness of Fit test of analysis was used to check the representativeness of the responses of the forty principals with those overall responses to this question by the superintendents in the state.

Question #6 and Question #7

Responses to these two questions were tabulated as described in Question #1 with the addition of the dimension of school years with percentages being calculated by state data and each of the variables of region, type of district, and wealth of district. A Chi-Squared Goodness of Fit test was used to compare the responses of the superintendents to those of each principal from that respective district. A correlation was made of only those principals indicating dissonance with each year where impasse or strike is indicated.
Question #8

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1. Percentages were reported for the state profile along with those variables of region, type of district, and wealth of district. No additional statistical analysis was made.

Question #9

These data were used to categorize districts within regions and type of district as either wealthy or non-wealthy prior to the final sample being drawn. All district data were reported into means, standard deviation, and a frequency of comparison of Chi-Squared results.

Question #10

These data were only used to build the actual population frame from which the sample was drawn. Each principal's name meeting the criteria was placed in a stratified listing along with the school district's name as part of the final population. See Methodology Section on Selection of the Population/Sample for a detailed explanation.

Data from Principal's Interview Schedule

The Principal's Interview Schedule is composed of three major sections. These are: (1) Demographic Data, (2) Team Membership Data, and (3) Data on Feelings and Actions.

Section I is composed of seven questions designed to elicit important demographic data about sample participants and the length of time that principals have been involved as a member of the board of education's bargaining team. Section II is composed of nine questions designed to gather data about the participant's membership, including
method of selection and the specific role played on the bargaining team. Section III is composed of a combination of fifteen questions. These are designed to elicit and record those feelings and actions reported by the sample participants relevant to their attempt to reduce or eliminate any felt discomfort as a member of the bargaining team. This section of questions deals directly with testing each of the research objectives or hypotheses. The questions in the interview schedule were analyzed as described in the following paragraphs.

Section I, Demographic Data

Question #1

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. The data were reported as a mean and standard deviation for each dimension of the matrix format plus a grand total mean and standard deviation. The writer used a three (3) way analysis of variance to show any difference that might be present by region, type of district, and the factor of wealth.

Question #2 and Question #3

The responses to these two questions were tabulated the same as for Question #1 above.

Question #4

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A new dimension was added to the matrix for each of the three responses listed with a frequency distribution being reported and a percentage being calculated.
Question #5

These responses were tabulated the same as described for Question #4 above with the addition of the new dimension as described by the four choices in the question.

Question #6

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. Percentage of Yes and No responses were reported. A Point-Biserial correlation coefficient was done to see if the incidence of impasse correlates with amount of dissonance reported by sample participants. Dissonance is defined as any score of seven or above on the criteria provided for in Question #1, Section III, Principal's Interview Schedule. Non-dissonance is defined as any score of six or below on the same criteria in Question #1, Section III, Principal's Interview Schedule.

Question #7

These responses were tabulated the same as described in Question #6 above.

Section II, Team Membership Data

Question #1

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. Four new dimensions were added to the matrix, reported in four separate tables, for each of the six school years plus a sum calculated. A Pearson-Product Moment correlation coefficient was done to see if the number of years
correlates with the incidence of dissonance reported by principal participants.

Question #2

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A new dimension was added to the matrix for each of the three choices used in the question. A frequency distribution was reported and a percentage calculated for each dimension.

Question #3

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A frequency distribution was reported and a percentage calculated.

Question #4

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A new dimension was added to the matrix for each of the three choices used in the question. A frequency distribution was reported and a percentage calculated for each dimension. A Point-Biserial correlation coefficient was done to see if choice versus no choice correlates with participants incidence of dissonance.

Question #5

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A new dimension was added to the matrix for each of the five choices used in the
question. A frequency distribution is reported and a percentage calculated for each dimension. A Chi-Squared Goodness of Fit test was done to examine the relationship between those principals that volunteered to be on the team and those that were appointed to the team.

Question #6

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A new dimension was added to the matrix for the four choices used in the question. A frequency distribution was reported and a percentage calculated for each dimension.

Question #7

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A new dimension was added to the matrix for the three choices used in the question. A frequency distribution was reported and a percentage calculated for each dimension. A Point-Biserial correlation coefficient was done to see if any correlation exists between Yes and No responses and the principals indication of dissonance. The choice of Not Certain was combined with No responses.

Question #8

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format for Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A new dimension was added to the matrix for the four choices used in the question. A frequency distribution was reported and a percentage calculated for each dimension.
Question #9

Responses were tabulated by percentage as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A frequency distribution was reported and a percentage calculated.

Section III, Data on Feelings and Actions

The questions in this section of the interview schedule were designed to determine the existence and degree of dissonance felt by principal participants as a subsequent experience of their bargaining team assignment. In addition, some of the questions attempted to determine what actions were taken to reduce or eliminate any apparent dissonance. Special treatment designed to analyze the questions in this section is described in the following paragraphs.

Question #1

Responses were tabulated for each of three continua (comfortable-uncomfortable, harmonious-dissonant, pleasurable-painful) feelings with raw scores being reported for each category of personnel. The tabulation was completed by using the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. The first level of analysis includes a calculation of the mean and standard deviation statistics for all levels of independent variables plus all categories of personnel. Both sum and marginal calculations were made for each part of the analysis matrix. In addition, a percentage for dissonance and non-dissonance was calculated for all categories of personnel with a total calculation being computed across all categories.
The second level of analysis includes a three-way analysis of variance. This statistic allows for a main-effect analysis to be obtained for each independent variable. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #1.

Question #2-A

Narrative responses were tabulated for each category of personnel reported on, then grouped, into sets of similar responses. A frequency distribution of these major sets of responses is reported. These data were used to assist the writer when completing the discussion in Chapter IV.

Question #2-B

Narrative responses were tabulated for each category of personnel reported on, then grouped into sets of similar responses. A frequency distribution of these major sets of responses was reported. These data were used to assist the writer when completing the discussion in Chapter IV. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #1.

Question #3-A

Responses were tabulated as described in Question #2-A and Question #2-B, Section III, Principal's Interview Schedule.

Question #3-B

Responses were tabulated as described in Question #2-A and Question #2-B, Section III, Principal's Interview Schedule. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #1.
Question #4

Responses were tabulated by each category reported in the analysis format described in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A frequency distribution was made and percentage calculated for each level of the matrix. This question and subsequent data were primarily used to make a final determination if any dissonance might be reported for any category by respondent before closing the interview at this point. If the respondent, at this point, indicated having had any degree of uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings the interviewer moved to Question #2-B, Section III, Principal's Interview Schedule and continued the questioning with the respondent for those categories that dissonance was indicated. If more than one participant of the total of forty (N=40) took this route on this question, the writer had to recalculate those dissonant and non-dissosnent percentages in Question #1, Section III, Principal's Interview Schedule.

Question #5

Responses were tabulated for each category of personnel for each of the three response choices with raw scores being reported in the same analysis format described in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A frequency distribution was reported for each choice of the new dimension. A Point-Biserial correlation coefficient was done to see if any correlation exists between participants' responses and the fact that they reported having dissonance according to the definition of dissonance found in Question #1, Section III, Principal's Interview Schedule. The correlation was made by combining the choices of to a great extent and to some extent. It was possible that fewer than forty
principal participants answered this question due to the report of non-dissonance by some respondents. This question and analysis tests Hypothesis #2.

Question #6-A

Narrative responses were tabulated for each category of personnel reported on and then grouped, if possible, into sets of similar responses. A frequency distribution, by code, was reported with the percentage of participants able to reduce or eliminate dissonance and a percentage for those unable to reduce or eliminate dissonance. It is possible that fewer than forty principal participants may be answering this question due to the report of non-dissonance by some respondents. This question and analysis tests Hypothesis #2.

Question #6-B

Narrative responses were tabulated the same way as described in Question #6-A, Section III, Principal's Interview Schedule. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #2.

Question #7

Narrative responses were tabulated for each category reported and then grouped into sets of similar responses. A frequency distribution, by code, was reported. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #2.
Question #8

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format for Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A frequency distribution was made and percentages calculated for each dimension. A Point-Biserial correlation coefficient was done to see if any correlation exists with a response of easy or hard and the dissonance reported by participants. It was possible that fewer than forty principal participants might be answering this question due to the report of non-dissonance by some respondents. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #5 and Hypothesis #6.

Question #9

Responses were tabulated with raw scores being reported for each category of personnel. Individual scores of two points or less indicated a lesser degree of dissonance and a score of three points or more indicated a greater degree of dissonance. A frequency distribution was made, by category of personnel, showing incidence of lesser or greater degree of dissonance. It was possible that fewer than forty principal participants might be answering this question due to the report of non-dissonance by some respondents. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #5 and Hypothesis #6.

Question #10

Responses were tabulated as described in the analysis format in Question #1 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. A new dimension was added to the matrix that included each of the three choices listed in the question. A frequency distribution was made and percentages
calculated for each dimension. No additional statistical analysis will be made. It was possible that fewer than forty principal participants might be answering this question due to the report of non-dissonance by some respondents. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #3.

Question #11

Narrative responses were tabulated for each category of personnel reported on and then grouped into sets of similar responses. A frequency distribution, by code, was reported. In addition, a frequency distribution and percentage calculated for all Yes and No responses to the question. It was possible that fewer than forty principal participants might be answering this question due to the report of non-dissonance by some respondents. This question and analysis described above tests Hypothesis #4.

Question #12

Responses were tabulated for each of the points on the continuum with raw scores being reported. The tabulation was made in the analysis format described in Question #10 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire. The first level of analysis includes a calculation of the mean and standard deviation statistic for all levels of independent variables plus all categories of personnel. Both sum and marginal calculations were made for each part of the analysis matrix. In additional, a percentage for dissonance and non-dissonance was calculated for all categories of personnel with a total calculation being computed across all categories. The second level of analysis includes an analysis of variance. In
addition, a Pearson-Product moment correlation coefficient was made be­
tween Question #1 and Question #12, Section III, Principal's Interview
Schedule.

Summary

This section on Methodology describes the design of the study used
to ascertain data in order to provide answers to the objectives stated.
More specifically, this section provides the sequence of events inherent
in this investigation from its inception to the point of statistical
analysis.

The section includes a discussion of the description of the total
and "actual" population and the selection of the stratified random sam­
ple, both the independent and dependent variables, instrument construc­
tion including the Superintendent's Questionnaire and the Principal's
Interview Schedule, the procedure for conducting participant interviews,
statistical procedures used to analyze the data, and a section on prob­
lems encountered during the data collection phase of the study.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The findings of the study are presented in this Chapter. The focus of the study was on the public school principal in Ohio and the positive or negative affect felt by principals when they were assigned as a member of the board of education's bargaining team. These data are presented statistically in table format with the narrative data collected being included in the Appendices.

Data collection for the study was completed in two phases. First, a questionnaire was mailed to 566 superintendents of both City and Local school districts in Ohio. The Superintendent's Questionnaire (Appendix A) contained ten questions. The writer received a response return of 93.5 percent with only one follow-up letter. Seven of the 519 questionnaires were not answered satisfactorily and, therefore, could not be included in the analysis of data. The writer feels that there were three primary reasons for the high percentage of return. These reasons included: (1) the survey document only contained ten questions on one sheet of paper, (2) the topic with regards to collective bargaining is a timely topic with school administrators, and (3) Mr. Martin's letter carrying OSBA's endorsement had a great deal of clout with superintendents.
From the Superintendent's Questionnaire the names of principals were compiled into five areas of the state known as regions. These regions were designated by the Ohio School Boards Association. A stratified random sample of forty principals was interviewed by the writer using the Principal's Interview Schedule (Appendix E). The writer traveled over 4,000 miles throughout Ohio collecting specific data from the forty principals in the sample. All principals identified for the sample agreed to an interview, therefore, the writer reports that a 100 per cent response to the interview schedule was completed. This response is worth noting in that these data analyses were completed with no missing information from the sample.

The independent variables used in the study included (1) region, (2) type of school district (City and Local), and (3) wealth of district (wealthy or non-wealthy based on per pupil expenditure for the 1978-79 school year). The dependent variables include all of the questions on both the Superintendent's Questionnaire and the Principals Interview Schedule.

Most of the data collected in both phases of data collection were analyzed and are presented in table form by a three-way analysis format matrix. This matrix is outlined as follows.

Phase I Data Analysis - Superintendent's Questionnaire

These data collected on each of the ten questions from the Superintendent's Questionnaire were analyzed according to the Analysis Format Matrix using the three independent variables of 1) region, 2) type of district, and 3) wealth. These data were analyzed by each of the three variables to determine similarities or differences. When these data
## ANALYSIS FORMAT MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of District</td>
<td>City Local</td>
<td>City Local</td>
<td>City Local</td>
<td>City Local</td>
<td>City Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflected major differences by region, type of district or wealth the writer reported these differences among variables.

The analysis of these data from each dependent variable contained in the Superintendent's Questionnaire is presented in this chapter as a discussion of the analysis for each variable in a table or appendix to show the reader what is being reported.

Superintendents were asked to indicate whether their district (the board) had a bargaining team that formally negotiated with teachers. These data were analyzed according to the Analysis Format Matrix. It was found that a greater majority of districts responding, by far, reported having a formal bargaining team. Data included in Table 1 report a frequency and percent of the 512 districts that have and those that do not have formal bargaining teams.

| TABLE 1 |
| FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE SCHOOL DISTRICTS HAVING AND THOSE NOT HAVING A FORMAL BARGAINING TEAM |
|---------|-----------------|-------|
|         | Frequency | Percent |
| Team     | 435       | 85     |
| No Team  | 77        | 15     |
| N = 512  |           | 100.0  |

Data in Table 2 present a frequency and percent by region, type of district and wealth for the 435 districts reporting a formal bargaining team. An analysis of these data show that wealthy and non-wealthy city districts had no substantial difference, whereas, there were twice as many non-wealthy local districts having formal bargaining teams. In addition 64% of the local districts have a bargaining team as opposed to 36%
TABLE 2

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE SCHOOL DISTRICTS HAVING A
FORMAL BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of District</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 435
for city districts. A comparison of the regions indicate that formal bargaining teams ranged from 155 to 40 in number while three of the five regions had little difference in number. There were 42% more non-wealthy local districts having teams. This appeared to be the most significant difference across all data collected for this question.

Data in Table 3 present a frequency and percent by region, type of district and wealth for the 77 districts that reported not having a formal bargaining team. None of these districts reporting were in the category of non-wealthy. A large number of the districts (81.8%) were included as local wealthy. Regions I and III contained the most districts with no bargaining team.

For those districts responding "Yes" to having a formal bargaining team, superintendents were asked to record the number of principals that served on the board's bargaining team during a three year period including 1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81. From 435 districts reporting that they had a formal bargaining team, data included in Table 4 represent the number of districts that did and those districts that did not include principals as members of the formal bargaining team.

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE SCHOOL DISTRICTS INCLUDING AND THOSE NOT INCLUDING PRINCIPALS ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Districts</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals Included</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals Not Included</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 445</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE SCHOOL DISTRICTS NOT HAVING A FORMAL BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of District</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY 14 18.2  LOCAL 63 81.8  N = 77
An analysis was made of the 266 districts that included principals as members of the bargaining team. It would appear that some slight difference occurs among regions with the biggest difference being between Region II and Region V. Over all, local districts have more principals involved than city districts and non-wealthy districts, and by a slight margin, have more principals than wealthy districts. Data for this analysis are presented in Table 5. All data reported from this point in Chapter IV are based on the 266 districts reporting they include principals.

There were 179 districts responding they did not include principals as members on or associated with the board’s bargaining team. All of these districts were wealthy districts. There were more than twice as many local (70.4%) than city districts responding to this category. An analysis was made of all three independent variables and these data are reported in Table 6. A large percentage (70.4%) of the districts having principals were local districts while 29.6% of these districts were city. It should be noted that the table does not include the factor of wealth since the questionnaire was constructed so that respondents did not answer anymore of the questions if they did not have principals on the bargaining team.

Superintendents were asked to respond to the questionnaire by indicating the number of principals that served on the district’s bargaining team for the school years 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81. An analysis of these responses indicate that 256 principals served on the bargaining team for 1978-79 and 1980-81, with 259 principals serving their district teams in 1979-80. Table 7 presents an average for the three years
TABLE 5
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE SCHOOL DISTRICTS INCLUDING PRINCIPALS AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY 114 43.8 LOCAL 152 57.1
N = 266
TABLE 6
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE CITY AND LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS
NOT INCLUDING PRINCIPALS AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD'S
BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 179
100.0

TABLE 7
AN AVERAGE OF THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS SERVING ON THE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 267
100.0
that principals served on the bargaining teams in the State of Ohio.

It should be noted that three districts had three more principals serving on the bargaining teams in 1979-80 than for the other two years.

Question #3 in the survey asked superintendents to respond to a set of six options regarding how the principals were selected for the bargaining team. Table 8 presents data that indicate how many principals volunteered and how many were appointed to the board's bargaining team. A principal who volunteered had total to some control over his membership on the team while those that were appointed may not have had a choice in the process of becoming a member. These data indicate that both methods of selection had equal weight.

TABLE 8

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS WHO VOLUNTEERED AND THOSE THAT WERE APPOINTED TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Selection</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 256

An analysis of these data by region, type of district and wealth indicate that there were essentially no difference among these three variables. Data included in Table 9 represent the five methods of selection used by the districts in including principals on the bargaining team. These data are shown by region only in order that the reader may
TABLE 9
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS SELECTED BY EACH METHOD OF REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Selection</th>
<th>Region I</th>
<th>Region II</th>
<th>Region III</th>
<th>Region IV</th>
<th>Region V</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 16.7 90 37.5 45 18.8 44 18.3 21 8.8  N = 240

Legend

VOL  Volunteered
VAR  Volunteered after request of Superintendent
ABS  Appointed by the Superintendent
ABE  Appointed by the Board of Education
ACO  Appointed by other central office administrator
see the responses to methods of selection. A principal considered to have volunteered for the bargaining team include the choices of: (1) volunteered, and (2) volunteered after the request of the superintendent. A response to one of the following choices indicated the principal was appointed: (1) appointed by the superintendent, (2) appointed by the board of education, (3) appointed by other central office administrator. The category of "OTHER" is presented in Table 10. One questionnaire returned did not include any response to this question.

**TABLE 10**

**COMPOSITE LISTING OF SIXTEEN RESPONSES DESCRIBING OTHER METHODS OF SELECTING PRINCIPALS FOR BARGAINING TEAM MEMBERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification/Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Principals are rotated on an annual or periodic basis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Selected among themselves (principals) on a &quot;take turn&quot; basis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appointed by the superintendent with the right to decline</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Superintendent and assistant superintendent discussed team candidates and made selection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evolved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16
Included in Table 10 is a composite of sixteen (16) responses for the category of "Other" which describe other ways that respondents reported principals were selected for the board's bargaining team. Five (5) separate classifications were drawn together from the responses. Both classifications #3 and #4 are very similar in response to options found in the question, but they are included here since they were recorded under the category of "Other".

The Chi-Squared Goodness of Fit test described for this question in Chapter III could not be accomplished. A similar question asked principals in the Principal's Interview Schedule was not exact enough to develop a statistical analysis with this statistic. The writer, therefore, does not present an analysis with this statistic.

In Question #4 superintendents were asked to use a listing of different positions, and indicate which position served as chief spokesman for the board's bargaining team during each of the school years 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81. An analysis of these data collected indicate that there was no substantial difference among the variables of region, type of district and wealth. In addition there was no difference for the added dimensions of the three school years. Wealthy and non-wealthy school districts were evenly split on this question. The writer found that more local than city districts responded to the question.

Due to the analysis, data in Table 11 present only the frequency and percent of those six (6) positions serving as chief spokesman. A comparison of all six (6) positions indicate that the superintendent served as chief spokesman in many more cases than the other five positions. Data in this table, therefore, reflect the state picture over
the three years of 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81 across all independent variables.

**TABLE 11**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Category</th>
<th>School Year By Frequency/Percent</th>
<th>1978-79</th>
<th>1979-80</th>
<th>1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDM</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOA</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONG</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 225 100.0  
N = 228 100.0  
N = 204 100.0

**Legend**

- BDM: Board Members
- SUPT: Superintendent
- PRIN: Principal
- TREA: Treasurer
- OCOA: Other Central Office Administrator
- ONG: Outside Negotiator

Included in Table 12 is a composite listing of responses to the category of "Outside Negotiator." This listing is compiled from a total of 162 separate narrative responses included for each of the three years. These data are separated into each of the three school years (1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81) so that the reader can make a comparison. These data
show, by a wide margin, that school districts favor the attorney over the other five (5) categories listed. The six (6) categories reflected in the table were used because the responses indicated these titles were most often used when all responses were reviewed and analyzed. A blank in the table indicates that no response was made for the category.

**TABLE 12**

COMPOSITE LISTING AND FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES DESCRIBING TYPE OF OUTSIDE NEGOTIATOR BY SCHOOL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Outside Negotiator</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attorney/Lawyer</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outside Person</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ohio School Boards Association</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Former Board Member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Labor/Professional Negotiator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 61**

In Question #5 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire respondents were asked to identify the role played by the principals in each district from a list of choices including (1) chief spokesman, (2) team member, (3) advisor to the team, and (4) other. These data were recorded for each of the three school years 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81. An analysis of these data indicate that there was no substantial difference
among the three independent variables of region, type district and wealth. In addition there was no difference across the three school years. Regions and wealthy and non-wealthy school districts are evenly split on this question. There was a higher percentage of local over city school districts that responded to this question.

As a result of the analysis, data in Table 13 present the frequency and percent of those four choices (chief spokesman, team member, advisor to the team and other) reported by superintendents for this question. Data included reflect only the state picture over the three years of 1978-79, 1979-80, and 1980-81 across all independent variables. Table 14 provides a composite of narrative responses to the category of "OTHER."

TABLE 13


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Role</th>
<th>School Years By Frequency/Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 202 100.0 N = 205 100.0 N = 202 100.0

Legend

CS Chief Spokesman AT Advisory to the Team
TM Team Member OTH Other
TABLE 14
NARRATIVE LISTING OF VARIOUS ROLES IDENTIFIED AND SERVED BY PRINCIPALS AS RECORDED UNDER THE CATEGORY OF OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Identified</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integral member</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource person</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spokesman for specific negotiated items</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provided advice to superintendent regarding content of master contract</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-participating observer</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recorder during bargaining sessions</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Observer</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Visitor</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The narrative responses reported for this question under the option of "OTHER" were compiled by similar role classification and are found included in Table 14. These data list eight (8) different roles identified by respondents and are recorded by region.

A Chi-Squared Goodness of Fit test of analysis was used to check the representativeness of the responses of the forty principals sampled with the overall responses of those superintendents responding. These data analyses will be found in a table in the Phase II Analysis of the principals' data later in this same chapter.
Superintendents were asked to indicate if impasse had been declared anytime during the bargaining process. Respondents were given the years of 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81 in which to select any or all as they applied to the local situation. An analysis was made of these data collected by region, type of district and wealth. The analysis indicated that the number of impasses declared during bargaining over the three years ranged (1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81) in number from 49, 41 and 43 respectively. These data indicate that there were no substantial differences across regions for each of the three school years. Wealthy districts, by only a slight margin, had more declarations of impasse than did non-wealthy districts. In 1978-79 city districts declared impasse by a margin of 61.2% as opposed to 38.8% for local districts. In the other two school years (1979-80, 1980-81) the local school district's declared slightly more impasses than did the city school districts responding. Included in Table 15 is a state profile by frequency and percent of city and local school districts by all three school years reporting the variable of impasse.

**TABLE 15**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Frequency/Percent By Year</th>
<th>1978-79</th>
<th>1979-80</th>
<th>1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 49 100.0  N = 41 100.0  N = 43 100.0
In addition to the question regarding impasse, superintendents were asked if they had experienced a teacher strike during any of the three school years, 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81. An analysis of these data was made for the variables of region, type of district and wealth. The analysis indicates that during the 1978-79 school year there were fifteen (15) strikes reported with an almost equal number of strikes being reported for each region. Both the 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years had nine (9) strikes. In 1979-80 two regions reported having no strikes while the other three regions reported one, six and two strikes respectively. Table 16 includes data by frequency and percent to show the pattern of strikes in the state for each of the three school years. The reader will note at a glance the small variance as described above. Over all three years Region II experienced almost three times as many strikes as the other four (4) regions.

**TABLE 16**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Region I</th>
<th>Region II</th>
<th>Region III</th>
<th>Region IV</th>
<th>Region V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>3 20.0</td>
<td>5 33.4</td>
<td>2 13.3</td>
<td>3 20.0</td>
<td>2 13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
<td>6 66.7</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
<td>3 33.3</td>
<td>3 33.3</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
<td>1 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=33 100.0
Data collected for the 1978-79 school year (Table 17) indicate that 71.4% of the fifteen (15) strikes reported occurred in city districts as opposed to only 28.6% for local districts. The trend is reversed, although with less margin, during the 1979-80 school year when 66.7% of the strikes were experienced in local districts as opposed to 33.3% for city districts. The same trend was true for 1980-81, but with less of a percentage. In addition to these differences for city and local districts these data reveal that for both the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years more strikes occurred in wealthy districts than they did in non-wealthy. There was a slight change in trend, however, in the 1980-81 school year when the majority of the strikes occurred in non-wealthy districts. These data included in Table 17 reflect the previous discussion regarding type of districts (city/local). The trends for the factor of wealth are included in Table 18.

TABLE 17


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Chi-Squared Goodness of Fit test of analysis was used to check the representativeness of the responses of the forty principals sampled with the overall responses made on the Superintendent's Questionnaire. These data analysis will be found in a table in the Phase II Analysis of the principals data later in this chapter.

The superintendent's survey requested the school districts enrollment as of October 1, 1980. These data were tabulated and analyzed by region, type of district and wealth and is included as statistical means in Table 19. These data reflect student enrollment figures by these statistics and include 257 responses from the Superintendent's Questionnaire that reflect those districts involving principals in collective bargaining. Data were originally collected to help in framing the sample, but later dropped as an independent variable of size. These data are presented in table form in order to reflect the average size of districts involved. An analysis of these data indicate wealthy city districts had a higher average student enrollment than local wealthy and city and local non-wealthy. All regions report enrollment averages
TABLE 19

STATISTICAL MEANS FOR STUDENT ENROLLMENT FOR RESPONDENT DISTRICTS
BY REGION, TYPE DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>8880.67</td>
<td>5819.03</td>
<td>6201.60</td>
<td>13505.89</td>
<td>2750.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1380.23</td>
<td>2182.46</td>
<td>3528.13</td>
<td>1695.20</td>
<td>2363.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>3174.40</td>
<td>3767.90</td>
<td>2982.75</td>
<td>4001.14</td>
<td>2276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3049.85</td>
<td>3180.86</td>
<td>2667.94</td>
<td>2180.63</td>
<td>1841.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3834.73</td>
<td>3879.07</td>
<td>4276.39</td>
<td>4674.94</td>
<td>2145.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 257

closely the same except for Region V which reports about half the average enrollment of the other four regions.

Superintendents were asked to record their school district evaluation. The writer collected these data along with per pupil expenditure in order to assist with the identification of districts by the variable of wealth. Data collected on district valuation were not used since the writer used the per pupil expenditure data to determine wealthy from non-wealthy districts. These data on district valuation seemed to be meaningless and difficult to use.

Each school district including principals on the bargaining team were asked to list their per pupil expenditure for the 1979-80 school year. These data were collected from 257 school districts and are represented in Table 20 as statistical means for each of the variables of
region, type district and wealth. An analysis of these data indicate that Region I and Region II spend slightly more per pupil than Region III, Region IV and Region V. Local wealthy districts appear to spend more per pupil than city wealthy, city non-wealthy and local non-wealthy, however, the difference is only slight. These data are included in the table by region, type of district and wealth.

Question #10 of the Superintendent's Questionnaire requested respondents to list the names of those principals who had participated in the bargaining process. All but about seven (7) returned questionnaires had the names of principals listed. The writer used the names to compile a target population from which a stratified random sample was drawn. The purpose of collecting individual names was to assist the writer in framing the sample of principals.

In addition to the principals' names, respondents were requested to identify the principals level of administrative assignment. Data included in Table 21 represent frequency and percent of principals assigned to elementary and secondary schools. These data represent 496 principals over the state and were analyzed for the variables of region, type of district and wealth. An analysis of these data indicate that both elementary and secondary principals were evenly distributed across all of the variables of region, type of district and wealth; therefore, a state profile is included in the table.

In addition to the data reported in Table 21 the writer is including a further breakdown of the administrative organization of those 496 principals involved. Data presented in Table 22 reflect only a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region I</th>
<th>Region II</th>
<th>Region III</th>
<th>Region IV</th>
<th>Region V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1774.22</td>
<td>2173.19</td>
<td>1301.29</td>
<td>1379.25</td>
<td>1386.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2731.85</td>
<td>2194.96</td>
<td>1821.75</td>
<td>1844.40</td>
<td>1842.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1368.60</td>
<td>1462.80</td>
<td>1450.75</td>
<td>1450.75</td>
<td>1399.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1257.31</td>
<td>1372.76</td>
<td>1855.95</td>
<td>1855.95</td>
<td>1252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1866.73</td>
<td>1866.49</td>
<td>1624.86</td>
<td>1532.49</td>
<td>1405.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1468.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 20

STATISTICAL MEANS FOR PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE FOR RESPONDENT DISTRICTS BY REGION, TYPE DISTRICT AND WEALTH
state profile since an analysis of these data by region, type of district and wealth indicate no substantial difference.

TABLE 21

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PRINCIPALS IN OHIO SERVING ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 496 100.0

TABLE 22

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS ASSIGNED TO DIFFERENT ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATIONS IN OHIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Administrative Organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 496 100.0
Phase II Data Analysis - Principal's Interview Schedule

These data, collected from the questions in the Principal's Interview Schedule, were tabulated and analyzed according to the Analysis Format Matrix using the three independent variables of 1) region, 2) type of district, and 3) wealth. These data were analyzed to determine both similarities and differences. When data reflected noticeable differences the writer presents them in table form.

The Principal's Interview Schedule was administered personally by the writer to each of the forty (40) sample principals. The survey document was divided into three parts including: 1) Section I on Demographic Data, 2) Section II on Team Membership Data and 3) Section III on Data About Feelings and Actions. The analysis and reporting of data is presented separately by each of the three sections.

Section I, Demographic Data

This section of the interview schedule was composed of seven (7) questions. The first question requested principals to indicate how many total years they had served as a building principal. The responses were analyzed by region, type of district and wealth. These data are included in Table 23 as mean scores for the number of years served as a building principal. An analysis of these data indicate that the number of years served varies only slightly by region and in some cases by type of district. Both wealthy city and wealthy local districts and non-wealthy city and non-wealthy local districts show five years difference on the average for the number of total years served as a building principal. The table includes data for all of three independent variables.
TABLE 23
NUMBER OF YEARS PRINCIPALS SERVED AS BUILDING PRINCIPAL EXPRESSED AS MEAN SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy City</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy City</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{N} = 40 \]

The second question requested principals to indicate how many years they had served as principal in their current school district. The responses were tabulated and analyzed by region, type of district and wealth. These data are included in Table 24 as mean scores for the number of years the participants served as principal in their respective districts. An analysis of these data indicate that the number of years varies only slightly by region. There was a small difference between city and local districts with city districts reflecting about four to five years more of experience. On the average both wealthy and non-wealthy districts indicated no difference in the number of years sample principals had served as building principal in their current districts.

The third question in the interview schedule requested sample principals to indicate how many years they had served as building principal
TABLE 24

NUMBER OF YEARS PRINCIPALS SERVED AS PRINCIPAL IN SCHOOL DISTRICT
EXPRESSED AS A MEAN SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.63  6.25  6.63  9.37  7.25  9.95

N = 40

in their current building assignment in the district. The responses were tabulated and analyzed by region, type of district and wealth. These data are included in Table 25 as mean scores for the number of years in their current building assignment. An analysis of these data indicate that regions and type of district varied only slightly while principals in local wealthy districts had only about two (2) years less experience on the average than those principals in city wealthy, city non-wealthy and local non-wealthy districts.

A three-way (region, type of district, wealth) analysis of variance statistics (ANOVA) was calculated to determine if any variance existed for total years served as principal by region, type of district and wealth and their interaction. Using a type 1 error level of 0.05, the
TABLE 25

NUMBER OF YEARS PRINCIPALS SERVED AS PRINCIPAL OF THE BUILDING
PRESENTLY ASSIGNED EXPRESSED AS MEAN SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region I</th>
<th>Region II</th>
<th>Region III</th>
<th>Region IV</th>
<th>Region V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy City</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy Local</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy City</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy Local</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.63 6.25 6.63 7.38 4.9 8.6

Analysis of these data indicate that there were no significant differences found for any main effects, two-way or three-way interaction. Data included in Table 26 report the results of the analysis of variance. Analysis of these data indicate no significant difference.

The same statistical calculations were completed for the total years principals served as principal in the district (Question #2) and the total number of years principals served as building principal in their current building assignment (Question #3). The analysis of these data indicate that there were no significant differences found for any main effects, two-way or three-way interaction. The data included in Tables 27 and 28 report the analysis of variance as described above.
TABLE 26
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE TOTAL YEARS SERVED AS PRINCIPAL BY REGION, TYPE OF DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124.60</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-district (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>299.00</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>108.60</td>
<td>27.15</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/RDW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>757.00</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1455.60</td>
<td>37.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

TABLE 27
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE YEARS SERVED AS PRINCIPAL IN THE DISTRICT BY REGION, TYPE OF DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>183.85</td>
<td>45.96</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-district (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.40</td>
<td>48.40</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>278.35</td>
<td>69.57</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58.25</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 27 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106.15</td>
<td>26.54</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/RDW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>597.00</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1283.60</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

### TABLE 28

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE YEARS SERVED AS PRINCIPAL IN THE BUILDING BY REGION, TYPE OF DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97.90</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-district (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120.40</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/RDW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>657.00</td>
<td>32.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1001.90</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40
In Question #4 of the interview schedule principals were asked to indicate the number of years that the board of education had been involved in formal collective bargaining procedures with teachers as a result of a formal negotiated agreement. The principals were given three choices for selection which included: 1) one year, 2) two to four years, and 3) longer than four years. These data were tabulated by frequency and percent and analyzed by the variables of region, type of district and wealth with the added dimension of the three choices as dependent variables. An analysis of these data indicate that all five regions had been involved in negotiations for five years or more. City districts were generally the same as for local districts with the exception that a local district in Region II indicated having only one year and Region I and Region III indicated involvement for two-four years. All non-wealthy districts indicated involvement for five years or more while there was some slight variance for wealthy with 85% of all districts reporting involvement for more than five years. Table 29 includes data for frequency and percent for wealth by each option of the dependent variable. Regional data was not included since each region reported the same number of responses across the other variables.

In Question #5 of the interview schedule principals were asked to estimate the length of time they had been included as members of the board's bargaining team. The principals were given four (4) choices from which to select their response. These included: 1) one year, 2) two to three years, 3) four years, and longer than four years. These data were tabulated by frequency and percent and analyzed by the three independent
TABLE 29
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF YEARS THAT PRINCIPALS' BOARDS OF
EDUCATION HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
BY FACTOR OF WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth Factor</th>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>2/4 Years</th>
<th>5 Years Plus</th>
<th>20 50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

variables of region, type of district and wealth with the added dimen-
sion of the four (4) dependent variables in the question. An analysis
of these data indicate that a very high percentage of principals were
involved for five (5) years or more in the board's bargaining team with
the exception of one city and one local district in Region V which re-
ported only one year of involvement. In addition, three (3) local dis-
tricts in Region I, II and III reported two to three years of involve-
ment. Wealthy districts reported having 80% with more than five (5)
years involvement or more, and non-wealthy districts reported 90% having
more than five (5) years of involvement. Table 30 includes data for
frequency and percent for the variables of type of district and wealth.
Regional data were not included since each region reported the same
number of responses across the other variables.
In Question #6 of the interview schedule principals were asked if impasse had been declared anytime during the bargaining process while they had served on the team. In addition, the principals were asked to indicate the year that the impasse was declared. The writer decided not to use data regarding the year. These data were tabulated by frequency and percent and analyzed by the three independent variables of region, type of district and wealth. An analysis of these data indicate that the number of impasses declared varied by region and slightly by wealth factor. The number of impasses declared between city and local district varied only slightly so these data are not represented in the table. Table 31 includes the frequency and percent of impasses declared.
reported by principals by region and wealth. Table 32 includes a frequency and percent for those districts declaring impasse and those that did not.

**TABLE 31**

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE DISTRICTS DECLARING IMPASSE WHILE PRINCIPALS SERVED AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

| Factor of Wealth | Region  
|------------------|--------  
|                  | I      | II     | III   | IV    | V     |
| Wealthy          | 4      | 22.2   | 3     | 16.7  | 1     | 5.5   | 2     | 11.1  | 1     | 5.5   | 11    | 55.0  |
| Non-Wealthy      | 3      | 16.7   | 0     | 0.0   | 1     | 5.5   | 2     | 11.1  | 1     | 5.5   | 7     | 35.0  |

7 38.9 3 16.7 2 11.1 4 22.2 2 11.1 18 100.0

N = 40 principals responded YES or NO

**TABLE 32**

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE DISTRICTS DECLARING AND THOSE DISTRICTS THAT DID NOT DECLARE IMPASSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impasse</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declared Impasse</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Declare Impasse</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40 100.0
Principals were asked in Question #7 if a strike had occurred anytime during their membership on the bargaining team. In addition, they were asked to indicate the year that the strike occurred. The writer did not use these data with regard to the year that the strike occurred. Data about the number of strikes were tabulated by frequency and percent and analyzed by the three independent variables of region, type of district and wealth. An analysis of these data indicate that Region III did not report any strikes occurring during the principals tenure on the team while the other four regions report having one or two strikes each. Of the five strikes reported 80% were in wealthy districts and only 20% occurred in a non-wealthy district. City districts reported having three strikes while local districts reported having only two. Table 33 present these data by frequency and percent for those districts having a strike by region and wealth. Table 34 include a frequency and percent for those districts having a strike and those that did not.

TABLE 33

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE DISTRICTS HAVING A STRIKE WHILE PRINCIPALS SERVED AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>1 20.0</td>
<td>2 40.0</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>1 20.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 20.0  2 40.0  0 0.00  1 20.0  1 20.0  5 100.0

N = 40 principals responded YES or NO
TABLE 34

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF THOSE DISTRICTS HAVING AND THOSE DISTRICTS THAT DID NOT HAVE A STRIKE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strike</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Strike</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 40\]

A Point-Biserial correlation-coefficient was calculated for both the variables of impasse and strike. These data in Table 35 and Table 36 present the correlation between the dissonance scores for each category of personnel (see Appendix E) and the variable of impasse and strike. Analysis of these data indicate that no statistical significance existed for each of the five categories of personnel. Data for teaching staff and superintendents appear to approach some correlation.

TABLE 35

POINT-BISERIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IMPASSE AND DISSONANCE SCORES FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Personnel</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>- .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 40\]
TABLE 36

POINT-BISERIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN STRIKES AND DISSONANCE SCORES FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Personnel</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>- .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>- .10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

Section II, Team Membership Data

This second section of the interview schedule is composed of nine (9) questions designed to elicit specific information about the principals' membership on the board's bargaining team.

Question #1 requested that each principal indicate the specific school year(s) that he/she served on the bargaining team. A listing of twelve (12) school years were given to principals as an option for their selection from 1969-70 to 1980-81. The responses were tabulated and analyzed by region, type of district and wealth. An analysis of these data indicate that with only very slight differences all of the school years are the same for principal involvement on the team. Data collected for the 1975-1969 school years were combined for the purpose of analysis and the same results with regard to principal involvement were found. When the data were analyzed across all the years from
1969-81 for all three independent variables it was found that there was very little difference in the principal's involvement between city and local difference and wealthy and non-wealthy districts. These data included in Table 37 report only the principal's involvement by frequency and percent by region for all of the years from 1969-1981. These regional data were the only major differences occurring.

TABLE 37
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS INVOLVED IN BARGAINING BY REGION FROM 1969-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 93 responses from sample of 40 principals

Table 38 present data analysis on a Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient between years served on the bargaining team and the dissonance scores for each of the five categories of personnel. The correlations show no significant relationship between the number of years served on the team and the dissonance scores for each of the five categories of personnel.
TABLE 38
PEARSON'S-PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN YEARS SERVED ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM AND DISSONANCE SCORES FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Personnel</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>- .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>- .07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 93 responses from sample of 40 principals

Question #2 in this section requested sample principals to indicate how long they had served as a member of the bargaining team. They were given three choices from which to choose. These included: 1) one year or less, 2) more than one year but less than three, and 3) more than three years. These data were tabulated by each of the variables of region, type of district and wealth plus the dependent variable of the question and the three choices. An analysis of these data indicate that there were differences for each of the independent variables as it related to the number of years that principals had served on the team. Table 39 includes a comparison, by region, of the number of years principals served on the bargaining team. Table 40 includes data between city and local districts and Table 41 present the frequency and percentage differences for years served for wealthy and non-wealthy districts. The analysis indicate that about half of the principals served one year or less and the other half served two years or longer.
### Table 39
**Frequency and Percent of Principals' Experience on the Board's Bargaining Team by Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>1-3 Years</th>
<th>3 Years Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 19     | 11        | 10           | 40 100.0 |

**N = 40**

### Table 40
**Frequency and Percent of Principals' Experience on the Board's Bargaining Team by Type of District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>1-3 Years</th>
<th>3 Years Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N = 40**
TABLE 41
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS' EXPERIENCE ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM BY FACTOR OF WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>9 45.0</td>
<td>7 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>10 50.0</td>
<td>4 20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

Question #3 requested sample principals to indicate whether they were currently serving on the board's bargaining team. The YES and NO responses were tabulated and analyzed by the variables of region, type of district and wealth. The analysis indicates that very little differences were apparent among regions and whether the principal was currently serving on the bargaining team except for a slight difference in Region 5 which had seven (7) persons serving as opposed to four (4) and five (5) for all other regions. Both city and local school districts reported ten (10) and fifteen (15) principals, respectively, currently serving, and the frequencies were exactly the same for wealthy and non-wealthy districts. These data are included in Table 42 and Table 43 as frequencies and percents for type of district and wealth only. Table 44 includes a general frequency and percent for those principals currently serving and those that reported not serving.
### TABLE 42
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE BOARD’S BARGAINING TEAM BY TYPE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Principals Serving</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25 responses from sample of 40 principals

### TABLE 43
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE BOARD’S BARGAINING TEAM BY FACTOR OF WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Principals Serving</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25 responses from sample of 40 principals
TABLE 44
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS CURRENTLY SERVING AND THOSE NOT SERVING ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently Serving</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Serving</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40 100.0

In Question #4 principals were asked if they felt they had any choice regarding their assignment to the bargaining team. They were given three choices from which to choose including: 1) total choice, 2) some choice, and 3) no choice. The principals responses were tabulated and analyzed according to the three independent variables and the added dimension of the three choices. An analysis of these data indicate that there were some differences in response to the options by region. Data included in Table 45 indicate that thirty (30) of the principals reported that they had either total or some choice in the decision to be on the bargaining team as opposed to ten (10) principals who indicated that they had no choice in their assignment. In addition, these data collected report that principals in city districts had slightly more choice of assignment to the bargaining team than did principals in local districts. These data are presented in Table 46. There was also a 10% difference between wealthy and non-wealthy districts with regard to total or some choice and no choice. These data
are reported in Table 47. Data are separated into three tables so the reader can see clear differences for each of the variables of region, type of district and wealth.

**TABLE 45**

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS CHOICE AND NO CHOICE ASSIGNMENT TO THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM BY REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Choice</th>
<th>Some Choice</th>
<th>No Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 25.0 20 50.0 10 25.0 40

N = 40

**TABLE 46**

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS CHOICE AND NO CHOICE ASSIGNMENT TO THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM BY TYPE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Total Choice</th>
<th>Some Choice</th>
<th>No Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 25.0 20 50.0 10 25.0 40 100.0

N = 40
TABLE 47
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS CHOICE AND NO CHOICE ASSIGNMENT TO THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM BY WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Choice Option</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Choice</td>
<td>Some Choice</td>
<td>No Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>5 25.0</td>
<td>11 55.0</td>
<td>4 20.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>5 25.0</td>
<td>9 45.0</td>
<td>6 30.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 25.0</td>
<td>20 50.0</td>
<td>10 25.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

A Point-Biserial correlation coefficient statistic and analysis was done for choice in assignment to the board's bargaining team. Data in Table 48 report the correlations between the dissonance scores for each category of personnel and the variable of choice. For purposes of analysis the options of Total Choice and Some Choice were combined against the options of NO Choice. The analysis shows a definite statistical significance for both the categories of Students and Parents. Both of the significant correlations reported in the table represent a probability of less than 0.05. The two correlations indicate that principals having some choice regarding the bargaining team assignment had less dissonance with the categories of Students and Parents if they had some choice as to their assignment on the bargaining team.

Question #5 principals were requested to describe the way in which they had become a member of the bargaining team. They were given five choices from which to choose. Those choices included, 1) volunteered,
TABLE 48
POINT-BISERIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ASSIGNMENT CHOICE AND DISSONANCE SCORES FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Personnel</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05  N = 40

2) volunteered after being requested by the superintendent, 3) appointed by the board of education, 4) appointed by the superintendent, and 5) other method (specify). Principals were asked to select the one choice that best described how they became a member of the bargaining team. These data were tabulated and analyzed. An analysis of these data indicate that when each method is compared by region there is a great deal of difference among regions. Table 49 presents the frequency and percent of each method of selection. More than half of the principals responded that they had volunteered for membership on the bargaining team often being requested by the superintendent over other choices of selection. None of the principals indicated that they had been appointed by the board of education. There were very slight differences between the responses of principals from city and local districts and the same was true with wealthy and non-wealthy districts. These data are not reported in table form.
TABLE 49

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONDING TO METHOD OF SELECTION TO THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Selection</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40 100.0

Legend

VOL  Volunteered
VAR  Volunteered after request of Superintendent
ABE  Appointed by the Board of Education
ABS  Appointed by the Superintendent
OTM  Other Method

An analysis of the choices when they were combined into volunteered and appointed indicate that 70% of the principals responded that they had volunteered for membership as opposed to 30% for appointed. The choices of volunteered and volunteered after the request of the superintendent combined to include the volunteered category with the appointed category including appointed by the superintendent, appointed by the board of education and other methods. These data are included in Table 50. Only one principal responded to Other Method by indicating that he was appointed to the bargaining team after being requested by the board of education.
TABLE 50

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS VOLUNTEERING AND THOSE APPOINTED TO MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Selection</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40 100.0

A statistical analysis using a Chi-Squared Goodness of Fit test was completed to see if there was any relationship between those principals that volunteered and those that were appointed. Table 51 includes this analysis and shows that the frequencies reported by principals did not fit the theoretical frequencies of the superintendents. The significant Chi-Squared value was largely determined by difference in the frequencies of principals and the theoretical expected frequencies for the (VAR) category. More principals reported that they volunteered after being requested by superintendent than was expected theoretically.

Principals were asked during the interview to select one of four choices that would best describe the reasons they volunteered to serve as a member of the bargaining team. This was a branching type question that was asked only of those principals who selected one of the first two choices (VOL and VAR) in the previous question. Only twenty-seven (27) principals out of forty (40) responded to this question. The
TABLE 51

OBSERVED AND THEORETICAL FREQUENCIES DESCRIBING THE METHOD BY WHICH PRINCIPALS BECAME MEMBERS OF THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Theoretical Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40
\[ \chi^2 = 10.45 \quad \text{df} = 4 \quad p < .05 \]

responses recorded for the four choices, however, show that some of the twenty-seven principals responded to more than one of the four choices listed in Question #6. The four choices listed in this question included, 1) gain experience from the bargaining process, 2) to be in a direct position to provide input for middle management concerns, 3) would assist as a means of upgrading your current position in administration, and 4) other reason (specify). These data were tabulated and analyzed by region, type of district and wealth for each of the four dimensions included in the question. An analysis of these data indicate that there were very slight differences in response between city and local districts and wealthy and non-wealthy districts. In each of these variables the choices most often selected by the twenty-seven (27) respondents included: 1) gain experience from the bargaining process, and 2) to be in a direct position to provide input for middle
management concerns. Eight (8) principals responded by listing other reasons they volunteered for membership on the team. These reasons are listed by participant number in Appendix Q. Table 52 includes data from each of the four choices and is presented by regions. It should be noted that the twenty-seven (27) principals responded to all of the choices a total of fifty-three (53) times. These responses are included in the table.

### TABLE 52

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONSES TO OPTIONS WHY THEY VOLUNTEERED FOR MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Volunteering</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 18.9 12 22.6 9 17.0 5 9.4 17 32.1 53 100.0

N = 27 principals responding from sample of 40

**Legend**

- **GE**: gain experience from the bargaining process
- **PI**: direct position to provide input for middle management concerns
- **UP**: would assist as a means of upgrading current position in administration
- **OR**: other reason (specify)
Question #7 requested principals to indicate whether they felt they made the right decision when they volunteered to be a member of the bargaining team. This was also a branching question that was answered only by the twenty-nine (29) principals that indicated they had volunteered for membership on the bargaining team. The question allowed for three choices which included, 1) Yes, 2) No, and 3) not certain. The response data were tabulated and analyzed by the three independent variables of region, type of district and wealth plus the three dimensions of the dependent variables. An analysis of these data indicate that there was a great difference reported among the dependent variables for each choice, but little difference among independent variables. Over 90% of the responses by principals indicated they made the right decision when they volunteered for the bargaining team. Only one principal indicated that he felt he had not made the right decision when he volunteered to be a member of the team. He represented a non-wealthy city in Region V. Table 53, Table 54 and Table 55 include data by frequency and percent that report principals' choice for this question and are presented by region, type of district and wealth.

Table 56 reports data on a Point-Biserial correlation coefficient for the decision regarding a principal volunteering as a member of the bargaining team. These data present a correlation of the dissonance scores for each category of personnel and the variable of YES and NO responses. The choices of NOT CERTAIN and NO were combined. The analysis shows there is a statistically significant correlation between student dissonance scores and choice. Principals responding that they had choice tended to have less dissonance.
### TABLE 53

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONSES REGARDING CHOICES IN VOLUNTEERING FOR MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM BY REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Decision Choice</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 29

### TABLE 54

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONSES REGARDING CHOICES IN VOLUNTEERING FOR MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM BY TYPE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Decision Choice</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 55

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONSES REGARDING CHOICES IN VOLUNTEERING FOR MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD'S BARGAINING TEAM BY WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Decision Choice</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 56

POINT-BISERIAL CORRELATION BETWEEN YES AND NO RESPONSES AND DISSONANCE SCORES FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Personnel</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.05  
N = 29 responses from sample of 40 principals
In Question #8 principals were to select, from one of four choices, the one that best described the role they played as a member of the board's bargaining team. The four choices included: 1) chief spokesman, 2) team member, 3) advisor to the team, and 4) other (specify). None of the forty (40) principals responded to the fourth choice of "Other". The responses were tabulated and analyzed by the three independent variables of region, type of district and wealth. An analysis of these data indicate a marked difference in the role played by the sample participants as members of the board's bargaining team. The majority of the principals by far served as team members with advisor to the team being second in frequency. Only one principal from a local wealthy district located in Region II indicated being the chief spokesman from the board's team. The variables of region, type of district and wealth were only slightly different in the roles played. Table 58 includes data that provide the general overall frequency and percent for each of the four choices of the dependent variable of role played.

TABLE 57

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS SERVING IN EACH OF THE FOUR DESCRIBED ROLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS Chief Spokesman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM Team Member</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT Advisor to the Team</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH Other (Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40 100.0
Question #9 requested principals to describe their presence at the bargaining table by selecting one of the following three choices including 1) always, 2) sometimes, and 3) not at all. The purpose of the question was to determine if the principal sat at the table during formal bargaining sessions as a member of the team. The responses were tabulated and analyzed by the three variables of region, type of district and wealth plus the three dimensions of the dependent variable. An analysis of these data indicate a great difference in the position of the principal at the bargaining table. The majority of the principals indicated that they always sat at the table during formal bargaining sessions. Only two principals responding indicated they never were present at the table during formal sessions; one being from a non-wealthy city and the other from a local district. Only a very few indicated their presence at the table as sometimes. The responses varied very slightly in relation to the independent variables of region, type of district and wealth. Table 58 only includes data that provide general frequency and percent for the three choices of the dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence at Table</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

100.0
Section III, Data on Feelings

The third and final section of the interview schedule was composed of twelve questions designed to gain specific information with regard to the principal's feelings about his role and positions as it related to his membership on the board's bargaining team. Some of the questions were branching in nature and are identified as the discussion continues. Much of these data collected were narrative in form and are found in the Appendices.

Question #1 presented to each principal a three-part semantic-differential encompassing the following terms: 1) Comfortable-Uncomfortable, 2) Harmonious-Dissonant, and 3) Pleasurable-Painful. Each differential was set up on a five point rating scale (see Appendix E). Each of the three scales included five categories of personnel. These included: 1) Students, 2) Teaching Staff, 3) Administrators, 4) Parents, 5) Superintendent, and 6) Other (specify). The other category was not responded to by principals, therefore, no data were included in the analysis that follows.

Principals were asked to describe their feelings as they related to their assignment and role on the bargaining team by responding to the five-point rating scale for each of the three semantic-differentials. As the principal responded to each during the interview, the writer computed a score for each of the five personnel categories. If the respondent developed a score of six (6) points or less for a category it indicated non-dissonance with the personnel category. If the score for a particular category was seven (7) or more it indicated a dissonance score with that category. The writer then used only the dissonance
categories for the remainder of the questions in Section III. The non-dissonance scores were ignored for the questionning process.

Table 59 includes a frequency and percent of responses showing both dissonance and non-dissonance from data tabulated from Question #1. This includes responses for each of the five categories of personnel.

**TABLE 59**

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS SCORING DISSONANCE AND NON-DISSONANCE FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Personnel</th>
<th>Frequency/Percent Dissonance</th>
<th>Frequency/Percent Non-Dissonance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>39 97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>24 60.0</td>
<td>16 40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>5 12.5</td>
<td>35 87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4 10.0</td>
<td>36 90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>4 10.0</td>
<td>36 90.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40 38 95.0 162

Tables 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64 include data that include a mean score for dissonance of students, teaching staff, administration, parents and superintendents scores across all three differentials of 1) Comfortable-Uncomfortable, 2) Harmonious-Dissonant, and 3) Pleasurable-Painful. This statistic reports a composite calculation for each of the five categories of personnel and are reported by the independent variables of region, type of district and wealth.
### TABLE 60

**Mean Scores for Student Dissonance by Region, Type of District and Wealth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               |                 | 3.0    | 3.0| 3.6| 3.75| 3.37| 3.57|
|               |                 |        | 61 |   |     |     |     |

\( N = 40 \)

### TABLE 61

**Mean Scores for Teaching Staff Dissonance by Region, Type of District and Wealth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               |                 | 8.75   | 4.75| 7.25| 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
|               |                 |        | 61  |   |     |     |     |

\( N = 40 \)
### TABLE 62
**MEAN SCORES FOR ADMINISTRATORS DISSONANCE BY REGION, TYPE OF DISTRICT AND WEALTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1  3.5  4.5  3.87  5.6  4.9

N = 40

### TABLE 63
**MEAN SCORES FOR PARENTS DISSONANCE BY REGION, TYPE OF DISTRICT AND WEALTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0  4.5  4.25  4.4  4.0  4.1

N = 40
TABLE 64

MEAN SCORES FOR SUPERINTENDENTS DISSONANCE BY REGION, TYPE OF DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |                  | 3.1 | 4.6 | 3.87| 4.37| 5.0 | 4.2 |

N = 40

Tables 65, 66, 67, 68, and 69 present a three-way analysis variance (ANOVA) for the aggregate of dissonance scores for each of the five categories of personnel and are reported by the variables of region, type of district and wealth. The main effect calculation for type of district is close to achieving statistical significance. All other calculations show no statistically significant difference even though several appear close to the 0.05 level.
### TABLE 65

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE AGGREGATE OF STUDENT DISSONANCE SCORES AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS BY REGION, TYPE OF DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type District (D)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/RDW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

### TABLE 66

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE AGGREGATE OF TEACHING STAFF DISSONANCE SCORES AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS BY REGION, TYPE DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type District (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/RDW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>154.80</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40
### TABLE 67

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE AGGREGATE OF ADMINISTRATORS' DISSONANCE SCORES AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS BY REGION, TYPE DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type District (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/RDW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>154.80</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

### TABLE 68

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE AGGREGATE OF PARENTS' DISSONANCE SCORES AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS BY REGION, TYPE DISTRICT AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type District (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/RDW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99.10</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40
TABLE 69
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE AGGREGATE OF SUPERINTENDENT'S DISSONANCE
SCORES AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS BY REGION, TYPE DISTRICT
AND WEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type District (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (W)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/RDW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>150.78</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40

If a principal received a score of seven (7) or more on Question #1 showing dissonance with any of the categories of personnel the interviewer directed the principal to Question #2b. If no dissonance was evident by score the principal was directed to Question #2a. These two were branching questions.

Question #2a requested principals to describe some of their comfortable, harmonious, pleasurable feelings about each category of personnel. The narrative responses were compiled and are listed separately for each category of personnel by participant number and are found in Appendix G. Participant responses are listed as direct quotes taken from each interview schedule. It should be noted by the reader that not all forty (40) principals responded to each category of personnel.
Question #2b requested principals to describe some of their uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings about each category of personnel that they scored as having dissonance feelings about. The narrative responses to this question were compiled and are listed separately for each category of personnel by participant number, and are found in Appendix H. Participant responses are listed as direct quotes taken from each of the interview schedules. Not all principals responded to this question or to each category.

Question #3a requested principals to describe some of the things that occurred or that they observed about each category of personnel that gave them comfortable, harmonious, pleasurable feelings. This was a branching question answered only by principals that indicated no dissonance with any of the five (5) categories of personnel. The narrative responses to this question were compiled and are listed for each category of personnel and are found in Appendix I. Participant responses were listed as direct quotes by participant number taken from each of the interview schedules. Not all forty (40) principals responded to this question or all categories of personnel.

Question #3b requested principals to describe some of the things that occurred or that were observed that gave them uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings. This was a branching question answered only by principals who scored dissonance with one or more categories or personnel. The narrative responses to the question are reported by participant number for all categories of personnel and are found in Appendix J. The responses are further broken down under each category by
separate groupings. Some principals made more than one response or comment for each of the five (f) categories. These responses are recorded as direct quotes as stated during the interview. Not all principals responded to this question.

Question #4 was only used with principals that did not score as having any dissonance with the five categories of personnel listed in Question #1. The principals were asked if they had had any uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings at anytime while they served on the board's bargaining team. The question was included in the interview schedule as a last effort to determine if any dissonance was felt by those ten (10) principals not scoring dissonance in Question #1. Principals not indicating any dissonant feelings at this point were terminated in the interview. These principals were categorized as having no dissonance.

If a principal indicated some dissonant feeling or experience with this question they were required to answer the rest of the interview schedule along with all other principals indicating dissonance. The narrative responses to this question are reported only for the personnel category of Teaching Staff and are found in Appendix K. No responses were made for Students, Administrators, Parents and Superintendent. The responses in the appendix report a YES or NO by the eleven (11) principals responding as direct quotes taken from the interview schedule. Not all principals answered this question.

Question #5 wanted to know if principals, through their own actions, were able to reduce or eliminate their uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings. The question gave the respondent three choices from which to choose. They included: 1) to a great extent, 2) to some extent,
and 3) not at all. Responses were to be made for each category of personnel that the principal had scored as dissonant. The responses were tabulated and analyzed for the three independent variables of region, type of district and wealth plus the additional three dimensions of the question. An analysis of these data indicate that a varied and small number of responses were made by fewer than forty (40) principals for each category of personnel and for each of the three choices given. A total of twenty-eight (28) responses were recorded for the personnel categories that had a response of five or less. There didn't appear to be much difference among responses for the three independent variables for this question. Table 70 includes the response data for all categories of personnel and for each of the three choices in the question. A total of forty-one (41) responses were recorded across all three dimensions of the question. Teaching Staff was the personnel category that reflected the greatest amount of dissonance felt by principals responding.

A Point-Biserial correlation-coefficient was calculated for this question. It was found that four of the five variables could not be computed due to the low number of responses. This analysis is, therefore, not included.

Question #6a is a branching question and was answered only by those principals who indicated in Question #5 they were able to reduce or eliminate their uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings. This question requested principals to describe the alternatives they considered prior to their attempt to reduce or eliminate those dissonant feelings. The narrative responses were tabulated and are found in Appendix L.
TABLE 70

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONDING ABOUT REDUCING OR ELIMINATING DISSONANT FEELINGS

| Personnel Category | Dissonance Reduction/Elimination |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                    | GE | SE | NA | GE | SE | NA |
| Students           | 1  | 2.4| 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| Teaching Staff     | 11 | 26.8| 17 | 41.4| 0  | 0  |
| Administrator      | 3  | 7.3| 2  | 4.8| 0  | 0  |
| Parents            | 2  | 4.8| 2  | 2.4| 0  | 0  |
| Superintendent     | 1  | 2.4| 3  | 7.3| 0  | 0  |
|                    | 18 | 43.7| 23 | 55.9| 0  | 0  |

N = 41 responses from sample of forty (40) principals

Legend

GE To A Great Extent
SE To Some Extent
NA Not at All

The responses are listed by participant number by each category of personnel as direct quotes taken from each interview schedule. Not all principals responded to this question.

Question #6b is also a branching question and was answered only by those principals who indicated in Question #5 they were unable to reduce or eliminate their uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings. This question requested principals to describe why they felt they were unable to reduce their dissonant feelings. No principals responded to this
question since they all indicated they were able to at least eliminate or reduce some of their dissonant feelings.

Question #7 requested all principals scoring as dissonant to describe the alternatives that they selected to try and reduce or eliminate their uncomfortable, dissonant painful feelings. Narrative responses to the question were separated by each category of personnel and listed by participant number and are presented in Appendix M. All principals scoring as having dissonance in Question #1 responded to this question.

Question #8 requested principals to indicate whether it was easy or hard for them to decide on which alternatives to use in attempting to reduce or eliminate their uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings. The purpose of this question was to gather data that would indicate the degree or magnitude of the dissonance that principals felt. The writer found that during the interview a greater majority of those principals responding did not understand the meaning of the question. In addition, most of the principals had difficulty in recalling more than one alternative they considered at the time of the felt dissonance. Very few principals were able to respond to this question primarily due to lack of understanding. Table 71 includes the responses made by a small group of principals to this question, however, the writer feels that due to the misunderstanding of the question on the part of the principals during the interview these data and any analysis were ignored and deemed inconclusive. The Point-Biserial correlation coefficient statistic attempted could not be computed for four of the five categories of personnel.
TABLE 71
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONDING TO EASY AND HARD ALTERNATIVES TO REDUCING OR ELIMINATING FEELINGS OF DISSONANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Category</th>
<th>Easy/Hard Alternatives</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 responses from a sample of forty (40) principals

Question #9 asked principals to consider the various sets of alternatives they thought about prior to their attempt to reduce or eliminate their dissonant feelings, and indicate which sets were more alike and which were more unlike in attractiveness or to their liking. The question also requested the principal to list the number of alternatives that they considered for each personnel category for which they had dissonance. The question was designed to try and determine the degree or magnitude of dissonance felt by principals. With only one or two exceptions the principals indicated to the writer that they did not understand the question. Only sixteen (16) principals responded to the question. In all cases, however, the principals could not indicate how
many alternatives were considered so the writer did not record these
data during the interview. Table 72 includes the number of responses
by personnel category, however, the writer feels that due to the vague-
ness and misunderstanding of the question by participants these data
and analysis was ignored and deemed inconclusive. In addition, the
Point-Biserial correlation coefficient statistic attempted could not be
computed for four of the five categories of personnel.

TABLE 72

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONDING TO ALIKE AND
UNLIKE ALTERNATIVES TO REDUCING OR ELIMINATING
FEELINGS OF DISSONANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Category</th>
<th>Alike/Unlike Alternatives</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 100.0

N = 15 responses from a sample of forty (40) principals
Question #10 requested principals to indicate whether their uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings changed their performance as a building principal with any of the categories of personnel. The question listed three choices from which to choose that included: 1) increased effectiveness, 2) did not change effectiveness, and 3) decreased effectiveness. Less than forty (40) principals responded to this question since several respondents had been eliminated at this point through non-dissonance. The responses were tabulated and analyzed to the three independent variables of region, type of district and wealth plus the additional three dimensions in the question. An analysis of these data indicate that a varied number of responses were made by fewer than forty (40) principals for each category of personnel and for each of the three choices given. A total of twenty-seven responses were recorded for the personnel category of Teaching Staff. All of the other categories had a response of seven (7) or less. There didn't appear to be much difference among responses for the three independent variables for this question. Table 73 includes these response data for all categories of personnel and for each of the three choices in the question. A total of forty-seven (47) responses were recorded across all three dimensions of the question. Teaching staff is the personnel category that reflect the most dissonance felt by principals responding.

Narrative comments recorded as part of Question #10 data were compiled into three separate categories relating to the three choices found in the question. These narrative responses are listed as direct quotes by participant number and are found in Appendix N.
### TABLE 73

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES BY PRINCIPALS ABOUT PERFORMANCE CHANGE FOR EACH OF THE CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Category</th>
<th>Performance Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 47 responses from sample of forty (40) principals*

**Legend**

- **IE**: Increased Effectiveness
- **NC**: Did Not Change Effectiveness
- **DE**: Decreased Effectiveness

Question #11 requested principals to indicate whether they considered doing anything to avoid having any additional feelings of discomfort. The principal was to respond to the question by a YES or NO and then make verbal comments about their response. Fewer than forty (40) principals responded. Table 74 includes a frequency and percent of those YES and NO responses made by principals. A total of thirty (30) principals responded to the question.
TABLE 74

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS INDICATING AVOIDANCE ACTIVITIES TO CREATING ADDITIONAL DISCOMFORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0

N = 30 responses to a sample of forty (40) principals

Narrative responses to this question were compiled by participant number and are found in Appendix 0. All forty (40) participants are listed by number with either their comment or an indication of no response.

Question #12 requested principals to rate each category of personnel on a scale from 1-5 with a rating of 1 indicating least discomfort and a rating of 5 indicating the most discomfort. The ratings did not necessarily need to be different for each category. Thirty (30) of the principals responded to this question. These data were tabulated and analyzed by several statistics. Table 73 includes raw scores from the ratings for each personnel category. The raw scores are represented as a frequency and percent. An analysis of these data indicate that the greatest amount of discomfort was with the teaching staff with a lesser
TABLE 75
FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS RESPONDING TO THE DEGREE OF DISCOMFORT FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total              | 87  | 58.0| 28  | 18.7| 23  | 15.3  | 8          | 5.3        | 5          | 3.3        | 150 | 100.0 |

N = 30 responses from a sample of forty (40) principals
amount if discomfort being recorded for all four of the other categories.

Tables 76, 77, 78, 79, and 80 include a mean score for each category of personnel by region, type of district and wealth. An analysis indicates that while the mean scores for the category of teaching staff from the other four, the scores are only very different across regions. The same is true for both type of district and wealth.

**TABLE 76**

**DISSONANCE FELT BY PRINCIPALS ON A SCALE 1-5 FOR STUDENTS EXPRESSED AS A MEAN SCORE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 1.0 1.3 1.2 1.3 1.2

N = 30 responses from a sample of forty (40) principals
TABLE 77
DISSONANCE FELT BY PRINCIPALS ON A SCALE 1-5 FOR TEACHING STAFF EXPRESSED AS A MEAN SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 30 responses from a sample of forty (40) principals

TABLE 78
DISSONANCE FELT BY PRINCIPALS ON A SCALE 1-5 FOR ADMINISTRATORS EXPRESSED AS A MEAN SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor of Wealth</th>
<th>Type of District</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-wealthy</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 30 responses from a sample of forty (40) principals
### Table 79
**DISSONANCE FELT BY PRINCIPALS ON A SCALE 1-5 FOR PARENTS EXPRESSED AS A MEAN SCORE**

| Factor of Wealth | Type of District | Region  
|------------------|------------------|-------
|                  |                  | I     |
| Wealthy          | City             | 3.0   |
|                  | Local            | 1.0   |
| Non-Wealthy      | City             | 1.5   |
|                  | Local            | 1.0   |

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Region} & \text{I} & \text{II} & \text{III} & \text{IV} & \text{V} \\
\hline
\text{Wealthy} & 3.0 & 0.0 & 1.0 & 2.0 & 1.0 \\
\text{Local} & 1.0 & 1.0 & 2.0 & 2.5 & 1.0 \\
\text{Non-Wealthy} & 1.5 & 2.0 & 1.5 & 1.0 & 1.5 \\
\text{Local} & 1.0 & 0.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 & 1.0 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[N = 30 \text{ responses from a sample of forty (40) principals}\]

### Table 80
**DISSONANCE FELT BY PRINCIPALS ON A SCALE 1-5 FOR SUPERINTENDENTS EXPRESSED AS A MEAN SCORE**

| Factor of Wealth | Type of District | Region  
|------------------|------------------|-------
|                  |                  | I     |
| Wealthy          | City             | 1.0   |
|                  | Local            | 1.5   |
| Non-Wealthy      | City             | 1.5   |
|                  | Local            | 1.0   |

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Region} & \text{I} & \text{II} & \text{III} & \text{IV} & \text{V} \\
\hline
\text{Wealthy} & 1.0 & 0.0 & 1.0 & 2.0 & 3.0 \\
\text{Local} & 1.5 & 3.0 & 1.0 & 1.5 & 1.5 \\
\text{Non-Wealthy} & 1.5 & 1.0 & 1.5 & 1.0 & 3.0 \\
\text{Local} & 1.0 & 0.0 & 1.0 & 2.0 & 2.5 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[N = 30 \text{ responses from a sample of forty (40) principals}\]
A Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient was calculated for the variables of dissonance score and discomfort rating scores. Data included in Table 81 present the correlations between the discomfort ratings for each category of personnel and the dissonance scores by each principal responding. An analysis of these data indicate that each correlation was statistically significant to the 0.05 level. Therefore, the table indicates a very strong correlation between the dissonance scores in Question #1, Section III, and Question #12, Section III and the principal's feelings of discomfort for each category of personnel.

A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated.

TABLE 81
PEARSON'S PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION BETWEEN DISCOMFORT RATINGS AND DISSONANCE SCORES FOR EACH CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Personnel</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 30 responses from a sample of forty (40) principals
Summary

This chapter on Presentation of Findings presents these data collected. The presentation of findings is divided into two phases. Phase I reports the findings of data collected from the Superintendent's Questionnaire. Phase II reports the findings of data collected during the interviews conducted by the writer with the administration of the Principal's Interview Schedule.

Chapter V presents the analysis and recommendations from the study.
CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion and analysis of data collected along with recommendations. The discussion and analysis will be presented in four sections. These sections include: 1) The Sample and Relationship to the State, 2) The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, 3) Trends Suggested by Data and Differences Among Independent Variables, and 4) Some Personal Thoughts. Each section, when appropriate, contains recommendations for further research, the school superintendent and board of education, the building principal and the field of educational administration.

Sample and Relationship to the State

A survey document (Superintendent's Questionnaire) was mailed to 566 city and local superintendents in the State of Ohio. From the 512 questionnaires returned, 435 respondents indicated that their district had a formal bargaining team that negotiated with the teachers. Of those having a formal bargaining team only 266 districts reported they included principals on the board's bargaining team. The 266 districts were used to construct a stratified random sample of forty (40) principals. This sample represents only a part of the total responses of 512 survey documents returned by the superintendents in the state.
Therefore, the sample data can only be generalized to Ohio School districts which are represented by principals on their collective bargaining teams.

The stratified sample was constructed with three independent variables. These variables include: (1) region, (2) type of district, and (3) wealth of district. The variable of region includes five geographical areas of the State of Ohio as designated by the Ohio School Boards Association. They include: (1) Region I-Northwest, (2) Region II-Northeast, (3) Region III-Southwest, (4) Region IV-Central, and (5) Region V-Southeast. This variable was used to see if there were any differences in data by regional classification.

The second variable was type of district was selected to include city or local school district.

Thirdly, the variable of wealth was selected to see if the wealth (based on per-pupil expenditure) of a school district had any impact on how the principal responded to the interview questionnaire. These three variables were selected so that data could be analyzed for comparisons and/or contrasts throughout school districts in the State of Ohio which include principals in their formal bargaining process.

The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance

In Chapter I the writer stated six (6) hypotheses that were developed from Festinger's Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. These hypotheses were tested through statistical and content analysis of data collected during the interviews of sample principals.
Hypothesis #1 states: Public school principals assigned to the board of education's bargaining team will experience feelings of discomfort (dissonance). An analysis of data collected from a sample of forty (40) principals indicate that thirty (30) principals reported they had some feelings of dissonance with one or more of the five categories of personnel (students, teaching staff, administrators, parents, and the superintendent). By far the largest percentage of principals responded that their dissonance was with the teaching staff.

Tables 60, 61, 62, 63 and 64 present mean scores for dissonance for each category of personnel by region, type of district and wealth. A mean score of six (6) or less indicated non-dissonance and a score of seven (7) or more represents dissonance. Analysis of these tables report that dissonance was recorded for teaching staff, administrators, and the superintendent. The overall mean score for teaching staff was more than seven (7) suggesting a strong dissonance score average by a majority of the thirty (30) principals responding.

After considering the narrative comments recorded in the appendices and determining that 75% of the sample principals scored as having dissonance with one or more of the five categories of personnel, the writer accepts Hypothesis #1. There seems to be little dissonance about students and parents. Some dissonance is felt with the superintendent and other administrators.

Narrative responses were recorded by the thirty (30) principals scoring as having dissonance and are found in Appendices H, J, and K. These appendices contain direct quotes from principals that state their uncomfortable, dissonant and painful feelings.
If principals received a dissonance score of seven (7) or higher they were asked to describe their uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings. These narrative responses are listed in Appendix H and indicate that teaching staff was the category that they overwhelmingly had negative feelings about. Principals' comments expressed strong feelings about the teachers' unreasonable bargaining proposals and issues, their negative behavior at the bargaining table and on the picket line, the miscommunication that the teacher leadership was passing along to the general rank and file, the principals dual role and the difficulty that it caused them and their teaching staff during the bargaining process and also many miscellaneous comments expressing discomfort in their bargaining role. A few principals expressed their frustration with other administrators because of their verbal behavior at the table as members of the team and the types of things they were doing in their buildings that created issues for the teachers to bring to the table as discussion items. Finally, four principals indicated that they had some problems with the Superintendent because of the blind support that he was requiring of them and the fact that it was sometimes difficult to support the superintendent since he was not always honest with teachers at the bargaining table. There were not many comments by principals expressing dissonance about the categories of students and parents.

Appendix J lists the things that occurred or that principals observed that gave them the uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings. The majority of the principals feeling dissonance indicated that the teachers' bargaining team members did not always keep the general group of teachers informed about the status of bargaining, regarded table
talk and negative behavior of teacher bargaining team members as making
them feel uncomfortable, did not like the comments and threats that
teachers made to other teachers during strike situation and they did
not like the fact that the teachers used other groups, such as parents,
to further their cause during impasse and strikes.

Ten (10) of the principals scoring non-dissonance were requested
to describe both their comfortable, harmonious, pleasurable feelings
and to indicate what those positive things that occurred or that they
observed that gave them these non-dissonant feelings. The principals'
narrative comments are listed in Appendix G and I. They express the
positive feelings that these principals had as a result of their role
on the bargaining team. The positive non-dissonant feelings were ex­
pressed by 25% of the sample.

Based on data collected for Hypothesis #1, the writer makes the
following recommendations:

A. Recommendations for further research:

1. A study could be designed that would test
   Festinger's theory with school superintendents
   and members of the board of education.

2. A study could be designed that would test
   Festinger's theory to see if principals had
   more dissonance when they served as team
   members sitting at the bargaining table as
   opposed to serving in an advisory role.
3. A study could be designed to test Festinger's theory as to whether principals involved in a strike had more dissonance than principals or superintendents who have not been involved in a strike.

B. Recommendations for superintendents and boards of education:
   1. Superintendents considering the assignment of a principal to the board's bargaining team should be aware that some degree of dissonance may be experienced by the person assigned.
   2. Superintendents and boards of education should not use principals in a rotation fashion in order to get middle management representation because more than likely some of these principals will have difficulty with the assignment because of dissonant feelings.
   3. Superintendents assigning principals to the board's bargaining team should consider both roles as team member and advisor to the team.

C. Recommendations for educational administration:
   1. Formal degree programs in educational administration should include a course in collective bargaining and in addition should provide for the theory would help principals better understand their feelings of dissonance when they were participating in the negotiations process.
Hypothesis #2 states: Principals that experience feelings of dissonance from their assignment to the bargaining team will initiate behavior changes or changes in beliefs in order to reduce or eliminate any felt discomfort. Analysis of data collected indicate that of the thirty (30) principals scoring as having dissonance all responded that they were able to reduce or eliminate their uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings either to a great extent or to some extent. Table 70 includes these data and also reports that none of the thirty (30) principals indicated they were unable to reduce or eliminate their dissonant feelings.

Narrative responses were recorded by the thirty (30) principals scoring as having dissonance and are found in Appendices L and M. These appendices contain direct quotes from principal that state the alternatives considered and executed in an attempt to reduce or eliminate their uncomfortable, dissonant and painful feelings.

A Point-Biserial statistic was used to determine any correlation between principals dissonance scores and the ability to reduce or eliminate felt dissonance. No correlation could be calculated due to the very low number of responses. Table 70 indicates by frequency and percent that principals responded that they were able to reduce or eliminate their dissonance at least to some extent.

After considering the importance of the narrative comments and the fact that all thirty (30) principals indicated they were able to either reduce or eliminate their dissonant feelings to some or to a great extent the writer accepts Hypothesis #2 and concludes that these data
collected support the theory of cognitive dissonance as it relates to this study.

Narrative data collected from Question #6a is found in Appendix L. These data describe the alternatives considered by principals prior to any attempt to reduce or eliminate their feelings of discomfort. The design of this question was important to the theory, because it required each sample principal to recall the kinds of things that they had thought about before actually taking any action to reduce or eliminate the dissonance felt. Appendix L lists the alternatives or thoughts considered for each of the personnel categories. No comments were recorded for parents and the superintendent and only one comment for students. Several comments were listed under the category of administrator which mainly expressed thoughts about talking with other principals regarding frustration, making excuses for not attending the next bargaining session and thought about reacting negatively to the bargaining session. The greatest number of recorded thoughts by principals were listed under the category of teaching staff. These thoughts or alternatives were difficult to pull together in separate groups, but in general stated things like talking with teachers individually and as a staff in the building to get them to discuss their perceptions and status of the bargaining process, talking with teachers to tell them the real truth about what the board was really offering the teachers, resigning my position as principal, talking with teachers about my participation on the board's team and thought about doing physical activity in order to relieve tensions. While the specific comments expressed about thoughts or alternatives to be considered were different, they
collectively described ways in which principals felt they could reduce or eliminate their dissonant feelings.

Once principals had a chance to recall thoughts and alternatives, they were asked to state what alternatives they selected to reduce or eliminate their feelings of dissonance. A quick review of Appendix M will indicate that principals executed many of the thoughts or alternatives that they had prior to initiating or executing their alternative for reducing or eliminating those dissonant feelings. The recorded actions were primarily made with reference to the teaching staff. It should be noted that several principals indicated during the interview that the alternative selected did not always eliminate or even reduce their feelings of dissonance so it was necessary to try other alternatives.

As a result of the foregoing analysis of Hypothesis #2, the writer makes the following recommendations:

A. Recommendations for further research:

1. A study designed to test the reduction and/or elimination of dissonance felt by principals that are not assigned as members to the board's bargaining team to determine if they use strategies to reduce different phase principals serving on the team.

B. Recommendations for superintendents and boards of education:

1. The superintendent should have a basic knowledge of Festinger's theory in order to be sensitive
to principals having difficulty with the role on the board's team.

2. The superintendent and members of the board should consider the merit of providing both pre-service and in-service training for all members of the bargaining team.

C. Recommendations for principals:

1. Principals interested in gaining experience in the bargaining process should think seriously about how they personally handle conflict, stress and adversary relationships before making the decision to serve in a bargaining role.

2. Principals should assess the relationship with their staff before deciding to take on a role on the board's bargaining team.

Hypothesis #3 states: Principals unable to satisfactorily reduce or eliminate their feelings of dissonance, will be less successful in cultivating, and maintaining positive relationships with students, parents, staff, administrative colleagues, and the superintendent. Question #10 found in the Principal's Interview Schedule was designed to test this hypothesis. Data collected from thirty (30) principals are included in Table 73. The table includes a frequency and percent of the principals' responses for all personnel categories as to their estimation of the effectiveness of performance as a result of their experiencing dissonance. An analysis of these data indicate that only
three principals responded that their effectiveness as a building principal had decreased with teaching staff.

After considering the narrative responses recorded in Appendix N and determining that better than 90% of all responses to this question indicated either increased effectiveness or no change in effectiveness in the role as building principal, the writer cannot test this hypothesis.

Principals responding that their effectiveness increased made statements that collectively indicated they increased their effectiveness primarily with staff because they had become much more sensitive to teachers and their needs, helped better define their role as a principal, improved personal growth and increased the awareness of the principal's role in the building on the part of the superintendent and the board of education. Those responding as having had their effectiveness decreased made statements that included comments such as the principal's effectiveness was decreased even if only temporarily, it was decreased because now there is no cooperative, helpful atmosphere, it has strained relationships, and performance and effectiveness have changed because the master contract takes all of the humanism out of people associations. The comments recorded for those principals indicating no change in effectiveness ranged from "its got to take its toll on me if I have to continue in the hard bargaining realm" to "I don't think it had any affect, however, it improved my rapport and understanding with the superintendent."
As a result of the previous analysis of data and conclusions about Hypothesis #3 the writer makes the following recommendations:

A. Recommendations for further research:
   1. A study designed to test Festinger's theory with Hypothesis #3 from the teachers' perceptions of the principals change or no change in effectiveness.

B. Recommendations for the superintendent and the board of education:
   1. Due to the high percentage of principals indicating both no change and increased effectiveness, the superintendent and board of education might consider the involvement of the principal on the bargaining team to be a positive way to improve administrative/staff relationships.

C. Recommendation for principals:
   1. Principals who are reluctant to get involved with the bargaining process should be aware that a large majority of the sample in this study indicated positive improvements in administrative/staff relationships.

Hypothesis #4 states: When dissonance is felt, the principal, in addition to attempting to reduce or eliminate the discomfort, will also try to avoid situations and/or information that would likely increase the discomfort. Table 74 includes data that indicate that of
thirty (30) principals responding to the question, fifteen (15) responded YES and fifteen (15) responded NO.

After considering the narrative comments recorded in Appendix 0 and noting that at least 50% of the principals responded as having made an effort to avoid further discomfort, the writer neither accepts nor rejects Hypothesis #4 and concludes that data collected tend to support the theory of cognitive dissonance but not enough data is available to fully accept the hypothesis.

In order to illustrate the comments made by the fifteen (15) principals responding YES, the writer includes examples of the types of comments made in response to the question. These examples are listed as follows:

- bit my tongue when I wanted to make comments.
- avoided eye-to-eye contact with persons on the opposite side of the bargaining table.
- kept my mouth shut when I felt I was losing my cool.
- following bargaining sessions I would avoid groups or discussions with teaching staff.
- would steer clear of the teachers lounge so that discussions about bargaining would not come up.
- broke away from any close personal contact with teachers on a regular basis.
- avoided conversations with teachers about bargaining issues.
- made myself unavailable at times.
- didn't say anything at the bargaining table especially when I wanted to.
- didn't discuss anything that went on at the bargaining table.
- stayed away on occasion from specific teachers because I knew they were uptight about the negotiations.
- put extra effort trying to rearrange music classes prior to the annual Christmas program.
- avoided criticizing anybody and very protective of my own opinion.
- talked with teachers during the strike in order to keep the lines of communication open.
- mixed socially with teachers on Friday by having a drink with them at the Holiday Inn.
- made every effort to keep communications going with teachers and tried to understand their position during a difficult time.

As a result of the previous analysis regarding Hypothesis #4 the writer makes the following recommendations:

A. Recommendation for principals:

1. Principals serving on the board's bargaining team should understand their dissonant feelings, and be prepared to use activities that will keep them from having additional feelings of discomfort.
Hypothesis #5 and #6 state respectively: The degree (magnitude) of dissonance felt by the principal, as a result of the bargaining team assignment will be increased if the alternatives (elements) considered are more nearly equal in attractiveness. The degree (magnitude) of dissonance felt by the principal, as a result of the bargaining team assignment, will be decreased if the alternatives (elements) considered are more unequal in attractiveness. Questions #8 and #9 in the Principals Interview Schedule were designed to try and get principals to think about the alternatives they considered for reducing or eliminating their dissonant feelings and from these thoughts rate which of the alternatives were easier and which were harder or more difficult to select as a result of comparison. The second of the two questions asked principals to rate alternatives on a scale from 1-4 indicating which alternatives were more alike and which were more unlike in attractiveness. The purpose was to get principals to indicate whether it was an easy task or hard task to select appropriate alternatives.

The writer found during the interviews that a large majority of sample participants did not understand the two questions. In some cases principals stated they could not answer the question; however, some did respond to the question even though they were not real certain of the meaning.

As a result of the analysis of data the writer neither accepts nor rejects these hypotheses. The writer takes this position based on the small amount of data collected. In addition, the writer suggests that the questions designed were not adequate to elicit the interpretation necessary for principals to recall or make a judgement about their
thoughts or alternatives considered at the time that they experienced their feelings of dissonance.

As a result of the foregoing analysis the writer makes the following recommendations:

A. Recommendations for further research:

1. A similar study could be re-designed to test the degree (magnitude) of dissonance felt by principals during the bargaining process with the sample of principals used being individuals who are currently involved in the process.

2. A study could be designed to test the magnitude of dissonance felt by principals that had recently been involved in a teachers' strike.

Differences Among Independent Variables

Data collected from both survey documents represent some differences among the three independent variables of region, type of district and wealth. In addition, it must be noted that much of these data show no significant difference among the three variables. An analysis of these differences are discussed in this section.

Data from the Superintendent's Questionnaire represent several differences among the independent variables. To begin, number of wealthy and non-wealthy districts having a bargaining team varied drastically with there being twice as many non-wealthy local districts reporting having a formal bargaining team. Data for region and wealth show no difference to this question. The writer suggests this would indicate that the level of sophistication for the formal bargaining process found
in wealthy city and local districts in all regions of the state has not had the opportunity to develop because of the lower level of financial need found in more wealthy districts.

Of the 179 districts (Table 6) responding they did not include principals on the bargaining team it was found that there were more than twice as many local (70.5%) than city districts falling in this category. These data would suggest that these local districts either do not have the formal team structure including superintendent, outside negotiator, principals and treasurer or perhaps they do not treat negotiations as a formal process as do those districts reporting that they included principals.

Superintendents were asked to indicate the occurrence of impasse in the district during the school years of 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81. While the data (Table 15) indicate no real differences across regions and for wealthy and non-wealthy districts, data collected report that in 1978-79 city districts declared impasse by a margin of 61.2% over local districts which reported 38.8%. In the other two school years (1979-80 and 1980-81) the local districts declared a slightly higher number of impasses than did the city districts. The writer cannot explain the difference between data collected, but only report the differences for the reader's consideration.

In other differences found in data collected across all independent variables the question regarding the number of strikes occurring in each district reflect some slight variances that are worth noting. All regions reported almost exactly the same number of strikes occurring for all three school years (1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81) except Region II
which reported fourteen (14) or almost three times as many strikes as the other four (Table 16). This fact is not surprising since other data collected (Tables 2, Table 5) indicated that the majority of formal bargaining teams and principals involved are found in Region II. Over all three school years the biggest difference was reported during 1979-80 in which Region III and Region IV reported having no strikes while Region I, Region II and Region V had one, six and two strikes, respectively (Table 16). Data in Table 17 indicate that in the 1978-79 school year 71.4% of all strikes occurred in city type districts. In 1979-80, however, the data (Table 18) are reversed by reporting 66.7% of the nine (9) strikes occurred in local type districts. In 1978-79 and 1979-80 more strikes occurred in wealthy districts than non-wealthy. The writer is reluctant to draw any conclusions from these differences across the three variables since the differences do not set any consistent pattern or trend.

Where student enrollment was analyzed by the three variables differences were found in all of the mean scores reported in Table 19, by region, type of district and wealth. There appears to be no trend or consistent pattern for the differences that occur in student enrollment data, therefore, the writer can made no statement about the data and/or draw any conclusions with the exception of regional mean scores. All regions report very close mean scores except for Region V which reports a mean score enrollment of about half of the other four regions.

Data from the Principal's Interview Schedule also represent some differences among the three independent variables. In the first section of the survey document dealing with demographic data, both wealthy city
and local districts and non-wealthy city and local districts reflect a four to five year difference in number of years served as a building principal (Table 2). The writer suggests that the reason that principals in city districts have more years on the average than local districts is that the formal bargaining process has been carried on longer in city as opposed to local districts. In addition, apparently principals have been selected because of their greater number of years of administrative experience.

Data collected from principals (Table 31) regarding the number of impasses that occurred during their time on the bargaining team indicated that differences occurred varied by region and slightly by wealth. Region I reported seven (7) impasses while the other four regions reported having either two, three or four impasse declarations during the bargaining process. Wealthy districts reported eleven (11) impasse declarations to non-wealthy with seven (7). The writer cannot suggest a reason for the difference across regions, but concludes that wealthy districts have more formal procedures that use more often an outside negotiator as chief spokesman than do the non-wealthy districts in the state. The outside negotiator by a wide margin was an attorney as opposed to other categories as presented in Table 12.

A similar question was asked of principals about the number of strikes that occurred while they served on the bargaining team. Data collected report that all regions indicated having a similar number of strikes except Region III which reported having no strikes while a large difference in data occurred for the variable of wealth. Wealthy districts reported having 80% of the five strikes that occurred while only
one strike occurred in a non-wealthy district. This difference in data was a surprise to the writer. Wealthy districts it would seem would have more dollars to spend in settling negotiated agreements thus fewer number of strikes than districts that have fewer dollars to offer teachers during settlements. On the other hand, it might be suggested that the reason for more of the strikes occurring in wealthy districts was because these districts used the hard bargaining approach using an outside negotiator that eventually forced the teachers to call for a strike.

In the second section of the interview schedule principals were asked questions that dealt with bargaining team membership. Several differences among variables are reviewed from these data. Data collected with regard to the number of years that principals served on the bargaining team reflect differences for region, type of district and wealth. While differences were reported across region, type of district and wealth, the primary difference occurred among the dependent variable options for the number of years (Table 39). Twice as many principals (19) indicated serving on the bargaining team for one year or less as opposed to an equal number responding one to three years and three years or more. Using the dependent variable of one year or less data differed primarily among regions in that the number of principals serving ranged from two principals in Region I to six principals in Region V with Regions II, III and IV being almost equal in number. These differences cannot be explained by the writer except to indicate that more districts are using as many principals with one year of experience or less as they are with one or more years.
Principals were asked to indicate their degree of choice or no choice regarding their assignment on the bargaining team. Data indicate that principals in city districts had slightly more choice than those in local districts (Table 46). The same was true for wealthy over non-wealthy districts by a margin of 10% (Table 47). While these differences are discussed by the writer to suggest that slight differences occur no suggestion is offered for the differences. Again, wealthy-city districts may have more sophistication and expertise in selecting the principals that were included.

Questions found in Section III of the Principal's Interview Schedule regarding data on feelings is not discussed with regard to differences among the independent variables in this section of Chapter V because they were dealt with in the first part of this chapter. A review and analysis of the trends along with the differences among the independent variables discussed in this section provide several implications that call for recommendations to be made:

A. Recommendations for further research:

1. A study designed to determine why at least 40% of the districts responding did not include principals on the board's bargaining team.

2. A study designed to determine why more non-wealthy school districts had bargaining teams than wealthy districts.

3. A study designed to determine why those school districts reported in this study not including
principals in the bargaining process were all wealthy districts.

4. A study designed to determine the frequency of teacher strikes by all five regions of the state from a period beginning 1970 to the present with emphasis on the position of the principal (management or teacher) during each strike situation.

5. A study designed to determine if the years of experience of a principal relates in any way to their assignment on the board's bargaining team.

6. A study designed to determine how those districts in Ohio that do not have a formal bargaining team negotiate salary increases and other items of interest with the teaching staff.

7. A study to determine if those districts that do not include the principal on the bargaining team, use a team of other administrators or if they use solely an outside negotiator.

8. A study to determine if city districts have been involved in formal bargaining with a team structure longer than local type school districts.
9. A study designed to see if city districts use more formal procedures than local districts and include an outside negotiator in more cases than the local districts.

Data Suggest Implications for Research Objectives

In Chapter I the writer stated four research objectives to help define the direction of the study. These four objectives will be discussed in this section in relation to the trends that are suggested by data collected in both the Superintendents Questionnaire and the Principals Interview Schedule.

Research Objective #1 states: If the principal opts for total allegiance to management, will it be accomplished at the expense of successful administrative/staff relationships?

Data collected during the interviews with principals indicated that the bargaining role did create some dissonance on the part of some principals, especially with the teaching staff. In some cases principals did not report having dissonant feelings with any personnel while they served on the board's bargaining team. Data collected from both survey documents suggest trends and/or implications for this research objective. These findings are listed as follows:

1. While 75% of the sample principals indicated they had some degree of dissonance as a result of their bargaining role, all reported they were able to reduce and/or eliminate their feelings of dissonance to either a great extent or to some extent (Tables 59 and 70).
2. Over 90% of those sample principals responding indicated they felt good about their decision to be a part of the bargaining process.

3. It would appear from the principals responses (Table 73) that their feelings of dissonance did not decrease their effectiveness as a building principal.

4. Better than 95% of the principals responding as having dissonance (Table 73) indicated that their effectiveness increased or did not change with the teaching staff following their involvement on the board's bargaining team.

5. Of the thirty (30) sample principals experiencing dissonance, the teaching staff was the group most identified as causing the uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings.

_Research Objective #2 states:_ Does a strong commitment to staff and positive staff relations cause the principal a concern and possible conflict with the role that must be played as a member of management and the board's bargaining team?

Data collected from the survey documents suggest some implications for this objective. From an analysis of these data the writer makes the following statements:

1. Principals that experienced positive staff relations with their teaching staff reported having both feelings of dissonance and in other cases no discomforting feelings.
2. Some principals indicated a strong allegiance to their staff than the administration. In most cases these were elementary rather than secondary principals.

3. Over 90% of the twenty-nine (29) sample principals responding indicated they felt good about their decision to be a part of the bargaining team (Table 53).

4. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the principals in the sample indicated they had volunteered for membership on the bargaining team as opposed to twenty-five (25%) percent who were appointed with no choice about the assignment.

5. A majority of sample principals indicated that their reason for volunteering for the bargaining team was to gain personal experience and also provide input for middle management concerns.

Research Objective #3 states: Will principals experience even greater concerns if they are associated in some way with the board's bargaining team?

The writer has already presented data that indicate some principals do experience dissonance and some do not when they are involved in the bargaining process as a member of the board's bargaining team. In addition to the statements made under Research Objectives #1 and #2 the writer presents the direct quotes of eleven (11) sample principals expressing dissonance that illustrate their reluctance or willingness
to serve another time on the board's bargaining team during negotiations with teachers. These direct quotes are listed as follows:

- "Wouldn't want to ever do it again—I didn't enjoy it—however, I gained some knowledge."
- "Would not want to ever do this again. Good experience and it made me a better principal."
- "No, although middle management does need to have input on issues so someone should allow for this to happen."
- "I don't want to be on the team next time (this time quite worried)."
- "If I were on the bargaining team today I would find it a lot tougher than in 1975-77—would probably have a lot of discomfort. No, I wouldn't want to serve again."
- "I don't think that I want to be on the bargaining another year."
- "If I had to do it again I sure wouldn't like it."
- "I'd do it again—but I wouldn't volunteer for it because it took a lot of time and effort."
- "I would serve again only if I had to."
- "I would do it, but I wouldn't look forward to it."
- "Yes, I suppose I would serve one more year if asked."

While the study did not collect any data relevant to other phases of management cooperation and/or team management it can be concluded that when a principal takes on a management role, such as collective bargaining, some individual principals will lose some of the successful relationships that might have developed before the new role was accepted and played out. The writer found during the interview with principals that various reactions and levels of frustration were reported. One principal indicated that he had such a traumatic experience
throughout and following the process that he would retire before he
would take his turn again. Other principals, however, reported lesser
feelings of dissonance during and after their role was completed.

Research Objective #4 states: Can a principal accept both the
roles of bargaining team member and building administrator and not be
subject to any conflict or discomfort as a result of serving both
roles?

From the sample of forty (40) principals, thirty (30) indicated
having some degree of conflict or discomfort as a result of their role
on the bargaining team and ten (10) reported having no feeling of dis-
comfort. This study has shown that Festinger's theory of cognitive
dissonance relates, as indicated in Hypotheses #1, #2 and #3, well to
the feelings that principals have as a result of their involvement in
the bargaining process and the strategies they use to reduce or elimin-
ate these feelings.

Some Personal Thoughts

While the study has produced much data with regard to the princi-
pals' feelings and involvement with the board of education's bargaining
team and the negotiations process, several aspects of the study have
special significance to the writer. These aspects are discussed in this
section of Chapter V and will serve as concluding remarks for this re-
search project.

The response the writer received from both survey documents has
special importance. The Superintendent's Questionnaire (93.5%) and
Principal's Interview Schedule (100%) each obtained a very high rate of
return and response. This high rate of response is indicative of the
importance that school administrators are placing on the bargaining process. Perhaps this is a very good time for other studies to be conducted that associate with the process of bargaining. The higher response rate also added substantial validity to the conduct of the study.

It was somewhat surprising to the writer that of 435 districts reporting having formal bargaining teams only 266 of these districts reported using principals. This amounts to only 61% participation on the part of principals. A much higher percentage was expected. The writer suggests that possibly the number of outside negotiators being used might be cause for the 61% of principal participation. It is further suggested that a study be designed to provide historical data regarding the principal's involvement on the bargaining team in Ohio over the past twenty years. Due to the increased number of teacher strikes in Ohio over the past five years, the writer speculates that the number of outside negotiators being used by board's of education have also increased.

The dissonance felt by thirty (30) of the forty (40) sample participants was primarily with the teaching staff. Only a few principals scored as having any dissonant feelings with the other four personnel categories. The writer was not surprised with these findings since it was speculated during the design of the study that this would be the case. The surprising factor related to the principal's dissonance with teaching staff was the fact that all thirty (30) of the principals indicated that they were able to reduce or eliminate their dissonant feelings to either "a great extent" or "some extent." None of the
principals reported not being able to reduce or eliminate some or all of their dissonant feelings. The narrative responses found in the appendices also indicate the trend that most principals felt a closer and more positive relationship with their teaching staff as a result of serving on the bargaining team. Perhaps the important implication here is that principals will better understand and make a more concerted effort toward establishing and maintaining successful positive administrative/staff relationships as an outcome of his/her team member involvement on the bargaining team.

The findings of thirty (30) principals with regard to their dissonance primarily with teaching staff can be generalized to those 266 school districts having principals on the board's bargaining team. The conclusion made by the writer is that some degree of dissonance will be experienced by 75% of all principals involved on the board's bargaining team.

The writer found during the sample interviews that dissonance was found to be greater with elementary than with secondary principals. More of the elementary principals indicated to the writer that they did not want to serve on the bargaining team for another term. This fact leads the writer to suggest that the implication here might well be cause for a research study to determine any real differences that might be present between the feelings and involvement of elementary and secondary principals on the board's bargaining team. The writer speculates that differences would be found between these two classifications.

Some comment needs to be made about the ten (10) sample principals that scored as having no feelings of dissonance. The writer felt that
all but two (2) of these principals reported honestly about not having any feelings of dissonance with any of the five (5) personnel categories. These eight (8) principals felt very strongly about their position in not experiencing any dissonance and in some cases indicated that they had served the bargaining team for more than just one year. The writer suggests that these principals had developed a very strong positive rapport with their teaching staff as well as the other four (4) categories and perhaps their personality and respect had something to do with their feelings of non-dissonance.

The remaining two principals reporting they felt no dissonance, in the writer's opinion, were not being totally honest about their responses. They appeared very nervous during the short time spent in the interview. They appeared overly concerned about how the data was to be used by the writer almost to the extent that they didn't really believe that this was a legitimate research project.

A final issue that needs some discussion is the issue of strikes. Only five strikes were reported by the sample of forty (40) principals that took place during the 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81 school years. It was found during the interviews that some of the sample principals had experienced a strike in other than those three school years. In some cases the principals were on the bargaining team at the time and in others they served on the team following a strike in the district. Although data collected does not indicate a high incidence of teacher strikes, principals involved in the sample could relate their feelings of dissonance with strikes they had experienced prior to their assignment to the bargaining team. The writer feels that the variable of
a teacher's strike has special implications for the principals' feelings of dissonance and non-dissonance.

It is, therefore, suggested that a study be designed to test the writer's six hypothesis with two groups of principals. The first group should contain principals that served on the board's bargaining team following a teacher's strike and the second group (control) would contain only principals that are serving on the team from districts that have had no history of teacher strikes. The findings about dissonance could be compared and conclusions drawn.

The writer feels that the teachers' strike has some very important implications for principals in a school district, not only as it relates to a bargaining assignment, but also to the general relationships of all personnel involved. The principal's involvement with personnel within a school district is of critical importance to a successful operation. The selection of the principal, therefore, to serve in a bargaining role is very important to the principal and his staff. A superintendent, in the writer's opinion, must be able to successfully involve middle management personnel in the bargaining process. Not all principals are desirous or have the personality to take on the additional assignment of bargaining team member and emerge from the assignment with successful administrative/staff relationships. Principals must be able to pull a staff together following the completion of negotiations and especially if a strike was part of the process.

As a final concern the writer noted a difference in perception on the part of the principal and superintendent regarding the way in which principals were assigned to the bargaining team. Both superintendents
and principals had several options from which to respond as to the way in which the principal was selected to membership on the bargaining team (Tables 8, 49, and 50). The options of 1) volunteered (VOL), and 2) volunteered at the request of the superintendent (VAR) were combined into the category of volunteered. The superintendents responded (Table 8) that about 50% of the principals volunteered for team membership while 70% of the principals indicated that they had volunteered for membership. The specific difference between the response categories of superintendent and principals lies in the fact that superintendents indicated by a large margin that principals volunteered on their own without the request of the superintendent while most of the principals indicated they volunteered only after the superintendent had requested them. This difference in communication between superintendent and principal could create a problem for principals that really didn't want to volunteer for the assignment. On the other hand, the writer feels that it would allow for some principal who might be somewhat reluctant to get involved to participate and find positive success with teaching staff as a result of the experience.

As a parting statement the writer feels that the building principal, by virtue of his/her management responsibilities, needs to have the experience of being directly involved in the bargaining role. The findings of this study indicate that principals experiencing feelings of discomfort were able to reduce or eliminate these feelings and in many cases improve the administrative/staff relationships associated with their role as building principal.
APPENDIX A

Superintendent's Questionnaire
Superintendent's Questionnaire on Collective Bargaining

February, 1981

School District Name ____________________________________________________

- Type of District (Check one)
  County ------------------------------------City   Local _________

1. Does your district have a "bargaining team" representing the Board of Education that sits at the bargaining table during negotiations with your teachers? Yes _____ No _____

2. If your response to Question #1 was YES, did any building principals serve as members of that team? Yes _____ No _____
   If YES, indicate the number of building principals that were members of the team during the following school years:
   1978-79  1979-80  1980-81

If your response to Question #2 is NO, please disregard the remaining questions and mail the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope provided.

3. How was the principal(s) selected? (Please check)
   _____ Volunteered
   _____ Volunteered after request of Superintendent
   _____ Appointed by the Superintendent
   _____ Appointed by the Board of Education
   _____ Appointed by other central office administrator
   _____ Other method (specify) ___________________________________

4. What position(s) listed below served as chief spokesman for the Board's bargaining team during the following school years? (Please check)
   1978-79  1979-80  1980-81

   Board Member
   Superintendent
   Principal
   Treasurer
   Other Central Office Administrator
   Outside Negotiator
   (Specify)
   Other (Specify) __________________________________________

5. If a principal(s) serves as a member of the Board's bargaining team, which of the following would best describe the principal's role on the bargaining team?
6. Was impasse declared anytime during the bargaining process? If so, please check the appropriate school year(s).

   ______ 1978-79  ______ 1979-80  ______ 1980-81

7. Did your school district have a classroom teachers' strike during any of the following school years? If so, please check the appropriate school year(s).

   ______ 1978-79  ______ 1979-80  ______ 1980-81

8. What was the school district's (1980-81) student enrollment as of October 1, 1980? ________________

9. What was your school district valuation as certified by the county auditor as of December, 1980? $ ______________ What was the per pupil expenditure for the 1979-80 school year? ______________

10. Please list the names of those principals that participated in the bargaining process as reflected in the previous questions. Indicate which are elementary principals (K-6 or K-8 or 6, 7 & 8) and which are secondary (7-9 or 9-12 or 10-12). Place an asterisk (*) next to those no longer under contract with the district.

   Name ________________________________
   Name ________________________________
   Name ________________________________

Person completing questionnaire:

   ________________________________  ________________________________
   Signature                      Position/Title

Date completed _______________________

Please return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope.
APPENDIX B

Informational Letter to Accompany Superintendent's Questionnaire

185
February 28, 1981

Dear Superintendent:

I am conducting a research project as part of the requirement for the Ph.D. degree at The Ohio State University. My research deals, in part, with the identification of elementary and secondary school principals that are currently or have recently been involved in some identifiable role with the Board of Education's bargaining team.

Questionnaires are being mailed to all City and Local school district superintendents in Ohio. The responses will provide general information regarding the board's degree of involvement and, more specifically, the involvement of principals in collective bargaining with employee groups in the school district. The information contained in each superintendent's response will be kept strictly confidential.

The names of principals recorded in the questionnaire by the respondent will subsequently become part of a population of principals throughout the state from which a stratified random sample of forty principal participants will be drawn. The forty sample participants will be contacted by the writer for the purpose of scheduling a structured interview. The information collected from each participant during the interview will not be used to identify the individual principal or draw any attention to any particular school district.

Please complete the questionnaire by Friday, March 20, 1981, and return by mail in the envelope provided.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

William H. Hanning, Jr.
9888 Pebble Beach Cove
Aurora, Ohio 44202
APPENDIX C

Letter of Endorsement
Ohio School Boards Association
March 2, 1981

Dear Superintendent:

The Ohio School Boards Association endorses the research project being conducted by Bill Hanning. It is indeed important to investigate and better define the roles and attitudes of public school principals in the collective bargaining process.

As you probably know the Ohio School Boards Association, as well as the other statewide education management organizations, enthusiastically endorses the management team approach to operating Ohio's public schools. Hopefully, Bill Hanning's work will help further our understanding of team management, particularly as it involves collective bargaining with employee groups.

I encourage you to give the enclosed questionnaire your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

David B. Martin
Executive Vice President

DBM/pag

serving the public school leadership team
APPENDIX D

Follow-Up Letter to Superintendents
March 20, 1981

Dear Superintendent:

on March 2, 1981, the enclosed questionnaire and a letter of endorse­ment from Mr. David B. Martin, Executive Vice-President, The Ohio School Board's Association, were mailed to all City and Local School district superintendents in the State of Ohio. As of this date I have not re­ceived your completed questionnaire. If you have returned the question­naire please excuse this reminder. If you have not completed the brief question­naire, please do so as soon as possible and return in the self- addressed stamped envelope.

I am conducting a research project as part of the requirement for the PhD. degree at The Ohio State University. My research deals, in part, with the identification of elementary and secondary school principals that are currently or have recently been involved in some identifiable role with the Board of Education's bargaining team.

The responses will provide general information regarding the board's degree of involvement and, more specifically, the involvement of principals in collective bargaining with employee groups in the school district. The information contained in each superintendent's responses will be kept strictly confidential.

The names of principals recorded in the questionnaire by the respondent will subsequently become part of a population of principals throughout the state from which a stratified random sample of forty principal parti­cipants will be drawn. The forty sample participants will be contacted by the writer for the purpose of scheduling a structured interview. The information collected from each participant during the interview will not be used to identify the individual principal or draw any attention to a particular school district.

Thank you for your assistance.

William H. Hanning, Jr.
9888 Pebble Beach Cove
Aurora, Ohio 44202
APPENDIX E

Principal's Interview Schedule
| Region Number | __________ |
| County Number | __________ |
| District Number | __________ |
| Principal's Number | __________ |
| Date of Interview | __________ |
| Time Interview Began | __________ |
| Time Interview Ended | __________ |
| Total Time | __________ |
| Participant's Current Position | __________ |

**Administrative Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K-3</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>K-6</th>
<th>5-8</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>K-8</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SECTION 1. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. How many years have you served as a building principal?
   ______ years

2. How many years have you served as principal in this district?
   ______ years

3. How many years have you served as principal in this school?
   ______ years

4. How long has the board of education been involved in formal collective bargaining procedures with teachers?
   ______ one year or less
   ______ two to four years
   ______ longer than four years

5. Could you estimate the length of time that principals have been included as members of the board's bargaining team?
   ______ one year
   ______ two to three years
   ______ four years
   ______ longer than four years

6. Was impasse declared anytime during the bargaining process while you served as a member of the bargaining team?
   ______ yes   ______ no   If Yes, what school year? ______

7. Did the school district experience a teachers' strike while you served as a member of the bargaining team?
   ______ yes   ______ no   If Yes, what school year? ______
SECTION II. TEAM MEMBERSHIP DATA

Now I would like to turn our attention to several questions regarding your position and role as a member of the bargaining team.

1. During which of the following school years have you served on the board's bargaining team?
   - 1980-81
   - 1979-80
   - 1978-79
   - 1977-78
   - 1976-77
   - 1975-76
   - 1974-75
   - 1973-74
   - 1972-73
   - 1971-72
   - 1970-71
   - 1969-70
   - Other

2. How long have you served as a member of the bargaining team?
   - one year or less
   - more than one year but less than three
   - more than three years

3. Are you currently serving as a member of the bargaining team?
   - yes
   - no

4. Do you feel that you had any choice regarding your assignment?
   - total choice
   - some choice
   - no choice

5. From the following choices which would best describe the way in which you became a member of the team?
   - volunteered
   - volunteered after being requested by the superintendent
   - appointed by the board of education
   - appointed by the superintendent
   - other method (specify)

If (*) move to Question #6
If (✓) move to Question #8
6. Which would best describe your reason for volunteering to serve on the team?

____ gain experience from the bargaining process

____ to be in a direct position to provide input for middle management concerns

____ would assist as a means of upgrading current position in administration

____ other reason (specify in one sentence)

______________________________________________________________

7. Do you believe that you made the right decision when you volunteered to be a member of the bargaining team?

____ yes   ____ no   ____ not certain

8. Which of the following choices best describes your role as a member of the team?

____ chief spokesman year(s) _______

____ team member year(s) _______

____ advisor to the team year(s) _______

____ other (specify) year(s) _______

______________________________________________________________

9. In your role as described in the previous question, which of the following would best describe your presence at the table during formal bargaining sessions?

____ always   ____ sometimes   ____ not at all
SECTION III. DATA ON FEELINGS AND ACTIONS

1. Once you had become a member of the board’s bargaining team, what kinds of feelings did you have about your assignment with regard to each of the following categories of personnel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMFORTABLE</th>
<th>UNCOMFORTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Staff</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrators</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (specify)</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HARMONIOUS</th>
<th>DISSONANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Staff</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrators</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (specify)</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLEASURABLE</th>
<th>PAINFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Staff</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrators</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (specify)</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: Students ___ Teaching Staff ___ Administrators ___ Parents ___ Superintendent ___

Definitions: Non-dissonance - respondent receives a score of 6 points or less in each category.

Dissonance - respondent receives a score of 7 points or more in any category.

- Hypothesis #2

**Note:** Respondents must select a score for all categories of personnel.

If a respondent receives a score of 6 points or less for all categories, move to Question #2-A.

If a respondent receives a score of 7 points or more for any category, move to Question #2-B.
2-A. Describe some of the *comfortable, harmonious, pleasurable* feelings that you had with each category of personnel.

Students

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Teaching Staff

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Administrators

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Parents

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Superintendent

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Other (specify)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

- Null Hypothesis of #1

Move to Question #3-A
2-B. Describe some of the uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings that you had with each category of personnel.

Students _________________________ __________________

______________________________________________________

Teaching Staff _________________________

______________________________________________________

Administrators _________________________

______________________________________________________

Parents _________________________

______________________________________________________

Superintendent _________________________

______________________________________________________

Other (specify) _________________________

______________________________________________________

- Hypothesis #1

Move to Question #3-B
3-A. What were some of the things that occurred or that you observed with each category that gave you **comfortable, harmonious, pleasurably** feelings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Null Hypothesis of #1

Move to Question #4
3-B. What were some of the things that occurred or that you observed with each category that gave you uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings?

Students

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Teaching Staff

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Administrators

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Parents

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Superintendent

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Other (specify)

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

- Hypothesis #1

Move to Question #5
4. Did you, at any time, have any uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings about any category?  ____ Yes  ____ No

Students

Teaching Staff

Administrators

Parents

Superintendent

Other (specify)

Discontinue interview if respondent continues to indicate no dissonance

Move to Question #2-B, 3-B, etc., if respondent indicates any uncomfortable, dissonant or painful feelings on this question
5. Have you been able, through your own actions, to reduce or eliminate those uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a Great Extent</th>
<th>To Some Extent</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hypothesis #2

Move to Question #6-A if respondent answers "To a Great Extent" or "To Some Extent"

Move to Question #6-B if respondent answers "Not at All"
6-A. Considering each category that you mentioned, describe the alternatives that you considered prior to your attempt to reduce or eliminate your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings.

Example: A) Become more visible to student body
        B) Meet with student leaders once a week
        C) Answer questions that students have about bargaining process

Students

Teaching Staff

Administrators

Parents

Superintendent

Other (specify)

- Hypothesis #2

Move to Question #7
6-B. Why do you feel that you were unable to reduce or eliminate your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings?

Students __________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Teaching Staff ______________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Administrators _____________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Parents _____________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Superintendent _____________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Other (specify) _____________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

- Hypothesis #2

Move to Question #8
7. Considering the alternative actions that you thought about and described in the previous question, which alternative(s) did you select to try and reduce or eliminate your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings?

Students ________________________________________________

Teaching Staff ____________________________________________

Administrators ___________________________________________

Parents _________________________________________________

Superintendent __________________________________________

Other (specify) __________________________________________

- Hypothesis #2

Move to Question #8

Move to Question #10 if only one alternative is recorded
8. Was it **easy** or **hard** to decide on which alternative(s) to use in attempting to reduce or eliminate your **uncomfortable, dissonant, painful** feelings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Easy to Decide</th>
<th>Hard to Decide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hypotheses #5 and #6
9. For each category discussed and considering each set of alternatives that you considered to act on, which sets of alternatives were more alike and which sets were more unlike in attractiveness to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>More Alike</th>
<th>More Unlike</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: Students: Teaching Staff: Administrators: Parents: Superintendent: 

Definitions: More Alike - respondent receives a score of 2 points or less in each category. 
More Unlike - respondent receives a score of 3 points or more in each category.

- Hypotheses #5 and #6
10. Do you think that your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings changed your performance as building principal with any of the categories?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Increased Effectiveness</th>
<th>Did Not Change Effectiveness</th>
<th>Decreased Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hypothesis #3

Record verbal comments

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
11. While you were considering and selecting your alternative actions to reducing and eliminating your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings, do you recall doing anything to avoid having additional feelings of discomfort? 

______ Yes _______ No

If so, describe the things that you did.

Example: You might have made every effort to avoid face-to-face contact with the superintendent.

Students ________________________________

_______________________________________

Teaching Staff ___________________________

_______________________________________

Administrators ___________________________

_______________________________________

Parents _________________________________

_______________________________________

Superintendent __________________________

_______________________________________

Other (specify) __________________________

_______________________________________

- Hypothesis #4

Move to Question #12
12. Considering the five categories listed, rate each on a scale from 1-5 with a 1 indicating the Least Discomfort and a 5 indicating the Most Discomfort.

NOTE: RESPONDENTS MUST SELECT A SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Felt Least Discomfort</th>
<th>Felt Most Discomfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: Students    
Teaching Staff     
Administrators     
Parents            
Superintendent    

END OF INTERVIEW
APPENDIX F

Letter Mailed to Sample Principals
April 15, 1981

Mr. --

Dear Mr.

I am conducting a research project as part of the requirement for the Ph.D. degree at The Ohio State University. My dissertation, in part, deals with the identification of both elementary and secondary school principals who are currently or have recently been involved in some role with the board of education's bargaining team.

Questionnaires were mailed in March, 1981, to all City and Local school district superintendents in Ohio. Responses from superintendents totaled 89.4%. These respondents have provided me with the names of those principals from their districts that have been involved with the board's bargaining team over the past three school years. I am enclosing, for your information, a copy of the questionnaire mailed to Ohio superintendents.

Your school district and your name have been selected as one of the forty principals that comprise a random sample drawn from a population of all principals reported through the Superintendent's Questionnaires. Due to the limited size of the sample, it is extremely important to obtain full participation from those individuals selected.

The purpose of selecting a sample of principals will be to allow for a person-to-person interview to be conducted by me in order to collect information about the membership and role of principals on the team along with demographic data related to that membership and role in the process of bargaining.

I am requesting your assistance with the collection of data by agreeing to participate and allowing me to schedule an interview with you. Within the next ten days I will contact you by telephone. At that time I will schedule a convenient date for the interview.

The superintendent of your district will be informed of your selection following the interview; however, all information collected during the individual interviews will be kept strictly confidential and not be shared with anyone. The aggregate data
collected from the forty sample principals will be analyzed and reported in the dissertation but will not bear the names of any individual participant or their school district.

I look forward to talking with you.

Sincerely,

William H. Hanning, Jr.
9888 Pebble Beach Cove
Aurora, Ohio 44202
Phone (216) 562-3237
APPENDIX G

Narrative Description of Comfortable, Harmonious and Pleasurable Feelings
Question 2-A - "Describe some of the comfortable, harmonious, pleasurable feelings that you had with each category of personnel."

**Participant/Category - Students**

P 9  "They weren't really aware of the process, especially the elementary students -- I felt comfortable."

P 13 "No real feelings, I doubt if parents and students knew that I was a member of the team."

P 14 "I don't believe that they were aware that I served this function."

P 20 "Felt very comfortable at all times."

P 22 "Would not have known that I was on the team."

P 25 "Things went on as usual -- they were probably not aware of the team."

P 26 "No awareness."

P 34 "In the spring of 1978, the students were not really into the strike situation. Routine things occurred with school running normally, but in the fall of 1978 the students were anti-strike."

P 35 "No real effect on students."

P 36 "Couldn't comment."

P 38 "No comment."

P 40 "Nothing really."

**Participant/Category - Teaching Staff**

P 4  "Felt no harassment from teachers following bargaining sessions."

"Even though teachers used OEA Uni-Serv, the teachers' bargaining team would be willing to discuss matters informally away from the table in the building during the day."
"I've enjoyed it — good experience, could chat very easily with the staff. Seniority was a big issue at district-wide level, it used to be only at the building level."

"We had very comfortable relationships, even the day following a bargaining session. I could always sit and talk informally with my staff."

"I felt that my role was a cooperative venture in solving system-wide concerns."

"Felt very comfortable at all times."

"They felt that I was being professional in my activities — know this by my personal contacts and other discussions that I had with the staff."

"No problem because we kept open communications with staff and teachers during the bargaining process."

"Staff associated with me would be mainly supervisors and administrators."

"I was communicating one-on-one to those teachers crossing picket line and working. Routine things were occurring inside the building."

"No resistance or comments thrown my way by staff — some occasional jabs passed off, but no real issue or concern here."

"Fairly cooperative throughout the process."

"Very comfortable with staff as a result of my role on the team."

"There were no uncomfortable feelings with this group."

Participant/Category - Administrators

"Other administrators were glad that I was representing them on the team rather than them."

"I could discuss the issues with them; I felt that they trusted me. It was my role to represent them at the bargaining table."
"My involvement drew the administrative group closer together as we worked on issues of concern at the bargaining table."

"Felt very comfortable at all times."

"They were always supportive of my participation."

"Communications were open between this group and the Board's bargaining team members."

"To make input for middle management was comfortable and pleasurable."

"No real effect."

"No comment."

"No problem -- still the same situation and rapport."

"I could report progress to the administrative group with good response from them — I had a good feeling about this."

"Very few parents knew that I was a part of the bargaining process plus the community is very supportive."

"No real feelings -- they did not know I was involved in the bargaining process."

"Same comment as for students, 99% of the parents wouldn't be aware of my involvement with the Board's bargaining team."

"Felt very comfortable at all times."

"Would not have really known of my participation."

"I don't know that they were aware of the process."

"No awareness."

"Parents were favorable to the Board's position, and I had no concern with any parents."

"No real effect."

"No comment."
"No comment."

"Parents were strong union supporters; however, they didn't make me feel uncomfortable."

Participant/Category — Superintendent

"Superintendent is a fine, professional type of person that has talent in dealing with people — brilliant person. I had no fear in working with the Superintendent."

"Worked well together — he would rely on my judgement at the table and in the bargaining team sessions."

"Developed a common bond and improved working relationships and knowledge of Superintendent's philosophy."

"Felt very comfortable at all times."

"Always supportive of my participation."

"I could always say what I wanted about the situation to him."

"Found pleasurable my limited contacts with Superintendent when closure was needed on proposals and issues."

"I had a very good relationship with the Superintendent throughout the bargaining process, strike, etc. Superintendent was not directly involved in the process, however."

"No real effect."

"No comment."

"We've always had a good relationship — probably better since I've been on the team."

"Brought me into a closer relationship with the Superintendent. Superintendent's regard for me increased as our experience or relationship progressed."
APPENDIX H

Narrative Description of Uncomfortable Dissonant, Painful Feelings
Question 2-B - "Describe some of the uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings that you had with each category of personnel."

Participant/Category - Students

A. Principal felt angry about students' behavior to teachers during strike action.

P 27 "They treated or mistreated teachers on the picket lines -- students made comments to teachers that they had heard at home -- felt very angry about the students' behavior."

Participant/Category - Teaching Staff

A. Principals expressed their feelings about the teachers' bargaining proposals and issues.

P 5 "Thought the teacher bargaining team members were unreasonable in their demands as presented in their proposals."

P 6 "Felt that the teachers were right about some of their demands (Proposals) and because of this I felt uncomfortable about my role on the Board's team."

P 7 A) "Salary was a big issue, and I felt sympathetic with the teachers' demands for salary change and would like to have supported staff but could not because of my team position (Board's team)."

B) "Major item of negotiations was the proposal request for a standardized evaluation procedure which was finally discussed, modified, and adopted. I have felt uncomfortable with this policy ever since it was adopted."

P 10 "There were times that teachers only talked about what would be good for kids, but when it came down to it all they wanted was money (as usual). This lowered my esteem for the staff -- they were hypocrites."

P 17 "It seemed that most of the things that teachers negotiated for were at the expense of the kids; i.e., personal days, out-of-classroom time, additional leaves other than sick leave, etc. Many bargaining issues were in conflict with principal's role and responsibility -- control issues."
P 28 A) "Teachers presented an 83-page proposal which was a waste of everyone's time -- this made me angry with teachers and OEA."

B) "I had personal trouble with proposals presented by teachers; i.e., (1) special phone, (2) personal days, (3) RIF policy, (4) length of school day, and (5) supplemental contracts. Angry about these items."

C) "Concerned about long-range proposals and concerns expressed by staff."

P 29 "Issues of personal business and personal leave made me feel disappointed with teachers when they would even have the courage or mind of proposing unrestricted leaves of this type."

P 31 "Teachers are asking through their proposals for more ridiculous items than ever before; i.e., evaluation procedures requested would tie the hands of the administration. I can't support some of their points of view -- makes me angry and frustrated."

P 39 "I was angry when teachers would put salary ahead of the students."

Participant/Category - Teaching Staff

B. Principals expressed feelings about the behavior at the bargaining table and on picket lines.

P 18 "Feelings at the table were hard and rough at times, and some teachers (on teachers' team) could not shift gears when they went back to the building -- they carried negative feelings around."

P 33 A) "I felt a lot of anxiety about the table demeanor; shouting at each other, physical gestures, etc."

B) "I had feelings of disgust because teachers took over (physically) the central office during the last strike."
C. Principals expressed their feelings about the teachers' bargaining team and the way information was being communicated to the general staff.

P 8 "I felt very frustrated since the bargaining process wasn't getting any closer -- getting short with other people and staff."

P 16 "I know that there were some things that were said at bargaining sessions that I knew weren't coming from teachers. This made me very angry and hot."

P 18 A) "I found that talk drifted away from the table -- teachers were discussing issues in the building -- this made me feel uncomfortable and angry."

B) "I was angry (not certain of the year) following a discussion of grievance procedure issue -- it was brought up by association team and later carried away by team members as happening at the high school rather than the elementary school where it actually took place."

C) "I had some suspicions about the general staff not knowing the true issues in negotiations from some of the innuendoes that I heard around the building; less than clear understanding.

P 29 "Felt resentful and disappointed that the teachers' bargaining team wasn't putting out the true information about what was going on at the bargaining team."

P 30 "Members of the teachers' bargaining team made me mad when they talked about concern for the kids -- they weren't really interested in kids, even though they said they were -- this made me angry."

D. Principals expressed feelings regarding their role on the Board's bargaining team and the difficulty that it caused for them and their staff.

P 2 "Felt upset about comments that were made by fellow (teacher) staff members."

P 3 A) "Bothered me, due to my rapport with staff (being a member of the team)."

B) "Feeling that I wished I was home and not doing this (being a member of the team)."
"Difficult in not being able to talk with teachers during negotiations."

"Sometimes things weren't going well and teachers wanted to discuss the bargaining issues in the principal's presence -- this made me feel uncomfortable."

"I had some minor feelings of discomfort because I had taught with so many of the teachers that are now under me in this building. I'm clear now on where I belong -- administrator."

"I always felt very uncomfortable during the day following the AM bargaining session."

"Felt that on some occasions I wanted to support the teachers' position, but couldn't because I was a member of the Board's bargaining team."

"My usual, open, casual relationship that I had with teachers in my building changed drastically with the staff the second year on the bargaining team -- this was the year impasse was declared."

"When I would approach a group of teachers they would stop talking and sometimes disperse."

"Teachers brought up the fact that principals received salary increases before teachers did -- I felt somewhat uncomfortable about this."

"I feel somewhat differently about teachers in my two buildings of responsibility -- one building has all members of the association's bargaining team and the other building only has one member on the team. I do have some friends (teachers) in both buildings."

"I felt disturbed, irritated and betrayed by my staff because of my involvement in negotiations."

"I did have some concerns when teachers didn't spend time talking with me."

"I felt my presence, at times, made them uncomfortable (teachers) when I went in the lounge. I never really felt uncomfortable about my role."

"I was uncomfortable, at least during the last few bargaining sessions. I had some anxiety because it was getting so close to settlement."
"Felt very uncomfortable when I went into the teachers' lounge — teachers kept away from me for two weeks that the bargaining sessions were going on."

"I felt worried at first about the teachers staying away and avoiding me, even though I knew it was a normal reaction under the circumstances."

"Very personal thing to see teachers (my friends) put in a strike situation — felt very uncomfortable."

"Some teachers worried about me and what I was going through when I knew they were hurting financially."

"Felt bad about the abusive conduct of some teachers -- lost some respect for dear friends."

"Would my middle management and teachers relationship be affected?"

"Worried about whether I would lose respect of teachers by being on the Board's bargaining team."

"Felt uncomfortable because some teachers were in the building teaching during the strike, while others were on the line."

"Members of the teachers' bargaining team put me in the middle -- which changed my attitude toward teachers from positive to negative."

"Feeling of being in the middle -- I am administration and must support from that aspect."

"Lines have been drawn this year due to the bargaining process; therefore, I feel worried, uneasy about consequences down the road."

"I felt uncomfortable when my teachers would ask me questions in the lounge about the status of bargaining."

"A fellow teacher remarked, 'Oh, Cheryl, I'm glad that you still consider yourself as a teacher', while I was on my way to a committee (of teachers) meeting. This made me feel really lousy."

"Another teacher in my building said to me, 'I need new living room furniture, but I'd better wait until after the strike.' This made me feel very anxious, a lump in my stomach."
"I had several dreams about the strike and the bargaining process which indicated that my role on the team was bothering me more than I realized.

"Gut feeling that you were on the opposite side of the table -- I could recall being a teacher."

E. Miscellaneous comments

"Teachers would take 'pot shots' at principals because they got a salary increase before the teachers."

"Gave me a feeling that there may be another strike."

"I can live with the agreement, but teachers want you to bend the rules from time to time -- can't agree with this."

"I felt that the teachers thought the Board was out to get them -- that was not the truth and made me angry (hot) at the time because teachers wouldn't listen to reason."

"I was embarrassed about the fact that something was said by teachers that happened at the table -- happened at all as reported."

"A strange situation was present; I felt a strange feeling of independence to make decision on a daily basis and let the chips fall where they may."

"I felt the teachers on the picket line (strike) were making a mistake in being on strike because there really wasn't any reason other than OEA Uni-Serv pushed it."

"I felt tense about the fact that my teachers were paralyzed or at opposite ends on agreement over the issues and status of bargaining; i.e., impasse versus strike."

"I felt concerned about children's attitudes, so I explained the reason to them (students) for the teachers being on strike."

"I feel a great deal of anxiety looking toward the possibility of another strike ahead in 1981."

"I was mad as hell when one teacher said to me following the strike, 'That's alright, we know why you were on the wrong side'."
Participant/Category - Administration

P 1 A) "Frustration about some of the things that other principals had been doing in daily administration procedures."

B) "Felt angry because of the issues that were brought to bargaining table because the way other principals were handling."

P 6 "I felt frustrated that I was a member of the team and didn't always agree with other Board bargaining team members -- I didn't say anything either."

P 18 A) "At times I get irritated with some principals when they take strong issue with certain things not understanding the rationale behind certain directions and decisions in the bargaining process."

B) "It was sometimes difficult to support the administrators on some issues being considered; i.e., case of building principal not wanting OEA Uni-Serv person in his building. This seemed only to irritate the bargaining situation -- I became angry."

P 32 "Since I was hand picked by the Superintendent, I felt uneasy with other principals feeling that they thought that I was the fair-haired boy."

B. Principal felt embarrassed and uncomfortable about the physical and verbal demeanor at the bargaining table.

P 6 "Felt uncomfortable about the demeanor at the table; i.e., loud voices, shouting at each other, questioning or belittling the other side of the table -- superintendent was the one who did this most of the time."

P 29 "I was embarrassed by the physical and verbal behavior that other Board team members (elementary principal) exhibited at the bargaining sessions -- this individual wanted to make too much verbal impact at the table even though he wasn't the Board's team spokesman."

C. Miscellaneous comments.

P 6 A) "Sometimes a group of administrators would discuss the issues and I found that they would agree with me on the teachers' demands -- they couldn't say much about how they felt, and neither could I."
B) "These issues were: (1) teachers' meetings, (2) telephone calls to teachers during the day, and (3) teachers afraid to talk with Principal without union steward."

Participant/Category - Parents

A. Principal felt uneasy and concern as a result of the parents' support of the teachers' cause.

P 3 "Felt parents would go the other way (with teachers instead of the Board) in support of the issues."

P 8 A) "Many parents were from the local university faculty as professors and supported the public school teachers."

B) "Teachers were able to get support of parents and organized a citizens' committee which eventually served as a mediation group for Board and teachers."

C) "Strike climate felt by parents very strongly during my second year on the Board's team."

D) "I felt concern about meeting and talking with my school parents -- some parents had students in school and some did not."

C. Other miscellaneous comments.

P 8 "Board of Education shut off community discussion at meetings."

P 24 "They really didn't know about my bargaining membership."

P 27 "The hurt came when I found out about the animosity that some parents had for the teachers on strike. I didn't have any specific problem with parents."

P 31 "I feel uneasy with this group because they are against the superintendent, and he has had a close association with me because superintendent is part of the bargaining team. His problems could rub off on me."
Participant/Category - Superintendent

A. Principals had feelings of frustration, discomfort, and anger toward the superintendent as a result of his relationship.

P 15  "I don't know whether he is telling the truth -- makes me feel uncomfortable. I don't like to see two parties (Association and Board) argue at the table. Superintendent likes to do this a lot during bargaining sessions."

P 24 A) "Had a feeling of anxiety since the superintendent is not in favor of organized bargaining. The Board had really appointed me in a round-about way, even though the superintendent requested that I be on the team."

B) "A certain amount of discomfort is present due to my day-to-day association with the superintendent and the great amount of support that he requires of me on some issues."

P 37 A) "I was really mad about the situation of the superintendent talking to a teacher regarding the issues of bargaining and especially the fact that he told her that the Board had and was willing to settle for more salary than they were proposing."

B) "I just didn't bother with this situation or with the superintendent after my feelings of anger were vented to myself about the above issue."

Participant/Category - Other

Board of Education

P 10  "Board is not realistic when dealing with people -- this made me feel uncomfortable because I was suppose to support their (Board) hard line or unrealistic line with teachers."

Non-Certificated

P 27  "I felt that this was the toughest for me because of their lack of honesty -- by playing both sides (teachers-parents) toward the middle. I felt uncomfortable because I didn't know where I stood with them."
"On more than one occasion the Board would take a hard line approach with teachers and show that they didn't know about the concept of bargaining. They took this position because they had already gone through a strike seven years previous."
APPENDIX I

Occurrences or Observations That Created Comfortable, Harmonious, Pleasurable Feelings
Question 3-A - "What were some of the things that occurred or that you observed with each category that gave you comfortable, harmonious, pleasurable feelings?"

**Participant/Category - Students**

P 13  "No involvement."

P 14  "Students not really aware of the process."

P 34  "Students really didn't seem concerned about the strike possibility in the spring."

P 35  "Students didn't have any participation in the process."

P 36  "Students were not really part of the process -- they were not directly involved."

P 40  "Students weren't aware of my involvement."

**Participant/Category - Teaching Staff**

P 4  "Board members and administrators were not blamed for any situation that would hold up the bargaining process."

P 13  "Could talk comfortably with teachers on the bargaining team and could always work with the staff with no repercussions."

P 14  "Teaching staff worked cooperatively with the principal -- never any unpleasant situations cropped up."

P 22  "Discussion that teachers had with me led me to believe that I was being honest. Teacher bargaining team members were not from any building."

P 25  "The open feeling of both sides, teachers and Board/Administration was good. This helped the positive situation."

P 34  "I talked to both teachers on the picket line during the strike and those that came in to work during this time and also communicated with two members of the teacher bargaining team from my building."
"Everything carried on as usual -- teachers saw my role and accepted it. None of my staff were members of the bargaining team."

"Teachers were very open about my involvement -- no concern."

"When we hit hard times we can always talk things over, they respect me and like me."

"I sensed that teachers had respect for me during my involvement."

"Other principals accepted the explanation that I gave them about working for the issues."

"Very positive atmosphere when we got together to work on issues of mutual concern -- no hassle from the other administrators about my role on the team."

"The group gave me positive feedback."

"No one discussed any pet peeves that they had -- they took no hard stand on my involvement."

"Mutual respect was apparent -- several administrators communicated to me that they were pleased with my involvement in the bargaining on their behalf."

"No involvement."

"Parents were not really aware of the process."

"Parents were strongly supporting the Board's position and not the teachers -- this I felt good about."

"Parents were really not part of the process."

"Several comments which indicated that they understood my role and they knew it wasn't always easy."
Participant/Category - Superintendent

P 13  "My judgements were valued and accepted by the Superintendent during bargaining sessions."

P 14  "Very good working relationship — Superintendent has recently appointed me as Assistant Superintendent and has kept me in the elementary principal's slot since that time."

P 22  "Superintendent said thanks to me for being involved."

P 25  "Superintendent had respect for my opinion."

P 34  "Good rapport and strong relationship with the Superintendent."

P 36  "Very comfortable relationship with the Superintendent — he is open and fair, different from last Superintendent we had."

P 38  "Superintendent felt good about my role and, in addition, recently complimented me on the way that I handled a grievance."

P 40  "Superintendent commented that he felt that I had done a fine job."
APPENDIX J

Occurrences or Observations that Created Uncomfortable, Dissonant, Painful Feelings
Question 3-B - "What were some of the things that occurred or that you observed with each category that gave you uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings?

Participant/Category - Students

A. Comments by students caused verbal harassment of teachers on strike.

P 27 "Verbal harassment of teachers on the picket lines."

Participant/Category - Teaching Staff

A. Teachers' bargaining team members did not always keep the general group informed of the issues and status.

P 5 A) "Teachers bargaining team members were saying things that weren't true about what was going on; i.e., would support the tentative agreement then they would go to the general staff and not present the issues as agreed to during the bargaining sessions."

B) "Teachers' bargaining team discussed salary and the Master's Plus column, and it was agreed to that this column would not be included in final agreement. It had not been initialed by both sides earlier, so it was then included by teachers in the final agreement that was ratified and approved."

P 18 A) "It became apparent that the members of the teachers' bargaining team were causing confusion for teachers with manner that they informed the staff in general about the status of issues."

B) "Issues that were discussed at the table were let out or released by the association bargaining team members to the general staff, but many times reported the situation incorrectly."

P 28 "Teachers, in general, didn't know what was included in the teachers' proposal package."

P 31 "Apparent that bargaining team (teachers) were not really representing the teachers in general."
B. Comments regarding behavior of participants at the bargaining table and issues discussed at table negotiations.

P 5  "Length of contract was used as a deceiving issue by the teachers' bargaining team when presented. It was ratified by staff as a one-year when it should have been a two-year."

P 10 A) "The negotiations proposals from teachers included several issues that would increase the education for students; however, the teachers were always willing to drop these issues when it came to compromise; i.e., (1) length of school day, (2) additional textbooks."

B) "Teachers always want more money each year but also want the work load decreased, class size smaller and length of day decreased."

P 12 A) "Issue of salary increase requested by the union was unrealistic."

B) "Some issues that were brought up at the table should have been taken up directly with the principal that was violating specific situations -- they should not have been brought up at the table."

P 16 "I didn't like OEA methods -- a lengthy package of OEA prepared proposals -- our teachers never worked out the package."

P 17 "Feelings of 'us' and 'them'. Teachers submitted a large 80-page proposal package -- lots of issues -- many would take principal's freedom or authority."

P 18 A) "Salary issue, constant argument about worth of employees, salary deserved and what can be given."

B) "Feelings were rough and hard at the table -- this carried over afterward."

P 23 "Disillusioned about teachers' actions and lying at the table."

P 24 A) "Teachers are very strong labor union -- very concerned about salary and other issues. I'm concerned about the strong possibility of impasse and/or strike."

B) "Some of the teachers' bargaining team members would act out of character at the bargaining table and shout, pound fists, etc."
P 29 A) "Comment about 'you are the Board's negotiators --
don't keep going back to them for input'."

B) "Sometimes insults came from the other side of the
table."

P 30 "Issue of bargaining with reference to students --
teachers always talked about issues that would help
the students, but always bargained these items away
in the end."

P 31 "Proposals and issues presented were ridiculous.
They were so interested in pushing OEA language
rather than develop their own language for issues."

C. Comments or actions by teachers that made principal feel uncomfortable.

P 6 "Teachers would stop talking when I approached the lunch
table or in the teachers' lounge or even if they were
in a group in the hall."

P 11 "Teachers would stop talking when I came into their group
or lounge."

P 16 "Some teachers did not speak with me or associate as
they had in the past. They seemed to stay away."

P 17 "I would walk in the teachers' lounge and discussion
would stop."

P 19 "When I entered the lounge the conversation would stop.
This made me feel uncomfortable at times."

P 21 "Some teachers withdrew from any discussion or conver-
sations with me."

D. Comments made to principals during the bargaining process.

P 2 "Comments from staff about administrators being granted
salary increases before the teachers received theirs."

P 3 "Teacher would call Board members and indicated that
they thought they were getting a raw deal."

P 6 "Some teachers would want to make conversation with
me or even comment about things that had taken place
during the bargaining sessions."
Participant/Category - Administrators

A. Comments by other administrators.

P 6  "Principals would want to discuss the bargaining issues in my presence making it difficult to remain silent, neutral and confidential about the issues. I didn't have license to discuss the issues."

P 32 "Other principals made comments such as, 'How did you get roped into that?' They weren't quite sure what my association was with the Superintendent."

B. Overt verbal behavior at bargaining table.

P 6  "Superintendent would discuss things at the bargaining table in a loud, boisterous voice when talking to the members of the teachers' bargaining team."

P 29 "I felt embarrassed when the elementary principal on the team would use loud language to try and intimidate the other side during the bargaining session."

C. Other

P 1  "The bargaining issues that were included in the teachers' proposal included: (1) teachers' meetings, (2) telephone calls, and (3) union steward concern. They were included because some principals weren't handling these very well."

P 6  "Board member on the team, who was usually not well versed on issues under consideration, would make statement during sessions that would tend to compromise the Board's position on certain issues."

Participant/Category - Parents

A. Parents supported teachers' cause.

P 3  "Parents would call Board members and advocate for the teachers' position."

P 8 A) "Parents were walking picket line during the strike in front of my building."

B) "There were a series of group meetings where I would have direct contact with parents -- especially those that sided with the teachers' cause."
"A comment was made by a close teacher friend that she was glad to see her going to the committee meeting, and that meant she was still a teacher."

"Teachers would ask me about the status of the bargaining process."

"Other comments made by teachers that made me feel bad or indicated that I was on the 'other' side."

"Conflicts existed between teachers on the picket lines and those that were not on strike -- phone calls, verbal threats, name calling."

"Teachers appeared polarized on the strike issue -- some were in favor, others weren't."

"One dissonant teacher told me during the strike that no one would be allowed to go into the building during the strike including the principal."

"OEA representative intimidated people when he stood in front of the building with a camera during the strike."

"Behaviors by teachers were very bad during the strike; i.e., yelling, spitting, hitting, vile threats, vandalism, etc., were done by teachers on the picket lines."

"Teachers used students by asking them to stay home during the strike -- used threats to students."

"Propaganda being given to parents by teachers -- both written and verbal, about the status of their concerns."
"Some open discussion and disagreement with one teacher in front of others about evaluation procedure prior to adoption of the final agreement."

"I felt uncomfortable (tension) that I suppose everyone else felt following the early morning bargaining sessions even though I didn't have any direct unpleasant experiences with my staff."

"There was an incident that occurred where teacher leadership discussed sending a letter to the principal about a situation that happened in his building; i.e., principal took information from the association bulletin board and threw it away."

"Teachers threatened a strike action."

"Some teachers took over the CO office during the strike."

H. Other miscellaneous comments.

"Older teachers would approach me about other teachers not doing the job."

"Non-renewal of teacher at the end of the school year."

"Principal had told teachers not to take things from the classroom during the summer -- looking ahead for possible strike situation."

"I had several bad dreams about the strike."

"I found out that there was at least one teacher who felt upset about one item agreed to during the bargaining session."

"Some teachers were concerned about me when they were hurting financially."

"Once I returned some films to the CO, and a teacher on the picket line during the strike commented, 'All they are doing to keep school open is to show films'."

"Teachers today, who are younger, are more labor oriented."
B. Parents supported the board and not the teachers.

P 14 "Parents told principals that they (parents) didn't support teachers."

P 27 "Some parents stated that they could not forgive teachers for going on strike."

C. Parents voice opinion about support to students.

P 14 "Parents would voice their personal feelings about the situation through their children."

Participant/Category - Superintendent

Superintendent

A. Comments and actions of the superintendent caused concern and mistrust on the part of the principal.

P 15 "At a private session with me the superintendent had indicated that the Board was now willing to offer $200.00 more in salary than the Superintendent had offered the last time. For this reason I wonder if the superintendent is really truthful with me regarding information."

P 24 "The Board had actually selected me rather than the superintendent. This concerns me."

P 31 "Superintendent's approach and manner prior to and during the bargaining session embarrassed me; i.e., he told me once that 'tonight we need to kick some ass'."

P 37 "Superintendent was meeting secretly with a teacher (strong OEA) and feeding her inside information about salary concerns."
Participant/Category - Other

Board of Education

P 10 "I feel the Board was over prudent in holding back on salary items even when the Board could afford more."

Non-Certificated

P 27 A) "Verbal abuse of teachers expressed by this employee group and playing both ends (with parents) toward the middle."

B) "It was difficult for me to know which non-certificated staff to talk with without feeling that I was being compromised."

Board of Education

P 29 "Board took a hard line against the teachers during the bargaining process and really didn't understand compromise."
APPENDIX K

Final Comments On Any Uncomfortable, Dissonant, Painful Feelings
Question 4 - "Did you, at any time, have any uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings about any category? ___ Yes ___ No."

Participant/Category - Teaching Staff

P 4 Yes ___ No ____

"One incident that was extremely uncomfortable took place at a bargaining session when the teachers' bargaining team would not (refused) recess at the usual time and kept discussion going for at least one additional hour. The teacher team members did this knowing that members of the Board's bargaining team had a retirement dinner that had been planned for that evening for an administrator. Our three team members arrived an hour late. We were somewhat angry about the matter; however, the incident was dissipated the next day when members of the teachers' bargaining team apologized."

P 13 Yes ___ No ____

"I had made a comment that all teachers were to be at the first PTA meeting. One teacher questioned my statement due to the bargaining agreement and meetings. I reacted out of character in anger over the issue and later apologized."

P 14 Yes ___ No ____

"One incident occurred with an individual history teacher at the high school. The issue was associated with RIF proposal and bumping procedure that occurred three years ago when I was on the team — my last year as principal. It resolved itself quickly, however."

P 20 Yes ___ No ___ (response about all categories)

P 25 Yes ___ No ___ (response about all categories)

P 26 Yes ___ No ___ (response about all categories)

P 34 Yes ___ No ___ (response about all categories)

P 35 Yes ___ No ___ (response about all categories)

P 36 Yes ___ No ___ (response about all categories)
"President of the teachers' association made me feel uncomfortable once at the table. I had made a comment about everyone should be fair. He retorted that I should keep my personal remarks to myself during the bargaining process -- my personal remarks were not needed or welcome. I got over the incident in a couple of days, however. The teacher is now teaching in my building and we work well together."
APPENDIX L

Description of Alternatives Considered to Reduce or Eliminate Uncomfortable, Dissonant, Painful Feelings
Question 6-A - "Considering each category that you mentioned, describe the alternatives that you considered prior to your attempt to reduce or eliminate your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings."

Participant/Category - Students

Alternatives or Thoughts Considered

P 27 A) "Thought about going out and pulling the kids off the picket line."

Participant/Category - Teaching Staff

Alternatives or Thoughts Considered

P 2 A) "Thought about that if they (teachers) only knew how little we make for all the responsibility we have."

P 3 A) "Thought about having a party or picnic for the staff so that they could be pulled together since a strike was a possibility -- maybe this would keep them together."

B) "Thought about talking to several influential teachers in my building to see if this would help avert the possibility of a strike.

P 5 A) "Thought about not talking to teachers about the bargaining process or issues being discussed."

B) "Thought about discussing my uncomfortable feelings about my participation on the team in hopes of reducing/eliminating my feelings."

C) "Thought about listening in on some of the teachers' conversations being held in the building whenever possible.

D) "Thought about dropping a hint to the teachers about taking a more active role in the settlement."

P 6 A) "Thought about joking with teachers about the issues when they were in a group."

B) "Thought about letting the teachers know how I felt about the issues and the fact that I agreed with them on some of their proposals under consideration."
"Thought about changing my administrative philosophy as a result of the conflict that I was experiencing."

"Thought that if I had to be stuck with an evaluation procedure that took away some of my control that, by god, I would make it tough on those border line cases and fire them."

"Thought about talking with the Superintendent and arguing the point that teachers need more salary for the job they are doing."

"Thought that if I had to comment to staff that I would give a nondescript answer."

"Thought about talking to a particular teacher in my building (chief negotiator for teachers) for the purpose of pulling the two teams together."

"Thought about getting off the bargaining team."

"Thought about doing physical activity in order to relieve tension."

"Thought about talking to individual teachers and the teacher bargaining team members in order to get the teachers positions on the bargaining issues."

"Thought about talking with my teachers and explaining that my position on the team should not be a personal matter to them."

"Thought about meeting with my staff and requesting to bring concerns they had about building operation to me rather than taking them to the bargaining table as issues of discussion."

"Thought about ways that I could keep teachers away from seeking help from parents and the community."

"Thought about quitting as principal and going back to teaching."

"Thought about moving to a different district, going out of state, etc."

"Thought about talking to individual teachers and teachers as a group in my building."
P 13 A) "Thought about apologizing to staff generally and to the specific individual whom I commented to about the PTA meeting."

P 14 A) "Thought about convincing the teacher on the bargaining team to change his position about a certain issue of bargaining."

B) "Thought about discussing my frustration and personal feelings with the Superintendent."

C) "Thought about talking personally and confidentially to one of my elementary teachers that was a member of the teachers' bargaining team."

D) "Thought about talking to other administrators to see what their position would be."

P 16 A) "Thought about trying to get rid of the OEA Uni-Serv representative."

B) "Thought about contacting the power structure of the teachers' organization so that they might better control the Uni-Serve representative."

C) "Thought about keeping my nose out of teacher groups while the bargaining process continued."

P 17 A) "Thought about talking to staff members regarding the issues under consideration and also one additional person serving on the teachers' bargaining team."

B) "Thought about stopping to talk with groups of teachers in the hall."

P 18 A) "Thought about getting aside with certain teachers (depending on circumstances) and discussing the issues informally since we both (teachers and me) were playing a specific role in order to try and settle the agreement."

B) "Thought about talking with teachers and clearing up misunderstandings."

C) "Thought about giving a lecture to teachers about professionalism."
P 19 A) "Thought about staying away from the teachers' lounge and not talking with teachers about the bargaining issues currently under discussion."

P 21 A) "Thought about staying away from the teaching staff and continue to make decisions as if they weren't there."

P 23 A) "Thought about packing it all in and quitting the bargaining team position and walking away."

B) "Thought about taking over the negotiations and cutting out all of the bullshit."

P 24 A) "Thought about how nice it would be to have it over with."

B) "Thought about how nice it would be to have it over with."

C) "Thought about quitting as a member of the Board's team."

P 27 No thoughts about this category.

P 28 A) "Thought about not talking with teachers and trying not to discuss the issues with them."

P 29 A) "Thought about how I could change the persons on the teachers' bargaining team -- I could have pushed things forward faster."

P 30 A) "Thought about talking to various of my teachers in the building during the strike."

P 31 A) "Thought about getting off the team while I already had regrets that I agreed to serve, especially this year since it looks like a strike is possible."

B) "Thought about talking to teachers' bargaining team members from my building."

C) "Thought about keeping my mouth shut during bargaining sessions."

P 32 A) "Thought about having a general meeting following the strike and discussing with the staff how we were going to put it back together."
"Thought about trying to make the teachers aware of my position."

"Thought about retreating or quitting -- I felt caught in the middle."

"Thought about talking with a specific teacher in the building plus other friends and other principals."

"Thought about being very open with the staff and making them feel more comfortable."

"Thought about accepting the teachers' behavior on the picket lines believing that this was the way they needed to act as a result of "mob" psychology, therefore thinking that I shouldn't react to them and their behaviors."

**Participant/Category - Administrators**

**Alternatives or Thoughts Considered**

"Thought about having five teachers meetings per month."

"Thought that we need to sit down as an administrative group and talk about this issue of teachers meetings."

"Thought about probing other principals on an individual basis to find out more of what is going on in different buildings with teachers meetings."

"Thought about riding out the situation and staying in the bargaining session as long as the teachers held us."

"Thought about walking out of the bargaining session as planned."

"Thought about talking to the Superintendent regarding the way he got so loud and boisterous and vocal at the bargaining table."

"Thought about making excuses for not being able to attend the bargaining sessions."

"Thought about quitting as a member of the bargaining team."
P 6 D) "Thought about talking more during the bargaining sessions when things appeared to get vocal and out of hand -- a mediator role."

Participant/Category - Other

Alternatives or Thoughts Considered

Board of Education

P 10 A) "Thought about discussing my feelings about the Board with other members of the Board's bargaining team to see if they could convince the Board to be less prudent and more fair to the teachers."

Non-Certificated

P 27 No thoughts about this category.

Board of Education

P 29 A) "Thought about discussing the "art of compromise" with members of the Board since they were taking a hard line with the teachers on issues."
APPENDIX M

Alternative Actions Selected to Reduce or Eliminate Uncomfortable, Dissonant, Painful Feelings
Question 7 - "Considering the alternative actions that you thought about and described in the previous question, which alternative(s) did you select to try and reduce or eliminate your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings?"

Participant/Category - Students

Alternatives Selected and Executed

P 2  No alternative recorded or executed.

P 3  A) "Brought Middle School and High School Staffs together on the first day of school plus classified personnel to try and pull them closer together in order to avoid a strike situation."

B) "Shared thoughts with several influential teachers about the issues."

P 4  A) "We (Board's bargaining team members) elected to remain in the bargaining session as planned until it was mutually agreed to adjourn."

P 5  A) "Did not talk with teachers in my building about the bargaining issues."

B) "Discussed with the Superintendent my uncomfortable feelings about my assignment and the teaching staff."

C) "I listened in on conversations with teachers when I could but did not let them know I was doing so."

D) "Dropped hints to teachers about suggesting that they take a more active part in the understanding and settlement of the issues and final agreement."

P 6  A) "I joked with teachers when I had a chance at recess duty, lunch table and in the teachers' lounge."

P 7  A) "I took a hard line on use of new evaluation procedures and actually took steps to recommend non-renewal of two teachers because of poor performance."

P 8  A) "I met with the spokesman for the teachers' bargaining team and was instrumental in getting the bargaining sessions going again."
P 8 B) "I held a teachers meeting the day following the strike and attempted to clear the air about the strike and talked about pulling together once more."

P 10 A) "Talked with individual members of the teachers' bargaining team to get a better feel for the teachers' actual position on the current bargaining issues."

P 11 A) "I did meet with staff and discussed my position on the bargaining team as one of assignment and not a personal issue with staff and, in addition, I gave the staff a questionnaire before school was out and asked them to make recommendations for improving procedures in the building. I received about a 95% return."

B) "I decided not to discuss the bargaining issues with staff so that they would not be uncomfortable."

C) "I was very careful not to change my feelings about teachers in the building or those on the teachers' bargaining team."

D) "I tried to act as a buffer between her staff and the Superintendent and tried to point out whenever possible the positive things that the Superintendent was doing to support staff and the educational process."

P 12 A) "Talked with some individual teachers and faculty members in order to clarify some of the unresolved bargaining issues."

P 13 A) "I apologized to the staff at the meeting and to those individuals personally regarding my speaking out on the PTA meeting issue."

P 14 A) "I met with a member of the teachers' bargaining team and verbally attempted to change his mind about a specific issue under consideration prior to the next session but was unable to accomplish my goal."

B) "Talked with other administrators about my rationale for wanting this specific issue to go my way and, in addition, gained support for my position from the other members of the Board's bargaining team."
P 14 C) "I talked with an elementary teacher from my building that was a member of the teachers' bargaining team and was able to gain her support for my point of view and requested that she support this position at the next bargaining session."

D) "I met privately with the Superintendent to see if he supported my position on the matter."

P 16 A) "I met with the members of the teachers power structure to see if they could call off the dogs (Uni-Serv) and get the issues going at the bargaining table once again."

B) "The members of the Board's team met one evening so that we could present a status report on negotiations and get additional direction so that we could proceed with the bargaining sessions."

P 17 A) "I did talk with several teachers and a member of the teachers' bargaining team about the issues under consideration to assess status of teachers on the issues."

B) "I did stop and talk with teachers individually and when they were in groups in the hall."

P 18 A) "I did talk privately with a few teachers about the issues but was extremely cautious and didn't let the Board's bargaining team members know about it."

P 19 A) "I stayed away from the teachers for about two weeks while the bargaining was going on and following this period things were back to normal."

P 21 A) "I always attended the staff social get-togethers (monthly coffee/donuts) and talked with teachers for the purpose of keeping up communications."

P 23 A) "I did my job as required by contract, and this is the way I was able to cope with the situation."

P 24 A) "I talked with selected teachers and informed them of my assignment to the Board's bargaining team and discussed my role."
P 27 A) "I made myself available to the teachers at any-
time so that if they needed moral support they
had it."

B) "I removed the students physically from the play-
ground area so that they could not converse with
teachers on the picket lines."

P 28 A) "I talked with the teacher who had taken three
personal days and nineteen (19) sick leave days.
In addition, I talked with other teachers about
their personal leave days."

B) "I talked to the Superintendent about the personal
leave issue."

P 30 A) "I talked with some of my staff members about the
issues that involved me personally and in regard
to my role on the Board's team."

P 31 A) "I talked briefly to members of the teachers' bar-
gaining team that were teachers in my building and
tried to influence them to change the approach to
bargaining, but I found that I didn't have enough
influence to get them to follow through."

P 32 A) "I held a general meeting of the staff following
the strike to try and get the teachers back to
working together and put things on a more even
keel."

B) "I explained to several teachers individually about
my tough position in the whole process."

P 33 A) "I talked to several teachers in my building that
I felt close to and discussed my frustrations and
feelings about the strike and the issues."

B) "I talked with three other administrators that I
felt I could trust about my bargaining team role
and the strike in general."

C) "I also talked with several close friends outside
of education about my feelings."

P 39 A) "I tried to be more open and available to staff in
my daily discussions and communications with them --
more willing to listen to their concerns."
Participant/Category - Administrators

Alternatives Selected and Executed

P 1 A) "Talked to the Middle School Assistant Principal about what procedures they were using at his building on how many teachers meetings they actually had and what kinds of things they talked about at these frequently scheduled meetings."

P 4 No alternatives executed.

P 6 A) "I met with the Superintendent and discussed my concern about his loud, boisterous voice at the bargaining table."

P 18 A) "I talked to administrators both individually and as a group."

P 29 A) "I talked with the other elementary principal on the Board's team one time following a formal bargaining sessions about his demeanor and role on the bargaining team."

P 32 A) "I met with other principals and discussed my role and my general awareness of bargaining."

Participant/Category - Parents

Alternatives Selected and Executed

P 3 No alternatives executed.

P 8 A) "I used parents as volunteers in the school building during the strike."

B) "I sent home written communications to the parents during the strike."

P 27 A) "I talked with some of the parents about the teachers strike and attempted to explain that they were doing what was right and regardless of that fact, they still were good teachers in the classroom and that parents shouldn't come down on them too hard."
Participant/Category - Superintendent

Alternatives Selected and Executed

P 15 A) "Talked privately/confidentially with the president of the teachers' union regarding the issue and stalemate on salary and did not let the Superintendent or Board know about my conversation."

B) "Talked with the Superintendent about the issue of the salary offer and informed him that teachers were concerned that the Superintendent wouldn't listen to them about this important issue; however, I don't think that I made any impression on him about the matter."

P 24 A) "I talked with the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent about the fact that the Board had assigned me to the team and the concern and uncomfortable feelings that I had over the way I was selected."

B) "I talked with the Board member who was serving on the Board's bargaining team and discussed my assignment and the way that I was selected without the Superintendent's consent."

P 37 A) "I met with the Board president and discussed the matter regarding the Superintendent, but to no avail."

Participant/Category - Other

Alternatives Selected and Executed

Board of Education

P 10 A) "Met with the Superintendent and suggested that he talk with the Board members about being less prudent on the teacher salary issue."

Non-Certificated

P 27 No alternatives executed.

Board of Education

P 29 A) "I talked with the two Board members of the Board's bargaining team about the issue of the art of compromise and the fact that their position was too prudent regarding the salary issue."
APPENDIX N

Responses That Indicate Change In Performance as Building Principal Who Had Uncomfortable, Dissonant, Painful Feelings
Question 10 - "Do you think that your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings changed your performance as building principal with any of the categories?"

A. Respondents indicating an increase in performance.

P 3  "Increased my effectiveness with staff since these issues are always on your mind -- you have to live with this on a daily basis."

"Increased my effectiveness with parents due to the increased contact and concern."

P 8  "I think the bargaining experience has increased my effectiveness because I've become much more sensitive to teachers."

P 11  "In the end I think my performance increased because I became more aware of teachers' feelings."

"The process of bargaining helped me to better define my role with the teaching staff."

P 21  "Because of the participation on the bargaining team and the strong positive relationship with the superintendent, I feel that I was a stronger person and principal than I had been in the past."

P 27  "I'll bet it increased my effectiveness with teachers because I'm much more concerned with inner-staff respect, in other words, I'm trying to build it now in my current assignment before a crisis situation appears."

"I tried to pull in non-certificated staff as members of the building team, where maybe they didn't feel a part of the team before the strike."

P 29  "It increased my effectiveness because now I feel the teachers have a better understanding of the bargaining process because I have grown through the experience."

"Increased my effectiveness with the Board of Education because they now have more respect for me and more empathy for the administration in general."
P 33  "I grew up over the experience -- yes, it increased my effectiveness."

P 39  "It increased my effectiveness because as I became a principal longer I could understand the problems and positions of teachers."

B. Respondents indicating a decrease in performance.

P 12  "It has definitely decreased my effectiveness."

"It has changed from cooperative, helpful atmosphere to pitching in only when it involves them -- this is their way of getting back at me."

P 15  "I felt our relationship was strained so, therefore, it decreased my effectiveness with the superintendent."

P 18  "I feel that the principal's effectiveness is decreased; however, it is only temporary."

P 23  "I'll tell you what changed my performance -- the fucking master contract. It takes all of the humanism out of people associations."

P 30  "By George, I don't think it increased it -- it decreased my effectiveness. Yes, probably so."

C. Respondents indicating no change in performance.

P 1  "I think that if I did this long enough (bargaining) I would have some real difficulties."

"It's got to take its toll on me if I have to continue in the hard bargaining realm."

"Caused a souring effect on me."

P 2  "I don't think it had any effect anyway."

"My participation on the team made me more aware of some of the general concerns that teachers had that I probably would not have known about if I had not taken part."
"Some of the things that I felt were petty, teachers had strong feelings about, and I found this out during the time I was on the team."

"Everything was back to complete normal by the bargaining session the next Saturday."

"Effectiveness did not change with staff in general but did decrease with one member of the staff who was the president of the OEA Uni-Serv."

"I don't think any bargaining experience changed my effectiveness with either category."

"I don't think so, at least not outwardly."

"Maybe some change of effectiveness was made individually with some staff members, but I can't really put my finger on it."

"I don't think it decreased my effectiveness at all. In the long range look I would have to say that it didn't change my effectiveness at all."

"It taught me that you must deal with the role of the principal and that of bargaining separately. Superintendent felt that I could separate these two roles, and that was one reason that he appointed me."

"If I had been the bargaining team spokesman, it would have been more difficult for me."

"I don't believe it affected my performance in any way -- my effectiveness has not changed."

"I don't think it had any affect; however, it improved my rapport and understanding with the superintendent."

"Of those choices above, it didn't change my effectiveness."

"No, did not change any effectiveness."

"I do not believe that it has changed my performance."

"No, not a bit."
P 31 "No, not yet."

P 32 "No."

P 37 "No."

D. Respondents making no response to the question — scored as non-dissonance.
APPENDIX 0

Statements and Actions Taken to Avoid Having Additional Feelings of Discomfort
Question 11—"While you were considering and selecting your alternative actions to reducing and eliminating your uncomfortable, dissonant, painful feelings, do you recall doing anything to avoid having additional feelings of discomfort?  

_____ Yes  _____ No

If so, describe the things that you did."

Participant

P 1  _____ Yes  _____ No  (Administrators)

"Stifled myself when I wanted to make comments; bit my tongue when I wanted to make comments -- generally more reluctant to make statements to teacher bargaining team members about those items that bothered me. I avoided eye-to-eye contact with persons on the opposite side of the bargaining table."

P 2  _____ Yes  x  No

"Did nothing -- a real neat experience being on the bargaining team."

P 3  _____ Yes  x  No

"I don't recall doing anything."

P 4  _____ Yes  x  No

No comments.

P 5  x  Yes  _____ No

"Kept my mouth shut when I felt I was losing my cool. This was done primarily at bargaining sessions, but I did it at other times as well."

P 6  x  Yes  _____ No  (Teaching Staff/Administrators)

"On occasions, following a bargaining session, I would avoid groups or discussions with the teaching staff; i.e., when teachers would come in the building early and get coffee I would steer clear of the lounge."
"I really didn't have any avoidance activities with administrators."

P 7  x Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

"Stayed out of the lounge."

"I broke away from any close personal contact with teachers on a regular basis."

P 8  ____ Yes  x No (Teaching Staff/Parents)

"No, I can't think of anything."

P 9  ____ Yes  ____ No (No response to the question. (ND))

P 10  ____ Yes  x No (Teaching Staff/Board of Education)

"Very simply, no."

P 11  x Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

"Avoided conversations with teachers about the bargaining issues, especially during the first year that I was a member of the team because I was new to the district and didn't know where the teachers were coming from."

P 12  x Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

"I made myself unavailable at times."

P 13  x Yes  ____ No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

"During negotiations, I tried to stay out of the teachers' lounge so that discussions about bargaining wouldn't come up."
P 14   ____ Yes  x  No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

"Nothing was done."

P 15   ____ Yes  x  No (Superintendent)

"Nothing at all."

P 16   x  Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

"Yes, I didn't say anything verbally at the bargaining table, especially when I wanted to."

"I didn't discuss anything that went on at the bargaining table except with the other two principals at the high school."

P 17   ____ Yes  x  No (Teaching Staff)

No comments.

P 18   x  Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff/Administrators)

"I stayed away on occasion from specific teachers because I knew that I was up-tight and felt they were too."

P 19   ____ Yes  x  No (Teaching Staff)

"I still did everything that I normally did."

P 20   ____ Yes  ____ No (All categories scores as non-dissonance)

No response or comments.

P 21   x  Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

"I put forth extra effort trying to rearrange elementary music classes prior to the annual Christmas Program."

"I gave a few more strokes to each teacher where maybe I hadn't in the past."
P 22  ____ Yes  ____ No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

No comments.

P 23  ____ Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

"A lot of times I wanted to walk the other way in the building, but I didn't."

P 24  ____ Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff/Parents/Superintendent)

No comments

P 25  ____ Yes  ____ No (All categories scored as Non-dissonance)

No comments

P 26  ____ Yes  ____ No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

No comments

P 27  ____ Yes  ____ No (Students/Teaching/Staff/Parents and Non-Certified Staff)

"I avoided criticizing anybody and was very protective of my own opinion."

P 28  ____ Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

"Five years ago I probably would have."

P 29  ____ Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff/Administrators and Board of Education)

"Not that I recall; the only thing that I can say is that when problems came up at the next bargaining session I was always on my guard."
P 30  _____ Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

No comments

P 31  ____ x Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff/Superintendent)

A) "I avoided making comments about issues or forming opinions about others."

B) "I avoided giving my views of certain issues under discussion for fear of creating additional negative feelings with the Superintendent."

P 32  _____ x Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff/Administrators)

"I talked with teachers during the strike to keep the lines of communication open."

P 33  ____ x Yes  ____ No (Teaching Staff)

A) "I mixed with teachers socially on Fridays by having a drink with them at the Holiday Inn."

B) "I attended a Management Stress Seminar."

P 34  _____ Yes  ____ No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

No response or comments

P 35  _____ Yes  ____ No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

No response or comments

P 36  _____ Yes  ____ No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

No response or comments

P 37  _____ Yes  ____ x No (Superintendent)

No comments
P 38  _____ Yes _____ No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

No response or comments

P 39  _____ Yes _____ No (Teaching Staff)

"I made every effort to keep communications going and trying to understand the teachers' position during a difficult time."

P 40  _____ Yes _____ No (All categories scored as non-dissonance)

No response or comments
APPENDIX P

Responses from Principals that Indicate Desire to serve or Not Serve on the Bargaining Team in the Future
Question 12 - "Would you be willing to serve again as a member of the Board's bargaining team?"

A. Respondents indicating willingness to serve without any reservations.

P 4    "Yes, I would be willing to serve another year if asked."

P 7    "Yes, I suppose I would serve one more year if asked."

P 10   "I would continue on the team. It's fascinating because of the interplay with people. I especially like the gamesmanship that's involved."

P 11   "I would continue with the bargaining role; interesting part of the job."

P 12   "If I had never been on in the past, I would request to be on next year and ask to go to the meetings."

P 15   "I would be team member or at least continue serving. I would rather be a team member than just in an advisory capacity."

P 18   "I would probably participate again on the Board's team as a member because someone needs to look out for my (Principal's) interest. I would not want to serve as chief spokesman and be a principal."

P 19   "If I had to do it again, I'd participate."

P 21   "I think that I would be willing to be a part of the process again if I had the chance. Another reason that I want to be a part of it is for the experience because I'm interested in a position as Assistant Superintendent."

P 23   "I would do it again, good learning experience. I gained growth and can do my job better for having gone through it."

P 28   "I really would; I'm learning a lot and have respect with fellow administrators."

P 29   "Sure, I'd serve again if I were a principal."
"Yes, I'd do it again -- good experience."

"Yes, I would participate again if I had a chance."

"Yes, I'd be a team member or chief spokesman if I had the chance."

"Yes, absolutely."

B. Respondents indicating willingness to serve only under certain conditions.

"I would serve again only if I had to."

"If I had to do it again, I sure wouldn't like it."

"I wouldn't want to be a part of the bargaining if I wasn't really serving a purpose. As principal, I have a specific and important role."

"I would Continue as a team member if I was a principal."

"I'd do it again, but I wouldn't volunteer for it because it took a lot of time and effort."

"I would do it, but I wouldn't look forward to it. It is very time consuming and forces me to be at odds with faculty when I serve as building principal. Principals should be included on the team, a necessary evil."

"I probably would be willing to serve again, but only after others had an opportunity."

"Yes, if the superintendent and Board of Education would be responsible to provide an opportunity for training. I feel a need for some formal work on the process."

C. Respondents indicating that they would not want to serve again.

"If I were on the bargaining team today, I would find it a lot tougher than in 1975-77; would probably have a lot of discomfort. No, I wouldn't want to serve again."
"I don't think that I want to be on the bargaining team another year."

"Wouldn't ever want to do it again; I didn't enjoy it at all; however, I did gain some experience. I only have four years until retirement. Hopefully, I can make it to that point before my name comes up again on the rotation. If not, I'll retire in three years."

"Would not want to ever do this again -- a good experience, however, and I'm sure that it made me a better principal."

"I don't want to be on the team next time. I don't think that principals should be on the team -- they need to be advisory only. They can make input on issues, but not at the bargaining table."

"No, although middle management does need to have input on issues so someone should allow for this to happen."

D. Respondents not responding to question -- scored all categories as non-dissonance.
APPENDIX Q

Responses from Principals that Indicate Other Responses for Volunteering for Membership on the Bargaining Team
Question 6 - "Which would best describe your reason for volunteering to serve on the team?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 4</td>
<td>&quot;To assist the school district in establishing a better relationship among the board, administration and teaching staff.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 6</td>
<td>&quot;It was expected of me to take my turn on a rotation basis.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 9</td>
<td>&quot;I felt it was important for me to be a part of enhancing the school district.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 10</td>
<td>&quot;To be in a direct position to provide input for all administrative positions.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 21</td>
<td>&quot;I felt it was my turn.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 28</td>
<td>&quot;Someday I may want to be a superintendent, therefore I need to do all of these kinds of things.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 38</td>
<td>&quot;I serve as a go-between or buffer among the teachers, administration and board of education.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 39</td>
<td>&quot;Protect the rights of students during the process.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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