

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF
SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS IN NEGOTIATING
AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL
DISTRICTS IN KANSAS

By

JOHN DALE WATSON

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma Panhandle State University
Goodwell, Oklahoma
1962

Master of Arts
University of Northern Colorado
Greely, Colorado
1966

Specialist in Education
Fort Hays State University
Hays, Kansas
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1980

Thesis
1980D
W339t
cop. 2



TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF
SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS IN NEGOTIATING
AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL
DISTRICTS IN KANSAS

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth H. Clair

Thesis Adviser

Carl R. Anderson

James D. Olson

Larry M. Perkins

Norman D. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the members of his doctoral committee: to Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, the chairman, for his encouragement, direction, patience, and endurance throughout the entire study; to Dr. Carl Anderson, Dr. Russell Dobson, and Dr. Larry Perkins for their counsel, motivation, and support.

The personal interest and attention shown to the writer by each of these committee members was appreciated. The attitude of this committee will long be remember by the writer. The philosophies taught by these gentlemen are personified by their actions.

A special thanks is given to the Board of Education of Unified School District #247, Cherokee, Kansas, for the encouragement and support given to the writer and for the released time given during the course of his work. Additional thanks is also given to the writer's office staff who assisted him in his educational endeavors. Thanks must also be given to my fellow graduate students without whose support and assistance this work would not have been completed.

Finally, the writer would like to recognize his parents, Mr. and Mrs. C.D. Conley, for their encouragement and continued interest. Recognition must also be given to the writer's in-laws, Mr. and Mrs. Herman Chipman, for their interest and constant encouragement; his wife Judy and children Jonna, Janae, and Jarred, without whose support and personal sacrifices this work would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Definition of Terms	7
Rationale	8
Summary	13
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
Literature Related to Leadership Behavior	14
Literature Related to Professional Negotiations	20
Summary	24
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	26
Introduction	26
Treatment of Data	29
Testing the Hypothesis	31
Summary	32
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	34
Introduction	34
Demographic Information	36
Respondents Comments	41
Analysis of the Hypotheses	42
Supplementary Data	49
Summary	52
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	54
Summary	54
Conclusions	58
Recommendations for Further Study	60
Recommendations for Administrators	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY	63
APPENDIX	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Totals by School Districts of Returns Received	35
II. Teacher Totals for Negotiating and Non-negotiating School District Returns	36
III. Superintendent Totals for Negotiating and Non-negotiating School District Returns	36
IV. Teacher Respondents in Background Categories	37
V. Superintendent Respondents in Background Categories	38
VI. Demographic Information	41
VII. Means and Standard Deviations of LBDQ-Real and LBDQ-Ideal for Teachers	44
VIII. Means and Standard Deviations of LBDQ-Real and LBDQ-Ideal for Superintendents	45
IX. Teacher Perceptions of the Leadership Behavior of Superintendents for Consideration in Negotiating and Non-negotiating School Districts According to Sex	50
X. Teachers Perceptions of the Leadership Behavior of Superintendents for Consideration in Negotiating and Non-negotiating School Districts According to Age	51
XI. Teacher Perceptions of the Leadership Behavior of Superintendents for Consideration in Negotiating and Non-negotiating School Districts According to Teaching Level	52

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

In recent years two things have come to the forefront in the school systems in Kansas. One is the increase in the number of school districts that have formal negotiations between the teachers' associations and the boards of education of the Unified School Districts. The second is the scrutiny being given to the Superintendents of Unified School Districts as to the qualities that make a "good" superintendent of schools (McGhehey, 1978).

Leadership has for ages been a restricted, prestigious, vague, and elusive concept. Only recently with the development of psychology and sociology has progress been made toward an understanding of leadership (Owens, 1970). One recent contribution toward a comprehension of leadership has been research in the area of leadership behavior. This research has placed an emphasis on the perception and expectation of the behavior of leaders. Research into leadership behavior has indicated that the behavior of leaders varies widely from one leadership situation to another (Halpin, 1966).

Within the past decade, collective bargaining laws and increasing teacher militancy have created situations that have caused questions in the traditional role-relationships within education. The leadership roles of the chief school administrators and other middle management personnel have been challenged by the negotiations process (Department of Elementary School Principals, 1969).

In 1970, the Kansas Legislature enacted K.S.A. 72-5413 et seq., the Professional Negotiations Act, which grants teachers the following:

. . . the right to form, join or assist professional employee's organizations, to participate in professional negotiations with boards of education through representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, protecting or improving terms and conditions of professional service (Kansas Statutes Annotated, 72-5413b, p. 15230).

Professional Negotiations are defined in the Act as:

. . . meeting, conferring, consulting and discussing in good faith effort by both parties to reach agreement with respect to the terms and conditions of professional service (Kansas Supreme Court, March 31, 1979, p. 15230).

When the collective negotiations act was initially enacted by the State Legislature, the Act did not define what "terms and conditions of professional service" were. This phrase was not defined and subjects which were negotiable were not listed in it. The Kansas Supreme Court in 1973 directly addressed itself to the subject of negotiations. The trial court in the case of National Education Association vs. Board of Education, 212 Kan. 714, 512 P2d 426, defined the terms and conditions of professional service as referring to the following areas:

Salaries and wage; hours and amounts of work; vacation allowance; holiday; sick and other leave; number of holidays; retirement; insurance benefits; wearing apparel; pay for overtime; jury duty and grievance procedure . . . (Kansas Supreme Court, March 31, 1979, p. 484).

In July of 1977 the Kansas Legislature put into effect 74-5413 (1), which defines the terms and conditions of professional negotiations which were exactly the same items determined by the trial court in N.E.A. vs. Board of Education previously mentioned, and added the following:

Disciplinary procedure, resignations, termination of contracts, matters which have a greater direct impact

on the well-being of the individual professional employee than upon the operations of the school system and the school district . . . and such other matters as the parties mutually agree . . . (Kansas Statutes Annotated, 72-5413b, p. 15231).

It was soon apparent that it would be necessary for the court to make a separate ruling concerning each of those items which are to be considered negotiable or non-negotiable. This was done in 1978 by Chee-Craw Teachers Association vs. Unified School District No. 247. The opinion was filed March 31, 1979, and was written by Justice Kay McFarland.

The Kansas Supreme Court, in a unanimous opinion, listed the following items as subject to the bargaining process: teacher association rights; procedures for disciplining teachers; pay for unused sick leave; in-service education, including number of days to be provided for in-service training; insurance coverage following layoff; and work day, including length of day, time of arrival and departure and number of teaching periods.

The items which school boards need not negotiate with teachers included binding arbitration grievances, non-discrimination clauses, academic and personal freedom, assignment and transfers, compensation for extra curricular work, reduction in personnel, dismissal procedures, frequency of grade cards, sufficient funds for textbooks and supplies, sabbatical leaves, residual rights for teachers' work copyrighted and sold by the school district, form of individual teacher contracts, and procedure for renewal of contracts.

In summary of this opinion, Justice McFarland urged school boards and teacher associations to go to court immediately if in the early stages of negotiations they cannot agree on what items they will discuss.

. . . An action for declaratory judgement should be commenced forthwith in the district court for judicial determination of the matter in order that the parties may effectively proceed with their professional negotiations (Kansas Supreme Court, March 31, 1979, p. 484).

In light of the actions and opinions that have been filed, this study is an attempt to determine if negotiations have brought about a difference in the perceptions of teachers of their superintendents. As teachers have become more involved in negotiations it has become necessary to determine which side the superintendent must take. In most circumstances he is no longer considered a teacher, but he is a member of the team of the board of education.

As the lines have been drawn and more clearly defined through litigation and negotiations there has been some unrest on the part of both parties involved in the negotiations process, the teachers and the boards of education and their teams. While the superintendents still consider themselves to be first and always a teacher, the teachers see them as no longer being concerned with teacher problems and desires. Teachers want the most they can get from the boards of education and they want negotiations to be concluded as rapidly as possible so they can have their contracts for the next year, along with the security that goes with the contract.

While professional negotiations have become an integral part of the school process, many school districts still do not engage in the professional negotiations process. This study is an attempt to determine if there are differences that do exist in the perceptions that teachers have of the leadership behavior of their superintendents of schools in districts that engage in professional negotiations as opposed to perceptions that teachers have in districts that do not negotiate

or who meet and confer.

Statement of the Problem

This study has been intended to try to expand the store of information in two areas, the teachers' perceptions of leadership behavior, and to try to determine the effect if any that negotiations have had upon the superintendents' perceptions of their own behavior.

The problem is, we don't know if this is really true as there is no evidence to indicate that a relationship between negotiations and leadership behavior does exist. A lack of knowledge exists in determining whether or not negotiations has an effect on leader behavior and group perceptions of leader behavior in negotiating and non-negotiating school districts.

The purpose of this study is to expand the field of knowledge that presently does exist in the area of negotiations in relation to school districts.

The dimensions of leadership behavior used in this research will be those identified by Halpin in 1966 as Initiating Structure and Consideration. Initiating Structure has been associated with leader behavior toward achieving organizational goals, and consideration has been identified with leader behavior toward maintaining the organizational esprit.

Professional negotiations laws and increased teacher militancy have created various situations under which the superintendent of schools must operate as a leader of a group within the formal organization. These laws and situations have created the criteria under which a superintendent of schools must operate. He is considered to be in one

of four positions: (1) a member of the board of education negotiating team, (2) with the teachers' negotiating team, (3) with the administrative team against the board of education, but not a member of the teachers' team, or (4) in "no man's land" not on any team but his own.

It would seem, then, that a knowledge of the Initiating Structure and Consideration behavior of superintendents of schools would be of benefit to those presently in administrative positions and to those contemplating becoming administrators in regard to the teachers' perceptions of "what is" and "what should be" concerning the behavior of superintendents of schools. With this information, administrators can be more responsive in formal negotiations situations and better prepared in their own positions as they go through periods of growth and change.

This research will deal with a central question concerning the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools in Kansas as perceived by teachers in school districts that have professional negotiations compared to perceptions of those teachers in school districts that do not have professional negotiations. A second question to be studied will be: how do superintendents of schools perceive their own leadership behavior?

With the increase in professional negotiations in the school districts, the question arises, has there been any effect on the superintendents of schools in the performance of their duties or are they still perceiving themselves as the teachers' "big brother" leader? This study will as one aspect try to determine if negotiations have made a difference in how the superintendent perceives his own leadership behavior. Is there a difference in the superintendents' own perceptions of their

leadership behavior in districts that engage in professional negotiations as compared to superintendents' own perceptions of their behavior in districts that do not engage in professional negotiations? In other words, have professional negotiations had an effect on the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools?

The following two hypotheses have been formulated:

H.1.: Teacher perceptions of the Leadership behavior of their superintendents will be higher in both Consideration and Initiating Structure in districts that do not negotiate as compared with parallel teachers' perceptions in districts that do negotiate.

H.2.: Superintendents' perceptions of their own leadership behavior will be higher in both Consideration and Initiating Structure in districts that do not negotiate as compared with parallel superintendents' self perceptions in districts that do negotiate.

The primary objective of this study will be to determine whether or not there is a significant difference between the teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior of superintendents of Unified School Districts in Kansas between districts who have formal negotiations and those who do not have formal negotiations. The variable to be studied in these two settings are Consideration and Initiating Structure of the superintendent of schools. Significance is to be considered at the .05 level.

Definition of Terms

Leadership Behavior - the way the person appointed by the formal organization to lead an organizational group behaves with regard to Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Initiating Structure - the leader's behavior in delineating the

relationship between himself and the members of his workgroup, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure (Halpin, 1966).

Consideration - the leader's behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff (Halpin, 1966).

Professional Negotiations - the systematic process whereby professional educators meet with their boards of education (through designated representatives) to discuss and agree upon (in writing or otherwise) salary and other conditions of employment.

Teacher - a certified professional teacher of children or adolescents in the public schools.

Superintendent of Schools - the chief school administrator of a Unified School District in the State of Kansas.

Rationale

During these periods of tension and change, effective administration and leadership have been viewed as being particularly important. The decade of the 1960's brought with it much tension and some powerful forces to affect the greater society and the educational establishment within it. Six major forces have been identified as having contributed to an atmosphere of stress and change in the sixties, a condition which has also been predicted for continuation into the seventies and eighties. They are: (1) federal involvement in education, (2) problems of the poor, the disadvantaged, and the racially-segregated, (3) the "business-education" interface, (4) increased teacher militancy, (5) the diffusion of management technologies into

education, and (6) the growth of research and development in education (Culbertson, Farquhar, Gaynor, and Shibles, 1969). This study has been directly related to two of these major forces--the growth of research in education and increased teacher militancy.

The rationale for this study is that because of the strained relationships that develop during the professional negotiations process in schools, the group as a whole suffers. The relationship that exists between the chief school administrator and the teachers in leadership of the group is strained because of the negotiating conditions. The possibility exists that these relationships are less strained in school districts that do not have professional negotiations.

Because of strained relationship that exists in some school districts, it is hypothesized that one of the reasons for this strain is professional negotiations. During the period that professional negotiations are in process a strain develops within the group and there is some carry over during the rest of the year. This researcher tries to determine to what extent, if any, that professional negotiations or lack of professional negotiations in a school district has on the teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior of the superintendent of schools.

Recent research in educational administration has been concerned with leadership behavior. Studies regarding aircraft commanders and educational administrators have produced evidence to show that leader behavior varies from one occupational situation to another (Halpin, 1955). It has also been suggested that the leadership behavior of school superintendents differs from one reference group to another (Halpin, 1956).

The professional negotiations process, itself, has further complicated the situation for the superintendent of schools when it comes to mediations, arbitrations and strikes.

Perhaps one of the most useful theories to be advanced in educational administration has been the theory of administration as a social process (Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, 1968). This theory is summarized as follows:

. . . roles are complementary in that each role derives its meaning from other related roles in the institution . . . to understand the behavior of specific role-incumbents in an institution, we must know both the role-expectations and the need-dispositions. The relationship between the principal and the teacher is perceived by the principal in terms of his needs, dispositions, and goals. On the other hand, this same relationship is perceived by the teacher in terms of his needs, dispositions, and goals. If these two sets of perceptions are congruent, the teacher and the principal understand each other and can function as contributing members of a team. When the perceptions are incongruent, that is, when they see the same thing differently, the teacher and the principal misunderstand each other and their working relationship is likely to be unsatisfactory . . . (Faber and Shearron, 1970, p. 309).

The application of this theory to this study, when superintendents of schools and their teachers register their perceptions of the leadership behavior of the superintendent, would tend to indicate the amount of institutional conflict present in the situations of negotiating and non-negotiating districts being studied. Those presently in administrative positions in school districts should be provided information regarding the perceptions of teachers and superintendents of "what is" and "what should be" regarding the Initiating Structure and Consideration behavior of superintendents of schools so that they can be more responsive to their own situations.

If significant role conflict situations between superintendents

of schools and teachers are discovered in one negotiating situation over another, this information should be of interest to those who influence or pass professional negotiations legislation. A knowledge of the Initiating Structure and Consideration behavior of superintendents of schools in these negotiating situations would seem to be necessary if institutions which prepare and recommend persons for positions as chief school administrators are to be relevant and effective.

The original form of the LBDQ contained 150 items and was designed to measure nine dimensions of leader behavior. An adaption of the instrument by Halpin and Winer for their Air Force Study had 29 Initiating Structure items with an estimated reliability (corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula) of .76 and 28 Consideration items with an estimated reliabilities of these two demensions on this form are .86 for Initiating Structure and .93 for Consideration.

The basis for the use of the LBDQ was aptly described as follows:

By measuring the behavior of leaders on the Initiating Structure and the Consideration dimensions, we can determine by objective and reliable means how specific leaders differ in leadership style, and whether these leader differences are related significantly to independent criteria of the leader's effectiveness and efficiency. In sum, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire offers a means of defining these leader behavior dimensions operationally, making it possible for us to submit to empirical test additional specific hypotheses about leader and group behavior (Halpin, 1966, p. 83).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire consists of 30 short, Likert-type items describing ways leaders might behave. The respondents (usually the leader himself and his immediate staff) indicate the frequency of the leader's behavior on each of the items, according to five adverbs: (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) occasionally, (4) often, and

(5) always. Each dimension contains 15 items and each item is scored on a scale from 0 to 4, never to always. Thus, the range of scores for each dimension is from 0 to 60. Some of the items used for each dimension are:

Initiating Structure

He assigned staff members to particular tasks.

He works without a plan.*

He maintains definite standards of performance.

Consideration

He is easy to understand.

He finds time to listen to staff members.

He keeps to himself.*

Those items with asterisks after them are scored by using reverse scoring, in which "always" equals 0 and "never" equals 4. There are six such items in the LBDQ, two in the Initiating Structure section and four in the Consideration section.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire may be used to measure perceptions of how a leader actually behaves and to describe how a leader should behave. These two distinctions may be made simply by wording each item on the LBDQ to describe the "real" and the "ideal" behavior. In fact these two versions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire have been referred to as the "LBDQ-Real" and the "LBDQ-Ideal". These two forms, the "Real" and the "Ideal" have been used in this study.

The LBDQ, both the "Real" and the "Ideal" may be used to measure the leader's perceptions of his own behavior as well as those of his staff. Such data have also been collected in this study.

Summary

Chapter I includes the statement of the problem and other pertinent information necessary in the development of the problem. The information found in Chapter I serves to provide for a theoretical base from which the researcher examines the questions raised in the present study. Chapter II contains an explanatory review of literature pertaining to both leadership behavior and to professional negotiations. Chapter III describes the design and methodology of the study. Chapter IV presents the findings of this study and Chapter V deals with the summary, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Literature Related to Leadership Behavior

Leadership has been conceptualized at various times through the years according to: (1) certain traits or characteristics that especially fit a person for a leadership role, (2) certain requirements of social situations, (3) certain "styles" or characteristic manners of acting exhibited by leaders, and (4) certain behaviors of the leader with regard to identified dimensions of leader behavior. It has been clear throughout history that leadership is an essential in organizations and that leaders have been highly regarded. What is less clear has been what is meant by "leadership".

. . . in the first place, there is no general agreement among researchers and writers on the meaning of the word "leader". For example, some writers, especially historians, do not distinguish clearly between a leader and the holder of a position with status in the organizational hierarchy. These persons, as well as persons generally, assume that the holder of an important position in the hierarchy, is by virtue of that, a leader. Most behavioral scientists do not hold that view (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1967, pp. 126).

Recent leadership behavior research has been based on the social systems theory, with its emphasis on role-personality, institutional-individual, expectations-need dispositions relationships within the formal organization. Therefore, much of this research has dealt with perceptions and expectations of observed behavior as a method of learning about the behavior of leaders. However, long before this behavioral

approach, it was common to consider leaders in terms of certain characteristics or traits.

Before 1945, most studies of leadership were concerned with the identification of the traits or personal characteristics of leaders. The basic assumptions of these studies were that: (1) human beings could be divided into two groups, leaders and followers, and (2) leaders possessed certain traits or qualities that were not possessed by followers. The adage "leader's are born, not made" has persisted through the years.

Later a contrary assumption was made: that leadership behavior is unique to the requirements of the situation. Give this premise, studies were conducted to discover the significant leadership characteristics within various situations (Faber and Shearron, 1970). Perhaps the greatest support of the situational approach to the study of leadership has been Hemphill, who conducted a study of approximately 500 assorted leader-group situations. He contended that the traits approach to leadership ignored the important factor of the characteristics of the group being led. He identified fifteen dimensions of group characteristics and studied leadership in relation to them. These dimensions included group size, group viscosity or cohesion, group homogeneity, group flexibility, group permeability or exclusiveness, group polarization, group stability, group autonomy, group control, group position, group potency, group hedonic tone or satisfaction, group participation, group intimacy, and group dependence. Of these only two were found that were positively correlated to leadership behavior, viscosity .52 and hedonic tone .51 (Hemphill, 1949).

Hemphill's dimensions of viscosity and hedonic tone were very

similar to Homans' (1950) element of sentiment in groups. Sentiment was defined by Homans as the feelings that people develop toward each other and their group as they work together. As the group works together, according to Homans, it develops norms as part of the internal system. Homans (1950, p. 43) defined a norm as "an idea in the minds of the members of a group, an idea that can be put in the form of a statement specifying what the members or other men should do, ought to do, are expected to do, under given circumstances".

As situational studies progressed, it became increasingly evident that certain commonalities might be found in the behavior of leaders in various situations. Stogdill (1948) predicted over two decades ago that the study of leadership should not be restricted to traits or situations, but should also concentrate on leadership behaviors:

The evidence suggests that leadership is a relation that exists between persons in a social situation, and that persons who are leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations. May it then be assumed that leadership is entirely incidental, haphazard, and unpredictable? Not at all. The very studies that provide the strongest arguments for the situational nature of leadership patterns as well as non-leadership patterns of behavior are persistent and relatively stable (p. 42).

Another approach to the study of leadership that has been the attempt to identify leadership according to various styles. Leadership style has been defined by Faber and Shearron (1970, p. 79) as "the characteristic manner of acting exhibited by a leader". Several different classifications of leadership styles have been developed through the year.

These have been classified according to their sources of authority. Such as: (1) traditional, (2) charismatic, or (3) rational, (Weber,

1947) the human relations are: (1) democratic, (2) authoritarian, and (3) laissezfaire. There are other classifications of leadership styles such as "task oriented", "technique-oriented", "people oriented", and "builder and consolidator" (Faber and Shearron, 1970).

Two leader types have emerged and reinforce the classification of leadership behavior in various situations. One has been the nomothetic, idiographic, transactional scheme of Getzels and Guba (1957). The nomothetic style emphasized the institution and the role; the idiographic style stressed the individual and the personality; and the transactional style combined both role and personality, as cited in Moser (1957).

The second type has been the contingency model of Fiedler. To classify leadership styles, Fiedler developed the least-preferred co-worker scale (LPC), that asks the leader to describe the person with whom he works least well. The basic postulates of the contingency model are:

1. that leadership style is determined by the needs the individual seeks to satisfy in the leadership situation, and
2. that the effectiveness of the group's performance is contingent upon the degree to which the situation provides the leader with influence over his workers (Fiedler, 1967, p. 8).

Fiedler identified two contrasting leadership styles. Task-oriented leaders derive major need satisfaction from the successful accomplishment of the task. Relationship-oriented leaders receive basic need satisfaction from successful interpersonal interactions. In short, leadership style denotes the primary process by which individuals fulfill their need structure-effective task completion or successful interpersonal relations (Hoy and Miskel, 1978).

It was from these various classifications that two dimensions of leadership behavior were identified by Halpin as Initiating Structure and Consideration. He made the decision to consider the leader behavior concept as being concerned only with the formal organization and its officially-designed leaders (Halpin, 1966).

In the 1950's the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to measure leader behavior and leadership ideology in the formal organization. This was a further refinement of the LBDQ into its two dimensions, Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Studies using the LBDQ have been undertaken to examine leadership behavior in various types of organizations, including military, educational, business, and others. Results of these studies have provided some insights into the nature of the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions of leadership behavior in the different organizational settings and in some of the various leadership levels within these organizational settings.

In an educational study using the LBDQ, Hemphill (1949) found a correlation between college departments who had chairmen scoring high in both Initiating Structure and Consideration and high departmental reputation. These early studies established, according to Halpin (1966): (1) evidence indicating that Initiating Structure and Consideration are basic dimensions of leader behavior, and that the LBDQ is useful in measuring the behavior of leaders on these two dimensions; (2) an association between effective leader behavior and high ratings on both dimensions; (3) a tendency for superiors to emphasize Initiating Structure and subordinates to stress Consideration

in a leader's behavior; (4) a positive relationship between favorable group attitudes and high leader ratings on both dimensions; and (5) a slight correlation between group members' descriptions and the leader's beliefs about leadership behavior, as cited in Hemphill (1949).

He maintained that the staffs' perceptions of leader behavior most accurately describe "real" behavior, and that the leaders' expectations of leader behavior are the best indicators of "ideal" behavior.

Past studies regarding the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools have served not only to encourage the use of the LBDQ for subsequent studies of other leaders within school systems, but also to question its use with particular groups of educational leaders. Halpin's (1966) initial study of 50 Ohio school superintendents produced several important findings concerning the perceptions and expectations of their immediate staff, the superintendents, and their board of education members: (1) all three groups each agreed among themselves on the superintendent's leader behavior, but no two groups agreed with each other; (2) boards saw the superintendents' Consideration behavior significantly higher than did the staffs; (3) boards, superintendents, and staffs expected the superintendents to be significantly higher on both Initiating Structure and Consideration than they perceived them to be.

Many of the studies of leadership behavior concluded with recommendations for further research on the situational aspects of Initiating Structure and Consideration behavior of leaders. Cave (1967) investigated the question of school superintendents' leader behavior as a contributing factor toward conflict in collective negotiations, but did not compare the leadership behavior of superintendents in

different collective negotiations situations.

Literature Related to Professional Negotiations

Certainly the various situations imposed upon the institutional settings of school districts by differing collective negotiations arrangements offer a fertile area in which to examine leadership behavior.

Professional negotiations as a variable which might affect the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools has recently emerged.

It is common knowledge that employment relations in American education have become a major source of conflict between the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and their state and local affiliates. The NEA advocates a set of procedures labeled "professional negotiation", and the AFT advocates "collective bargaining". The rivalry between these two organizations is a long-standing one, but in recent years has reached new heights - or perhaps new lows - in the organizational competition to persuade teachers that one of these procedures is superior to the other. Some respected authorities not connected with either the NEA or the AFT have asserted that there are no differences or only relatively unimportant ones between these procedures.

The term "professional negotiations" is used in Kansas and therefore is used in this paper. The negotiations process has been described as occurring in three stages: stage 1 (nativity), stage 2 (adolescence), and stage 3 (maturity). Stage 1 has been characterized as one of the employees' guilty, hesitant demand for recognition; the employer's reaction of shock and temporary decisional paralysis; and a negotiations

ineptness on both sides. Stage 2 has been highlighted by the employer's intransigent refusal or grudging acquiescence; and a hostile "we-they" negotiations posture by both sides. Stage 3 has been achieved when both employees and employer reach a state of homeostasis, with a balance of power and integrative bargaining in a spirit of accommodation toward mutual interests. Within the attitudinal evaluation of the negotiations process such reactions as bewilderment, hostility, and satisfaction have been observed (Walton and McKersie, 1965).

Few school districts have reached the third stage of negotiations since negotiations in education has been a relatively recent development (Carlton, 1969).

Although the two predominant teacher organizations, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), have been in existence since 1857 and 1916, respectively, professional negotiations did not formally appear in education until the 1960's. The NEA, the self-described "professional" organization, has claimed that the Denver Resolution that came out of its 1962 Representative Assembly served as an impetus for the passage of professional negotiations legislation. The AFT, an affiliate of the AFL-CIO, has credited the 1960 and 1962 United Federation of Labor teacher strikes in New York with emphasizing the need for professional bargaining legislation (Megel, 1970).

Most writers (Stinnett, 1968; Licherman and Moskow, 1966; Carlton, 1969; Corwin, 1969) have cited a combination of factors which contributed to teacher militancy and the passage of professional negotiations legislation in many states during the 1960's. Those factors mentioned most frequently were: (1) the increase in the number of young, married,

male teachers in education; (2) mounting impatience of teachers over the economic injustice reflected in their salaries; (3) the bitterness of teachers over the neglect of the schools by an affluent society; (4) the loss of individual identity of teachers because of the growth of school districts; (5) the new status of public employees posted by Executive Order 10988; (6) the demand for recognition and participation in decision-making by various groups within society which was spearheaded by the civil rights movement; (7) organizational rivalry between the NEA and the AFT, and (8) the "snowball" effect of professional negotiations legislation, one state after another.

Employees in the public sector have been differentiated from those in the private sector because of their "public service" function. These employees negotiated informally with their various agencies and departments until Executive Order 10988 was issued for federal employees in 1962. This order, and its subsequent replacement, Executive Order No. 11491, gave employees the right to organize and provided for mediation and arbitration, but did not authorize strikes, and generally separated supervisors from employee negotiating units. Negotiations laws governing state and local employees have followed this same format, with state negotiations laws increasing from 3 state laws in 1965 to 41 state laws in 1970 (N.E.A., 1970).

The growth of teacher militancy and professional negotiations legislation in the decade of the 1960's has been clearly reflected in the numbers of teacher strikes and professional negotiations laws that have resulted. Between 1962 and 1965, a total of 16 teacher strikes were reported by the Labor Bureau. In 1968 alone, Labor Bureau statistics showed 88 work stoppages involving 21,800 public school

teachers (Moskow, Loewenburg, and Koziara, 1970). Prior to 1965, Wisconsin was the only state with a comprehensive law regulating collective negotiations in education. In 1970, nearly half of the states had adopted legislation providing for negotiations in education.

There has been considerable variation in the negotiations laws passed by the different states. For example, in 1967 Alaska, New Hampshire, Michigan, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island passed public employee negotiations laws, sponsored by the AFL-CIO; while California, Connecticut, Florida, Oregon, and Washington enacted professional negotiations laws proposed by NEA affiliates. The differences among professional negotiations laws, therefore, were generally indicated by comparing NEA and AFT stands on two basic issues - unit representation and impasse procedures (Stinnett, 1968).

On the issue of unit representation, the NEA has taken the stand that, whenever possible, professional educators should belong to the same organization. The recommendation of the Task Force on Local Association Structure was adopted by the NEA (1968) Board of Directors on October 11, 1968, as follows:

In a given community the profession may organize in one of two ways:

- In separate associations for classroom teachers and administrators, with the two associations cooperating formally or informally through a coordinating council or unstructured joint committee
- In an all-inclusive association where policy is determined by "all members" meetings or by a representative council based on membership. The association should provide for unstructured caucuses for classroom teachers and administrators, or for two structured departments.

The AFT policy on the composition of the negotiating unit was adopted in 1964 as follows:

The AFT local should propose that only those persons who are certified personnel and employed on the basis of the classroom teachers salary guide be part of the bargaining unit . . . a classroom teacher (is one) who spends 50% of his time right to employ or dismiss, not the right to recommend employment or dismissal of teachers (Lieberman and Moskow, 1966, p. 154).

Professional negotiations in education have generated conflict which, in turn, has produced change within education. In some districts, teachers are achieving, almost overnight, desirable educational changes which principals have been trying to achieve for a long time. The results of teacher militancy are leading to positive educational improvements in many school districts (Cunningham, 1968). The nature of this change needs to be examined. The professional negotiations status of Kansas leads itself to an analysis of one aspect of this change, the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools on their "board team" positions in various professional negotiations situations.

Summary

The development of professional negotiations in education has had its background in the traditions of negotiations that have evolved in the private and public sector of employment.

Professional negotiations in education has grown rapidly from 1962 to the present. Increased teacher militancy resulting from the economic inequities of teachers; the "new breed" of teachers; the climate of civil rights demands; teacher organizational rivalry; and the "snow balling" of professional negotiations laws were some of the factors cited as contributing to this change. NEA and AFT stands for or against administrative representation by teacher negotiating units and teacher

strikes have influenced professional negotiations legislation in the various states.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The design and intent of the research to determine the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools in negotiating and non-negotiating districts in the State of Kansas was mentioned briefly in Chapter II. This chapter will go more into detail with a description of the design and procedures within the format of the negotiating and non-negotiating phases of the study.

After interviews with the executive director of the Kansas Association of School Boards (KASB) and the Senior Legal Advisor of the KASB, it was determined that sufficient information and materials would be available for such a study and that the KASB was willing to provide any information they might have.

In Kansas there are 307 school districts. Of these 307 districts the KASB had information on 288 districts as to whether or not they were involved in professional negotiations. This information was from a questionnaire sent out by KASB in August 1979. Nineteen school districts did not respond to the KASB questionnaire. Of the 288 districts responding, 184 indicated they did have professional negotiations and 102 indicated they did not have professional negotiations.

Permission to adapt and reproduce the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was obtained from Macmillian Publishing Company,

Inc., 866 Third Avenue, New York, New York, 10022, on February 12, 1980. The LBDQ used was from Theory and Research in Administration by Andrew W. Halpin. The two dimensions of leadership behavior, Initiating Structure and Consideration, were not mentioned or identified anywhere in the questionnaire. The questionnaire that was given to the respondents in the study consisted of a one page 8½ by 11 inch sheet of paper folder to form four pages. The first page provided the general instructions for completing the questionnaire and a section for background information in which the respondent was asked to check or fill in the categories, such as position, experience, sex, age, and educational degree. The second page was the LBDQ - Real and across from this was page three with the LBDQ - Ideal. The back or fourth page was blank. Copies of the questionnaires used with the teachers and the superintendents are included in the appendix.

Nowhere on the questionnaire was there a place for the person responding to identify himself, his school, or his unified school district. An unmarked envelope was attached to each questionnaire along with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, general instructions for completing the questionnaire, stressing the voluntary nature of participation, and assuring the confidentiality and anonymity of the respondent. The respondent was asked to return the completed questionnaire sealed in the envelope, to the building principal who in turn would forward them on to the researcher. The only coding mechanism involved in the research was that all envelopes from districts that had professional negotiations were addressed in blue and those from non-negotiating districts were addressed in black.

The procedure for distributing the LBDQ was essentially the same

in each of the participating districts. The packets were sent to the participating school district principals and were distributed by the principals from their list of teachers in alphabetical order taking the teachers' names that were odd numbered. The first 10 teachers on the alphabetical list, odd numbered, were to be selected. If the district had less than 20 teachers, the odd numbered were to be taken as far as could go and then the rest were to come from the bottom end of the list. Principals were encouraged to hand the questionnaires out personally but they could place them in the teachers' mail box. Principals names and addresses were obtained from the Kansas Educational Directory, 1979-80, issued by the Kansas State Department of Education.

Respondents were given one week to complete the questionnaire and return them, in the sealed envelope, to the principal's office. The principal then forwarded the completed packet to the researcher. After two weeks if there was no responses, the researcher then sent a follow-up letter to the principal asking him to check on the questionnaire response and asking that any questionnaires that might have come in be forwarded.

The participating districts were determined from a computer print-out obtained from the Kansas Association of School Boards that listed the districts that did and did not have professional negotiations in the State of Kansas. From this list the districts were divided into their enrollment categories as given by the Kansas State High School Activities Association. These categories are 1A (the smallest enrollment category in Kansas) to 6A (the largest enrollment category in Kansas). The largest school districts, the 6A and the smallest school districts, the 1A schools, were eliminated from the study to get

a closer grouping of responses. Another reason for eliminating the 6A schools, was that there were no 6A schools that did not have negotiations. From the four classifications remaining, 2A, 3A, 4A, and 5A schools, three districts were chosen from each classification in the negotiating districts and three districts from each of the non-negotiating districts, giving a total of twelve school districts that negotiate and twelve school districts that do not negotiate. The districts were located on a map of Kansas and selected districts were chosen by the researcher to try to give a cross-section of the population. From the twelve districts selected as negotiating districts, the return was 102 out of the 120 questionnaires sent or 85%. The return from the non-negotiating school districts was 104 returns out of the 120 sent. This was a return of 86.7 percent.

The return from the superintendents of the twelve non-negotiating districts and the twelve negotiating districts was 100% as all twenty-four superintendents responded to the questionnaire.

Treatment of Data

Each of the completed Leader Behavior Description Questionnaires was scored according to its three major sections: (1) Background Information, (2) LBDQ-Real, and (3) LBDQ-Ideal. Responses for each of the categories of the Background Information section, such as position, experience, grade level, sex, age, and education were compiled for each of the categories, negotiating and non-negotiating school districts. If respondents failed to mark some of the background categories, the information was simply not recorded, but the questionnaire was not thrown out and was still considered valid. Several respondents

failed to give their age even though they did fill out all the rest of the questionnaire. It was felt that this would not make the rest of the questionnaire invalid. The background information was used to gain some additional perceptions and knowledge about the samples being compared.

The LBDQ-Real and the LBDQ-Ideal sections were scored in the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions. For a dimension to be scored, every item in the dimension must have been answered. A questionnaire was considered usable if only one of the dimensions could be scored. If none of the dimensions could be scored on a questionnaire, the questionnaire was not considered usable. This only happened on five of the total responses and this figure was not used in the computation of the total percentage of responses. Each questionnaire was scored by the researcher, with the scores being verified by a second scoring.

When the questionnaires were scored, the data was compiled according to the categories of the research questions of negotiating and non-negotiating school districts. This information was then keypunched onto data computer cards for programming. The information was recorded onto 206 cards for the teachers and 24 cards for the superintendents by the researcher. The keypunch cards were then verified. Teachers' mean scores were computed next to represent descriptions of the Initiating Structure and Consideration behavior (Real and Ideal) of the superintendents of schools. These mean scores and standard deviations of the teachers and of the superintendents are shown. Mean scores were computed to serve as indices of the teachers' and the superintendents' perceptions and expectations of the two dimensions of leadership behavior

for each category of negotiating and non-negotiating school districts. These mean scores are shown in the tables in Chapter IV. All of the scores have been rounded off to the nearest decimal place for convenience.

Testing the Hypotheses

The first hypothesis is stated:

Teacher perceptions of the leadership behavior of their superintendents will be higher in Consideration in districts that do not negotiate and their perceptions will show higher in Initiating Structure in districts that do negotiate.

The LBDQ-Real and Ideal teachers mean scores were used as indices of the superintendents leadership behavior on the two dimensions, Initiating Structure and Consideration, for the two categories of negotiating and non-negotiating school districts. This was consistent with Halpin's (1966) concept that a leaders' behavior can best be described by "the mean LBDQ-Real scores", for each dimension, by which group members have described them. Therefore, the teachers' Initiating Structure and Consideration mean scores for each of the categories were used to test the hypothesis.

A frequency distribution was run on the 206 cards of the teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior of the superintendents of schools. The frequency distribution indicated the differences of the teacher mean scores by categories in the negotiating and non-negotiating school districts.

In order to test for specific significant differences in the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools in the two categories of negotiating and non-negotiating school districts the separate

variance t-test was used. The LBDQ-Real teachers mean scores for each of the categories were compared by this separate variance t-test to test the first hypothesis.

The second hypothesis is stated:

Superintendents' perceptions of their own leadership behavior will be higher in Consideration in districts that do not negotiate and their self perceptions will be higher in Initiating Structure in districts that do negotiate.

A frequency distribution was also run on the 24 cards of the superintendents' real and ideal perceptions of their own leadership behavior.

The LBDQ-Real superintendents' mean scores were compared with the LBDQ-Ideal superintendents scores on the two dimensions of Initiating Structure and Consideration for each category of negotiating and non-negotiating school districts to test this hypothesis. Each comparison in the testing of this hypothesis involved two mean scores from the same group. Therefore, the t-test for paired observations was used.

Summary

The steps involved in the present study included obtaining an appropriate population, determining an appropriate measuring instrument, applying the instrument, and analyzing the results. The population was determined from a computer printout obtained from the Kansas Association of School Boards that listed the districts that did and did not have professional negotiations in the State of Kansas. From this list the districts were divided into their enrollment categories as given by the Kansas State High School Activities Association. These categories are 1A (the smallest enrollment category in Kansas) to 6A (the largest

enrollment category in Kansas). The largest school districts, the 6A and the smallest school districts, the 1A schools, were eliminated from the study to get a closer grouping of responses. From the four classifications remaining, 2A, 3A, 4A, and 5A schools, three districts were chosen from each classification in the negotiating districts and three districts from each of the non-negotiating districts, giving a total of twelve school districts that negotiate and twelve school districts that do not negotiate.

The principals of these schools were contacted and asked to participate in the study. Each principal was then sent a packet containing the questionnaires and the appropriate reply envelopes. When these questionnaires were returned, the data was recorded, tested for statistical significance where appropriate, the findings were reported and conclusions and recommendations were compiled.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and analyze the data collected in the study. The presentation of the data and the analysis and interpretation of the data were organized around the two hypotheses formulated in Chapter I. The stated hypotheses are as follows:

- H.1.: Teacher perceptions of the leadership behavior of their superintendents will be higher in both Consideration and Initiating Structure in districts that do not negotiate as compared with parallel teachers' perceptions in districts that do negotiate.
- H.2.: Superintendents' perceptions of their own leadership behavior will be higher in both Consideration and Initiating Structure in districts that do not negotiate as compared with parallel superintendents' self perceptions in districts that do negotiate.

In prior chapters, descriptions have been given as to the permission granted by the school administrators of the school districts selected for the study. The cooperation of these school administrators was essential for the data-gathering ahead.

There were 12 school districts selected from each of the categories of negotiating and non-negotiating districts. Ten questionnaires were sent to each school district. The principal was asked to alphabetize the teachers and select the odd numbered teachers to

participate in the research project. These teachers were then given the questionnaire and an unmarked envelope and asked to complete the questionnaire, enclose it in the envelope and return it to the building principal. The principal after collecting the responses returned them to the researcher. The possible number of responses was 120 from each category; 102 were received from the negotiating school districts and 104 from the non-negotiating school districts (Tables I and II).

TABLE I
TOTALS BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS
OF RETURNS RECEIVED

Non-negotiating				Negotiating			
		<u>Sent</u>	<u>Received</u>			<u>Sent</u>	<u>Received</u>
School	#1.	10	8	School	#13.	10	10
	2.	10	6		14.	10	9
	3.	10	10		15.	10	8
	4.	10	10		16.	10	9
	5.	10	9		17.	10	8
	6.	10	8		18.	10	9
	7.	10	10		19.	10	10
	8.	10	9		20.	10	10
	9.	10	9		21.	10	7
	10.	10	9		22.	10	10
	11.	10	8		23.	10	5
	12.	10	8		24.	10	7

The questionnaire was also sent to the superintendents of schools in each of the selected school districts. There was a 100 percent return from all of the superintendents as shown in Table III.

TABLE II
TEACHER TOTALS FOR NEGOTIATING AND
NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL
DISTRICT RETURNS

	Negotiating	Non-negotiating
Number Sent	120	120
Number Returning	102	104
Percent of Return	85	86.7

TABLE III
SUPERINTENDENT TOTALS FOR NEGOTIATING
AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL
DISTRICT RETURNS

	Negotiating	Non-negotiating
Number Sent	12	12
Number Returning	12	12
Percent Return	100	100

Demographic Information

Data regarding the respondent's experience in present position, grade level taught, sex, age, educational background, and the number of years experience in education were collected for this study. This information is presented in Table IV for the teachers and in Table V for the superintendents of schools. Not all of the respondents chose to answer every item as requested in the demographic information section. This accounts for the difference in the number

of responses in the different areas.

TABLE IV
TEACHER RESPONDENTS IN BACKGROUND CATEGORIES

Variable	n	Response Code	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	205	Male	112	54.6
		Female	93	45.4
Experience in present position	206	1 to 5 yrs.	74	36
		6 to 10 yrs.	48	23.4
		11 to 15 yrs.	51	24.9
		16 to 20 yrs.	19	9.2
		21 to 25 yrs.	9	4.5
		26 and over	4	2.0
Grade level	205	Elementary	38	18.5
		Junior High	35	17.1
		Secondary	132	64.4
Age	199	Under 30 yrs.	39	19.6
		30 to 40 yrs.	90	45.2
		41 to 50 yrs.	43	21.6
		51 to 60 yrs.	24	12.1
		Over 60 yrs.	3	1.5
Highest	206	Bachelors	101	49.0
		Masters	81	39.3
		Ed. Specialist	23	11.2
		Doctors	1	0.5
Experience in Education	204	1 to 5 yrs.	38	18.6
		6 to 10 yrs.	51	25.0
		11 to 15 yrs.	51	25.0
		16 to 20 yrs.	29	14.3
		21 to 25 yrs.	20	9.9
		26 to 30 yrs.	9	4.5
		31 to 35 yrs.	6	3.0
Negotiate	206	Yes	102	49.5
		No	104	50.5

TABLE V
SUPERINTENDENT RESPONDENTS IN BACKGROUND CATEGORIES

Variable	n	Response Code	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	24	Male	24	100
		Female	0	0
Experience in present position	24	1 to 5 yrs.	13	54.1
		6 to 10 yrs.	4	16.7
		11 to 15 yrs.	6	25.0
		Over 15 yrs.	1	4.2
Age	24	Under 30 yrs.	0	0
		31 to 40 yrs.	4	16.7
		41 to 50 yrs.	11	45.8
		51 to 60 yrs.	8	33.3
		Over 60 yrs.	1	4.2
Highest degree	24	Bachelors	0	0
		Masters	10	41.7
		Ed. Specialist	5	20.8
		Doctors	9	37.5
Experience in education	24	1 to 10 yrs.	1	4.2
		11 to 15 yrs.	2	8.4
		16 to 20 yrs.	5	20.9
		21 to 25 yrs.	6	25.0
		26 to 30 yrs.	5	20.9
		31 to 35 yrs.	4	16.7
Negotiate	24	Yes	12	50
		No	12	50

The responses indicate that 74 or 36 percent of the teachers had been in their present position five years or less, and that 13 (almost 55 percent) of the superintendents had been in their present positions for five years or less. At the other end of the spectrum, only 13 or 8 percent of the teachers had been in their present positions for over 20 years and only two had been in their position for 15 or more years.

The grade level distribution was about equal for the elementary, grades kindergarten through sixth, and for the junior high, grades seven and eight, with 38 elementary teachers responding and 35 junior high teachers responding. There were responses from 132 senior high teachers which comprised about 64 percent of the total sample.

For the teachers who responded to the questionnaires, almost 45 percent were women with 93 responses and the remainder were men with 112 responses and almost 55 percent. As for the superintendents, all 24 respondents were men.

Only 199 respondents answered the question as to their age. Only 39 teachers or approximately 20 percent were 30 years old or younger while only 27 were over 50 years old and only 3 were over 60 years old. The group of over 50 years old was approximately 14 percent of the total sample. The average age for teachers was 38 years. The average age for the superintendents of schools was 47 years. There were no superintendents over 60 years old.

One hundred one or 49 percent of the teachers had bachelor's degrees. Eighty one or 39 percent listed master's degrees, 23 listed education specialist's degrees and only one had a doctor's degree. In the superintendents' category, 42 percent of them had master's degrees and 9 or 38 percent had doctor's degrees. The education specialist degree is a sixth-year equivalent and is considered as a terminal degree in Kansas schools.

As to their total years experience in education, only 38 or 18 percent of the teachers had been in education for five years or less while 91 or 44 percent had been in education for ten years or less. Only 6 of the teachers had over 30 years experience in education or

approximately 3 percent. The average number of years in education for teachers was approximately 13 years. For superintendents only one had been in education less than ten years, and four had been in education for over 30 years. The average number of years in education for superintendents was 23 years.

The demographic information indicated in Table VI was used in the study to indicate the cross section of the sample. The ages of the teacher respondents ranged from a low of 23 years to a high of 65 years. The mean age for the respondents was 38.2 years. The mean for the number of years in their present position was 9.3 years, and the mean for the number of years experience in education was 12.8 years. The years of experience in education ranged from first year teachers to 35 years.

The superintendent respondents ranged in age from 31 to 63 years with a mean age of 47.4 years. The mean number of years' experience in their present position was 6.9 years and ranged from first year superintendents in the present position to one superintendent who had been in his present position for 17 years. The mean for the total number of years experience in education was 23.6 years and ranged from a low of 9 years to a high of 34 years in education.

Of the 205 teacher respondents who answered the sex category, there were 112 male and 93 females who answered the questionnaire. The superintendents who responded to the questionnaire were all male. From information received from the Kansas Association of School Boards, it was learned that there are no females in chief school administrator positions in the State of Kansas.

TABLE VI
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Variable	n	Mean	Range
Teacher age	199	38.2	23 yrs. to 65 yrs.
Teacher experience in present position	206	9.3	1 yr. to 33 yrs.
Teacher experience	204	12.8	1 yr. to 35 yrs.
Superintendent age	24	47.4	31 yrs. to 65 yrs.
Superintendent's experience in present position	24	6.9	1 yr. to 17 yrs.
Superintendent's experience in education	24	23.6	9 yrs. to 34 yrs.

Respondents Comments

Comments were not solicited from the respondents to the questionnaire, but, there were several questionnaires returned with comments on them. The comments ranged from those about the questionnaire in general, to those about their superintendent, to comments on the individual items on the LBDQ.

One envelope was returned, sealed, with nothing at all on the questionnaire. The envelope was not considered among the 206 respondents. One respondent stated, "The man lives in a world of his own, never sticks his neck out. He uses the school board and principals for leverage. No personal contact. He'd be a good Librarian."

Another teachers' comment about her superintendent was that, "He is one of the finest people I know. He is very considerate and has my greatest respect. Of course he's my husband which may have clouded my opinion somewhat."

One respondent stated, "This is one of the most poorly developed questionnaires I have ever seen. There is no way it could be considered valid at all." This respondent did fill out the questionnaire completely and answered all the questions. Several of the respondents stated that it would be interesting to see the results of this study.

One of the interesting developments of the questionnaire was that even though it was stated that everything would be in strictest confidence and the questionnaires and the envelope provided were unmarked so that the respondents could remain anonymous, five of the superintendents of schools signed their questionnaires. This might have been a reflex action to sign everything that goes across their desks or it might have been an indication of their acceptance and confidence in their position. This researcher would also like to think that this indicates that they thought this was an interesting and worthwhile research project.

Analysis of the Hypotheses

The major questions of the study dealt with whether differences existed in the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools in negotiating and non-negotiating school districts as perceived by teachers and if differences existed in the superintendents perceptions of their own leadership behavior in negotiating and non-negotiating districts.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) yielded four categories of descriptions of the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools in the study: (1) LBDQ-Real-Teachers, (2) LBDQ-Ideal-Teachers, (3) LBDQ-Real-Superintendents, (4) LBDQ-Ideal-Superintendents. Each of these categories included scores of the two dimensions of leadership behavior, Initiating Structure and Consideration. Initially, 824 scores were computed from the 206 teacher responses and 96 scores were computed from the 24 superintendents' responses to the questionnaire.

These responses were reduced to eight scores for teachers and eight scores for superintendents' when the Initiating Structure and Consideration scores were combined into mean scores for teachers' and for the superintendents. The teachers' mean scores and standard deviations are shown in Table VII and the superintendents' self-description scores for each dimension are shown in Table VIII. Inspection of these teacher mean scores and superintendent mean scores revealed that: (1) the distribution of the Real scores fell within the upper 60 percent of the theoretical range from 0 to 60, and (2) the Ideal scores were higher than the Real scores. Halpin (1956), Everson (1958), Roberts (1963), and Hunt (1967) found similar distributions of scores.

Data Related to Hypothesis 1. The first hypothesis of the study was:

Teacher perceptions of the leadership behavior of their superintendents will be higher in both Consideration and Initiating Structure in districts that do not negotiate as compared with parallel teachers' perceptions in districts that do negotiate.

The LBDQ-Real-Teachers means scores were used to represent the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools in each of the

TABLE VII
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF LBDQ-REAL
AND LBDQ-IDEAL FOR TEACHERS

	Initiating Mean	Structure Std. Dev.	T Value	Prob.	Consideration Mean	Std. Dev.	T Value	Prob.
Real-negotiating	36.9	9.2	1.33	0.185	44.6	7.0	0.84	0.403
Real-non- negotiating	38.6	9.1			45.4	5.7		
Ideal-negotiating	46.1	6.5	0.11	0.909	31.7	11.3	2.46*	0.015
Ideal-non- negotiating	46.2	6.6			35.9	13.2		

*Significant at .05 level

TABLE VIII
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF LBDQ-REAL
AND LBDQ-IDEAL FOR SUPERINTENDENTS

	Initiating Mean	Structure Std. Dev.	T Value	Prob.	Consideration Mean	Std. Dev.	T Value	Prob.
Real-negotiating	37.8	6.4	1.78	0.088	45.1	3.5	0.62	0.540
Real-non- negotiating	42.4	6.4			46.1	4.3		
Ideal-negotiating	47.3	6.6	-0.66	0.514	39.2	6.1	0.80	0.434
Ideal-non- negotiating	45.8	5.0			41.2	6.7		

categories of negotiating and non-negotiating school districts.

Upon examination it was found that the first part of the hypothesis was borne out by the fact that the teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior of their superintendents of schools mean scores was higher in non-negotiating school districts than that in negotiating school districts. The mean score for non-negotiating school districts was 45.4 for Consideration while the mean score in negotiating school districts was 44.6. The second part of the first hypothesis was not borne out in that the teachers in the non-negotiating group perceived their superintendents to be higher in Initiating Structure with a mean score of 38.6 than the teachers in the negotiating group who perceived their superintendents' mean score to be 36.9.

Even though the significance level on Initiating Structure was not within the more stringent 0.05 level set for this study it was considered to be higher and more noteworthy than the level on Consideration.

The LBDQ-Ideal-Teachers perceptions of the superintendents leadership behavior T-value was significant for Consideration. The mean scores for Ideal non-negotiating districts was 35.9 and the mean scores for the negotiating districts was 31.7. This shows a level of significance that is acceptable at the 0.05 level.

There was no significance shown between the mean score perceptions of the Ideal negotiating and non-negotiating school districts in the Initiating Structure category. The non-negotiating mean score was 46.2 and the negotiating mean score was 46.1 for virtually no difference.

While in the Consideration category, the non-negotiating teachers perceived the leadership behavior to be higher in both Real and Ideal

concepts, there was no significant T difference in the Real. There was a significant difference found in the Ideal. In the Initiating Structure category, it was found that the perceptions of the teachers was higher for the non-negotiating Real than the negotiating Real and there was some significance but not enough to bear out the hypothesis. In the Ideal-Initiating Structure, there was virtually no difference in the teachers' perceptions between the negotiating and non-negotiating districts. Therefore the first hypothesis would have to be rejected.

Data Related to Hypothesis 2. The second hypothesis of the study was:

Superintendents' perceptions of their own leadership behavior will be higher in both Consideration and Initiating Structure in districts that do not negotiate as compared with parallel superintendents' self perceptions in districts that do negotiate.

The LBDQ-Real-Superintendents mean scores were used to represent the leadership behavior of superintendents' self perceptions in each of the categories of negotiating and non-negotiating school districts.

Upon examination of Table VIII, it was found that the first part of the second hypothesis was borne out in that the self perceptions of the superintendent of schools T-value scores were higher in the non-negotiating school districts than the mean scores in negotiating school districts. The mean scores for the non-negotiating superintendents was 46.1 in the Consideration category and the mean score for the negotiating superintendents was 45.1. The second part of the second hypothesis was not borne out in that the superintendents' self-perceptions in the Initiating Structure category was higher in T-value score for the non-negotiating superintendent than the self perceptions for the negotiating superintendent. The mean score for the self percep-

tions of the non-negotiating superintendent was 42.8 while the mean score for the negotiating superintendent was 37.8.

The significance level on the Initiating Structure category was just larger than the 0.05 level of significance; it was considerably higher in T value at 1.78 than the T value for the Consideration category at 0.62.

The LBDQ-Ideal-Superintendent perceptions of the own leadership behavior was not significantly different for Consideration. The mean scores for the Ideal non-negotiating superintendent was 41.2 and the mean score for negotiating superintendent was 39.2. While this bears out the idea that Ideal superintendents in non-negotiating districts will be higher in Consideration than superintendents in negotiating districts, there is not enough difference to be significant at the 0.05 level.

In the Ideal category, the second part of the second hypothesis, that superintendents in negotiating districts should rate higher in Initiating Structure than Consideration, was carried out. The mean score for the Ideal negotiating Initiating Structure was 47.3, while the mean score for the non-negotiating was 45.8.

As with the teachers' perceptions, the T-values of the superintendents self perceptions bore out the hypothesis as far as the Consideration part of the hypothesis was concerned although not with much significance. In the Initiating Structure part of the hypothesis, the idea was not proven to be true as the superintendents' self perceptions were higher for non-negotiating superintendents than for negotiating superintendents.

In the Ideal category the hypothesis was carried out as stated.

The superintendents' self perceptions were higher in Consideration in non-negotiating districts than in negotiating districts. In the Initiating Structure area, the superintendents' mean scores were higher in negotiating districts than in the non-negotiating districts. While this bears out the hypothesis as far as the Ideal category is concerned, it is not significant enough to be considered at the 0.05 level of significance required for this study.

The hypothesis for the superintendents' self perceptions therefore must be rejected as far as the significance of this study is concerned.

Supplementary Data

Several interesting items came from the demographic information collected from the questionnaire. T-tests were run on the information collected in relation to the age of the respondents, the sex of the respondents, and the teaching level of the respondents. There was no way of determining the responses from the individual school districts as the respondents were assured that their confidentiality would be protected. The researcher was able to determine the number of responses from the individual school districts only by inspecting the postmarks on the return envelopes and by the process of elimination on the envelopes that did not have a local post office postmark. There was no place on the questionnaire to indicate the size of the school the response was coming from so this information was also unavailable.

The t-test that was determined from the information as to the teacher's perceptions according to sex did not have any significance. This would indicate to the researcher that sex was not a determining factor as to teachers' perceptions of the superintendents leadership

behavior. As there was no significance indicated, being male or female did not make any difference as to teachers' perceptions on Initiating Structure or Consideration. This information is indicated in Table IX.

TABLE IX
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR
OF SUPERINTENDENTS FOR CONSIDERATION IN
NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING
SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING
TO SEX

Variable	Number	T-Value	Prob.
Male	113	-0.26	0.796
Female	95		

A t-test was also run on the teachers age as determined by the information gathered from the questionnaire. The median age of the teacher respondents was found to be 38.2. The teachers whose age was below the mean, or younger than 38 were considered in the group of "younger" teachers and those whose age was above the mean were considered in the group of "older" teachers.

At the 0.05 level of significance, there was significance shown in the age factor as to the perceptions of the teachers in regard to their superintendents of schools. It is the idea of this researcher that as teachers get older and become more acclimated to their positions they either become more sympathetic to the superintendents

behavior or become more tolerant. From the information gained from Table X; it would appear that the "older" teachers rank their superintendents higher in Consideration than do the "younger" teachers.

TABLE X
TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF
SUPERINTENDENTS FOR CONSIDERATION IN
NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING
SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING
TO AGE

Variables	Number	T-Value	Prob.
Above mean	82	2.71*	0.007
Below mean	117		

* Significant at 0.05 level

Table XI indicates the teacher perceptions of the leadership behavior of their superintendent according to the teaching level of the respondents. As indicated by the number of responses, there were more responses from the secondary level than from the elementary level. There was no real significance indicated when considered at the 0.05 level. This would indicate that the level of teaching, elementary or secondary, really had very little to do with teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior of their superintendents. One school of thought that has emerged in recent years is that teachers on the secondary level are more militant than those on the elementary level. The

information gathered by this researcher would indicate that teaching level had little or no effect on the teachers perceptions.

TABLE XI
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF
SUPERINTENDENTS FOR CONSIDERATION IN
NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING
SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING
TO TEACHING LEVEL

Variable	Number	T-Value	Prob.
Secondary	129	1.76	0.079
Elementary	74		

Summary

The study sample consisted of 206 teachers and 24 superintendents of schools in 24 school districts in the state of Kansas. This represented a return of 85 percent of the teachers surveyed in the selected school districts and 100 percent of the superintendents of schools.

Background information regarding experience in present position, grade level taught, sex, age, educational level, and years of experience in education were given for the teacher and the superintendent of schools for each questionnaire returned. Comments given by the respondents on the questionnaire were also discussed in this chapter.

Data related to each of the hypothesis of the study were pre-

sented and discussed in the remainder of the chapter. The first hypothesis that teachers would perceive the leadership behavior of superintendents to be higher in Consideration in non-negotiating districts and higher in Initiating Structure in negotiating districts was borne out for the Consideration part of the hypothesis but was not found to be true for the second part. Therefore the first hypothesis was rejected on the basis of not being significant at the 0.05 level.

The second hypothesis, that superintendents would perceive themselves as being higher in Consideration in non-negotiating districts and higher in Initiating Structure in negotiating districts was borne out for the Consideration part of the hypothesis but was not found to be true on the Initiating Structure part of the hypothesis. The second hypothesis was also rejected as the difference was not found to be significant at the 0.05 level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to analyze the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools as perceived by their teachers and their self perceptions in negotiating and non-negotiating school districts in the State of Kansas. Leadership behavior was described according to the two dimensions identified by Halpin (1966) and others as "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration". Initiating Structure referred to the leaders' behavior toward achieving organizational goals, and Consideration was associated with the leaders' behavior toward maintaining the organizational esprit.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which was developed by the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University and later revised by Andrew Halpin (1966) and others, was the instrument used in the study. The LBDQ was distributed to 240 teachers and 24 superintendents of schools in 24 selected school districts. Usable information, including background information and LBDQ responses, was gathered from 206 volunteer teachers and all 24 of the superintendents.

The data were compiled and frequency distributions and t-tests were run to determine the differences between the teachers' and the superintendents' mean scores on Initiating Structure and Consideration

(Real and Ideal) for each of the groups of negotiating and non-negotiating school districts.

A detailed description of the number of responses and the demographic information on the respondents was given in Chapter IV. It was necessary to run two frequency distributions, one for the teachers and one for the superintendents responses. Eight t-tests were also run for the testing of the two hypotheses. The level of significance was set at the customary 0.05 level.

The first hypothesis was rejected; no significant difference was found. While the first part of the first hypothesis did prove to be correct and was carried out there was no significance in the difference. The second part of the first hypothesis was not proven at all, in fact just the opposite of the way it was stated was found. Teachers perceived their superintendents as being higher in Consideration and higher in Initiating Structure in non-negotiating school districts than in negotiating school districts. Though the significance level was higher it was still not high enough to be significant at the 0.05 level. The first hypothesis was therefore rejected.

The second hypothesis was also found not to be acceptable. The first part of the second hypothesis was carried out in that superintendents' self perceptions of their leadership behavior rated higher in Consideration in non-negotiating school districts. The difference in the mean scores in the negotiating and non-negotiating superintendents perceptions was not great enough to be at the significance level. The second part of the first hypothesis was not carried out either. The superintendents' own perceptions of their Initiating Structure was not higher in negotiating school districts than that in non-negotiating

school districts. Superintendents' perceptions tended to be higher in both Consideration and Initiating Structure in districts that did not negotiate than in districts that did negotiate. The second hypothesis was also rejected on the basis of lack of significance.

There have been several commonly held suppositions, or "ideas" going through educational circles for years that did not hold up according to the data gathered from the supplementary material in this research problem.

Some of the supplementary data that was collected from the questionnaire was included in Chapter IV. This researcher discovered from the supplementary data that three of these suppositions were dealt with in the statistics gathered: (1) That teachers on the secondary level are more active in negotiations than are elementary teachers; (2) that males are more active in negotiation situations than are females; and (3) that teachers with less experience in education, younger, are more active than are teachers with several years teaching experience, older teachers.

The data gathered did not indicate that there was any significant difference in the perceptions of the leadership behavior of superintendents between secondary teachers and elementary teachers. Because there was no significant difference indicated, it would seem that the theory that secondary teachers are more active or militant than elementary teachers would not hold true.

The second area that did not hold true, was that of sex having a bearing on the perceptions of the leadership behavior of the superintendent of schools. There was no difference indicated in the perceptions between the male and female respondents. It has been thought that the

male would be the more militant in their actions and perceptions, but this was not found to be the case as the perceptions of the male and female respondents showed no significant difference.

The third area included in the supplementary data was that of teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior or superintendents according to teachers age below and above the mean of the total teacher respondents. It was found that there was significance at the 0.05 level for teachers' perceptions of the superintendent in the Consideration category. This would indicate to this researcher that the theory of the "younger" teacher, those below the mean, were less tolerant in their perceptions than the "older" teacher or those whose age was above the mean.

Some of the supplementary data that was collected from the questionnaire was included in Chapter IV. One of the areas included was teachers' perceptions according to age below and above the mean of the teacher respondents. It was found that there was significance at the 0.05 level as to teachers perceptions of superintendents leadership behavior. This would indicate to this researcher that the theory of the two categories of teachers, the "younger" and the "older" has some merit.

This research problem was not designed to measure this theory but to some degree it seemed to be present as the older teachers or the teachers with more experience seemed to rate their superintendents as being higher in Consideration than did the younger teachers. It may be that as teachers have more years of experience they tend to empathize more with the role of the superintendent, thus they tend to rank the superintendent higher in Consideration than they do in Initiating

Structure.

The younger teachers, those with fewer years of teaching experience seemed to rate the "Ideal" superintendent as one they expected to be higher in Initiating Structure. Each group wanted the superintendent to be high in Consideration but they expected the "Ideal" superintendent to rank higher in Initiating Structure.

In each of the categories, the older, and the younger teachers, one will find teachers who are not true to the theory of more or less dedicated teachers. As with any case, one will find that there are exceptions and one will find that there are young teachers who really have the welfare of the student in mind just as one will find older teachers who fit into the more militant category.

It would be an interesting study for someone to undertake to study this "older, "younger" theory using the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire in regard to the Consideration and Initiating Structure of the teachers with less experience in the field of education as compared to those who have more years experience in education.

Two other areas of supplemental data that were collected were related to sex of the respondents and grade level taught. In both cases there was no significance indicated and it was determined that at least for this research problem they had no bearing on the original hypothesis.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study of the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools in negotiating and non-negotiating school districts in the State of Kansas. These

conclusions are not intended to be generalized beyond the study sample.

1. In this study the teachers in the Real category perceived their superintendents of schools as being higher in Consideration in both the negotiating and in the non-negotiating situations than they did in the Initiating Structure category. This came as somewhat of a surprise to the writer as the expected outcome was for the superintendents to rank higher in Consideration in the non-negotiating school districts and higher in Initiating Structure in the negotiating school districts.

2. The Teachers' Ideal perceptions, or what they expected their superintendents to be, was as expected. The teachers' in both the negotiating and non-negotiating situations expect their superintendent to be higher in Initiating Structure than they really perceived them to be. The teachers' perceived their superintendents as being higher in Consideration than what they expected him to really be like.

3. With the superintendents it was found that they rated themselves higher in Real Consideration than what the Ideal expectations for themselves were. They perceived that the teachers were expecting them to be considerably higher in Initiating Structure than they perceived themselves to be. This would seem to be an indication that superintendents should be taking more of the initiative and not be the, "good old boy" as they perceive themselves to be. The teachers and expecting an authority figure rather than a good fellow.

4. One reason that the hypothesis did not prove out may be that the writer was expecting the impact of negotiations to have had a much greater effect upon the teachers and the superintendents than it apparently has had. This may in effect be that negotiations are just now reaching the "professional" stage in Kansas schools and that teachers

and superintendents are still able to enjoy a closer relationship than is possible in some areas where professional negotiations are further developed.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based upon the findings from this study, the following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1. A similar study should be conducted using a much larger sampling of teachers to represent negotiating and non-negotiating situations. The writer realizes that this may become more and more difficult as the increased emphasis on professional negotiations continues to spread throughout the state. The number of schools who do not have professional negotiations will decrease and before too many more years it is foreseeable that all schools in Kansas will have professional negotiations.

2. Research is suggested to determine the effects of other situational variables, such as political power structures of various communities, proximity to larger population centers, or size of the school districts, on the leadership behavior of chief school administrators.

3. A study should be conducted to discover whether personal characteristics, such as age, sex, experience, education, or grade level taught have any bearing upon the way respondents perceive the leadership behavior of principals and or superintendents.

4. Studies should also be undertaken to describe the leadership behavior of secondary and elementary school principals, boards of education, chief negotiators, and presidents of local teachers associations.

Recommendations for Administrators

As a result of this study the following recommendations are made to chief school Administrators.

1. While many administrators feel that one of the most important parts of their position is to build esprit within the teachers of the school district, and in the Real Consideration group the superintendents' rated themselves higher in Consideration than in Initiating Structure, neither the superintendents themselves or their teachers perceived this to be true in the Ideal category. Both the teachers' and the superintendents' perceived that they should rank higher in Initiating Structure than in Consideration for the Ideal category. This would indicate that superintendents, while being concerned with the esprit of his teachers, should be more concerned with his behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his workgroup, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure.

2. That while superintendents want to be "liked" by their staffs and rightfully so, it appears that the superintendent may be able to better achieve this goal by establishing himself as a leader in Initiating Structure, which appears to be what the teachers want and expect.

In conclusion, this researcher found this study to have been an enlightening and interesting one. The researcher had several ideas changed through the study. Prior to this study, the researcher had concluded that negotiations or the lack of negotiations played a very important part in the way teachers perceived their superintendent of schools. The data collected for this study did not bear this out

so it must be concluded that there are other factors that play a more important role in teacher perceptions of their superintendent, in fact there may be and are many factors that form teachers' perceptions.

One of the more interesting aspects of this study, at least to this researcher, was the part that age seemed to play in teacher perceptions. The fact that "older" teachers, or those whose age was above the mean, perceived their superintendents higher in Consideration than did those whose age was below the mean was of great interest to this researcher and will in the future lead to additional study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Carlton, R. W. "Educators Attitudes and Value Differences in Collective Negotiations." The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education. Eds. Patrick W. Carlton and Harold I. Goodwin. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1969.
- Cave, D. R. "A Critical Study of the Leader Behavior of School Administrators, in Conflict with Teachers' Unions." (Unpub. Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.)
- Corwin, R. G. "Professional Persons in Public Organizations." Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Eds. Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969.
- Culbertson, J., R. H. Farquhar, A. K. Gaynor, and M. R. Shibles. Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies. Washington, D. C.: The United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969.
- Cunningham, L. L. "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship." Theory into Practice. Vol. 7 (April, 1968), pp. 62-71.
- Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington, D. C.: The Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1969.
- Faber, C. F. and G. F. Shearron. Elementary School Administration - Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Fiedler, F. E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Getzels, G. W., J. M. Lipham, and R. F. Campbell. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Halpin, A. W. "The Leadership Ideology of Aircraft Commanders." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 39 (April, 1955), pp. 82-84.
- Halpin, A. W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1956.

- Halpin, A. W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.
- Hemphill, J. K. Situational Factors in Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1949.
- Homans, G. C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1950.
- Hoy, W. K. and C. G. Miskel. Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Random House, Inc., 1978.
- Kansas Statutes Annotated. Public Law 72-5413b.
- Kansas Supreme Court. Case Number 49,993. Syllabus by the Court. March 31, 1979.
- Lieberman, M. and M. H. Moskow. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.
- Maher, J. E. "An Analysis of the Leadership Behavior of Elementary School Principals as Perceived by School Personnel in Selected Collective Negotiations Situations." (Unpub. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1972.)
- McGheley, Marion A. Director, Kansas Association of School Boards. Personal Interview. Roaring River Conference, Cassville, Missouri, May 5, 1978.
- Mequel, C. J. An AFT Guide for AFT Legislative Action and State Collective Bargaining Laws. Washington, D. C.: American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, 1970.
- Moser, R. P. "The Leadership Patterns of School Superintendents and School Principals." Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 6, (1957).
- Morphet, E. L., R. L. Johns, and T. L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration, Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Moskow, M. H., J. J. Loewenberg, and E. C. Koziara. Collective Bargaining in Public Employment. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.
- National Education Association. Report: Task Force on Local Association Structure. Washington, D. C.: Division of Affiliates and Membership, National Education Association, 1968.
- Owens, R. G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood, Cliffs, New, Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Stinnett, T. M. Professional Problems of Teachers. 3rd Ed. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968.

Stogdill R. M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of Literature." Journal of Psychology, Vol. 25 (1948), pp. 35-71.

Walton, R. E. and R. B. McKersie. A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Weber, M. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Ed. Talbott Parsons. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1947.

APPENDIX

CLASSIFICATIONS AND ENROLLMENTS FOR 1979-80

Enrollments include the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades since classifications are based on these three grades only. Enrollment figures are as of September 17, 1979.

* Boys' School - Enrollment Doubled ** Girls' School - Enrollment

Doubled

CLASS 6A
32 Co-ed Schools

Range: 2091-905

Derby 1229
Dodge City 1021
Garden City 992
Great Bend 986
Hutchison 1340
Junction City 1215
Kansas City-Harmon 1115
Kansas City-Schlagle 1201
Kansas City-Turner 969
Kansas City-Washington 1593
Kansas City-Wyandotte 1484
Lawrence 1795
Leavenworth 1326
Manhattan 1238
Olathe 1589
Salina-South 905
Shawnee Mission-East 1746
Shawnee Mission-North 1708
Shawnee Mission-Northwest 1961
Shawnee Mission-South 2091
Shawnee Mission-West 1919
Topeka 1289
Topeka-Highland Park 1104
Topeka-Seaman 937
Topeka-West 1316
Wichita-East 1454
Wichita-Heights 1011
Wichita-North 1283
Wichita-Northwest 1230
Wichita-South 1677
Wichita-Southeast 1853
Wichita-West 1179

CLASS 5A
32 Co-ed Schools

Range: 905-440

Altamont-Labette County 497
Arkansas City 766
Atchison 543
Bonner Springs 513
Buhler 515
Chanute 499
Coffeyville-Field Kindley 751
El Dorado 523
Emporia 903
Fort Scott 507
Goddard 532
Hays 651
Independence 643
Kansas City-Ward 544
Liberal 675
McPherson 587
Mulvane 440
Newton 766
Ottawa 582
Paola 461
Parsons 518
Pittsburg 697
Salina-Central 905
Shawnee Mission-Meige 709
Stanley-Blue Valley 596
Tecumseh-Shawnee Heights 865
Topeka-Hayden 548
Topeka-Washburn Rural 617
Wichita-Carroll 517
Wichita-Haysville Campus 677
Wichita--Kapaun-Mt. Carmel 558
Winfield 550

CLASS 4A

60 Co-ed Schools
 2 Girls' Schools
 2 Boys' Schools

Range: 438-205

Abilene 394
 Andale 284
 Andover 257
 Anthony--Anthony-Harper-
 Chaparral 311
 Atchison-Maur Hill Prep 416*
 Atchison-Mt. St. Scholastica 292**
 Augusta 438
 Baldwin 233
 Baxter Springs 218
 Belleville 209
 Beloit 205
 Carbondale-Santa Fe Trail 282
 Chapman 380
 Clay Center 370
 Clearwater 213
 Colby 336
 Columbus 371
 Concordia 406
 Council Grove 257
 DeSoto 355
 Effingham-Atchison Co. Comm. 269
 Eureka 215
 Fredonia 259
 Galena 208
 Gardner--Gardner-Edgerton 332
 Garnett 330
 Girard 325
 Goodland 390
 Haven 225
 Hays-Marian 260**
 Hays-Thomas More Prep 392*
 Hiawatha 297
 Hoisington 244
 Holton 245
 Hoyt-Royal Valley 210
 Iola 384
 Kansas City-Sumner Academy 356
 Kingman 258
 LaCgyne-Prairie View 213
 Lansing 284
 Larned 328
 Louisburg 240
 Lyons 242
 Maize 215
 Marysville 327
 Minneapolis 213

CLASS 3A

63 Co-ed Schools
 1 Boys' School

Range: 202-141

Alma-Wabaunsee 162
 Arma-Northeast 152
 Basehor 194
 Belle Plaine 155
 Burlington 194
 Caney-Caney Valley 191
 Cheney 150
 Cherokee-Southeast 202
 Cherryvale 168
 Conway Springs 141
 Cottonwood Falls-Chase County 158
 Easton-Pleasant Ridge 174
 Ellinwood 157
 Ellis 149
 Ellsworth 196
 Erie 179
 Eskridge-Mission Valley 184
 Eudora 170
 Gypsum-Southeast of Saline 150
 Halstead 148
 Herington 167
 Hesston 183
 Hill City 173
 Hillsboro 151
 Horton 158
 Howard-West Elk 147
 Hoxie 153
 Hugoton 183
 Humboldt 163
 Kansas City-Piper 197
 Kinsley 160
 Kismet--Kismet-Plains-SW Hts. 155
 Lakin 146
 Langdon-Fairfield 151
 Leavenworth-Immaculata 198
 Leon-Bluestem 161
 Leoti-Wichita County 185
 Lindsborg 161
 Marion 167
 Medicine Lodge 168
 Meriden-Jefferson West 191
 Neodesha 156
 Ness City 159
 Nortonville-Jefferson County
 North 141
 Oakley 200
 Oberlin-Decatur Community 167

Nickerson 349
 Norton 234
 Osawatomie 274
 Perry--Perry-Lecompton 246
 Phillipsburg 226
 Pratt 341
 Rose Hill 210
 Russell 307
 Scott City 316
 Seneca-Nemaha Valley 229
 Shawnee-St. Joseph 206
 Spring Hill 271
 Tonganoxie 333
 Towanda-Circle 265
 Ulysses 374
 Valley Center 411
 Wamego 271
 Wellington 418

Osage City 182
 Osborne 156
 Plainville 189
 Richmond-Central Heights 163
 Riverton 172
 Rossville 148
 St. Marys 188
 Sabetha 195
 Salina-St. John's Military 146*
 Salina-Sacred Heart 192
 Sedan 148
 Silver Lake 172
 Smith Center 186
 WaKeeney-Trego Community 177
 Washington 145
 Wellsville 184
 Whitewater-Remington 153
 Yates Center 161

CLASS 2A
 64 Co-ed Schools

Range: 140-93

Allen-Northern Heights 127
 Atwood 138
 Axtell 99
 Baileyville-B & B 97
 Blue Rapids-Valley Heights 131
 Buffalo--Altoona-Midway 99
 Burden-Central 117
 Centralia 104
 Cimarron 111
 Claflin 102
 Douglass 136
 Elbing-Berean Academy 131
 Elkhart 140
 Frontenac 112
 Garden Plain 134
 Grainfield-Wheatland 98
 Hanover 108
 Hartford 98
 Holcomb 112
 Holton-Jackson Heights 135
 Hutchinson-Central Christian 95
 Inman 108
 Johnson-Stanton County 120
 Kiowas-South Barber 107
 LaCrosse 131
 Lincoln 132
 Linn 106
 Lost Springs-Central 112

Lyndon 110
 McLouth 140
 Manhattan-Luckey 109
 Mankato 99
 Meade 119
 Moran-Marmaton Valley 100
 Mound City-Jayhawk Linn 140
 Moundridge 111
 Olpe 100
 Onaga 112
 Oskaloosa 126
 Oswego 123
 Otis--Otis-Bison 100
 Oxford 103
 Peabody 120
 Pittsburg-Colgan 106
 Pomona 129
 Pratt-Skyline 101
 Pretty Prairie 100
 Riley-Riley County 114
 St. Francis 137
 St. John 109
 Sedgwick 119
 Solomon 127
 Spearville 100
 Sterling 134
 Stockton 131
 Sublette 117

Syracuse 136
 Tribune-Greeley County 103
 Troy 118
 Udall 93

Uniontown 130
 Valley Falls 133
 Victoria 128
 Wathena 127

CLASS 1A
 124 Co-ed Schools
 1 Boys' School

Range: 93-19

Agra-Eastern Heights 46
 Alma-Northern Valley 59
 Argonia 68
 Ashland 90
 Attica 32
 Bazine 25
 Beloit-St. John's 66
 Bennington 68
 Bern 47
 Bird City-Cheylin 87
 Brewster 48
 Brookville-Ell Saline 78
 Bucklin 55
 Burlingame 84
 Burr Oak 37
 Burrton 82
 Bushton-Quivira Heights 70
 Caldwell 92
 Canton--Canton-Galva 91
 Cawker City-Waconda East 85
 Cedar Vale 76
 Chase 61
 Chetopa 83
 Clifton 60
 Clyde 81
 Coldwater 78
 Colony-Crest 88
 Copeland 33
 Cuba-Hillcrest 56
 Cunningham 60
 Deerfield 44
 Denton-Midway 62
 Dexter 64
 Dighton 92
 Dorrance 32
 Downs 79
 Elwood 61
 Ensign 33
 Esbon 33
 Fowler 58
 Frankfort 90

Geneseo 29
 Glasco 67
 Goessel 72
 Gorham 22
 Greensburg 84
 Gridley 36
 Grinnell 84
 Hamilton 44
 Hanston 30
 Haviland 51
 Healy 32
 Herndon 31
 Highland 90
 Hope 69
 Hutchinson-Trinity 82
 Ingalls 58
 Jamestown 20
 Jennings 43
 Jetmore 89
 Jewell 57
 Junction City-St. Xavier 83
 Kansas City-Ks. St. Sch./Vis. Han. 19
 Kansas City-Savior of the World 42
 Kensington-West Smith County 57
 Lebanon 49
 Lebo 81
 Lenora 54
 LeRoy 42
 Lewis 53
 Linwood 93
 Little River--Little River-Windom 80
 Logan 91
 Longton-Elk Valley 48
 Lucan--Lucas-Luray 63
 McCracken 27
 Macksville 77
 Madison 91
 Marquette 58
 Melvern-Marais des Cygnes Valley 76
 Miltonvale 72
 Menneola 62

Montezuma 44	Satanta 90
Morland 60	Scandia-Pike Valley 75
Morrowville-North Central 61	Sharon 41
Moscow 42	Sharon Springs-Wallace County 85
Mullinville 52	South Haven 49
Natoma 67	Stafford 86
Norwich 75	Sylvan Grove-Sylvan 55
Olathe-Kansas Sch for the Deaf 62	Tescott 48
Palco 69	Thayer 65
Pleasanton 88	Tipton 38
Powhattan 25	Utica-Nes Tre Le Go 20
Protection 54	Wakefield 52
Quinter 87	Waverly 69
Randolph-Blue Valley 66	Weskan 25
Ransom 71	Westmoreland 74
Reading 27	Wetmore 60
Rexford-Golden Plains 59	White City 70
Rolla 46	Williamsburg 65
Rosalia-Flinthills 64	Wilson 58
Rosel-Pawnee Heights 48	Winona-Triplains 39
St. George 84	Zenda--Nashville-Zenda 42
St. Paul 91	

SCHOOL THAT DO NEGOTIATE

1A

1.	USD# 213	Lenora
2.	221	Haddam
3.	224	Clifton
4.	228	Hanston
5.	236	Lebanon
6.	238	Kensington
7.	240	Bennington
8.	269	Palco
9.	272	Cawker City
10.	277	Mankato
11.	280	Morland
12.	291	Grinnell
13.	293	Quinter
14.	302	Ransom
15.	307	Salina
16.	323	Westmoreland
17.	324	Kirwin
18.	328	Lorraine
19.	332	Cunningham
20.	349	Stafford
21.	371	Montezuma
22.	384	Randolph
23.	386	Madison
24.	399	Natoma
25.	419	Canton
26.	433	Denton
27.	444	Little River
28.	454	Burlingame
29.	456	Melvern
30.	471	Dexter
31.	474	Haviland
32.	481	Hope
33.	486	Elwood
34.	507	Satanta
35.	511	Attica

SCHOOLS THAT DO NOT NEGOTIATE

1A

1.	USD# 103	Bird City
2.	209	Moscow
3.	212	Almena
4.	216	Deerfield
5.	219	Minneola
6.	220	Ashland
7.	225	Fowler
8.	227	Jetmore
9.	241	Sharon Springs
10.	243	Waverly
11.	245	LeRoy
12.	273	Beloit
13.	275	Winona
14.	276	Esbon
15.	279	Jewell
16.	283	Longton
17.	295	Jennings
18.	299	Sylvan Grove
19.	301	Utica
20.	304	Bazine
21.	314	Brewster
22.	317	Herndon
23.	326	Logan
24.	334	Glasco
25.	344	Pleasanton
26.	351	Macksville
27.	359	Argonia
28.	360	Caldwell
29.	390	Hamilton
30.	401	Chase
31.	411	Goessel
32.	422	Greensburg
33.	424	Mullinville
34.	426	Scandia
35.	455	Cuba
36.	459	Bucklin
37.	468	Healy
38.	476	Copeland
39.	477	Ingalls
40.	479	Kincaid
41.	482	Dighton
42.	492	Rosalia
43.	496	Rozel
44.	502	Lewis
45.	509	South Haven
46.	510	Powhattan

SCHOOLS THAT DO NEGOTIATE

2A

1.	USD# 102	Cimarron
2.	200	Tribune
3.	223	Barnes
4.	249	Frontenac
5.	251	Americus
6.	252	Hartford
7.	255	Kiowa
8.	287	Pomona
9.	292	Grainfield
10.	300	Coldwater
11.	311	Pretty Prairie
12.	318	Atwood
13.	322	Onaga
14.	354	Claflin
15.	358	Oxford
16.	376	Sterling
17.	378	Riley
18.	380	Vermillion
19.	387	Buffalo
20.	393	Solomon
21.	395	LaCrosse
22.	396	Douglass
23.	397	Lost Springs
24.	398	Peabody
25.	421	Lyndon
26.	423	Moundridge
27.	432	Victoria
28.	439	Sedwick
29.	448	Inman
30.	451	Bailyville
31.	462	Burden
32.	488	Axtell
33.	494	Syracuse
34.	498	Blue Rapids
35.	504	Oswego

SCHOOLS THAT DO NOT NEGOTIATE

2A

1.	USD# 218	Elkhart
2.	226	Meade
3.	235	Uniontown
4.	256	Moran
5.	271	Stockton
6.	278	Mankato
7.	346	Mound City
8.	350	St. John
9.	374	Sublette
10.	381	Spearville
11.	403	Otis
12.	438	Pratt Skyline
13.	452	Johnson
14.	463	Udall

SCHOOLS THAT DO NEGOTIATE

3A

1.	USD# 203	Kansas City Piper
2.	205	Leon
3.	206	Whitewater
4.	208	Wakeeney
5.	210	Hugoton
6.	237	Smith Center
7.	244	Burlington
8.	247	Cherokee
9.	254	Medicine Lodge
10.	274	Oakley
11.	282	Howard
12.	286	Sedan
13.	289	Wellsville
14.	294	Oberlin
15.	303	Ness City
16.	306	Gypsum
17.	327	Ellsworth
18.	329	Alma
19.	330	Eskridge
20.	347	Kinsley
21.	356	Conway Springs
22.	357	Belle Plaine
23.	372	Silver Lake
24.	388	Ellis
25.	404	Riverton
26.	410	Hillsboro
27.	430	Horton
28.	440	Halstead
29.	441	Sabetha
30.	447	Cherryvale
31.	458	Basebor
32.	483	Kismet
33.	487	Herington
34.	491	Eudora

SCHOOLS THAT DO NOT NEGOTIATE

3A

1.	USD# 101	Erie
2.	215	Lakin
3.	222	Washington
4.	258	Humboldt
5.	268	Cheney
6.	270	Plainville
7.	281	Hill City
8.	284	Cottonwood Falls
9.	288	Richmond
10.	297	St. Francis
11.	298	Lincoln
12.	321	St. Marys
13.	340	Meriden
14.	355	Ellinwood
15.	363	Holcomb
16.	392	Osborne
17.	400	Lindsburg
18.	408	Marion
19.	412	Hoxie
20.	420	Osage City
21.	449	Easton
22.	460	Hesston
23.	461	Neodesha
24.	467	Leoti

SCHOOLS THAT DO NEGOTIATE

4A

1.	USD# 211	Norton
2.	230	Spring Hill
3.	232	DeSota
4.	239	Minneapolis
5.	257	Iola
6.	264	Clearwater
7.	266	Maize
8.	309	Nickerson
9.	315	Colby
10.	320	Wamego
11.	325	Phillipsburg
12.	331	Kingman
13.	332	Concordia
14.	336	Holton
15.	337	Mayetta
16.	343	Perry
17.	348	Baldwin City
18.	352	Goodland
19.	361	Anthony
20.	364	Marysville
21.	365	Garnett
22.	367	Osawatomie
23.	375	Towanda
24.	377	Effingham
25.	379	Clay Center
26.	394	Rose Hill
27.	402	Augusta
28.	405	Lyons
29.	407	Russell
30.	417	Council Grove
31.	427	Belleville
32.	434	Carbondale
33.	436	Caney
34.	442	Seneca
35.	464	Tonganoxie
36.	469	Lansing
37.	473	Chapman
38.	484	Fredonia
39.	493	Columbus
40.	495	Larned
41.	508	Baxter Springs
42.	312	Haven

SCHOOLS THAT DO NOT NEGOTIATE

4A

1.	USD# 214	Ulysses
2.	231	Gardner
3.	248	Girard
4.	262	Valley Center
5.	353	Wellington
6.	362	LaCyne
7.	382	Pratt
8.	385	Andover
9.	389	Eureka
10.	415	Hiawatha
11.	416	Louisburg
12.	431	Hosington
13.	435	Abilene
14.	499	Galena

SCHOOLS THAT DO NEGOTIATE

SCHOOLS THAT DO NOT NEGOTIATE

5A

1. USD# 204 Bonner Springs
2. 229 Shawnee Mission Miego
3. 234 Fort Scott
4. 250 Pittsburg
5. 253 Emporia
6. 261 Haysville
7. 263 Mulvane
8. 265 Goddard
9. 290 Ottawa
10. 305 Salina
11. 313 Buhler
12. 373 Newton
13. 409 Atchison
14. 413 Chanute
15. 418 McPherson
16. 437 Topeka
17. 445 Coffeyville
18. 446 Independence
19. 465 Winfield
20. 480 Liberal
21. 489 Hays
22. 490 ElDorado
23. 503 Parsons
24. 506 Altamont

5A

1. USD# 368 Paola
2. 470 Arkansas City

6A

1. USD# 202 Kansas City
2. 259 Wichita
3. 260 Derby
4. 308 Hutchinson
5. 383 Manhattan
6. 428 Great Bend
7. 443 Dodge City
8. 453 Leavenworth
9. 457 Garden City
10. 475 Junction City
11. 497 Lawrence
12. 500 Kansas City
13. 501 Topeka
14. 512 Shawnee Mission

6A

John D. Watson
R. R. #1
Cherokee, KS 66724
February 5, 1980

Mrs. Agnes Fisher
MacMillian Company
866 3rd Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022

Dear Mrs. Fisher:

I am trying to get permission to reprint and use the LBDQ, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, from Theory and Research in Administration by Andrew W. Halpin, copyright 1966.

This is to be used as a research tool for my dissertation topic, Teacher Perceptions of the Leadership Behavior of Superintendents of Schools in Negotiating and Non-negotiating School Districts in Kansas.

I'm trying to get my Ed. D. at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma and very much need your permission to use the LBDQ.

Please answer as soon as possible as I would like to get started as quick as I receive your reply. I plan to complete my research in the Spring of 1980 and graduate in the Summer.

Sincerely,

John D. Watson

MACMILLAN PUBLISHING CO., INC.
866 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022

February 12, 1980

Mr. John D. Watson
R. R. #1
Cherokee, Kansas 66724

Dear Mr. Watson:

You have our permission to use, in the English language only, the "Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire" from THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ADMINISTRATION by Andrew W. Halpin, subject to the following limitations:

Permission is granted for usage of the material in the manner and for the purpose as specified in your letter. Note: if your dissertation is published, other than by University Microfilms, it is necessary to reapply for permission;

Permission is granted for a fee of \$35.00. This fee is payable upon signing;

Full credit must be given on every copy reproduced as follows:

Reprinted with permission of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
from THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ADMINISTRATION by Andrew H. Halpin.
Copyright by Andrew W. Halpin, 1966.

If you are in agreement, please sign both copies of this letter in the space provided below and return one copy and your remittance to this department.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Agnes Fisher
Contracts Supervisor

AGREED TO AND ACCEPTED:

JOHN D. WATSON

UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT 247

Cherokee, Kansas 66724

Cherokee, Kansas 66724
January 28, 1980

Dear Colleague:

As a doctoral candidate at Oklahoma State University, I am researching the dissertation topic, "Teacher Perceptions of the Leadership Behavior of Superintendents of Schools in Negotiating and Non-negotiating School Districts in Kansas". Your school district has been selected to be included in this study. I would also like to have the Superintendents responses as well. Your participation in the study by completing the enclosed questionnaire would be very much appreciated.

Please be assured that all school personnel, schools, and school districts participating in the study will remain anonymous. To ensure the confidentiality of your response, please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope, seal the envelope, and return it to me.

A copy of the results of the completed dissertation abstract will be available to you upon request.

In advance I would like to express my appreciation for your cooperation and participation in this research study.

Sincerely,

John D. Watson

UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT 247

Cherokee, Kansas 66724

Cherokee, Kansas 66724
January 15, 1980

Dear Principal:

Will you please help me with my dissertation for my doctors degree at Oklahoma State University by handing out the enclosed questionnaires to some of your teachers.

The method for teacher selection that I would appreciate you using is as follows: From a list of teachers in alphabetical order, select the teachers who are the odd numbers. There are ten (10) questionnaires enclosed and ten teachers need to be selected. If you have less than 20 teachers, please select 10 at random and hand out the enclosed questionnaires.

I would appreciate it if you would see that they are returned, and put them all in the enclosed envelope and drop it in the mail.

Thank you in advance for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

John D. Watson

JDW/js

UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT 247

Cherokee, Kansas 66724

Cherokee, Kansas 66724
January 23, 1980

Dear Colleague:

As a doctoral candidate at Oklahoma State University, I am re-searching the dissertation topic, "Teacher Perceptions of the Leadership Behavior of Superintendents of Schools in Negotiating and Non-negotiating School Districts in Kansas". Your school district has been selected to be included in this study. Your participation in the study by completing the attached questionnaire would be very much appreciated.

Please be assured that all school personnel, schools, and school districts participating in the study will remain anonymous. To ensure the confidentiality of your responses, please place the completed questionnaire in the attached envelope, seal the envelope, and return the unmarked envelope to your principal who will then forward your responses to me.

A copy of the results of the completed dissertation abstract will be available to your school upon request.

In advance, I would like to express my appreciation for your cooperation and participation in this research study.

Sincerely,

John D. Watson

JDW/js

DIRECTIONS

The questionnaire is in three sections: (1) background information, (2) the Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire - Real, and (3) the Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire - Ideal. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT EVERY ITEM IN EACH SECTION BE ANSWERED. The background information simply requires that the appropriate information be put in the space provided. The Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire-Real requires that one number (from Never = 0 to Always = 4) be circled for each of the 30 items regarding your perception of what your superintendent's behavior is on each item. The Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire - Ideal required responses (from Never = 0 to Always = 4) be circled regarding your perception of what your Superintendent behavior should be on each item.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please place a check mark to the right of the appropriate category.

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------|----------|
| 1. Position: | Teacher | 1. _____ |
| | Superintendent | 2. _____ |
| 2. Experience in present position: | | 1. _____ |
| 3. Grade level(s) (or equivalent) responsible for: | | 1. _____ |
| 4. Sex: | Male | 1. _____ |
| | Female | 2. _____ |
| 5. Age: | | 1. _____ |
| 6. Education: | Bachelor's Degree | 1. _____ |
| | Master's Degree | |
| | Sixth Year Equivalent | |
| | Doctor's Degree | |

7. Experience in
education

1. _____

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - REAL - TEACHERS

Please circle one.

Never = 0 Seldom = 1 Occasionally = 2 Often = 3 Always = 4

The Superintendent of my school should . . .

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. make his attitudes clear to the teachers & principals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 2. try out new ideas with the teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 3. rule with an iron hand. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 4. criticize poor work. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 5. speak in a manner not to be questioned. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 6. assign teachers to particular tasks. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 7. work without a plan. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 8. maintain definite standards of performance. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 9. emphasize the meeting of deadlines. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 10. encourage the use of uniform procedures. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 11. make sure that his part in the school is understood by all teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 12. ask that teachers follow standard rules and regulations. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 13. let teachers know what is expected of them. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 14. see to it that teachers are working up to capacity. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 15. see to it that the work of staff members is coordinated. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 16. do personal favors for teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 17. do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the staff. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 18. be easy to understand. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 19. find time to listen to staff members. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 20. keep to himself. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 21. look out for the personal welfare of individual staff members. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 22. refuse to explain his actions. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 23. act without consulting the teachers & principals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 24. be slow to accept new ideas. | 0 1 2 3 4 |

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 25. treat all teachers as his equals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 26. be willing to make changes. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 27. be friendly and approachable. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 28. make teachers feel at ease when talking to them. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 29. put suggestions made by teachers into operation. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 30. get staff approval on important matters before
going ahead. | 0 1 2 3 4 |

Reprinted with permission of the Macmillian Company from Theory and Research in Administration by Andrew W. Halpin. Copyright by Andrew W. Halpin, 1966.

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - IDEAL - TEACHERS

Please circle one.

Never = 0 Seldom = 1 Occasionally = 2 Often = 3 Always = 4

The Superintendent of my school should . . .

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. make his attitudes clear to the teachers & principals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 2. try out new ideas with the teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 3. rule with an iron hand. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 4. criticize poor work. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 5. speak in a manner not to be questioned. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 6. assign teachers to particular tasks. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 7. work without a plan. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 8. maintain definite standards of performance. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 9. emphasize the meeting of deadlines. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 10. encourage the use of uniform procedures. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 11. make sure that his part in the school is understood by all teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 12. ask that teachers follow standard rules and regulations. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 13. let teachers know what is expected of them. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 14. see to it that teachers are working up to capacity. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 15. see to it that the work of staff members is coordinated. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 16. do personal favors for teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 17. do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the staff. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 18. be easy to understand. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 19. find time to listen to staff members. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 20. keep to himself. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 21. look out for the personal welfare of individual staff members. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 22. refuse to explain his actions. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 23. act without consulting the teachers & principals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 24. be slow to accept new ideas. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 25. treat all teachers as his equals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 26. be willing to make changes. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 27. be friendly and approachable. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 28. make teachers feel at ease when talking to them. | 0 1 2 3 4 |

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 29. put suggestions made by teachers into operation. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 30. get staff approval on important matters before going ahead. | 0 1 2 3 4 |

Reprinted with permission of the Macmillian Company from Theory and Research in Administration by Andrew W. Halpin. Copyright by Andrew W. Halpin, 1966.

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - REAL - SUPERINTENDENTS

Please circle one.

Never = 0 Seldom = 1 Occasionally = 2 Often = 3 Always = 4

The Superintendent of my school should . . .

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. make his attitudes clear to the teachers & principals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 2. try out new ideas with the teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 3. rule with an iron hand. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 4. criticize poor work. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 5. speak in a manner not be questioned. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 6. assign teachers to particular tasks. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 7. work without a plan. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 8. maintain definite standards of performance. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 9. emphasize the meeting of deadlines. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 10. encourage the use of uniform procedures. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 11. make sure that his part in the school is understood
by all teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 12. ask that teachers follow standard rules and regulations. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 13. let teachers know what is expected of them. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 14. see to it that teachers are working up to capacity. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 15. see to it that the work of staff members is coordinated. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 16. do personal favors for teachers. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 17. do little things to make it pleasant to be a member
of the staff. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 18. be easy to understand. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 19. find time to listen to staff members. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 20. keep to himself. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 21. look out for the personal welfare of individual
staff members. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 22. refuse to explain his actions. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 23. act without consulting the teachers & principals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 24. be slow to accept new ideas. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 25. treat all teachers as his equals. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 26. be willing to make changes. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 27. be friendly and approachable. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 28. make teachers feel at ease when talking to them. | 0 1 2 3 4 |

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 29. put suggestions made by teachers into operation. | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| 30. get staff approval on important matters before going ahead. | 0 1 2 3 4 |

Reprinted with permission of the Macmillian Company from Theory and Research in Administration by Andrew W. Halpin. Copyright by Andrew W. Halpin, 1966.

VITA

John Dale Watson

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF
SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS IN NEGOTIATING AND
NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN KANSAS

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Holdenville, Oklahoma, January 20, 1939,
the son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Watson.

Education: Graduated from Medicine Lodge, Kansas, High School in
May, 1957; attended Pratt Junior College, 1957-1958 school
year; attended Oklahoma Panhandle State University, Goodwell,
Oklahoma during the period 1959 to 1962; received the
Bachelor of Science degree in May, 1962, with a major in
Industrial Arts; received a Master of Arts from the
University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado in 1966,
with a major in Education Administration; received the
Specialist in Education degree from Fort Hays State
University, Hays, Kansas, in 1973 with a major in
Educational Administration; completed requirements for the
Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in
July, 1980.

Professional Experience: Teacher, Arriba High School, Arriba,
Colorado, from August 1962 until May, 1966; High School
Principal, Rolla High School, Rolla, Kansas, from 1966 until
1971; Superintendent of Schools, Trumbull, Nebraska, 1971
until 1974; Superintendent of Schools, Unified School
District #247; Cherokee, Kansas, 1974 to present.