

PERCEPTIONS OF OKLAHOMA EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATORS AND SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS RELATIVE TO FEDERAL
INVOLVEMENT IN LOCAL
EDUCATION

By

JOHN L. MARTIN

Bachelor of Science
Southwestern State College
Weatherford, Oklahoma
1959

Master of Arts
Rutgers, The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey
1962

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
August, 1969

NOV 5 1969

PERCEPTIONS OF OKLAHOMA EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATORS AND SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS RELATIVE TO FEDERAL
INVOLVEMENT IN LOCAL
EDUCATION

Thesis Approved:

Richard P. Junger

Thesis Adviser

Kenneth H. Clair

W. A. Reinhard

Robert M. Fisher

D. N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

730024

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to all those who have been instrumental in the completion of this study. A special thanks to Dr. Richard P. Jungers, committee chairman, whose guidance has been invaluable. I am indebted to the other members of my committee, Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Dr. Robert Meisner, and Dean Edward Burris for their advice and counsel.

Acknowledgment is due Dr. Robert Brown, Department of Education, for his assistance and helpful suggestions concerning the statistical techniques used in the analyses of the data.

A note of appreciation is due Dr. Gene Pingleton, who has provided encouragement and assistance throughout my program.

I am most grateful for the devotion of my wife, Fran, who has served as both father and mother to Cammi and Mark this past year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
The Identified Problem Areas	6
Statement of the Problem	12
Hypotheses	13
Definitions	14
Need for the Study	15
The Design of the Study	17
Summary	19
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	20
The Legal Role of the Local, State, and Federal Government	20
Federal Aid	23
Major Federal Aid Laws and Their Significance	33
The Future	39
Summary	43
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	46
Introduction	46
Scope of the Study	48
Development of the Questionnaire	50
Analyses of Data	54
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA	72
Curriculum Development--Present Situation	73
Curriculum Development--As Should Be	78
Curriculum Development--Summary	80
Curriculum Balance--Present Situation	81
Curriculum Balance--As Should Be	82
Curriculum Balance--Summary	85
Administration of Federal Funds--Present Situation	85
Administration of Federal Funds--As Should Be	87
Administration of Federal Funds--Summary	90
Local Response to Federal Aid Programs--Present Situation	90
Local Response to Federal Aid Programs--As Should Be	93
Local Response to Federal Aid Programs--Summary	95

Chapter	Page
Fiscal Policy--Present Situation	96
Fiscal Policy--As Should Be	99
Fiscal Policy--Summary	104
Preference for General Federal Aid	105
Summary of Educational Leaders' Preferences for General Aid	109
Importance of Federal Programs	109
 V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	 112
Analyses of the Hypotheses	116
The Future	120
 A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	 122
 APPENDIX A--INSTRUMENTS USED IN COLLECTION OF DATA	 126
 APPENDIX B--DATA RELATIVE TO INTERVENING VARIABLES WHICH HAD NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT	 135

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Number of Respondents and the Number of Random Samples for Each Group	49
II. The Number of Questionnaires Sent and Returned	59
III. Responses by Enrollment	62
IV. Grouping by Enrollment	64
V. Responses by Wealth	65
VI. Grouping by Wealth	66
VII. Responses by Local Support	67
VIII. Grouping by Local Support	67
IX. Responses by Federal Support	68
X. Grouping by Federal Support	68
XI. Grouping by Age	69
XII. Grouping by Tenure	70
XIII. Grouping by Education	71
XIV. Curriculum Development - Present Situation by Totals and Type of District	75
XV. Curriculum Development - Present Situation by Enrollment	77
XVI. Curriculum Development - As Should Be by Totals and Type of District	79
XVII. Curriculum Balance - Present Situation by Totals	82
XVIII. Curriculum Balance - As Should Be by Totals and Type of District	83
XIX. Administration of Federal Funds - Present Situation by Totals and Type of District	86

Table	Page
XX. Administration of Federal Funds - As Should Be by Totals and Type of District	88
XXI. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - Present Situation by Totals and Type of District	91
XXII. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - As Should Be by Totals and Type of District	94
XXIII. Fiscal Policy - Present Situation by Totals	97
XXIV. Fiscal Policy - Present Situation by Enrollment of District	98
XXV. Fiscal Policy - As Should Be by Totals and Type of District	100
XXVI. Fiscal Policy - As Should Be by Wealth of District	101
XXVII. Fiscal Policy - As Should Be by Federal Support	103
XXVIII. Preference for General Federal Aid by Total and Type of District	106
XXIX. Preference for General Federal Aid by Federal Support.	107
XXX. Preference for General Federal Aid by Local Support	108
XXXI. Importance of Federal Programs: Per Cent That Each Program Was Selected First or Second	110
XXXII. Curriculum Development - Present Situation by Wealth and Local Support	136
XXXIII. Curriculum Development - Present Situation by Federal Support and Education	137
XXXIV. Curriculum Development - Present Situation by Age and Tenure	138
XXXV. Curriculum Development - As Should Be by Enrollment	139
XXXVI. Curriculum Development - As Should Be by Wealth and Local Support	140
XXXVII. Curriculum Development - As Should Be by Federal Support and Education	141
XXXVIII. Curriculum Development - As Should Be by Age and Tenure	142

Table	Page
XXXIX. Curriculum Balance - Present Situation by Enrollment	143
XL. Curriculum Balance - Present Situation by Wealth and Local Support	144
XLI. Curriculum Balance - Present Situation by Federal Support and Education	145
XLII. Curriculum Balance - Present Situation by Age and Tenure	146
XLIII. Curriculum Balance - Present Situation by Type of District	147
XLIV. Curriculum Balance - As Should Be by Wealth and Local Support	148
XLV. Curriculum Balance - As Should Be by Federal Support and Education	149
XLVI. Curriculum Balance - As Should Be by Age and Tenure	150
XLVII. Curriculum Balance - As Should Be by Enrollment	151
XLVIII. Administration of Federal Funds - Present Situation by Wealth and Local Support	152
XLIX. Administration of Federal Funds - Present Situation by Federal Support and Education	153
L. Administration of Federal Funds - Present Situation by Age and Tenure	154
LI. Administration of Federal Funds - Present Situation by Enrollment	155
LII. Administration of Federal Funds - As Should Be by Wealth and Local Support	156
LIII. Administration of Federal Funds - As Should Be by Federal Support and Education	157
LIV. Administration of Federal Funds - As Should Be by Age and Tenure	158
LV. Administration of Federal Funds - As Should Be by Enrollment	159
LVI. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - Present Situation by Wealth and Local Support	160

Table	Page
LVII. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - Present Situation by Federal Support and Education	161
LVIII. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - Present Situation by Age and Tenure	162
LIX. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - Present Situation by Enrollment	163
LX. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - As Should Be by Wealth and Local Support	164
LXI. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - As Should Be by Federal Support and Education	165
LXII. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - As Should Be by Age and Tenure	166
LXIII. Local Response to Federal Aid Programs - As Should Be by Enrollment	167
LXIV. Fiscal Policy - As Should Be by Enrollment	168
LXV. Fiscal Policy - Present Situation by Wealth and Local Support	169
LXVI. Fiscal Policy - Present Situation by Federal Support and Education	170
LXVII. Fiscal Policy - Present Situation by Age and Tenure	171
LXVIII. Fiscal Policy - Present Situation by Type of District.	172
LXIX. Fiscal Policy - As Should Be by Local Support and Education	173
LXX. Fiscal Policy - As Should Be by Age and Tenure	174
LXXI. Preference for General Federal Aid by Wealth	175
LXXII. Preference for General Federal Aid by Enrollment	175
LXXIII. Preference for General Federal Aid by Education	176
LXXIV. Preference for General Federal Aid by Age and Tenure	176

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

A United States Office of Education Study, prepared by the National Center for Educational Statistics, says that the nation's educational costs will increase four times as fast as the school population during the next decade. They project the nation to spend 76 billion dollars in 1977-78 to educate 63 million students. This represents a forty per cent increase in expenditures over the 1967-68 school year.¹

Consequently, now, more than ever before, educational leaders across the nation are infinitely concerned about the financing of our nation's schools. One aspect of this concern is the role the federal government should play in the financing of our schools.

To ask whether the federal government should or should not provide financial assistance to education would be a moot question. It is fact that the federal government has been subsidizing education since the Land Ordinance of 1785 and this trend has greatly increased during the past quarter century. Since 1945 federal appropriations for the

¹Education U.S.A. (Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, May 5, 1969), p. 99.

support of education has increased thirty-fold.² It would be difficult to evaluate whether federal involvement in education has increased proportionally during this same period. The literature does substantiate that this involvement has greatly increased.

The issue of federal aid to education has been debated since the beginning of public education. There have always been those who favor federal aid and those who oppose federal aid to education. The basic fear expressed by the opponents of federal aid has been that of federal control. Sidney Tiedt, writing in his book The Role of the Federal Government in Education, has said that "control inevitably goes with the purse strings."³ The literature reveals that many educators are fearful that federal funds will sooner or later mean federal standards for curriculum, teaching methods, teacher salaries, and other areas of education.

Charles Mosher, U. S. Congressman from Ohio, does not fear federal regulation or control but just "plain federal politics." He believes political manipulation of education will prove most dangerous to our nation's well being.⁴ It seems logical that the more money the federal government expends on education the greater the possibility of government intervention.

Elaine Exton, writing in the American School Board Journal, fears that the government is moving toward making education the tool of an

²Galen Saylor, "The Federal Colossus in Education--Threat or Promise," Educational Leadership, 23 (October, 1965), p. 8.

³Sidney W. Tiedt, The Role of the Federal Government in Education (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 73.

⁴Charles Mosher, "A Milestone of Progress in American Education," Ohio Schools, 43 (September, 1965), pp. 9-10.

increasingly planned society in which freedom for diversity will gradually diminish.⁵ If this transpires local school boards, instead of initiating educational policy, will become primarily compliers with decisions reached elsewhere.

Dawson Hales, author of Federal Control of Public Education, says that

. . . out of our early system of educational control and the prevailing political and philosophical beliefs, the principles that a locally controlled system of public schools is both desirable and democratic developed.⁶

Despite sweeping economic and political change, the principle is today still generally accepted by many. Hales also points out that proponents of local control fear that increased federal control will result in a huge bureaucratic machine. They believe the bureaucrats would direct from Washington educational programs of local communities throughout the nation and would eventually control public education from the "mother's knee" to graduation.⁷ This was written by Hales more than fourteen years ago, and those who oppose federal involvement believe their fears are very close to becoming a reality as a result of recent federal aid programs such as The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

There are also many proponents of federal aid that have no fear of federal control. The late Adlai Stevenson once said,

⁵ Elaine Exton, "Will Increased Federal Planning Decrease Local Control?", American School Board Journal, 150 (January, 1965), p. 38.

⁶ Dawson Hales, Federal Control of Public Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954), p. 9.

⁷ Ibid., p. 10.

We hear those who push aside federal action with the usual cries of socialism and regimentation. But there has been federal help for education ever since 1785 . . . and we are not closer to federal control of our schools than we were then.⁸

During the more recent expansion of federal assistance programs, educational leaders have supported proposed legislation which would provide general financial assistance to public schools rather than that directed to the support of specific purposes in education. The need for relief from increasing taxation at state and local levels has become critical for those responsible for providing revenue for public school purposes, and educators generally recognize the federal government as a source of revenue for such relief. However, educational leaders have viewed general federal aid as providing financial assistance without the possible controls which specific purpose programs entailed. It may very well be a naive educator who believes that general grant-in-aid would not also involve some controls.

The implications of specific purpose federal aid for control of education are apparent. First, Congress determines a priority in education when establishing a specific educational purpose for proposed legislation. Second, the federal government is then obligated to determine how effectively the purposes of the legislation are being fulfilled in the use of federal funds allocated. Third, federal auditing of federal funds used by states must be assumed. These implications are factors which involve the federal government in local educational programs.⁹

⁸Tiedt, p. 34.

⁹Exton, pp. 38-39.

The acceptance of federal financial assistance by states and local communities for specific purposes in public education implies a re-evaluation of state and local programs. Philosophies of education, curricula, personnel services, financial planning, and other areas of educational policy are affected, and adjustments are necessitated by participation in such federal programs. During the process of such adjustments in state and local policy, the question arises as to the degree to which the national government is involved in these various areas.¹⁰

Following the National Defense Education Act of 1958, evidence is present in the literature of the concern for the effect of specific-purpose federal aid on certain phases of local educational programs. Several such phases were identified by McKnight in a study at Ohio State University.¹¹ McKnight's first list included thirteen problem areas. Through reviewing a questionnaire sent to a group of educational administrators, McKnight reduced the list by eliminating overlapping areas and those least directly affecting the local educational programs. The problem areas used by McKnight in his study were curriculum development, curriculum balance, administration of federal funds, local response to federal aid programs, teaching materials, teacher improvement, educational services, and fiscal policy.¹²

Because of the extensive scope and analysis of this study, only five of the problem areas identified by McKnight will be considered.

¹⁰John Allen McKnight, "Perceptions of Ohio State Educational Administrators Regarding the Use of Federal Funds for Education" (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1965), p. 5.

¹¹Ibid., p. 53.

¹²Ibid., p. 54.

These are curriculum development, curriculum balance, administration of federal funds, local response to federal aid programs, and fiscal policy. This does not imply that these areas are necessarily more important than the others. It did seem, to this writer, that there was a definite relationship between teaching materials and curriculum balance. Teacher improvement and educational services are important aspects of some federal programs, and may provide material for future studies.

Following is a discussion of the identified problem areas and rationale for being chosen.

Identified Problem Areas

Curriculum Development

Congressional committee hearings are lengthy testimony to the fact that justification for federal legislation has been established on some inadequacy in the nature of the local educational programs. The passage of each federal aid act assumes a specific need to be met at the local level. When such legislation results in changes in the curriculum, it follows that the federal government has joined the state and local educational governments in curriculum development.

Although discussion of a national curriculum for all schools is limited and openly supported only by a few national leaders, its proponents argue that:

Movements and influence on the schools come too fast, require too much research, and are too costly in staff and personnel to get the job done on a local, state or regional basis. Furthermore, curriculum change and emphasis, whether we like it or not, will be increasingly national rather

than local in scope.¹³

James B. Conant, in his book Shaping Educational Policy, suggests that the state enter into a compact for the creation of an Interstate Commission for Planning a Nationwide Educational Policy.¹⁴

The challenges to the adequacy of local curriculum programs to meet the needs of individual and society and the proposal of some that the need is now apparent for a national curriculum are reasons for this being identified as a problem area.

Curriculum Balance

Curriculum planning for balance takes full account of the fundamental American ideal that every child is entitled to the full development of his talent through education.¹⁵

From the earliest days of public education in the United States, a lack of complete balance has been recognized. Imbalance in education was the justification for the establishment of the land grant for higher institutions of learning in 1862, and for initiating federal vocational programs in 1917. In fact, almost every federal aid program to the public schools is justified on the basis of state and local failures to provide adequately balanced educational opportunities.

Many educational leaders believe that specific purpose federal

¹³Paul R. Hanna, "Design for a National Curriculum," The Nation's Schools, 62 (September, 1958), p. 43.

¹⁴Exton, p. 39.

¹⁵William D. Ragan, Modern Elementary Curriculum (New York: The Dryden Press, 1953), pp. 53, 77.

assistance creates imbalances in the local curriculum.¹⁶ The appropriation of federal funds for the stimulation of science education adversely affects the study of the humanities, some assert. Arthur H. Rice, writing in the Nation's Schools, says,

. . . whatever may be said in favor of the N.D.E.A. of 1958 and other acts that have followed it . . . and a good deal can be said . . . the Congress has neither expressed any interest of its own in a well balanced curriculum, nor been disposed to help local or state authorities to strengthen the balance at their level.¹⁷

These leaders hold that each such grant leads to further grants for other specific purposes.

As this concern rose in level following the success of the Russian launching of the first space satellite in 1957, and the prompt enactment of N.D.E.A. of 1958, some apprehension developed that our educational goals might become directed to the service of the state, thus disregarding the personal inclination of the individual.¹⁸

One method for counteracting possible imbalance created by federal programs is through budgetary redistribution at the local level. In long-range budgetary planning, participation in federal programs can be anticipated and funds distributed to maintain the degree of balance desired by local educational officials. This method of counteracting possible adverse effects may become more difficult if the federal government becomes more insistent that a change in balance take place

¹⁶ Robert I. Sperber, "Federal Aid and Federal Control of Education," Teachers College Record, 61 (March, 1960), p. 338.

¹⁷ Arthur H. Rice, "Are Federal Funds Leading Schools the Wrong Way?," Nation's Schools, 76 (October, 1965), p. 28.

¹⁸ Elaine Exton, "Congress Looks at the Curriculum," American School Board Journal, 137 (July, 1958), p. 36.

in the use of federal funds.

Dr. Norman Kurland, Director of Center on Innovation, New York State Education Department, indicates that E.S.E.A. funds can improve teacher working conditions and salaries. According to Kurland, you can determine what parts of your program can be properly supported by federal funds, then use new local or state funds that the federal funds replace for salary increases.¹⁹

Curriculum balance is justified as a problem area on the basis of the conflicting goals for education which various levels of government tend to emphasize and the effect of federal aid on specific curriculum areas.

Administration of Federal Funds

The administration of specific purpose federal assistance programs requires assurance that the purpose of the legislation providing these programs is properly fulfilled by the participating state and local school systems. The history of the administration of this type of federal funds has raised the question of how much governmental regulation is necessary to guarantee the fulfillment of such purposes.

In responding to N.D.E.A. of 1958, Dr. Allen, then Commissioner of Education of the State of New York and now United States Commissioner of Education, wrote:

My colleagues have been somewhat overwhelmed with the mass of specifications, regulations, and detail concerned with the preparation of our state plans . . . we wonder whether the provisions of the Act itself and the volume of regulations are not tending to establish a type of federal control

¹⁹Norman D. Kurland, "How Federal Funds Can Free Dollars For Teacher Salaries," Nation's Schools, 79 (January, 1967), p. 72.

which was the very thing all of us, including Congress, hoped to avoid.²⁰

Should all programs be administered through state departments of education? Should auditing procedures permit federal determination of the state and local policy in effecting federal programs? These questions and the concern of educators that the accounting, auditing, and purchase order procedures of the federal programs are burdensome and possibly irrelevant give rise to this being identified as a problem area.

Local Response to Federal Aid Programs

An assumption has existed for several years now, that the local effort has reached a maximum and that as the cost of financing educational programs continues to rise, other sources of tax income must be found. This concern is more prevalent in some states than in others. In Oklahoma the feeling seems to become more dominant each year.

State education leaders have devoted much time and effort to secure additional income at the state level, with little success to date. The other basic source of revenue is the federal government. Local districts in Oklahoma have for many years voluntarily accepted federal funds for certain phases of the local school program.

Has local acceptance of federal funds led to less control of our public schools? Has local community concern for education been reduced with increased financial assistance from outside the local district? The need for additional revenue for our schools and the question of local control are rationale for this being identified as a problem area.

²⁰Exton, p. 47.

Fiscal Policy

One justification for federal aid has been the inequality of educational opportunity between the various states. Should the federal government distribute federal funds on an equalization formula? Should federal aid programs attempt to equalize educational opportunities within each state?

Pierce, writing in Federal, State and Local Governments in Education, takes the position that the only authority for achieving general equality of educational opportunity resides with the federal government. He cites the argument that herein lies the true role of the federal government in education. The whole nation, according to Pierce, should be taxed to support education, and through the distribution of federal funds a minimum level of educational opportunity should be provided for all within the fifty states.²¹

In a study done by Weidenbaum and Swenson, it was found that Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 does serve as a regional income equalizer to a considerable degree. They found that it is a highly progressive program with respect to its tendency of yielding more than proportional amounts to low income areas and less than proportional amounts to high income areas, thus tending to lessen regional income differentials.²²

The ideal of equal educational opportunity for every child in the

²¹Truman M. Pierce, Federal, State and Local Governments in Education (Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964), p. 110.

²²Murray L. Weidenbaum and Norman P. Swenson, "Federal Aid to Education and Low Income Areas," Educational Administration Quarterly, 2 (Autumn, 1966), pp. 225-233.

United States is the basis for fiscal policy being selected as a problem area.

In the use of specific purpose funds local educational leaders may, or may not, perceive the implied shift of responsibility for education from local and state government to the federal government. A change in the relative responsibilities of the three levels of government for education may be in the process. What are the perceptions of local educational administrators and school board members of the respective responsibilities of these three levels of government for the education of our youth? It has been said that one of the interesting attributes of human beings is the capacity to look at the same thing and see different things. Thus, with the trend toward more and more federal aid to education it seems appropriate that we investigate the perceptions of local educational leaders in Oklahoma relative to federal involvement in education.

Statement of the Problem

The basic assumption of this study was that federal aid to public education implies federal involvement in public education.

Federal aid tends to be directed toward certain areas of phases of the educational program. From a study of the literature and from an analysis of the federal programs themselves, five problem areas were selected.

Oklahoma school law indicates that the local boards of education determine local educational policy. In reality this is usually accomplished through the assistance and guidance of the superintendent of schools in independent school districts and principals in dependent

school districts. Hence, the educational administrators and school board members work as a team in determining local school policy.

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of Oklahoma's local educational leaders, administrators and school board members, relative to federal involvement in local education. The study attempted to:

1. Determine how these educational leaders perceive the present federal involvement in local education relative to the identified problem areas.
2. Determine what these educational leaders perceive to be the optimum involvement of the federal government in local education relative to the identified problem areas.
3. Determine these educational leaders' preference for general federal aid versus specific-purpose federal aid.
4. Determine which federal aid programs these educational leaders perceive to be the most important to their district.

Hypotheses

Following are the hypotheses that were presented, tested, and analyzed in this study.

1. There will be no significant difference in educational administrators' and school board members' perceptions of the present situation relative to the identified problem areas.
2. There will be no significant difference in educational administrators' and school board members' perceptions of the optimum policy relative to the identified problem areas.
3. The amount of federal support the district receives, the

wealth of the district, the local millage effort of the district, and the type of district will not significantly affect the administrators' and school board members' perceptions of the present situation or the optimum policy relative to the identified problem areas.

4. The age, education, and tenure of the respondents will not significantly affect their perceptions of the present situation or the optimum policy relative to the identified problem areas.

5. There will be no significant difference in educational administrators' and school board members' preference for general federal aid.

6. The amount of federal support the district receives, the wealth of the district, the local millage effort of the district, and the type of district will not significantly affect the administrators' and board members' preference for general federal aid.

7. The age, education, and tenure of the respondents will not significantly affect their preference for general federal aid.

8. There will be no significant difference in educational administrators' and school board members' perceptions of the federal aid programs most important to their district.

Definitions

Educational administrators. This refers to principals of dependent school districts and superintendent of independent school districts.

School board members. In Oklahoma these are the elected representatives of the community who serve as members of the local board of education.

Local educational leaders. In this study this refers to the

educational administrators and school board members.

Problem areas. Phases of public education that are affected by federal aid. Those selected for this study were (1) curriculum development, (2) curriculum balance, (3) administration of federal funds, (4) local response to federal aid programs, and (5) fiscal policy.

Dependent school districts. Districts that do not have a high school.

Independent school districts. Districts that have a high school.

Federal support. The ratio of federal aid received during 1968-69 to the general fund budget of 1968-69.

Wealth of district. The ratio of assessed valuation of the district to the enrollment of the district. This gives valuation per student.

Size of district. Enrollment of district, grades one through twelve, for the 1968-69 school year.

Local support. The number of permissive mills voted by the district.

Federal involvement. Involvement as a result of federal aid programs to local districts.

Need for the Study

N.D.E.A. of 1958, the Vocational Act of 1963, E.S.E.A. of 1965, and other recent federal aid programs have caused great concern over federal involvement in public education. E.S.E.A. of 1965 has affected nearly every public school in Oklahoma and the nation. Title I of the Act involves over ninety per cent of the country's school districts.²³

²³Tiedt, p. 193.

It could be hypothesized that E.S.E.A. alone has affected the perceptions of educational administrators and board members relative to federal involvement in education.

Much has been written about the involvement of the federal government in public education, but review of the literature finds very little research done on the perceptions of local educational leaders relative to this involvement.

A similar study was done in Ohio in 1965, but it considered the perceptions of only educational administrators in the State of Ohio.²⁴ It seems very significant to consider the perceptions of school board members as they are by law the local educational policy makers. Also, they may more nearly represent the perceptions of the local community as they are the community's legally elected representatives.

The Ohio study was done prior to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and, as mentioned above, this Act has possibly affected perceptions of local educational leaders relative to federal involvement in public school education.

Peter Drucker, writing in Harper's, says that it is going to be impossible to avoid large scale federal support of education.²⁵ Thus, if programs of federal aid continue to increase in the future, a conflict between the respective responsibilities of local, state, and federal government for various phases of education seems inevitable. To assess these responsibilities in terms of the perceptions of local educational leaders who must advise state educational officials and

²⁴McKnight

²⁵Peter F. Drucker, "American Directions: A Forecast," Harper's, 230 (February, 1965), pp. 19-45.

state government officials on the use of federal aid would appear to be a contribution to the administration of Oklahoma public schools.

The Design of the Study

Scope

The samples for this study were drawn from all school districts in Oklahoma. From the population of 445 superintendents in the state of Oklahoma, a random sample of 255 was drawn. From the population of 226 principals in the state, a random sample of 117 was drawn. The board president of each of the above randomly selected school districts was chosen. This gave a random sample of 372 administrators and 372 board members. A questionnaire was developed and sent to each of the randomly selected educational leaders.

The Questionnaire

Through this questionnaire, educational administrators and school board members indicated their perceptions of federal involvement in local education.

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of some characteristics of the school district and biographical information about the respondent. These data were type of district, enrollment of district, assessed valuation of district, general fund budget for 1968-69, federal support during 1968-69, local millage voted for 1968-69, and age, formal education, and tenure of the respondent.

The questionnaire also included two questions which involved the respondent's perception relative to federal aid. One, they were asked to answer yes or no to the following question: Would you prefer one

general federal aid law to be distributed to the states in preference to the several specific-purpose laws? Two, the respondents were asked to rank in order of importance to their district a list of federal programs. These included vocational education, federal affected Public Law 815, N.D.E.A. Title III, E.S.E.A. Title I, E.S.E.A. Title II, and a blank was left for other preferences.

The second part of the questionnaire involved statements relating to the five problem areas selected for this study. Each problem area consisted of two sets of statements. In the first set the respondent was asked to select one statement which he perceived represented the present situation relative to the problem area. In the second set of statements the respondent was asked to select one statement which he perceived represented the optimum policy relative to the problem area.

The Statistical Analysis

The statistical test chi square was selected for the analysis of the data. This test is used to test the hypothesis that two groups differ with respect to some characteristic. Thus, it is an appropriate test to use in testing the stated hypotheses of this study. The .05 level of significance was used in testing for significant differences.

Scope and Limitations

Federal involvement in public education is a concern of educational leaders in all fifty states, but this study will only include a random sample of educational leaders in Oklahoma.

The study does not include problems relating to federal aid for private schools or higher education.

Areas of educational programs identified as phases of education affected by federal aid have not been validated statistically.

Perceptions of respondents will be determined by a questionnaire. Weaknesses of the questionnaire or other personal biases could possibly prevent the respondent from indicating his true feelings.

Representativeness of responses was not statistically tested, but an analysis of this is given in Chapter III.

Summary

Paralleling increased federal aid to public schools has been an increase in federal involvement. Some areas of the school program are affected more than others by this federal intervention. For this study the areas of curriculum development, curriculum balance, administration of federal funds, local response to federal aid programs, and fiscal policy were identified as problem areas.

Through the use of a questionnaire, the perceptions of Oklahoma administrators and school board members relative to federal involvement were obtained. These data are analyzed and presented in Chapter IV of this study.

Chapter II of this study reviews the literature concerning federal aid and federal involvement in education. Chapter III contains the design and methodology of the study. Summary and conclusions are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Legal Role of the Local, State, and Federal Governments

Public schools in Youngstown, Ohio were closed from Thanksgiving holidays 1968 until January 1969, because of a lack of operating funds. Other schools across the nation are feeling the same financial bind or, as some call it, the taxpayer revolt. Who is responsible for providing financial support for public school education? This is one of the most crucial issues in government relations to education. There is and has been at no time a generally accepted policy which clearly identifies the extent of government responsibility for financial support of schools or the appropriate sharing of such responsibility by the three levels of government: local, state, and federal.¹

In 1968 the Detroit Board of Education sued the State of Michigan for more operating funds because it said the state has a constitutional obligation to provide equal educational opportunity for all children. The suit, the first of its kind in the nation, centers on the meaning of "state responsibility for education."²

¹Truman M. Pierce, Federal, State and Local Governments in Education (Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964), p. 109.

²Education U.S.A. (Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, January 29, 1968), p. 116.

The notion that education is a necessary and proper concern of government is as ancient as classical political theory. Aristotle wrote that "the education of youth ought to form the principal part of the legislators' attention . . . since education first molds, and afterward sustains the various modes of government." He went on to note that "the better and more perfect the system of education, the better and more perfect the plan of government it is intended to introduce and uphold." For this reason, Aristotle deduced that ". . . education ought to be regulated by the general consent, and not abandoned to the blind decisions of chance, or to idle caprice."³

While there are no policies determining financial support from the three levels of government, the legal responsibilities are very clear. Since the Constitution of the United States makes no direct reference to education, under the provision of the Tenth Amendment the basic responsibility for education has been allocated to the states.⁴ Theoretically, it would seem a state might have chosen not to provide schools. Historically, however, each state has assumed the responsibility for establishing and maintaining a public school system. It should be noted that all states after Ohio had to have provision for education in their constitution.

The people of the state may make any provisions for the establishment and support of the public schools they consider desirable, subject, of course, to limitations imposed and implied by the Federal

³Quoted in U. S. Department of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1868), p. 331.

⁴R. L. Johns and Edgar L. Morphet, Financing the Public Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 171.

Constitution.

A structure for the public school system is set forth for each state either by its constitutional provisions or legislative enactment. From the beginning there was a need for a plan of organizing and administering the public schools from the state level. From this need the local school district has been invented. The local district is in essence an arm of the state reaching into the local community.⁵

No local school system in any state has any inherent right or authority to levy taxes or expend funds for schools. Legally all rights, duties, and responsibilities for local officials in any state must be authorized or prescribed by law.⁶

Although the Constitution of the United States makes no direct reference to education, there seems to be no doubt that Congress has the necessary authority to make any reasonable appropriation for the support of education. This is pointed out by Edwards:

. . . it seems clear that the national government may tax and spend in the support of education, it may enter into voluntary agreement with the state for the mutual support of education, it may not spend funds for the primary purpose of regulating the educational policies of the states, and it may enforce whatever control measures are incidental but essential in the accomplishment of the purposes for which Federal funds are appropriated and spent.⁷

Americans have viewed education as being of paramount importance in providing for the welfare of the people. It seems safe to say that historically America has not felt that the welfare of her people could

⁵Pierce, pp. 14-15.

⁶Johns and Morphet, p. 168.

⁷Newton Edwards, The Courts and the Public School (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, rev. ed., 1955), p. 5.

be adequately safeguarded and assured without a system of education. The General Welfare Clause as it has been interpreted, authorizes the United States government to levy and collect revenues which can be used for the support of education.⁸

States have accepted responsibility for financing schools in their constitutions. Local school districts are given certain responsibilities by the state for financing schools. These responsibilities may be both mandatory and permissive. The federal government, though, has had complete freedom to determine whether or not it chose to support education financially and, if so, for what ends. The government early established the precedent for such support and has steadily strengthened this precedent.

Federal Aid

Major Issues

The participation of the federal government in the financing of public education is the most important controversial issue concerning school financing in the United States.⁹ Controversy exists over the question of federal support, the extent of state support, and the degree of financial support provided at the local level. Points of view range from strong convictions that the federal government should provide no support for schools and that local communities should provide their own school support to the belief that the federal government and state governments should provide the total support and the local

⁸ Edwards, p. 2.

⁹ Johns and Morphet, p. 361.

districts none.

Peter F. Drucker has said that "our society is becoming school-centered; at least one third of the American people will be in school all of the time contrasted with one fourth who are there now." He goes on to say:

Total expenditures will exceed our present defense budget by a substantial amount, and at the same time the structure of American education, its purposes, values, content, and direction will become issues in which more and more people will become involved openly and emotionally.

He labels the new circumstance "the knowledge state."¹⁰

There seems to be little doubt but what federal aid to education is going to continue to increase. It likewise seems clear that the controversy relative to federal aid will continue. The literature reveals some basic arguments for and against federal aid to public education. First some of the arguments for federal aid to education will be reviewed.

Equality of educational opportunity is an objective to which practically every citizen has subscribed in theory for many years. But practical application is a different matter. There exists a wide range of per pupil expenditure among states. These differ by a ratio of approximately three to one between states of high and low support.¹¹

Frances Keppel, while Assistant Secretary for Education of the United States, stated:

We must find ways to eliminate the inequality of educational opportunity. There are rural slums, backward areas in which

¹⁰Peter F. Drucker, "American Direction: A Forecast," Harper's, 230 (February, 1965), pp. 19-45.

¹¹Charles S. Benson, The Economics of Public Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 252.

children don't have a fair chance to learn. There are growing, high density areas where the schools don't keep up.¹²

Proponents of federal aid point out that the social benefits of education are not confined within the borders of a state. Hence, residents of all parts of the country are affected adversely by the existence of inadequate school programs anywhere.

Those in favor of federal aid cite the magnitude of needs that exist in the public schools. It is argued that we need increased school buildings, equipment, and personnel to meet the increase in school enrollment. It is pointed out that local districts, with their heavy reliance upon the property tax as their major source of securing funds, are finding that they do not have enough money to support public schools properly. It is indicated that progress of state and local governments in raising the support level is too slow and only through liberal federal aid can the needs be met.

The support of education by Americans has found justification primarily in the duty of the country to promote the general welfare and to protect itself from the consequences of an ignorant and incompetent citizenry.¹³ Thus proponents of federal aid argue that education is of national concern. New forces which threaten national survival, which have cast this nation into a grim international struggle, and which have overwhelmed us with social, economic, and technological problems necessitate large amounts of federal aid for education. Because, say these proponents of federal aid, it is only through education that

¹²Sidney W. Tiedt, The Role of the Federal Government in Education (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 34.

¹³Edwards, p. 147.

solutions to these problems can be found.¹⁴

Throughout our history men have recognized the importance of education to our society. Horace Mann, in his famous report of 1848 to the Massachusetts State Board of Education, said, "Education is the great equalizer of men, the balance wheel of the social machinery."¹⁵ James Bryant Conant expressed similar sentiments in a 1952 address to school administrators.

If we so desire it, secondary education can be used to restore fluidity to our social and economic life each generation, and in so doing make available for the nation's welfare resources of potential talent now untapped.¹⁶

It is further maintained that the majority of the people are in favor of federal aid to education. The Louis Harris Poll in 1963 revealed that seventy per cent of voters favored federal aid to education.¹⁷ It is certainly true that most educators favor federal aid to education. The National Education Association has led this fight for many years.

Equalization of educational opportunity, need for assistance, and national interest have historically been the basic arguments for federal aid to public education. Paralleling these arguments have been the arguments opposing federal aid to public education.

Opponents of federal aid to education maintain that any attempt

¹⁴Franklin Parker, "Federal Influences on the Future of American Education," School and Society (October 28, 1967), p. 383.

¹⁵V. T. Thayer, The Role of the School in American Society (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1960), p. 9.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁷"Voters Favor Federal Aid," Nation's Schools, 75 (September, 1963), p. 9.

to equalize educational opportunity on a national level would fail. Those who oppose federal aid say that this effort would have the effect not of bettering national education, but rather that of dragging the educational standards down to the average or mediocre level. The ones against federal aid argue that schools have always reflected society and it is only natural that these schools should differ somewhat from each other. This diversity, according to the opponents of federal aid, has been one of the strengths of the American educational system.¹⁸

Those opposed to federal aid to education say that there is lack of need for federal assistance, that the basic issue is not of quantity but quality. According to these critics, we need to eliminate the frills, to tighten up the present curriculum, and to use existing facilities to better advantage. It is maintained that state governments are in a better fiscal position to finance education than is the federal government. Also, according to this group, there is evidence to demonstrate that we are making real progress at the state and local level in meeting the educational needs of our nation.¹⁹

The weapon that has been used most successfully by the opposition in their fight against federal aid to education has been the issue of control. The issue of control is one that both the advocates and the opponents of federal aid agree. Neither wants the federal government to control education. They differ in that one believes you can have the aid without control and the other believes the two are inseparable. Because of the historic belief in local control and its significance in

¹⁸Midwest Debate Bureau, What Should Be the Role of the Federal Government in Education (Normal, Illinois, 1961), pp. 215-226.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 191-194.

educational decisions, a closer view will be given to this issue.

The Issue of Control

One of the unique features of education in this country is a high degree of community autonomy. In the vast majority of instances the school board is elected directly by the people of the school district. This board selects the administrative and instructional staff; prepares the budget; writes the rules and regulations governing the functions of the administrative staff, the teachers, and students; approves the curricula; and in many other respects acts as the governing body of the schools. But all the functions are delegated functions and are subject to the will of the state.²⁰

How then do we explain the fact that school systems which are both created by state and subject to its control and regulations are, nevertheless, thought of as essentially local in authority and responsibility? According to Pierce, the answer is found, in part, in the American tradition of local self government. Also, another reason is that the earlier public schools had their authorizations from the local community rather than from the state.²¹

Although disagreement is pronounced over the amount of control to be exercised by local, state, and federal bodies, there is agreement, at least among members of the educational profession, about the desirability of a continued measure of educational autonomy and

²⁰Thayer, p. 47.

²¹Pierce, p. 16.

freedom.²² Adaptability to community needs, fostering of democratic processes, protection against totalitarianism, and freedom from bureaucratic administration are only a few of the arguments given in favor of local control of education.

Although the principle of local control of education is still prevalent, in reality the states have increased their control over local education many fold during the last fifty years. This change in control has taken place but most lay people are not aware that the local district is an agent of the state.

State control by the end of the nineteenth century had been extended to include some regulations and supervision of courses of study, textbooks, educational materials, and qualifications and selections of teachers, as well as some control over grading, sanitation, and discipline.²³ From 1923 to 1930 approximately one hundred thirty-one new curricular prescriptions were written into the statutes of the various states.

We note that despite traditional devotion to the principle of local control, the increase in the number of legislative requirements has centered a considerable degree of education control in the states.

It is important to note that increased control paralleled increased state aid and industrial development. It was also concurrent with a growing belief that an educated citizenry is essential to democracy. Hales, writing in his book Federal Control of Public

²²Dawson Hales, Federal Control of Public Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954), p. 4.

²³Ibid., p. 45.

Education, says the following concerning state and federal participation in education:

The increased educational obligations created by the use of industrialism and the demands of Jacksonian democracy could not be met by local communities. It was consequently natural, in a period dominated by the doctrine and practice of State "rights," for the states to increase their participation in education. It is just as natural, under a combination of forces and trends more national than ever before, for educational control to become increasingly centralized in a period dominated by the activities and power of the federal government.²⁴

This change in the distribution of control from the local to the state level seems to be widely accepted today. The speculation of federal control of education is not so widely accepted.

As was previously mentioned, the bugaboo of federal control is very real. Most educators advocate increased federal subsidies for education; with but few exceptions, they oppose an extension of federal control. The record of educational history, however, indicates that with state aid came a measure of state control.²⁵

The Council of Chief State School Officials has shown a great deal of concern over the issue of federal control. The American Association of School Administrators has taken a similar position. Both organizations have criticized the "control features" of N.D.E.A. type programs and the "guidelines" of E.S.E.A.

There are those who have absolutely no fear of federal control of education. The following is a quote from Sidney Suffrin's book, Administering the National Defense Education Act.

²⁴Hales, p. 50.

²⁵Ibid., p. 53.

The fear that the federal government will dominate public education is completely unfounded and is based upon a conception of government which, in fact, does not exist in the United States. The federal government is not despotic. It is as sensitive to local and state powers as it is to the political and economic power of any other group in the society.²⁶

Realistically, federal control might be considered to describe any kind of federally induced limitation on the free choice among policy alternatives by the state or local school district. In practice, however, this is not the case. "Undesirable" limitations on state or local choice are "federal controls," while "desirable" limitations on local choice are usually described as "federal regulations."²⁷

When discussing federal control three sources of authority should be identified: federal, state, and local. The Council of Chief School Officials may see no sign of federal control in a particular federal aid bill, the local district may predict much, and both may be right. For the result of the federal grant may be to increase the power of the State School Office acting as disbursing officer for the federal government and permit the state department of education to control more effectively the local district.

All this suggests that federal control means different things to different people. Whatever the nature of the concern, however, it seems clear that federal control constitutes a real issue in the sense that it has served to separate out the support of some who have been willing to spend federal money for education but are genuinely fearful

²⁶ Sidney C. Suffrin, Administering the National Defense Education Act (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963), p. xii.

²⁷ Frank J. Munger and Richard F. Fenno, Jr., National Politics and Federal Aid to Education (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962), p. 49.

of the possibility of federal control implicit within some specific programs.²⁸

Elaine Exton, writing in the American School Board Journal, indicates that the federal partnership system in educational affairs is reducing the range of choices and, hence, the prerogative of state and local boards of education which accept the federal programs.²⁹

Contending that "the national level is becoming the more powerful, at the expense of the local and state levels," in a paper presented at the 1966 Cubberley Conference at Stanford University, Roald F. Campbell, Dean of the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Education, said that

. . . recent federal activity in education has created a dis-equilibrium for many school boards, and that a new equilibrium is being established in which the role of school boards will be somewhat more restricted than it has been.³⁰

The real threat, according to Galen Saylor, comes from control by federal officials over the educational aspects of the plans developed for carrying out some of the federal aid acts. The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 gives the United States Commissioner of Education authority to approve plans for carrying out the act and hence the conditions within provisions of the law under which the grants will be made.³¹

²⁸Munger and Fenno, pp. 52-53.

²⁹Elaine Exton, "The Emerging Federal Partnership," American School Board Journal, CXV (May, 1967), p. 8.

³⁰Ibid., p. 9.

³¹Galen Saylor, "The Federal Colossus in Education...Threat or Promise," Educational Leadership, 23 (October, 1965), p. 10.

With federal, state, and local relations in education at a cross-roads, school boards and administrators have the opportunity to play a vital part in determining the course to be followed in future years. There are many questions to be answered. What is the significance of the current federal programs with regard to the way in which our educational system is organized? What are the appropriate areas for decision making and which of these areas should respectively belong to federal, state, or local authorities? In the future, how and to what extent should the federal government participate in the financing of schools?

The battle for and against federal aid is historic, but the fact remains that we have had federal aid to public education for many years and the trend seems to be for greater amounts in the future. It now seems appropriate to review the development of the major federal aid laws.

Major Federal Aid Laws and Their Significance

According to the twenty-seventh annual report by the Research Division of the National Education Association, the federal government will provide approximately 2.5 billion dollars for public school education during 1968-69.³² This is a staggering sum when compared to approximately 1.7 million it spent in 1917 as a result of the Smith-Hughes Act.

The federal government is deeply involved in American education. From nursery schools to university campuses, it would be hard to find a

³² Education U.S.A. (Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, January 13, 1969), p. 103.

single pupil, teacher, or classroom in the nation not in some way affected by the government's expanding interest and assistance.

Land Ordinance of 1785

The first example of legislation specifically involving the national government in education is the Land Ordinance of 1785. The Ordinance included the provision "there shall be reserved the lot number sixteen of every township for the maintenance of public schools in each township."³³ Land grants were continued under the Statehood Acts, beginning with the Ohio Enabling Act of 1802 and continuing through the more recent statehood acts of Alaska and Hawaii.

Two characteristics of these early grants were of significance. First, they were for general public school purposes. Second, the federal government exercised no control whatsoever over education as a condition for receiving the grants.

The Morrill Act of 1862

This act provided for a grant of 30,000 acres to each state for each representative and senator then in Congress. This Act did not directly affect public school education, but is significant as it is the first instance of the federal government providing a grant for specific educational purposes. It is also significant because it again demonstrated the national interest in education.³⁴

³³Morphet and Johns, p. 371.

³⁴Ibid., p. 374.

The Smith-Lever Act

In 1914, Congress created the Agricultural Extension Service through the Smith-Lever Act, which was set up to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects pertaining to agriculture and home economics.³⁵

The extension services provided under this Act are not an integral part of the system of public education. The significance of the Act is that it was far more specific in detailing the purposes for which the grant could be spent than the grants provided by the Morrill Act. Hence, the trend toward more governmental regulations.

The Smith-Hughes Act

The purpose of this 1917 Act was to foster vocational education and home economics training for high school students. This Act provided the first specific-purpose grants made available to public schools by Congress.³⁶ It also involved the federal government in the payment of teacher salaries and included the principle of matching funds.

The Impact Laws

In 1950, Congress enacted two laws, Public Law 815 for school construction and Public Law 874 which provided funds to meet operating costs of the districts. The purpose of these laws was to alleviate hardships in communities where certain federal activities had been or

³⁵ Tiedt, p. 22.

³⁶ Morphet and Johns, p. 376.

were being carried on. The Impact Laws, as they are called, are popular with school administrators that receive them because they serve to lighten the financial difficulties of fast growing districts and they are also free from any control or influence by the federal government.

Public Law 874 exemplifies the first granting of federal funds to a school district for general operating costs. The funds issued under this law are not earmarked for any specific purpose or area of the curriculum. They may be spent for teachers' salaries, or any of the operating cost incurred by a school district.³⁷

The National Defense Education Act of 1958

By far the largest federal commitment to the national general education level up to 1958 was embodied in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This was a one billion dollar program designed to improve the teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. It was passed in reaction to Russian achievement in space technology, symbolized by the 1957 orbiting of the first Earth satellite.³⁸

This program has been expanded and now includes ten subject areas. The Act clearly was a specific-purpose grant and has involved the federal government in almost all areas of curriculum in the public schools. Since this Act the literature indicates educators' concern over the government's involvement in curriculum development and curriculum balance in the public schools.

³⁷Tiedt, p. 27.

³⁸Congressional Quarterly Service, Federal Role in Education (Washington, D. C., 1965), p. 8.

Vocational Education Act of 1963

In 1963, Congress enacted a law which established new and expanded existing vocational educational programs. This bill has led to the establishing of several area vocational schools in the state of Oklahoma and across the nation. Congress has been convinced that there is a need in this area and they have been almost unanimous in their support.³⁹

The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965

On January 12, 1965, President Johnson presented to the 89th Congress his proposals for aid to education. In this presentation he said, "I think it is time now, I think it is time past, for a new revolution in education in America."⁴⁰ On April 9, 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 was passed by the United States Senate in the same form as it had earlier been passed by the United States House of Representatives. President Johnson had this to say:

I am very proud of your House of Representatives and your United States Senate, and I know everyone is applauding the historic action that the Congress has just taken. Since 1870, almost a hundred years ago, we have been trying to do what we have just done . . . pass an elementary school bill for all children of America.⁴¹

As enacted, PL 89-10 authorized (1) a 1 billion dollar, three-year program to aid pupils from low-income families, (2) a five-year

³⁹ Ibid., p. 11.

⁴⁰ Tiedt, p. 189.

⁴¹ Philip Meranto, The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965: A Study in Political Innovation (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1st ed., 1967), p. 1.

program of grants for the purchase of textbooks and library materials, (3) establishment of centers to provide cultural and remedial programs that individual schools could not afford, (4) a five-year program of grants for improving educational research, and (5) a five-year program to strengthen state departments of education.⁴²

This Act represents the largest single commitment by the federal government to strengthen and improve educational quality and opportunity in elementary and secondary schools across the nation.⁴³

E.S.E.A. of 1965 must be considered a specific-purpose grant, as it has many restrictions and regulations placed on its use. Even though it has a specialized and impacted area characteristic, it has some traits of general aid. The major part of the Act, Title I, involves ninety per cent of the country's school districts.⁴⁴ Title II grants provide for a program to enable school libraries to purchase textbooks and other instructional materials for use by children and teachers in all public and private elementary and secondary schools. Although the Act does not clearly represent general federal aid, it very well may be considered a major breakthrough in the direction of general federal aid to education. The Act almost tripled the federal commitment to primary and secondary education of the previous year.⁴⁵

Review of the literature reveals that the Elementary and Secondary

⁴²United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Profile of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 1.

⁴³Meranto, p. ix.

⁴⁴Tiedt, p. 193.

⁴⁵Meranto, p. 5.

Act of 1965 has greatly increased the furor over the question of federal control. Many educational leaders feel that the many rules, regulations, guidelines, and red tape created by the Act have brought us ever nearer to federal control of public education.

On the brighter side, there are those who think that the pacesetting of E.S.E.A. may let our schools realize what Jefferson hoped for in his day. He desired that the school would enable the state to avail itself "of those talents which nature has sown as liberally among the poor as the rich, but which perish without use, if not sought for and cultivated."⁴⁶

The Future

Year by year the nation's problems become more varied and complex. One estimate of the vast range of America's problems is the report of the President's Commission on National Goals which classifies the goals under such headings as these: the individual, the democratic process, science, defense, culture, the economy, governmental organization, urban society, farm policy, human needs, and foreign relations. In every field the Commission mentions, education plays an essential part.⁴⁷

What does the future hold for the local, state, and federal governments in education if education is to meet the challenge of these many and varied problems?

⁴⁶Thayer, p. 16.

⁴⁷Cubberly Conference Stanford University, 1961. Education: An Instrument of National Goals; Papers presented at 1961 Cubberly Conference. Edited by Paul R. Hanna (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 193.

Of significance at the federal level is the new Nixon administration which will be setting national education policy for the next four years. President Nixon has stressed less federal influence at the local level. "We want no rigid blueprint or inflexible guidelines,"⁴⁸ he says. The President has also suggested federal "block grants" to the states to replace some of the categorical aid now going from Washington to the states.

Elaine Exton, a regular writer for the American School Board Journal, has the following statement relative to block grants:

. . . a block grant approach to federal assistance would leave state and community development of education processes in the hands of state and local boards of education. This possibility requires a reversal of the present categorical system of financing federal school aid. Although not easy to attain, it is a goal worth working for. But to achieve it school board members through the nation will have to take an active part in fully informing their congressmen and the general public how American education is being restructured by recent federal laws.⁴⁹

James E. Allen, Jr. is the new United States Commissioner of Education. Some important changes in emphasis are anticipated by some observers. More sympathy to problems facing the states and local districts and greater willingness to give more voice and authority to state and local officials in developing and implementing federal aid programs are two significant changes.⁵⁰

President Nixon's task force on education has urged him to spend at least 1 billion more on education, maybe even 2 billion. It also

⁴⁸Washington Monitor, Supplement to Education U.S.A. (Washington: National School Public Relations Association, October 28, 1968), p. 53.

⁴⁹Exton, p. 8.

⁵⁰Washington Monitor, February 10, 1969, p. 131.

recommends that the administration make early childhood education a "Presidential Priority," equalize per-pupil expenditures among states, reorganize federal legislation to simplify fund application and increase federal efficiency, and consider creating a separate department of education, headed by an officer of Cabinet rank.⁵¹

If these potentialities develop we could predict more federal money with fewer federal guidelines. Generally this is what educators would prefer, but they have learned from past history not to be overly optimistic.

A significant shift is occurring in the relationship between state educational agencies and the United States Office of Education. A new spirit of cooperation is replacing a climate of acrimony and suspicion that has so often marred relations between the two groups in recent years. This change has been brought about by recent success in efforts to bring the states into a partnership relationship with the United States Office of Education at points critical to the states.⁵²

The state governments across the nation are continuing to make an increasing financial effort in the support of their public schools. The National Education Research Division shows that state support increased 12.2 per cent during the 1968-69 school year. The N.E.A. Study shows that local sources still provide more than half of the revenues for public schools, but the amount is steadily dwindling. The local burden this year is 52 per cent compared to 57.1 per cent six years

⁵¹Washington Monitor, February 10, 1969, p. 43.

⁵²Education U.S.A. (Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, December 2, 1968), p. 79.

ago.⁵³

In Oklahoma the local districts are still making by far the greatest effort of the three levels of government. Local effort is 62.1 per cent, state 25.1 per cent, and federal 12.8 per cent for the 1967-68 school year.⁵⁴

In looking to the future, the James Bryant Conant plan of complete state financing for the public schools should be mentioned. Dr. Conant said that his formula would end "gross inequalities" in district support schools.⁵⁵

Commenting on Dr. Conant's plan, Calvin Grieder, writing in Nation's Schools, says that a question that needs attention is the determination of whether or not complete state support would result in a loss of freedom for the exercise of local initiative, and in the sloughing of local responsibility. In order to safeguard opportunity for assumption of partial responsibility for education, Mr. Grieder suggests that for the nation as a whole the three levels of government support education in the following proportions. The support would be 50 per cent from state, 30 per cent from local districts, and 20 per cent from federal funds.⁵⁶

The immediate task, in a society in which a degree of federal

⁵³Education U.S.A. (Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, January 13, 1969), p. 103.

⁵⁴"New Conant Plan Shakes Up 500 at Compact," Education News (July 8, 1968), p. 25.

⁵⁵Finance Division, Oklahoma State Department of Education, "Sources of Revenue and the Amount Collected From Each Source by the Common Schools of Oklahoma for the Fiscal Year 1967-68."

⁵⁶Calvin Grieder, "New Conant Plan Raises Some Searching Questions," Nation's Schools, 82 (November, 1968), p. 6.

participation appears to be essential and inevitable, is to formulate desirable policies for effecting this participation. The content of statutes to be enacted; the extent of the authority national, state, and local governments should possess; the methods and techniques or administration are all significant problems.

Summary

The legal roles of the local, state, and federal governments in education have been reviewed. There is no direct mention of education in the United States Constitution; hence, by the Tenth Amendment the responsibility of education has been allocated to the states. The states in turn have delegated certain responsibilities to local communities and we have a history of local control of our schools.

The General Welfare Clause provides the federal government with legal basis for becoming involved in education. The federal government has increased its interest and financial support significantly during the past twenty years.

The fight for federal aid has been a long and sometimes bitter struggle. The basic issue against federal aid has been that of federal control. As the amount of federal aid increases the fears of federal control seem to follow. The local control concept has its roots deep in our political, economic, and social background. It was indicated, however, that in reality, the local district is an arm of the state, but the perception of local control still remains.

The major federal aid laws were reviewed and their significance given. The Land Ordinance was constituted general aid with no strings attached. The Smith-Hughes Act was the first specific-purpose grant

for public education. It had some regulations and guidelines that had to be followed. The Impact Laws of 1950 were specific-purpose grants in the sense that they were in lieu of tax grants. PL 874 was general in the sense that the money could be used for any operating purpose.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was the first massive federal aid program to public education. It involved the federal government, at least indirectly, in many areas of the school curriculum.

The most significant federal aid act has been the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It involves most of the public school children in the nation and has some characteristics of a general aid bill. The guidelines that must be followed in order to participate in the program also indicate a trend toward stronger federal control of education.

It can be observed that it has been the emergence of some national crisis that has caused action concerning federal aid to education. Impacted legislation followed one national crisis, while N.D.E.A. of 1958 was called into existence by the cold war crisis that followed the launching of the Soviet sputnik.⁵⁷ E.S.E.A. of 1965 followed as a weapon in the war on poverty.

It seems safe to forecast that in the future elementary and secondary education will be served by local, state, and federal agencies all joining together to improve education in the light of the need and circumstances in each state, community, or region involved. A quote from Hales, writing in Federal Control of Education, vividly pictures the significance of such a relationship:

⁵⁷Munger and Fenno, p. 17.

A program based on federal, state, and local cooperation, with the educational profession actively involved at all levels . . . a program in which most activities are administered by officials of the local school districts . . . could adapt itself to local needs and free communities from the delusion of a freedom that in effect has left them powerless to solve many problems. Under such a program competent leadership would become more accessible, additional protection and security for the profession would result, and an increase in efficiency with a corresponding decrease in cost should occur. Finally, the glaring inequality of educational services and opportunities would be reduced. There would be dangers and difficulties, it is true. But in it there is also promise for the future of American education.⁵⁸

⁵⁸Hales, p. 123.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Assuming federal aid to public education will continue, what are the implications in the use of such funds for education at the local level? Do educational leaders in Oklahoma perceive a trend toward more federal involvement? What do these educational leaders believe should be the involvement of the three levels of government in public education?

Oklahoma has a history of local autonomy in its public schools. As was noted in Chapter Two, the local financial support in Oklahoma is considerably higher than the national average of local support. But the recent federal aid laws are having definite effects on public schools in Oklahoma. Studies made by the Oklahoma State Department of Education show that schools across the state have greatly increased their expenditures and programs since N.D.E.A. of 1958 and E.S.E.A. of 1965. There has been an expansion of vocational programs in the high schools since the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Also, several vocational area schools have been formed and more are in the process.

Oklahoma received approximately 38 million dollars from the federal government for public education during 1967-68. Although the local support is above the national average, the federal support of 12.8 per

cent for Oklahoma is above the national average of 7.3 per cent.¹ In Oklahoma, as in the nation, there is probably not a school system that is not somehow affected by federal financial support.

The following is a quote from School Laws of Oklahoma relative to the function of local school boards.

The Board of Education of each school district shall have the power to elect its own officers; to make rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the law or rule and regulations of the State Board of Education, governing the board and the school system of the district; to maintain and operate a complete public school system of such character as the board of education shall deem best suited to the needs of the school district; . . . ²

The Annual Bulletin for Elementary and Secondary Schools published by the Oklahoma Department of Education says that "the board of education is responsible for the general policies of the school."³ It goes on to say that the board of education, upon the recommendation of the administrator, shall adopt general policies.

The superintendent is the executive officer of the board of education and the chief administrator of the district in independent districts in Oklahoma. In dependent districts the principal serves as the chief administrator although by Oklahoma School Law the County Superintendent is the executive officer of the board of education.

These three groups--superintendents, boards of education, and principals--are the primary educational leaders at the grass roots

¹Finance Division, Oklahoma State Department of Education, "Sources of Revenue and the Amount Collected From Each Source by the Common Schools of Oklahoma for the Fiscal Year 1967-68."

²School Laws of Oklahoma, 1967. Article IV, Section 58, p. 43.

³Annual Bulletin for Elementary and Secondary Schools, State of Oklahoma Department of Education, Bulletin No. 113 (July, 1968), p. 13.

of our public school system in the state of Oklahoma. Their concern for present and future problems of the local school systems is rationale to study their perceptions of federal involvement in Oklahoma public schools.

Scope of Study

Population

The population of this study was all school districts in Oklahoma. The population included all superintendents of independent districts, principals of dependent districts, and the school board president of all school districts in Oklahoma.

Sample

The first step in obtaining the samples was the coding of all the school districts listed in the Oklahoma Educational Directory by counties. The independent and dependent districts of each county were separated, and approximately one-half of the dependent districts and one-half of the independent districts from each county were drawn.

This is a stratified sampling technique. According to Popham, stratified random samples are particularly good representatives of the population.⁴

From the 445 independent districts in the population, a random sample of 255 was drawn. From the 226 dependent districts, a random sample of 117 was drawn. The samples of superintendents, principals,

⁴W. James Popham, Educational Statistics (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967), p. 47.

and board members were taken from these districts. The board president for the year 1968-69 was chosen from each of the randomly selected schools because of the availability of the names and addresses in the Oklahoma Educational Directory.

This gave a random sample of 255 superintendents, 117 principals, and 372 board members, or a total of 372 educational administrators and 372 board members. Table I lists the groups that make up the population, the number of random samples, and the percentage of the sample to the population.

TABLE I
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS AND THE NUMBER
OF RANDOM SAMPLES FOR EACH GROUP

Respondents	Totals	Sample	Per Cent of Total
Superintendents	445	255	57.2
Principals	226	117	51.8
Total Administrators	671	372	55.4
Independent Board Members	445	255	57.2
Dependent Board Members	226	117	51.8
Total Board Members	671	372	55.4

Development of the Questionnaire

The basic purpose of this study was to determine how local educational leaders in Oklahoma perceived the federal involvement in public education. To accomplish this purpose, a questionnaire was developed. A questionnaire used by McKnight in a study at Ohio State University was used as a guideline.⁵ There were several changes made in the instrument that was used by McKnight.

The McKnight questionnaire allowed multiple responses for each set of statements in the problem areas. According to McKnight this prohibited him from using a statistical test in his analysis of the data.⁶ The rationale in developing the questionnaire for this study was to devise statements in such a way as to allow the respondents to logically choose only one statement in each set of the problem areas. This allowed a statistical test to be used in analyzing the data.

This writer made several attempts in developing the questionnaire before the final draft was made. Assistance was sought and received from the writer's graduate faculty committee, Dr. Robert Brown of the Oklahoma State University, and professional colleagues of the Stillwater public schools.

Part I of the Questionnaire

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of some characteristics of the school district of the respondent and biographical

⁵John Allen McKnight, "Perceptions of Ohio State Educational Administrators Regarding the Use of Federal Funds for Education" (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1964), p. 242.

⁶Ibid., p. 68.

information about the respondent. These data were respondent's position; type of district; enrollment of district; assessed valuation of district; general fund budget for 1968-69; federal aid received during 1968-69; local millage voted for 1968-69; and age, formal education, and tenure of the respondent.

Part I of the questionnaire also included two questions which involved the respondent's perception relative to federal aid. They were asked to answer yes or no to the following question: Would you prefer one general federal aid law to be distributed to the states in preference to the several specific-purpose laws?

The respondents were also asked to rank, in order of importance to their district, a list of federal aid programs. These included vocational education, federally effected Public Law 815, N.D.E.A. Title III, E.S.E.A. Title I, E.S.E.A. Title II, and a blank was left for other preferences.

Part One contained a space for the address of the respondent if they desired a copy of the analyzed data. This, of course, was included in an effort to encourage more returns.

Part II of the Questionnaire

This part of the questionnaire involved statements relating to the five problem areas chosen for this study. Each problem area was identified as one phase of education which is affected by the use of specific-purpose federal aid. The five problem areas, as given in Chapter I, are curriculum development, curriculum balance, administration of federal funds, local response to federal aid programs, and fiscal policy.

Each problem area was headed by an introduction to the area and instruction for responding. Each problem area consisted of two sets of statements. In the first set the respondent was asked to select one statement which he perceived best represented the present situation relative to the problem area. In the second set of statements the respondent was asked to select one statement which he perceived best represented the optimum policy relative to the problem area.

The Problem Areas

Curriculum development involves what should be taught and how it should be taught. As changes in our society produce new concerns, new emphases in the curriculum are reflected. The statements in this problem area were designed to determine the respondent's perception of present federal involvement in curriculum development and his perception of the role this level of government should be playing in curriculum development.

The statements provided the respondent with the choice of local, state, federal, or a combination of these. This allowed the researcher not only to determine the respondent's perception of the role of the federal government but also his perception of the role of the local and state governments in curriculum development.

Curriculum balance implies an effort to meet several goals at one time. The development of educational programs which meet the needs of all the youth of our society has been an accepted goal of our educational leaders. Failure to adjust the curriculum to new concerns, as well as special attempts to meet these needs, may result in curriculum imbalance.

The statements in set one of this problem area were designed to determine if the respondent perceived the specific purpose programs as having created a curriculum imbalance or if he thought the local district had compensated for possible imbalance. The statements in the second set of this problem area were designed to determine how the respondent thought the districts should respond to federal aid relative to the problem of curriculum balance.

The administration of federal assistance programs for specific purposes requires assurance that the purposes of the legislation providing these programs are fulfilled by participating states and local school systems.

The statements for this problem area were designed to indicate how educational leaders in Oklahoma believe the federal funds are being administered and how they should be administered. The responses offered choices of local, state, federal, or a combination of these. Again the responses indicated the role of the state and local educational agencies as well as that of the federal government relative to this problem area.

The problem area of local response to federal aid programs was specifically dealing with the issue of local versus federal control. Local communities have been charged by state laws with the responsibility of educating their youth. The long history of local control of education in Oklahoma has created a pattern of decision making.

The statements in this problem area were developed to determine the educational leaders' perceptions of the present situation and the optimum situation relative to the acceptance of federal aid and the issue of local control.

Fiscal policy refers to the distribution of federal funds. Based solely on local tax revenue, the ideal of equal opportunity for every child in the United States is impossible. States and the federal government are providing more and more of the necessary revenues to meet the cost of an adequate education for all youth. The statements in this problem area specifically sought the perceptions of the respondents relative to the role the federal government is playing and should play in providing equal educational opportunity for every child in the United States.

Cover Letters

A cover letter was written by the researcher briefly explaining the study and asking for responses. Also, for the board members a short letter was prepared by John P. Weilmuenster, past president of the Oklahoma School Board Association. He introduced the researcher to the board members and asked for their cooperation in contributing to the study. This letter was on an Oklahoma School Board Association letterhead. A self-addressed and stamped envelope was prepared for the return of the questionnaire.

Analyses of Data

The study consisted of the independent variables of educational administrators and school board members. It also involved the intervening variables of enrollment, wealth, type of district, federal support, local support, age of respondent, formal education of respondent, and tenure of respondent. The dependent variables were the two questions in Part I of the questionnaire and the statements in each problem

area of Part II of the questionnaire.

The problem was to test if there was any significant difference in the way administrators and school board members responded to the dependent variables. Also a problem was to determine if the intervening variables had any significant effect on how these respondents answered the dependent variables. Thus an appropriate statistical test was needed.

The Statistic

In the choice of a statistical test the researcher must consider the manner in which the sample scores were drawn, the nature of the population from which the samples were drawn, and the kind of measurement or scaling which was employed in the scores.⁷

A parametric and nonparametric statistical test differ in that the former specifies certain conditions about the parameter of the population and the latter does not. Moreover, parametric tests do not require measurement so strong as that required for the nonparametric test. Most nonparametric tests apply to data in an ordinal scale, and some apply to data in a nominal scale.⁸

Since normal distribution of the population could not be assumed and the data was nominal in nature, a nonparametric test was chosen. When the data of research consist of frequencies in discrete categories, the chi square test may be used to determine the significance

⁷ Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 18.

⁸ Ibid., p. 31.

differences between two or more independent groups.⁹

When using the chi square test the hypothesis is usually that two groups differ with respect to the relative frequency with which group members fall in several categories. The primary characteristics of chi square are that it applies easily to any sample size and it utilizes nominal data. The data are generally presented in a contingency table which shows the observed frequencies.

The requirements for chi square are (1) that as many categories as possible will be used in order to make the test more sensitive, (2) no more than twenty per cent of the cells will have an expected frequency less than 5 and none will have an expected frequency less than one, and (3) all observations can be considered as independent. The third requirement means that when one sample is placed in a particular category, this has no effect on where any other sample will be placed.¹⁰

The observations for the statements relative to the problem areas and the question of general aid versus specific purpose aid were independent. The data for the two areas were nominal, therefore the chi square test was selected for the statistical analysis. Appropriate contingency tables were programmed to present the data in the manner by which the hypotheses were to be statistically tested.

The question concerning the importance of federal aid programs to the school district was not statistically tested. Because of the nature of the data, the requirement that all observations can be

⁹Siegel, p. 104.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 179.

considered as independent was not met and the chi square test could not be used. The data were nominal in nature, thus appropriate rank test could not be found. This limitation in analyzing this question was a result of the researcher's design of the question.

The data relative to this question were analyzed by programming tables showing the percentage that each federal program was chosen as first and second in importance by the respondents.

In testing to determine if the intervening variables had a significant effect on the responses of the educational leaders, the data for each intervening variable were grouped into three categories. The categories were low, medium, and high, and the extremities were tested for significant differences.

In considering the intervening variable of enrollment, only independent districts were used, as most dependent districts are small as compared to independent districts.

Collection of Data

The 744 questionnaires were mailed March 10, 1969. The first ten days found a regular return of several questionnaires a day from superintendents but a smaller return from principals and board members. At the end of three weeks 8 questionnaires had been received from board members from dependent districts, 54 from board members of independent districts, 36 from principals, and 150 from superintendents. This represented a return of 8 per cent, 21 per cent, 30 per cent, and 58 per cent, respectively.

The decision was made to send another questionnaire to board members. Sixty-five board members that had not returned the first

questionnaire were sent a second one. Once again a random sample technique was used. From the board members of independent districts that had not returned the first questionnaire 20 were drawn and mailed another questionnaire. From the board members of dependent districts that had not returned the first questionnaire a sample of 45 was drawn and mailed another questionnaire.

The cover letter enclosed in this second mailing indicated that it would not be necessary for them to complete the first seven questions on Part I of the questionnaire. The researcher could obtain these data at the State Department of Education. It was hoped that this would increase the number of responses. Of this second mailing only 12 were returned and used in the analysis.

The decision was made, at the time of the second mailing, to wait two weeks for further returns and then proceed with the analysis. No data were used that were received after April 22, 1969. Table II shows the number of questionnaires sent and the number and percentage of returns.

Of the sample of superintendents 76 per cent returned their questionnaire, while only 37.6 per cent of principals returned the questionnaire. This gave a total return of 63.9 per cent from administrators.

Board members of independent districts returned 28.3 per cent of the questionnaires, while those from dependent districts returned only 17.1 per cent. The total return of 24.7 per cent for board members was far below the return of the administrators.

There obviously must be some reasons for this differentiation in the number of returned questionnaires. Time, availability of data, and

involvement are probably three factors in explaining this difference.

TABLE II
THE NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES SENT AND RETURNED

Respondents	Sent	Returned	Per Cent
Superintendents	255	194	76.0
Principals	177	44	37.6
Total Administration	372	238	63.9
Independent Dist. Board Member	255	72	28.3
Dependent District Board Member	117	20	17.1
Total Board Members	372	92	24.7

Superintendents have more clerical help, usually, than do principals and board members. Principals of dependent schools usually are part-time teacher; hence time could have prevented them from completing the questionnaire. Board members receiving the questionnaire at their home may have put it aside until they found time to complete it and never found the time.

Board of education members in Oklahoma serve without compensation, and this is a secondary role for them. Their basic interest must be with their own businesses. Therefore, they are not as totally involved in the local educational program as are educational administrators.

Consequently, they may not have the interest, as do the administrators, in such studies as this one.

Dependent districts do not have a high school; therefore, they would not be as extensively involved in as many federal programs as independent districts. This may account for the small per cent of returns from this group of respondents.

The information relative to the school district that was asked for on the questionnaire was readily available to the administrators. The board members would not have this data available, thus had to make a special effort to contact the administrator to obtain it. This could have resulted in this group returning fewer questionnaires.

There may have been other reasons, but surely time, availability of data, and interest were contributing factors. Representativeness of the returned samples is more important than the number of samples. Although representativeness could not be statistically tested, it is analyzed later in this chapter.

Use of the Computer Center

As the data were received they were transferred to a coding form for punching IBM cards provided by the Oklahoma State University computer center. This form was designed to conform to that of the IBM cards.

When all the data had been transferred to the coding form, they were taken to the computer center. One of the card punchers of the computer center transferred these data to the IBM cards, thus producing a master set of 330 cards, each of which contained all the data for a particular questionnaire.

The computer programmer assigned for this project programmed the

transformation to give the intervening variables of wealth and federal support. The ratio of assessed valuation to enrollment of district was computed for each district to determine the wealth of the district. The ratio of federal aid received during the school year 1968-69 to the total general fund budget for 1968-69 was computed for each district to determine the federal support of each district.

The researcher requested a print-out giving the rank order of each group, superintendents, principals, board members of dependent districts, and board members of independent districts, relative to each of the intervening variables of size, wealth, federal support, and local support.

By analyzing these print-outs three categories for each of the intervening variables were determined. The questionnaire was designed so that the data relative to each of the intervening variables of age, education, and tenure were received in three categories. After the categories of low, medium, and high for each intervening variable were established, this information was given to the programmer, and he proceeded with the computing of the statistical test. A discussion and tables relative to these intervening variables follow.

Responses by Enrollment

The enrollment of the districts represented by the respondents ranged from 28 pupils to 71,000 pupils. It is easily seen from Table III that dependent districts are small in enrollment when compared with independent districts. The range of enrollment in the dependent districts was from 28 to 437, while the range in independent districts was from 151 to 71,000.

TABLE III
RESPONSES BY ENROLLMENT

Enrollment	Superintendent	Principal	Board Member Dependent District	Board Member Independent District
0-30	0	1	0	0
31-40	0	0	2	0
41-50	0	2	1	0
51-60	0	5	2	0
61-70	0	4	3	0
71-80	0	5	3	0
81-90	0	4	4	0
91-100	0	3	0	0
101-300	22	18	3	5
301-500	46	2	2	13
501-700	34	0	0	15
701-900	20	0	0	7
901-1100	18	0	0	5
1101-1300	11	0	0	7
1301-1500	5	0	0	1
1501-1700	9	0	0	0
1701-2000	3	0	0	1
2001-2500	7	0	0	4
2501-3500	4	0	0	2
3501-5000	6	0	0	5
5001-7000	2	0	0	1
7001-9000	3	0	0	2
9001-20000	4	0	0	3
20000-higher	0	0	0	1
Totals	194	44	20	72

In the analysis of the effects of the intervening variable enrollment done in the next chapter only superintendents and board members from independent districts were considered.

Although representativeness of responses was not statistically tested, a study of Table III shows that a larger number of responses was received from smaller districts than from larger districts. In Oklahoma there are many more small districts than large ones. Small and large are used here in terms of student enrollment. It would seem, therefore, that the responses are proportional to the population. Hence, it appears that there is representativeness in the responses relative to enrollment.

For testing purposes the districts represented by the superintendents and board members from independent districts were grouped into three categories according to enrollment. By analyzing Table III the categories selected were low, 101-700; medium, 701-1400; and high, greater than 1400. These categories are shown in Table IV with the number of respondents in each group.

Responses by Wealth

The range in the wealth of the districts represented by the respondents was from \$540 per pupil to \$132,211 per pupil. Table V shows the number of responses relative to some intervals of wealth. Of interest is the observation that respondents from districts having more than \$40,000 valuation per pupil are from dependent districts. These districts have a small number of students and a large assessed valuation.

TABLE IV
GROUPING BY ENROLLMENT

Group	Enrollment	Superintendent	Board Member
Low	101-700	102	33
Medium	701-1400	50	20
High	1401-higher	42	19
Totals		294	72

Again, in analyzing Table V it can be assumed that there is a representative response. The majority of school districts in Oklahoma are of average or lower wealth. The majority of the responses are from districts with \$7000 or less valuation per student.

A rule of thumb is that districts in Oklahoma of wealth less than \$4000 are considered below average, and those above \$7000 are considered above average. Using these rationale and an analysis of Table V, the respondents were grouped into three categories of wealth. These data are presented in Table VI.

Responses by Local Support

The local school districts in Oklahoma can vote a 10 mill local support levy, a five mill emergency levy, and a five mill building levy. The range of the local support of the districts represented by the respondents was from 0 through 20. Table VII verifies the claim of educational leaders that the majority of the districts in Oklahoma

are making the maximum effort in supporting their schools.

TABLE V
RESPONSES BY WEALTH

Wealth	Superintendent	Principal	Board Member Dependent District	Board Member Independent District
\$500-1000	4	2	0	0
1001-1500	6	1	0	4
1501-2000	4	4	4	4
2001-2500	13	3	1	0
2501-3000	18	1	0	6
3001-3500	21	3	1	10
3501-4000	17	1	0	3
4001-4500	19	2	1	7
4501-5000	15	0	0	7
5001-6000	12	2	1	8
6001-7000	12	5	1	7
7001-8000	9	2	2	5
8001-10000	13	1	2	5
10001-12000	7	2	2	3
12001-15000	9	5	1	3
15001-20000	8	7	1	2
20001-30000	5	3	1	1
30001-40000	2	0	1	0
40001-higher	0	3	4	0
Totals	194	44	2-	72

TABLE VI
GROUPING BY WEALTH

Group	Wealth	Administrator	Board Member
Low	\$500-4000	95	27
Medium	4001-7000	67	32
High	7001-higher	76	33
Totals		238	92

TABLE VII
RESPONSES BY LOCAL SUPPORT

Local Support (Mills)	Superintendent	Principal	Board Member Dependent District	Board Member Independent District
0-4	0	1	1	0
5	7	1	3	0
6-8	4	2	1	0
9-10	20	4	4	7
11-15	30	7	4	11
16-19	13	0	0	6
20	120	27	9	48
Totals	194	44	20	72

The respondents were grouped into three categories of local support. The groups selected were 0-10 mills, low; 11-15 mills, medium; and 16-20 mills, high. This would appear to give a representative response in each group. This breakdown is presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
GROUPING BY LOCAL SUPPORT

Group	Mills	Administrator	Board Member
Low	0-10	41	14
Medium	11-15	37	15
High	16-20	160	63
Totals		238	92

Responses by Federal Support

Table IX shows that the range of federal support is somewhat evenly distributed in the responses and that there is a representative sampling.

The average for federal support in Oklahoma is approximately 12%. Considering this and Table IX, the respondents were grouped into three categories. The intervals determined were from 0 to 7 per cent, low; from 7 to 14 per cent, medium; and from 14 and more, high. These groupings and the number of responses in each are shown in Table X.

TABLE IX
RESPONSES BY FEDERAL SUPPORT

Federal Support (Per Cent)	Superintendent	Principal	Board Member Dependent District	Board Member Independent District
0-1.9	11	7	7	3
2-3.9	22	4	1	14
4-5.9	23	8	2	12
6-6.9	15	3	1	11
7-7.9	10	2	1	0
8-9.9	18	2	1	4
10-13.9	26	1	3	8
14-19.9	39	4	0	16
20-24.9	15	8	2	1
25-29.9	5	2	0	16
30-49.9	6	1	2	1
50-higher	4	2	0	1
Totals	194	44	20	72

TABLE X
GROUPING BY FEDERAL SUPPORT

Group	Per Cent	Administrator	Board Member
Low	0 to 7	93	51
Medium	7 to 14	59	17
High	14 and higher	86	24
Totals		238	92

Responses by Age and Tenure

The questionnaire was designed so that the respondent had to choose one of three categories of less than 35 years, from 35 to 45 years, and greater than 45 years. Table XI shows that there were only three responses from board members who were less than 35 years old. Consequently a chi-square statistic was not obtained relative to the low and high age groups of board members.

TABLE XI
GROUPING BY AGE

Group	Age	Administrators	Board Members
Low	Less than 35 years	25	3
Medium	35-45	90	28
High	Over 45	119	41
Totals		234	72

The questionnaire provided three choices for tenure: less than 10 years, 10-20 years, or more than 20 years. Table XII shows that data were only received from 4 board members who had served on the board of education for more than 20 years. Again, a statistic was not obtained for the high and low groups of board members relative to this intervening variable.

TABLE XII
GROUPING BY TENURE

Group	Tenure	Administrators	Board Members
Low	Less than 10 years	121	62
Medium	10-20	64	25
High	More than 20	49	4
Totals		234	91

Responses by Education

This intervening variable was only checked to see if it significantly affected board members' responses to the dependent variables. All superintendents in Oklahoma must have at least a Master's degree, and the majority of the principals must have one. Hence, the educational level of these administrators cannot be clearly differentiated.

As Table XIII shows, the board members were divided into categories of less than a high school education, those with a high school education, and those with at least a Bachelor's degree.

Summary

Randomly selected samples of two groups of educational leaders in Oklahoma, educational administrators and school board members, were sent questionnaires in an attempt to determine their perceptions of federal involvement in public schools.

TABLE XIII
GROUPING BY EDUCATION

Group	Education	Board Members
Low	Less than high school	14
Medium	High school	51
High	At least a Bachelor's degree	16
Total		81

It was observed that the number of returned questionnaires varied significantly between the two groups. It was hypothesized that board members did not have the interest that administrators do in this type of study, the basic reason being that they are not as involved in the educational process as are the administrators.

Rationale was given for choosing the statistic chi square for the testing of the hypotheses. The limitation on testing the hypotheses relating to the ranking of federal programs was given.

The limitation of representativeness was discussed relative to each of the intervening variables. It was noted that this was not statistically tested and the reader should be aware of this while reading the presentation of the findings in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The Oklahoma State University computer center has a program for the chi square statistic that was selected for this study. A chi square statistic for each of the following was obtained relative to both sets in each problem area and the question concerning preference for general federal aid. These statistics were checked for significance at the .05 level.

1. Total board members and administrators.
2. Administrators by type of district; dependent and independent.
3. Board members by type of district; dependent and independent.
4. Administrators by enrollment of district; low and high groups.
5. Board members by enrollment of district; low and high groups.
6. Administrators by wealth of district; low and high groups.
7. Board members by wealth of district; low and high groups.
8. Administrators by federal support; low and high groups.
9. Board Members by federal support; low and high groups.
10. Administrators by local support; low and high groups.
11. Board members by local support; low and high groups.
12. Administrators by age; low and high groups.
13. Administrators by tenure; low and high groups.
14. Board members by education; low and high groups.

In this chapter the above data will be presented and analyzed. Percentages of the total responses of the administrators and board members for each of the problem areas and the preference for general aid question will be presented in contingency tables.

Tables of the intervening variables that significantly affect the perception of the administrators or board members are presented in the text of this chapter, while those that do not are presented in the Appendix. The statistical test for the intervening variables was programmed on the low and high groups, but the medium group is also presented in the tables.

In this discussion, significant difference means that the groups being considered differ statistically with respect to the relative frequency with which group members responded to the dependent variables. The dependent variables are the statements in each problem area and the question relative to educational leaders' preference for general federal aid. These differences are verbally described.

The rankings of the federal programs according to their importance by the respondents are presented and analyzed.

Curriculum Development-- Present Situation

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XIV)

There was a significant difference in the administrators' and board members' perception of the present situation relative to curriculum development. Of the administrators, 13 per cent thought that developing adequate curricula is being done at the local level. Of the board members, 22 per cent responded this way. Thirty-seven per cent

of the administrators believe the local, state, and federal educational agencies are jointly developing the curricula of our schools. Twenty-one per cent of the board members perceived this.

Of interest is the fact that only 5 per cent of the administrators and board members perceived the federal government as presently developing curriculum for the local schools.

An analysis of Table XIV shows that administrators as a group differ in their perception of who is developing the curricula for the public schools. Thirty-seven per cent believe it is presently a total state and federal partnership while 36 per cent perceive only the local and state as presently developing curricula. A majority of the respondents saw curricula as being developed by a combination of educational agencies.

Type of District (Table XIV)

The type of district did have a significant effect on the board members' perception of the present situation relative to curriculum development. Of the board members from independent districts, 14 per cent perceived the state as playing the major role in developing curricula, while 37 per cent of the board members from dependent districts indicated this.

Sixteen per cent of the board members from dependent districts perceived that the U. S. Office of Education is determining curriculum policies for the public schools, while only 3 per cent of board members from independent districts responded in this way.

Of the independent board members, 26 per cent perceive the local, state, and federal educational agencies as jointly developing the

curricula of our schools. Only 5 per cent of the board members from dependent districts see this relationship.

TABLE XIV
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - PRESENT SITUATION
BY TOTALS AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Totals*		Type of District			
			Adm.		Bd. Mem.*	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is being done at the local level	13	22	14	13	21	23
B. The State Department of Education is playing the major role in developing adequate curricula for our public school system	11	19	12	11	37	14
C. Because of Federal financial assistance to schools, the U. S. Office of Education is determining curriculum policies for the public schools . .	6	6	9	4	16	3
D. The local, state, and federal educational agencies are jointly developing the curricula of our schools .	37	21	40	36	5	26
E. The state and local educational agencies are developing curricula for the public schools	36	32	26	35	21	35

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Type of district did not significantly affect the administrators' perception of the present situation relative to curriculum development.

Enrollment of District (Table XV)

Significance was found in the way administrators in high and low enrollment districts perceive the present situation in curriculum development. Table XV shows that 24 per cent of the administrators in the larger districts, more than 1400 students, as compared to 10 per cent in the smaller districts, less than 701 students, perceive the local schools to be developing adequate curricula.

In the larger districts 45 per cent of the administrators believe that the local, state, and federal educational agencies are jointly developing the curricula of our schools. This compares with 35 per cent of the administrators from small districts.

Only 2 per cent of the administrators in the larger schools perceive the State Department of Education to be playing the major role in developing curricula for our schools. This compared to 11 per cent of the administrators from small districts.

Enrollment did not significantly affect board members' perception of the present situation relative to curriculum development.

Other Intervening Variables

The intervening variables of wealth, federal support, local support, education, age, and tenure did not significantly affect administrators' or board members' perception of the present situation relative to the problem area of curriculum development. These data are presented in Appendix B.

TABLE XV
 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - PRESENT
 SITUATION BY ENROLLMENT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators*			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is being done at the local level	10	8	24	11	29	33
B. The State Department of Education is playing the major role in developing adequate curricula for our public school system	11	18	2	22	14	0
C. Because of federal financial assistance to schools, the U. S. Office of Education is determining curriculum policies for the public schools . . .	8	0	2	4	0	6
D. The local, state, and federal educational agencies are jointly developing the curricula of our schools . .	35	34	45	19	29	33
E. The state and local educational agencies are developing curricula for the public schools	36	40	26	44	29	28

L = 101-700; M = 701-1400; H = 1401-higher.

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Curriculum Development--
As Should Be

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XVI)

There was no significant difference in board members' and administrators' perception of the optimum policy relative to this problem area. An analysis of Table XVI reveals that there are some variations in responses.

There were 17 per cent of the administrators who thought that curriculum development should be a local responsibility, while there were 29 per cent of the board members who perceive this to be the best policy. There was complete agreement in that neither group wants the federal educational agency developing curricula for the local schools.

More administrators, 31 per cent, than board members, 23 per cent, think the development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local, state, and federal educational agencies. Almost half of each group perceive that development of curricula should be a joint responsibility of the local and state educational agencies.

Although there was not a statistical difference, from Table XVI it appears that board members favor local responsibility in developing curricula more strongly than do administrators.

Type of District (Table XVI)

Type of district had a significant effect on administrators' perception of the optimum policy relative to curriculum development. From Table XVI may be seen that 32 per cent of the administrators from dependent districts believe curriculum development is a local responsibility, while only 14 per cent of the administrators from independent

districts perceive this.

TABLE XVI
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - AS SHOULD BE
BY TOTALS AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Type of District					
	Totals		Adm. [*]		Bd. Mem.	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is a local responsibility	17	29	32	14	50	24
B. Curriculum development is a state responsibility; the State Department of Education should establish curriculum for our public schools	2	2	2	2	5	1
C. As new national concerns are identified, the U. S. Office of Education should play the major role in curriculum development	1	0	0	1	0	0
D. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local and state educational agencies	50	46	46	51	35	49
E. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local, state, and federal educational agencies	31	23	21	33	10	26

* Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Of the administrators from dependent districts, only 21 per cent perceive that development of curricula should be a joint responsibility of the local, state, and federal educational agencies. This compared with 33 per cent of administrators from independent districts.

Type of district did not significantly affect board members' perceptions of the optimum policy relative to this problem area. It is of interest to note that 50 per cent of the board members from dependent districts think that curriculum development is a local responsibility.

Other Intervening Variables

The other intervening variables did not significantly affect board members' or administrators' perception of the optimum policy relative to curriculum development. These data are presented in Appendix B.

Curriculum Development--Summary

There was a significant difference in administrators' and board members' perception of the present situation relative to curriculum development. But these educational leaders were in agreement concerning the optimum policy relative to this problem area. Both groups indicated that the U. S. Office of Education should not play the major role in curriculum development and that the development of curricula is a local and state responsibility.

The intervening variable of type of district had a significant effect on the way board members perceived the present situation and the way administrators perceive the optimum policy.

The enrollment of the district significantly affected the perception of administrators relative to the present situation in this problem area.

Curriculum Balance--Present Situation

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XVII)

There was no significant difference in board members' and administrators' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. Of the administrators, 28 per cent definitely feel the use of federal funds has created an imbalance in the curriculum. Twenty per cent of the board members perceive this. More of the board members, 33 per cent, than the administrators, 25 per cent, perceive that federal funds have not created an imbalance.

The largest per cent of the administrators, 47 per cent, and board members, 46 per cent, perceive that through redistribution of local funds, districts compensate for possible imbalance resulting from use of federal funds for selected curriculum areas. This would indicate that these educational leaders do perceive curriculum balance as a potential problem.

Other Intervening Variables

None of the intervening variables had a significant effect on administrators' and board members' perception of the present situation relative to curriculum balance. These data are presented in Appendix B.

TABLE XVII
CURRICULUM BALANCE - PRESENT
SITUATION BY TOTALS

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Adm.	Bd.
A. The use of federal funds to stimulate certain curriculum areas, such as mathematics and science, has created an imbalance in the curriculum	28	21
B. Specific-purpose federal aid as now effective has not created an imbalance in the curriculum	25	33
C. Through redistribution of local funds, districts compensate for possible imbalance resulting from use of federal funds for selected curriculum areas	47	46

Curriculum Balance--As Should Be

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XVIII)

There was no significant difference in administrators' and board members' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. Table XVIII shows that only 12 per cent of the administrators and 9 per cent of the board members feel you should refuse federal aid because of the problem of curriculum balance.

The majority of these educational leaders perceive that the local district should redistribute funds at the local level to compensate for possible imbalance caused by federal assistance. Sixty-nine per cent of the administrators and 67 per cent of the board members responded this way.

TABLE XVIII
CURRICULUM BALANCE - AS SHOULD BE
BY TOTALS AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Totals		Type of District			
			Adm.		Bd. Mem.*	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
A. Local districts should oppose the use of federal assistance for specific areas of the curriculum because of the curriculum imbalance it has created	12	9	9	12	10	3
B. Local districts should accept federal funds for specific-purpose programs with the assumption that they have not created an imbalance in the curriculum	20	24	26	18	45	18
C. Local districts should redistribute funds at the local level to compensate for possible imbalance caused by use of federal assistance to specific curriculum areas	69	67	65	70	45	74

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Type of District (Table XVIII)

There was a significant difference in board members' from dependent districts and board members' from independent districts perception of the best policy relative to curriculum balance. Of the board members from dependent districts, 45 per cent indicated we should accept federal funds with the assumption that they had created an imbalance, while only 18 per cent of the board members from independent districts responded this way.

Forty-five per cent of the board members from dependent districts and 74 per cent from independent districts indicated that the local district should redistribute the local funds to compensate for possible imbalance.

Possibly the two groups perceive the problem of curriculum balance differently because dependent districts do not have a high school. The problem of curriculum balance may be more pronounced in high schools than in elementary schools.

Type of district did not significantly affect administrators' perception of the best policy relative to curriculum balance.

Other Intervening Variables

The other intervening variables did not significantly affect the administrators' or board members' perception of the best policy relative to curriculum balance. These data are presented in Appendix B.

Curriculum Balance--Summary

It was found that there was no significant difference in the perception of administrators and board members relative to curriculum balance. These educational leaders agree that local districts are and should redistribute local funds to compensate for possible curriculum imbalance.

The type of district was the only intervening variable that significantly affected the board members' or administrators' perception relative to curriculum balance. More board members from dependent districts thought you should accept federal aid with the assumption that it has not created an imbalance in the curriculum.

Administration of Federal Funds-- Present Situation

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XIX)

There was a significant difference in administrators' and board members' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. Of the administrators, 69 per cent perceive that most federal programs are supervised by the State Department of Education, while 53 per cent of the board members so indicated. Another difference is that only 3 per cent of the administrators think the federal educational agency directly administers the federal programs, while 13 per cent of the board members perceive this.

Seven per cent of the board members believe the federal programs are administered primarily by the local districts, while less than one-half of one per cent of the administrators perceive this.

TABLE XIX

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - PRESENT
SITUATION BY TOTALS AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Totals*		Type of District			
			Adm.*		Bd. Mem.	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
A. Most federal programs of assistance are supervised by the State Department of Education, local districts being responsible to the State Department of Education	69	53	58	71	40	56
B. The federal educational agency guarantees that the purposes of its program are fulfilled, and secures evidence of such fulfillment directly from the local level	3	13	9	1	25	10
C. The administration of federal assistance programs is handled primarily by the local school district	0	8	2	0	10	7
D. The administration of federal assistance programs is being jointly supervised by the state and federal educational agencies	29	26	31	28	25	27

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Type of District (Table XIX)

This intervening variable had a significant effect on the administrators' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. The major difference was that 58 per cent of the administrators

in dependent districts and 71 per cent of the administrators in independent districts perceive that federal programs are being administered by the State Department of Education.

Nine per cent of the administrators in dependent districts and only 1 per cent of administrators in independent districts perceived the federal programs being administered by the federal educational agency.

Type of district did not significantly affect the board members' perception of the present situation relative to the administration of federal funds.

Other Intervening Variables

None of the other intervening variables had a significant effect on these educational leaders' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. These data are presented in Appendix B.

Administration of Federal Funds-- As Should Be

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XX)

There was no significant difference in the administrators' and board members' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. The majority of each group believe federal funds should be supervised at the state level with the local district responsible to the State Department of Education only.

There was a slight difference in board members' and administrators' response to the statement that the administration of federal aid programs should be handled primarily by the local school district.

Table XX shows that 32 per cent of the administrators and 19 per cent of the board members perceive this to be the best policy.

These educational leaders were in agreement that the federal programs should not be administered by the U. S. Office of Education.

TABLE XX
ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - AS SHOULD BE
BY TOTALS AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Totals		Type of District			
			Adm.*		Bd. Mem.*	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
A. All federal assistance programs should limit supervision to the state level, responsibility of local districts to be to the State Department of Education only	67	54	43	72	30	61
B. All federal assistance programs to local schools should be administered by the U. S. Office of Education . .	0	1	2	1	5	0
C. The administration of federal assistance programs should be handled primarily by the local school district, not being directly responsible to the state or federal educational agencies	19	32	36	15	55	25
D. The administration of federal assistance programs should be the joint responsibility of the state and federal educational agencies . . .	13	13	18	12	10	14

* Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Type of District (Table XX)

This variable had a significant effect on administrators' and board members' perception of the best policy relative to the administration of federal funds.

Of the administrators in dependent districts, 43 per cent believe federal funds should be administered by the state and 36 per cent believe they should be administered by the local district. This compares with 72 per cent of the administrators in independent districts who believe the federal funds should be administered by the state educational agency and 15 per cent who believe they should be administered by the local district.

This same trend is indicated by board members in dependent and independent districts. Thirty per cent of the board members from dependent districts and 61 per cent of the board members from independent districts believe the federal funds should be administered by the State Department of Education.

The majority of the board members from dependent districts, 55 per cent, believe the federal funds should be administered at the local level, while only 25 per cent of the board members from independent districts indicated this.

It is quite clear that educational leaders from dependent districts are more in favor of federal funds being administered by the local district than are the education leaders from independent districts.

Other Intervening Variables

The other intervening variable did not significantly affect administrators' or board members' perception of the best policy.

relative to administration of federal funds. These data are presented in Appendix B.

Administration of Federal Funds-- Summary

Board members and administrators differ significantly in the way they perceive the present situation but are in agreement in what should be the policy relative to administration of federal funds.

Type of district affected administrators' perception of the present situation and their perception of the best policy. It affected the board members' perception of what should be the best policy.

Educational leaders from the independent districts strongly favor federal funds being administered by the State Department of Education. Educational leaders from the dependent districts lean toward the federal programs being administered by the local districts.

Local Response to Federal Aid Programs-- Present Situation

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XXI)

No significant difference was found in board members' and administrators' perception of the present situation relative to local response to federal aid programs.

Of the administrators, 39 per cent perceive that the local tax burden is so heavy that federal aid for education has been inevitable. Also, 18 per cent indicated federal aid has not led to less local control, while only 6 per cent perceive that federal aid has reduced community concern for education.

TABLE XXI
 LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - PRESENT
 SITUATION BY TOTALS AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Totals		Type of District			
			Adm.*		Bd. Mem.	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
A. The local tax burden is so heavy that federal assistance for education has been inevitable	39	29	29	42	30	29
B. Local general acceptance of federal assistance has not led to less local control of our schools	18	30	13	19	25	32
C. Local resistance to federal assistance programs has been essential to continued local control of our schools	7	10	18	4	25	6
D. A. and B.	23	18	24	22	10	20
E. Local community concern for education has been reduced with increased financial assistance from outside the local district	6	5	7	6	10	3
F. A. and F.	7	8	9	7	0	10

* Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Of the board members, 30 per cent perceive federal aid as not leading to less local control, while only 5 per cent perceive that federal aid has reduced community concern for education. Twenty-nine per cent of the board members and 39 per cent of the administrators indicated that the local tax burden had made federal aid inevitable.

Type of District (Table XXI)

This variable had a significant effect on administrators' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. Forty-two per cent of the administrators from independent districts and only 29 per cent of the administrators from dependent districts perceive the local tax burden as being so heavy that federal aid is inevitable.

Another difference is in the response to the statement that local resistance to federal programs has been essential to continued local control of our schools. Eighteen per cent of the administrators from dependent districts selected this statement, while only 4 per cent of the administrators from independent districts selected it.

Type of district did not affect board members' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. There is one variation that should be noted as it corresponds to the responses of the administrators. Twenty-five per cent of the board members from dependent and only 6 per cent of the board members from independent districts perceive that local resistance to federal assistance programs has been essential to continued local control of our schools.

Other Intervening Variables

The other intervening variables did not significantly affect the administrators' or board members' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. These data are presented in Appendix B.

Local Response to Federal Aid Programs--
As Should Be

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XXII)

There is a significant difference in administrators' and board members' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. Twenty-six per cent of the administrators and 20 per cent of the board members think the community should accept federal funds because of the local tax burden.

Nine per cent of the administrators and 19 per cent of the board members believe all federal funds belong to the people, thus the community should accept them without fear of federal control.

Responses to statements D and F indicate that 55 per cent of the administrators believe the community should be involved in understanding the purpose of each federal assistance program, in determining the degree of financial aid to the local districts, and in assessing the potential loss of control of the educational program at the local level. Forty-five per cent of the board members perceived this.

It is of interest and significant that only 4 per cent of the administrators and 8 per cent of the board members thought the local community should refuse federal funds and make the additional effort to provide for an equivalent program locally.

Type of District (Table XXII)

The type of district significantly affected administrators' perception of what should be the best policy relative to local response to federal aid programs. Table XXII shows the greatest variation in

TABLE XXII
 LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - AS SHOULD
 BE BY TOTALS AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Totals*		Type of District			
			Adm.*		Bd. Mem.	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
A. Because the local tax burden is so great, the community should accept federal assistance for the public schools	26	20	24	27	20	19
B. As federal funds belong to the people, the local community should accept them for specific-purpose programs without concern of federal control	9	19	9	9	30	15
C. The local community should refuse federal funds and make the additional effort to provide for an equivalent program locally	4	8	15	1	10	7
D. The school officials should involve the community in understanding the purpose of each federal assistance program, in determining the degree of financial aid to the local districts, and in assessing the potential loss of control of the educational program at the local level	22	23	20	22	20	24
E. B. and D.	7	10	9	6	0	15
F. A. and D.	33	22	24	35	20	22

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

that 15 per cent of the administrators from dependent districts and only 1 per cent of the administrators from independent districts perceive the best policy to be to refuse federal funds and make the additional local effort to provide an equivalent program.

More of the administrators from independent districts selected statements D and F than did the administrators from dependent districts. These statements indicated that because of the heavy local tax burden the community should accept federal aid and that the school officials should involve the community in decisions relative to federal programs.

Type of district did not significantly affect the board members' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area.

Other Intervening Variables

None of the other variables significantly affected the board members' or administrators' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. These data are presented in Appendix B.

Local Response to Federal Aid Programs--Summary

While there was no significant difference in the way board members and administrators perceive the present situation relative to this problem area, there was a significant difference in their perception of the best policy. More administrators than board members thought the community should be involved in decisions regarding federal programs.

Type of district affected administrators' perception of the present situation and their perception of the best policy relative to this problem area.

Administrators and board members from dependent districts appear to be more concerned with the issue of federal control than do the educational leaders from independent districts.

Fiscal Policy--Present Situation

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XXIII)

No significant difference was found in administrators' and board members' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. A study of Table XXIII does indicate some interesting responses.

It is clear from these educational leaders' responses to statements A, D, and E that they perceive the federal aid programs as equalizing educational opportunities between the states. But there is also a strong feeling that these programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within the states.

The number of responses to statements C and E would appear to mean that these educational leaders feel that the State Legislature and State Department of Education have not enacted laws and regulations that provide adequate equalization of educational opportunities within the state.

Enrollment of District (Table XXIV)

Enrollment of district significantly affected administrators' perception of the present situation relative to the problem area of fiscal policy. Responses to statements A, D, and E show that administrators from high enrollment districts, greater than 1400 students, do not perceive that the federal programs have resulted in equalizing

educational opportunities between the states to any great degree. These administrators feel very strongly that the federal programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within the state.

TABLE XXIII
FISCAL POLICY - PRESENT SITUATION BY TOTALS
(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Adm.	Bd.
A. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities between the states	16	20
B. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within each state	36	30
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education have enacted laws and regulations that provide adequate equalization of educational opportunities within the state	10	21
D. A. and B.	18	14
E. A. and C.	20	14

The administrators from low enrollment districts, less than 701 students, perceive that the federal programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities both within and between states.

Other Intervening Variables

The other intervening variables did not significantly affect board members' or administrators' perception of the present situation relative to fiscal policy. These data are presented in Appendix B.

TABLE XXIV
FISCAL POLICY - PRESENT SITUATION
BY ENROLLMENT OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators*			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities between the states . .	21	10	0	18	16	28
B. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within each state . . .	27	33	61	21	32	39
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education have enacted laws and regulations that provide adequate equalization of educational opportunities within the state	11	4	13	25	26	6
D. A. and B.	17	25	16	25	5	11
E. A. and C.	24	27	10	11	21	17

L = 101-700; M = 701-1400; H = 1401-higher.

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Fiscal Policy--As Should Be

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XXV)

There was no significant difference in the administrators' and board members' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. These two groups definitely believe the federal government should not be responsible for equalizing educational opportunity within the states. A study of Table XXV clearly shows that these educational leaders perceive that the federal programs should result in equalizing educational opportunity between the states and that the state legislature and State Department of Education should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the state.

Type of District (Table XXV)

This variable did significantly affect administrators' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. Eleven per cent of the administrators from dependent districts and only 2 per cent of the administrators from independent districts thought the federal government should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the state.

Responses to statements A, D, and E indicate that more of the administrators from independent districts than from dependent districts think the federal government should equalize educational opportunities between the states.

There was no significant difference in the board members' perception of the best policy relative to fiscal policy.

TABLE XXV
FISCAL POLICY - AS SHOULD BE BY TOTALS
AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Totals		Type of District			
			Adm.*		Bd. Mem.	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
A. Federal assistance programs should result in equalizing educational opportunities between the states	19	19	13	21	21	18
B. The federal government should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the states	4	6	11	2	0	7
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state	30	33	39	28	47	30
D. A. and B.	10	8	13	9	5	9
E. A. and C.	37	34	40	26	26	37

* Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Wealth of District (Table XXVI)

Although, statistically, wealth of the district significantly affected administrators' perception of the best policy relative to fiscal policy, an analysis of Table XXVI would indicate that both groups are saying the same thing.

TABLE XXVI

FISCAL POLICY - AS SHOULD BE
BY WEALTH OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators*			Board Members*		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs should result in equalizing educational opportunities between the states . . .	22	23	13	4	25	25
B. The federal government should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the states	2	8	3	15	0	3
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state	20	32	41	27	28	44
D. A. and B.	12	12	7	19	3	3
E. A. and C.	44	26	37	35	44	25

L = \$500-\$4000; M = \$4001-\$7000; H = \$7001-higher.

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Responses to statements A, C, and E indicate that the respondents believe the best policy related to fiscal policy is for the federal government to equalize between states and the state agencies to equalize educational opportunities within the state. Of the administrators from low wealth districts, less than \$4000 valuation per student, 86 per cent selected either statement A, C, or E. Of the administrators

from high wealth districts, more than \$7000 valuation per student, 91 per cent selected statement A, C, or E.

Forty-one per cent of the administrators from high wealth districts selected the statement that indicated the State Legislature and State Department of Education should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the state. Only 20 per cent of the administrators from low wealth districts responded this way. This may indicate that administrators from high wealth districts are more concerned with equalization within the state than educational equalization nationwide.

Wealth of district also significantly affected board members' perception of the optimum policy relative to this problem area. Responses to statements A, C, and E by board members from low wealth districts, 65 per cent, was much lower than similar responses from board members from high wealth districts, 94 per cent. This would seem to imply that board members from low support districts are not as definite about the respective responsibilities of the state and federal governments relative to equalization of educational opportunities as are board members from high support districts.

Board members from high wealth districts, like administrators from high wealth districts, seem to be more concerned with state equalization than national equalization of educational opportunities.

Federal Support (Table XXVII)

Federal support significantly affected board members' perception of the optimum policy relative to fiscal policy. Analysis of Table XXVII seems to imply that board members from high federal support

districts, greater than 14 per cent of the general fund budget, are more concerned that federal aid programs should result in equalizing educational opportunities between states than are the board members from low federal support districts, less than 7 per cent of general budget.

TABLE XXVII

FISCAL POLICY - AS SHOULD BE
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators			Board Members*		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs should result in equalizing educational opportunities between the states . . .	22	18	21	22	15	15
B. The federal government should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the states	4	2	5	6	5	5
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state . . .	34	31	25	46	25	10
D. A. and B.	8	10	13	6	10	10
E. A. and C.	35	40	36	20	45	60

L = 0 to 7%; M = 7 to 14%; H = 14% and higher.

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Forty-six per cent of the board members from low federal support districts selected the statement that said the State Legislature and State Department of Education should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state. Only 10 per cent of the board members from the high federal support districts selected this statement.

Other Intervening Variables

The other intervening variables did not significantly affect the board members' or administrators' perception of the optimum policy relative to fiscal policy. These data are presented in Appendix B.

Fiscal Policy--Summary

There was no significant difference in administrators' and board members' perception of the present situation or their perception of the optimum policy relative to this problem area.

These educational leaders perceive that the federal programs are presently resulting in equalization of educational opportunities within the state, but they do not think the federal government should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state.

Responses from both groups of these educational leaders indicate that the State Legislature and State Department of Education are not doing enough relative to equalization within the state.

They are in agreement that the State Legislature and the State Department of Education should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the state, and the federal government should be responsible for equalization between the states.

Enrollment of district had a significant effect on administrators' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area. Sixty-one per cent of the administrators from high enrollment districts perceive the present federal programs as equalizing educational opportunities within the state.

Type of district and wealth of district significantly affected administrators' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. Wealth and federal support significantly affected board members' perception of the best policy relative to fiscal policy.

Preference for General Federal Aid

Total Administrators and Board Members (Table XXIII)

There was no significant difference in administrators' and board members' preference for general federal aid over specific purpose aid. These educational leaders very strongly favored general federal aid. As Table XXVIII shows, 84 per cent of the administrators and 79 per cent of the board members answered "yes" to the question.

Type of District (Table XXVIII)

There was a significant difference in the way administrators from dependent districts and administrators from independent districts responded to this question. From Table XXVIII is seen that only 64 per cent of the administrators from dependent districts favored general federal aid, while 88 per cent of the administrators from independent districts favored general aid.

TABLE XXVIII
PREFERENCE FOR GENERAL FEDERAL AID
BY TOTAL AND TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Question: Would you prefer general federal aid over specific-purpose aid?	Totals		Type of District			
			Adm.*		Bd. Mem.	
	Ad.	Bd.	Dep.	Ind.	Dep.	Ind.
Yes	84	79	64	88	65	83
No	16	21	36	12	35	17

* Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Statistically there was no significant difference in the way board members from independent districts and board members from dependent districts answered this question. Again, though, the respondents from the independent districts favored general aid more strongly than those from the dependent districts.

Federal Support (Table XXIX)

There was a significant difference in the way administrators from low federal support districts and administrators from high federal support districts responded to this question.

Both groups of administrators were strongly in favor of general aid, but those from low federal support districts said "yes" 87 per cent of the time and those from high federal support districts said "yes" 75 per cent of the time.

TABLE XXIX
 PREFERENCE FOR GENERAL FEDERAL AID
 BY FEDERAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Question: Would you prefer general federal aid over specific-purpose aid?	<u>Administrators</u> *			<u>Board Members</u>		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
Yes	87	90	75	86	70	70
No	13	10	25	14	30	30

L = 0 to 7%; M = 7 to 14%; H = 14 and higher %.

* Significant at the .05 level of significance.

The administrators in the high federal support schools may be a little apprehensive about the amount of aid they would receive in general aid as compared to what they receive under the present programs.

Statistically there was no significant difference in the way board members responded to this question; but, like the administrators, the board members from low federal support districts were more in favor of general aid than those from high federal support districts.

Local Support (Table XXX)

This intervening variable affected administrators' response to the question of general federal aid versus specific-purpose aid. Both groups are in favor of general aid, but, as Table XXX indicates,

administrators from high local support districts, more than 16 mills, were more strongly in favor of general aid than were administrators from low local support districts, less than 11 mills. Low local support districts usually are those that have a high valuation and thus do not need to vote the maximum millage. Consequently, more of these administrators may perceive that they benefit from present federal programs than they would from general federal aid.

Local support of the district did not significantly affect board members' perception relative to this question.

TABLE XXX
PREFERENCE FOR GENERAL FEDERAL AID
BY LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Question: Would you prefer general federal aid over specific-purpose aid?	<u>Administrators</u> *			<u>Board Members</u>		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
Yes	73	76	89	71	87	79
No	28	24	12	29	13	21

L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

* Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Other Intervening Variables

The other variables did not significantly affect administrators' or board members' preference for general federal aid. These data are presented in Appendix B.

Summary of Educational Leaders' Preference for General Aid

Administrators and board members strongly favored general federal aid over specific-purpose aid.

It was found that the intervening variable of type of district, federal support, and local support significantly affected administrators' response to this question.

Importance of Federal Programs

Table XXXI gives the federal programs that the respondents were asked to rank in order of importance to their district. It gives the number of administrators and board members that indicated the particular federal program did not apply to their district and the number that ranked the programs. Of the respondents that ranked the program, the per cent that ranked the program first and second is given.

Public Law 874 was not listed on the questionnaire. As the data were tabulated, it was observed that this federal program was being placed in the blank provided for "other" programs. Since P. L. 874 was the only program placed in the blank that had a ranking of first or second, the data are presented.

Sixteen per cent of the administrators ranked vocational education first and 40 per cent ranked it second. This compared with 33 per cent

of the board members who ranked it first and 27 per cent who ranked it second. Both groups obviously feel the federal vocational programs are important to their district.

TABLE XXXI

IMPORTANCE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS: PER CENT THAT EACH PROGRAM WAS SELECTED FIRST OR SECOND

Federal Programs	Number That Programs Do Not Affect		Number of Responses		Per Cent Ranked First		Per Cent Ranked Second	
	Adm.	Bd.M.	Adm.	Bd.M.	Adm.	Bd.M.	Adm.	Bd.M.
A. Vocational Education	61	29	177	63	16	33	40	27
B. Public Law 815	142	58	96	34	22	12	28	27
C. NDEA Title III	43	26	195	66	3	5	16	14
D. ESEA Title I	19	14	219	78	66	53	24	33
E. ESEA Title II	35	26	203	66	2	2	14	17
F. Public Law 874	182	69	56	23	52	52	18	30

Administrators and board members perceive Title I ESEA as being the most important federal program. Sixty-six per cent of the administrators ranked it first and 24 per cent second. Fifty-three per cent of the board members perceived it as being the most important program, and 33 per cent ranked it second.

Table XXXI shows that the educational leaders from districts affected by P. L. 874 or 815 tend to rank these programs high. Of the districts affected by P. L. 874, 52 per cent of the administrators and 52 per cent of the board members ranked it as the most important federal program for their district.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The basic purpose of this study was to determine Oklahoma educational administrators' and school board members' perception of federal involvement in local education. In general, these two groups of educational leaders agree on what should be the best policy relative to the identified problem areas. They are not as consistent in their perception of the present situation relative to these problem areas.

In the area of curriculum development, administrators and board members were almost unanimous in indicating that the U. S. Office of Education should not play the major role. Thirty-one per cent of the administrators and 21 per cent of the board members thought the role of the federal government in curriculum development should be a partnership with the local and state educational agencies.

The responses indicated that board members are more concerned with local autonomy than are administrators. Twenty-two per cent of the board members indicated that developing curricula is a local responsibility, while only 13 per cent of the administrators perceived this.

These two groups of educational leaders differ in their perception of the present situation relative to curriculum development. A larger per cent of the board members think the local district is developing adequate curricula. Also, more board members believe the State Department of Education is playing the major role in curriculum development.

The responses of these educational leaders to statements relative to curriculum balance clearly indicate that they perceive federal aid as presenting a problem in this area. The majority of each group said that local districts should redistribute funds at the local level to compensate for possible imbalance caused by federal aid.

These educational leaders believe that federal aid programs should not be administered by the U. S. Office of Education. Only a small per cent of each group thinks the federal educational agency should have any role in the administration of such funds.

The majority of each group perceive that federal aid programs should be administered by the State Department of Education. Again, board members are more local-oriented than administrators. Thirty per cent of the board members believe the federal programs should be administered primarily by the local district.

Administrators and school board members differ in that a larger per cent of the latter perceive that the federal government is directly administering the federal programs. A potential problem exists, as 13 per cent of the board members think the federal agency is administering federal programs, while only 1 per cent think they should.

An analysis of these educational leaders' responses to the statements relative to local response to federal aid programs seems to indicate one thing of interest. It appears that these educational leaders do not perceive present federal aid programs as reducing local control or community concern for education.

What should be the role of the federal government in equalization of educational opportunities? Both administrators and board members believe it should be to equalize educational opportunities between the

states. At the same time both groups perceive that present federal programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within the state. This clearly indicates that these educational leaders feel that it is the responsibility of the State Legislature and State Department of Education to equalize educational opportunities within the state, but that they have not been fulfilling this responsibility.

Would these educational leaders prefer one general aid law in lieu of the present specific-purpose programs? The response to this question was an emphatic yes. Approximately 80 per cent of each group would prefer a general aid law. Probably these leaders perceive that general aid would reduce some of the problems associated with specific-purpose aid. They may perceive that general aid would allow more flexibility in the use of funds or that it would increase the amount of federal monies distributed to the schools.

Administrators and board members perceived Title I ESEA as being the most important federal program. Administrators ranked it somewhat stronger than did the board members. Educational leaders in districts affected by P. L. 874 ranked this program as most important to their district.

Of interest is the fact that only a small per cent of administrators or board members ranked Title III NDEA or Title II ESEA as first or second in importance to their district. These are two of the programs that the Nixon Administration cut out of their recent budget revision.

The only intervening variable that consistently affected board members' and administrators' perceptions was type of district. The educational leaders from independent districts perceive more federal

involvement and have a slightly stronger feeling against federal involvement than do the educational leaders from the independent districts.

Remembering that dependent districts do not have high schools and consequently are smaller schools and located in smaller communities gives a hint of the possible reason for the above conclusion. In Oklahoma, as across the nation, these schools are fighting for existence. Thus, educational leaders from these schools may perceive that involvement by any outside agency presents a threat to their existence.

This study does seem to identify or at least verify a basic dilemma. Administrators and board members do not perceive the present federal involvement to be the same as their perception of the optimum federal involvement. It should be noted that this difference was not statistically validated. These educational leaders agree that there should be less federal involvement in all of the identified problem areas. This is very significant because history has shown us that the more federal aid, the more federal involvement. Hence the dilemma: educational leaders want more federal aid and less federal involvement, but in the past with federal aid has come federal involvement.

Can this dilemma be solved? Is it realistic to think that there can be large sums of money distributed to local schools with no strings attached? Will general federal aid reduce federal involvement in the local schools? Or, if general aid does come, will it not present problems other than those identified in this study? These and other questions may give rise to future studies.

Analyses of the Hypotheses

There were eight hypotheses stated for this study in Chapter I. These hypotheses and the findings relative to each are now presented.

Hypothesis No. 1: There will be no significant difference in educational administrators' and school board members' perceptions of the present situation relative to the identified problem areas.

Problem Area No. 1: Curriculum Development

Reject the hypothesis, there was a significant difference.

Problem Area No. 2: Curriculum Balance

There was no significant difference.

Problem Area No. 3: Administration of Federal Funds

Reject the hypothesis, there was a significant difference.

Problem Area No. 4: Local Response to Federal Aid Programs

There was no significant difference.

Problem Area No. 5: Fiscal Policy

There was no significant difference.

Hypothesis No. 2: There will be no significant difference in educational administrators' and school board members' perception of the optimum policy relative to the identified problem areas.

Problem Area No. 1: Curriculum Development

There was no significant difference.

Problem Area No. 2: Curriculum Balance

There was no significant difference.

Problem Area No. 3: Administration of Federal Funds

There was no significant difference.

Problem Area No. 4: Local Response to Federal Aid Programs

Reject the hypothesis, there was a significant difference.

Problem Area No. 5: Fiscal Policy

There was no significant difference.

Hypothesis No. 3: The amount of federal support the district receives, enrollment of the district, wealth of the district, the local millage effort of the district, and the type of district will not significantly affect the administrators' or board members' perception of the present situation or of the best policy relative to the problem areas.

Problem Area No. 1: Curriculum Development

Type of district significantly affected board members' perception of the present situation and administrators' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area.

Enrollment significantly affected administrators' perception of the present situation relative to this problem area.

The intervening variables of wealth, local support, and federal support did not significantly affect administrators' or board members' perception relative to curriculum development.

Problem Area No. 2: Curriculum Balance

Type of district had a significant effect on board members' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. The other variables did not have a significant effect on the perceptions of these

educational leaders.

Problem Area No. 3: Administration of Federal Funds

Type of district significantly affected administrators' perception of the present situation and their perception of the best policy relative to this problem area. This variable also affected board members' perception of the best policy.

The other intervening variables did not significantly affect the perception of these educational leaders.

Problem Area No. 4: Local Response to Federal Aid Programs

Type of district was the only intervening variable that had a significant effect. It affected the administrators' perception of both the present situation and of the best policy relative to this problem area.

Problem Area No. 5: Fiscal Policy

Type of district significantly affected administrators' perception of the best policy relative to his problem area.

Enrollment significantly affected administrators' perception of the present situation relative to this area.

Wealth of district significantly affected administrators' and board members' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area.

Federal support significantly affected board members' perception of the best policy relative to this problem area.

The intervening variable of local support did not significantly affect the perception of these educational leaders relative to fiscal policy.

Hypothesis No. 4: The age, education, and tenure of respondents will not significantly affect their perception of the present situation or of the best policy relative to the identified problem areas.

The intervening variables tested did not significantly affect the responses of these educational leaders. Age and tenure of board members were not statistically tested. Education of administrators was not statistically tested.

Hypothesis No. 5: There will be no significant difference in educational administrators' and school board members' preference for general federal aid.

There was no significant difference.

Hypothesis No. 6: The amount of federal support, the wealth of the district, the enrollment of the district, the local millage effort of the district, and the type of district will not significantly affect the administrators' or board members' preference for general federal aid.

Type of district, federal support, and local support had a significant effect on administrators' preference for general federal aid.

Hypothesis No. 7: The age, education, and tenure of the respondents will not significantly affect their preference for general federal aid.

The intervening variables tested did not significantly affect the responses of these educational leaders. Age and tenure of board members were not statistically tested. Education of administrators was not statistically tested.

Hypothesis No. 8: There will be no significant difference in

educational administrators' and school board members' perceptions of the federal aid programs most important to their district.

Although a statistical test was not applied, it did not appear that there was any significant difference in administrators' and board members' perception of the federal aid programs most important to their district.

The Future

The federal government has had an interest in education since the "Old Deluder Satan" law in the colony of Massachusetts in 1642. Intermittently at first but with increasing consistency in the twentieth century, public education has become a matter of government interest and concern.¹

Oklahoma educational leaders are involved daily in federal aid programs for our local schools. Will the federal government continue to contribute more and more money to public education? It is difficult to conceive otherwise. The May 5, 1969 issue of Education U.S.A. told of fifty organizations that have pooled their lobbying resources as the

. . . Emergency Committee on Full Funding of Federal Education Programs. Represented on the steering committee are the National Educational Association, The National School Board Association, Impact Aid Superintendents, American Council on Education, U. S. Catholic Conference, and the AFL-CIO.²

Will federal aid to public education continue to be controversial? The House of Representatives just recently passed a bill authored by

¹Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1968), p. 1.

²Education U.S.A. (Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, May 5, 1969), p. 200.

Representative Edith Green. This bill extends ESEA two years and has a block-grant provision. Under the block-grant provision in Mrs. Green's bill, two programs from ESEA and two from NDEA would be consolidated into one big program. "It does not make any sense to me to have four separate programs with four separate sets of procedures," Mrs. Green told the House.³

Funding this program is another matter. Ironically, the Nixon Administration's budget revision only a few days before this bill was passed had knocked out all funds for three of the four programs.

The National School Boards Association at their 1969 convention adopted a resolution asking Congress to establish a program of federal foundation support for public education which would provide within five years not less than \$12,000 per pupil. This reversed the NSBA policy of four years ago.⁴

Federal aid and the controversies relative to federal aid apparently are here to stay. Local educational leaders in Oklahoma and across the nation should be cognizant of the potential problem areas associated with federal assistance. These leaders can and should play a vital part in determining the direction federal aid takes, the area of need it feeds, the point of emphasis it makes, and the contribution it makes to the whole educational system.

³"House Extends ESEA Two Years, OK's 'Block Grant' Provision," Nation's Schools, 83 (June, 1969), p. 26.

⁴Phi Delta Kappan, 50 (June, 1969), p. 554.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bailey, Stephen K. and Edith Mosher. ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1968.
- Benson, Charles S. The Economics of Public Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961, p. 252.
- Carr, W. G. "Breakthrough in Federal Legislation," National Educational Association Procedures, CIII (1965), 25-29.
- Congressional Quarterly Service. Federal Role in Education. Washington, D. C., 1965.
- Cubberly Conference Stanford University, 1961. Education: An Instrument of National Goals. Papers presented at 1961 Cubberly Conference. Edited by Paul R. Hanna. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962, p. 193.
- Cunningham, L. L. "Federal Intervention in Education," American School Board Journal, CIII (April, 1966), 7-8.
- Drucker, Peter F. "American Directions: A Forecast," Harper's, CCXXX (February, 1965), 19-45.
- Education U.S.A. Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, January 29, 1968, p. 116.
- _____ . December 2, 1968, p. 79.
- _____ . January 13, 1969, p. 103.
- _____ . May 5, 1969, p. 99.
- Edwards, Newton. The Courts and the Public School. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, rev. ed., 1955, p. 5.
- Exton, Elaine. "Congress Looks at the Curriculum," American School Board Journal, CXXXVII (July, 1958), 36.
- _____ . "Will Increased Federal Planning Decrease Local Control?" American School Board Journal, CL (January, 1965), 38.
- _____ . "The Emerging Federal Partnership." American School Board Journal, CXV (May, 1967), 8.

- Finance Division, Oklahoma State Department of Education. "Sources of Revenue and the Amount Collected From Each Source by the Common Schools of Oklahoma for the Fiscal Year 1967-68."
- Grieder, Calvin. "New Conant Plan Raises Some Searching Questions." Nation's Schools, LXXXII (November, 1968), 6.
- Hales, Dawson. Federal Control of Public Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954.
- Hall, William H. "The Dollar Cost of An Investment in Federal Aid." Associated Public School System, an affiliate of the Institute of Administrative Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.
- Hanna, Paul R. "Design for a National Curriculum." Nation's Schools, LXII (September, 1958), 43.
- "House Extends ESEA Two Years, OK's 'Block Grant' Provision." Nation's Schools, LXXXIII (June, 1969), 26.
- Howe, Harold II. "Schoolmen Worry: Will Federal Education Laws Do More Harm Than Good in the Long Run?" Nation's Schools, LXXVII (February, 1966), 48-49.
- Johns, R. L. and Edgar L. Morphet. Financing the Public Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960, p. 171.
- Kurland, Norman D. "How Federal Funds Can Free Dollars for Teacher Salaries." Nation's Schools, LXXIX (January, 1967), p. 72.
- McKnight, John Allen. "Perceptions of Ohio State Educational Administrators Regarding the Use of Federal Funds for Education." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964.)
- Meranto, Philip. The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965: A Study in Political Innovation. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1st ed., 1967.
- Midwest Debate Bureau. What Should Be the Role of the Federal Government in Education? Normal, Illinois, 1961.
- Mosher, Charles. "A Milestone of Progress in American Education." Ohio Schools, XLIII (September, 1965), 9-10.
- Munger, Frank J. and Richard F. Fenno, Jr. National Politics and Federal Aid to Education. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962, p. 49.
- "New Conant Plan Shakes Up 500 at Compact." Education News (July 8, 1968), p. 25.
- Parker, Franklin. "Federal Influences on the Future of American Education." School and Society (October 28, 1967), p. 383.

- Phi Delta Kappan, L (June, 1969), 554.
- Pierce, Truman M. Federal, State and Local Governments in Education. Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964.
- Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967, p. 47.
- Ragan, William D. Modern Elementary Curriculum. New York: The Dryden Press, 1953, pp. 53, 77.
- Rice, Arthur H. "Are Federal Funds Leading Schools the Wrong Way?" Nation's Schools, LXXVI (October, 1965), 28.
- Saylor, Galen. "The Federal Colossus in Education--Threat or Promise." Educational Leadership, XXIII (October, 1965), 8.
- School Laws of Oklahoma, 1967. Article IV, Section 58, p. 43.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Sperber, Robert I. "Federal Aid and Federal Control of Education." Teachers College Record, LXI (March, 1960), 338.
- State of Oklahoma Department of Education. Annual Bulletin for Elementary and Secondary Schools. Bulletin No. 113, July 1968, p. 13.
- Suffrin, Sidney C. Administering the National Defense Education Act. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963, p. xii.
- Thayer, V. T. The Role of the School in American Society. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1960, p. 9.
- Tiedt, Sidney W. The Role of the Federal Government in Education. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- U. S. Department of Education. Report of the Commissioner of Education. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1868, p. 331.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Profile of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967, p. 1.
- U. S. Office of Education. Profile of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. 1967.
- Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Education Research, 2nd ed. rev. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- "Voters Favor Federal Aid." Nation's Schools, LXXV (September, 1963), p. 9.

Washington Monitor, Supplement to Education U.S.A. Washington:
National School Public Relations Association, October 28, 1968,
p. 53.

_____. 1968, p. 108.

_____. February 10, 1969, p. 131.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS USED IN COLLECTION OF DATA

March 1, 1969

Dear Educational Leader:

What should be the role of the federal government in education? This is one of the most controversial questions of our time. A specific aspect of this question concerns the role of the federal government in the financing of our public schools. You are aware of the different types of specific-purpose financial assistance that our schools receive, the most recent and familiar probably being N.D.E.A. Title III and E.S.E.A. Title I. As a result of this financial assistance from the federal government, many educational leaders have become concerned about the federal government's involvement in local educational policy making.

As a graduate student in public school administration at Oklahoma State University, I am doing a study concerning the federal government's involvement in certain areas of the public school program. The study is an attempt to determine administrators' and school board members' opinions of the federal government's involvement in the public school program.

Because you are an educational leader in your community, your participation is vitally needed for this study. I am aware of the importance of your time, but will appreciate very much your taking time to complete the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. The questionnaire appears to be time consuming, but it will take less than twenty-five minutes to complete.

The questionnaire is designed for you to indicate how you perceive the present conditions and what you perceive to be the best policy relative to federal involvement in local educational policy making. By Oklahoma school law, the local school board is the local educational policy-making body. In practice, school boards and superintendents of high school districts, or principals of elementary districts, work together in formulating educational policies. Thus, it seems significant to know the perceptions of these educational leaders relative to federal involvement in local policy making.

If you desire a summary of the analyzed data after the study is completed, please indicate in the space provided on the questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

John Martin
Business Manager
Stillwater Public Schools

OKLAHOMA STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Affiliated with National
School Boards Association

J. Orville Bumpus, Executive Secretary
1216 N. E. 23 Oklahoma City, Okla. 73111

Publishers of O K L A H O M A S C H O O L B O A R D J O U R N A L

Dear Fellow Board Member:

I would like to introduce you to John Martin, Business Manager of the Stillwater Public Schools. John is a graduate student at Oklahoma State University and is doing a study concerning federal involvement in education as part of the requirement for a doctorate of education degree in school administration.

His study requires participation of school board presidents across the state. As an executive officer of the State School Board Association, I urge you to take a few minutes of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

The study will provide our State Association with some very useful information about your opinions of federal involvement in public education. This information will help the Association to make future decisions about our goals and objectives concerning federal aid to education.

Any information you do not have about your school can be obtained from your superintendent.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ John P. Weilmuenster

Johnny Weilmuenster
Past President
State School Board Association

FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This is a study of educational leaders' opinions of federal involvement in public schools. There will be absolutely no use of individual names or school district names in this study. Part I of the questionnaire asks for information about your school district and you as a respondent.

PART I: SCHOOL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

(Board members may obtain this information from the superintendent)

1. Your position: (circle one) Superintendent Board Member Principal
2. Type of school district: (circle one) Dependent Independent
3. Total enrollment of district: (do not include kindergarten) _____
4. Assessed valuation of district: \$ _____
5. Total general fund budget for school year 1968-69: \$ _____
6. Estimated federal aid you will receive during the school year 1968-69: (exclude lunch program) \$ _____
7. Number of mills your school district votes from the following sources:
 - a. Emergency levy (5 mills) _____
 - b. Local Support levy (10 mills) _____
 - c. Building Fund levy (5 mills) _____
8. Your age: (circle one) less than 35 35-45 over 45
9. Your formal education: (circle one) less than high school diploma
high school diploma bachelor degree
master's degree doctorate degree
10. Your tenure: How many years have you served as a member of a school board or as a superintendent of schools:
(circle one) less than 10 10-20 over 20
11. Would you recommend one general federal aid law providing funds to be distributed by the states, in preference to the several specific purpose laws? (circle one) yes no
12. Please rank the following specific-purpose federal assistance programs in their importance to your district. Put the number one to the left of the program you believe is the most important, the number two for the next, etc. Place the letter 0 to the left of any program that does not apply to your district.

A. ___ Vocational education	B. ___ Federally affected PL 815
C. ___ NDEA Title III	D. ___ ESEA Title I
E. ___ ESEA Title II	
F. ___ Other _____	

13. Name of your school district: (Optional) _____
14. County located: _____
15. If you desire a summary of the analyzed data, please give your address. _____

PLEASE CONTINUE TO PART II--
IT WILL REQUIRE LESS THAN 15 MINUTES OF YOUR TIME

PART II: PROBLEM AREAS

Directions for part II

Part II of the questionnaire includes statements regarding five problem areas chosen for this study. Each problem area has been established as one phase of educational policy which is affected by the use of specific purpose federal aid. For each problem area, two sets of statements have been prepared. In the first set you are to select one statement that you believe best describes the present situation relative to the problem area. In the second set you are to select one statement that you believe represents the best policy relative to the problem area.

Problem area No. 1: Curriculum Development

Curriculum development involves what should be taught and how it should be taught. The curriculum of our schools is designed to meet the needs of each individual child, and to satisfy the concerns of our society. As changes in our society produce new concerns, new emphases in the curriculum are reflected.

Set 1: Check one statement that you believe best describes the present situation relative to curriculum development.

- ___ A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is being done at the local level.
- ___ B. The State Department of Education is playing the major role in developing adequate curricula for our public school system.
- ___ C. Because of federal financial assistance to schools, the U. S. Office of Education is determining curriculum policies for the public schools.
- ___ D. The local, state and federal educational agencies are jointly developing the curricula of our schools.
- ___ E. The state and local educational agencies are developing curricula for the public schools.

Set 2: Check one statement that you believe represents the best (ideal) policy relative to curriculum development.

- A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is a local responsibility.
- B. Curriculum development is a state responsibility; the State Department of Education should establish curriculum for our public schools.
- C. As new national concerns are identified, the U. S. Office of Education should play the major role in curriculum development.
- D. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local and state educational agencies.
- E. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local, state and federal educational agencies.

Problem area No. 2: Curriculum Balance

Curriculum balance implies an effort to meet several goals at one time. The development of educational programs which meet the needs of all the youth of our society has been an accepted goal of our educational leaders. Failure to adjust the curriculum to new concerns, as well as special attempts to meet these new needs, may result in curriculum imbalance.

Set 1: Check one statement that you believe best describes the present situation relative to curriculum balance.

- A. The use of federal funds to stimulate certain curriculum areas, such as mathematics and science, has created an imbalance in the curriculum.
- B. Specific-purpose federal aid as now effective has not created an imbalance in the curriculum.
- C. Through redistribution of local funds, districts compensate for possible imbalance resulting from use of federal funds for selected curriculum areas.

Set 2: Check one statement that you believe represents the best (ideal) policy relative to curriculum balance.

- A. Local districts should oppose the use of federal assistance for specific areas of the curriculum because of the curriculum imbalance it has created.
- B. Local districts should accept federal funds for specific-purpose programs with the assumption that they have not created an imbalance in the curriculum.
- C. Local districts should redistribute funds at the local level to compensate for possible imbalance caused by use of federal assistance to specific curriculum areas.

Problem area No. 3: Administration of Federal Funds

The administration of federal assistance programs for specific curriculum areas requires assurance that the purposes of the legislation providing these programs are fulfilled by participating states and local school systems.

Set 1: Check one statement that you believe best describes the present situation relative to the administration of federal funds.

- A. Most federal programs of assistance are supervised by the State Department of Education; local districts being directly responsible to the State Department of Education.
- B. The federal educational agency guarantees that the purposes of its program are fulfilled, and secures evidence of such fulfillment directly from the local level.
- C. The administration of federal assistance programs is handled primarily by the local school district.
- D. The administration of federal assistance programs is being jointly supervised by the state and federal educational agencies.

Set 2: Check one statement that you believe represents the best (ideal) policy relative to the administration of federal funds.

- A. All federal assistance programs should limit supervision to the state level, responsibility of local districts to be to the State Department of Education only.
- B. All federal assistance programs to local schools should be administered by the U. S. Office of Education.
- C. The administration of federal assistance programs should be handled primarily by the local school district; not being directly responsible to the state or federal educational agencies.
- D. The administration of federal assistance programs should be the joint responsibility of the state and federal educational agencies.

Problem area No. 4: Local Response to Federal Aid Programs

Local communities have been charged by state laws with the responsibility of educating their youth. The long history of local control of education has created a pattern of decision-making. Local districts for many years have voluntarily accepted federal funds for certain phases of the local school program.

Set 1: Check one statement that you believe best describes the present situation relative to local response to federal aid programs.

- A. The local tax burden is so heavy that federal assistance for education has been inevitable.
- B. Local general acceptance of federal assistance has not led to less local control of our schools.
- C. Local resistance to federal assistance programs has been essential to continued local control of our schools.
- D. A. and B.
- E. Local community concern for education has been reduced with increased financial assistance from outside the local district.
- F. A. and E.

Set 2: Check one statement that you believe represents the best (ideal) policy relative to local response to federal aid programs.

- A. Because the local tax burden is so great, the community should accept federal assistance for the public schools.
- B. As federal funds belong to the people, the local community should accept them for specific-purpose programs without concern of federal control.
- C. The local community should refuse federal funds and make the additional effort to provide for an equivalent program locally.
- D. The school officials should involve the community in understanding the purpose of each federal assistance program, in determining the degree of financial aid to the local districts, and in assessing the potential loss of control of the educational program at the local level.
- E. B. and D.
- F. A. and D.

Problem area No. 5: Fiscal Policy

Fiscal policy refers to the distribution of federal funds. Based solely on local tax revenue, the ideal of equal opportunity for every child in the United States is impossible. States and the federal government are providing more and more of the necessary revenues to meet the cost of an adequate education for all youth.

Set 1: Check one statement that you believe best describes the present situation relative to fiscal policy.

- A. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities between the states.
- B. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within each state.
- C. The state legislature and state department of education have enacted laws and regulations that provide adequate equalization of educational opportunities within the state.
- D. A. and B.
- E. A. and C.

Set 2: Check one statement that you believe represents the best (ideal) policy relative to fiscal responsibility.

- A. Federal assistance programs should result in equalizing educational opportunities between the states.
- B. The federal government should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the states.
- C. The state legislature and department of education should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state.
- D. A. and B.
- E. A. and C.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION. PLEASE PLACE THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE AND MAIL.

APPENDIX B

DATA RELATIVE TO INTERVENING VARIABLES
WHICH HAD NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

TABLE XXXII
 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - PRESENT SITUATION
 BY WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT
 (Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is being done at the local level	11	18	12	20	23	23	15	18	14	14	23	24
B. The State Department of Education is playing the major role in developing adequate curricula for our public school system . .	13	14	7	24	10	23	7	11	12	29	8	19
C. Because of federal financial assistance to schools, the U. S. Office of Education is determining curriculum policies for the public schools	4	5	8	4	0	13	2	8	6	0	23	3
D. The local, state, and federal educational agencies are jointly developing the curricula of our schools	39	41	30	16	30	17	24	44	39	29	8	22
E. The state and local educational agencies are developing curricula for the public schools	33	22	43	36	37	23	51	28	30	29	39	31

Wealth: Low = \$500 - 4,000; Medium = \$4,001 - 7,000; High = \$7,001 - higher.

Local Support: Low = 0-10 mills; Medium = 11-15 mills; High = 16-20 mills.

TABLE XXXIII

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - PRESENT SITUATION
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is being done at the local level	18	9	11	28	21	11	7	23	38
B. The State Department of Education is playing the major role in developing adequate curricula for our public school system	8	13	13	13	26	26	14	23	13
C. Because of federal financial assistance to schools, the U. S. Office of Education is determining curriculum policies for the public schools	9	2	5	9	0	5	14	6	0
D. The local, state, and federal educational agencies are jointly developing the curricula of our schools	28	41	44	15	32	26	21	21	6
E. The state and local educational agencies are developing curricula for the public schools	38	35	27	36	21	32	43	26	44

Federal Support: L = 0 - 7%; M = 7 - 14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; Medium = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE XXXIV

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - PRESENT SITUATION
 BY AGE AND TENURE
 (Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure		
	Administrators			Board Members			Administrators		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is being done at the local level	4	15	13	0	21	25	13	13	14
B. The State Department of Education is playing the major role in developing adequate curricula for our public school system . .	8	9	13	33	13	23	14	10	16
C. Because of federal financial assistance to schools, the U. S. Office of Education is determining curriculum policies for the public schools	13	2	7	0	11	2	7	6	2
D. The local, state, and federal educational agencies are jointly developing the curricula of our schools	29	32	42	0	29	16	33	35	49
E. The state and local educational agencies are developing curricula for the public schools	46	42	25	67	26	34	38	37	20

Age: L = less than 35 years; M = 35-45 years; H = over 45 years.

Tenure: L = less than 10 years; M = 10-20 years; H = over 20 years.

TABLE XXXV

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - AS SHOULD BE
BY ENROLLMENT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is a local responsibility	6	20	24	19	29	26
B. Curriculum development is a state responsibility; the State Department of Education should establish curriculum for our public schools	1	4	0	3	0	0
C. As new national concerns are identified, the U. S. Office of Education should play the major role in curriculum development	2	0	0	0	0	0
D. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local and state educational agencies	62	37	41	53	52	37
E. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local, state and federal educational agencies	29	39	36	25	19	37

L = 101-700; M = 701-1400; H = 1401-higher.

TABLE XXXVI

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - AS SHOULD BE
BY WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is a local responsibility	16	22	15	30	25	33	12	11	20	29	27	30
B. Curriculum development is a state responsibility; the State Department of Education should establish curriculum for our public schools	2	2	1	4	0	3	2	0	2	7	0	2
C. As new national concerns are identified, the U. S. Office of Education should play the major role in curriculum development . . .	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
D. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local and state educational agencies . . .	49	37	62	48	44	46	66	54	45	36	47	48
E. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local, state, and federal educational agencies	31	40	22	19	31	18	20	35	33	29	27	21

Wealth: Low = \$500 - 4,000; Medium = \$4,001 - 7,000; High = \$7,001 - higher.

Local Support: Low = 0-10 mills; Medium = 11-15 mills; High = 16-20 mills.

TABLE XXXVII

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - AS SHOULD BE
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is a local responsibility	17	21	13	33	30	19	27	31	38
B. Curriculum development is a state responsibility; the State Department of Education should establish curriculum for our public schools	2	2	1	2	5	0	7	2	0
C. As new national concerns are identified the U. S. Office of Education should play the major role in curriculum development .	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
D. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local and state educational agencies	49	49	52	45	50	43	33	49	44
E. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local, state, and federal educational agencies	32	28	32	20	15	38	33	18	19

Federal Support: L = 0-7%; M = 7-14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE XXXVIII

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - AS SHOULD BE
BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Developing adequate curricula to meet the changing needs of our society is a local responsibility	24	13	18	0	36	26	17	11	24	27	0	50
B. Curriculum development is a state responsibility; the State Department of Education should establish curriculum for our public schools	0	1	3	0	3	2	2	0	4	1	0	0
C. As new national concerns are identified, the U. S. Office of Education should play the major role in curriculum development	0	0	2	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	0	50
D. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local and state educational agencies	68	54	43	100	36	50	52	56	37	47	0	50
E. The development of curricula for our schools should be a joint responsibility of the local, state, and federal educational agencies	8	31	35	0	26	22	28	33	33	24	0	0

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.

Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE XXXIX
 CURRICULUM BALANCE - PRESENT SITUATION
 BY ENROLLMENT
 (Data in Percentages)

Statements	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Board Members</u>		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. The use of federal funds to stimulate certain curriculum areas, such as mathematics and science, has created an imbalance in the curriculum	26	35	24	27	14	16
B. Specific-purpose federal aid as now effective has not created an imbalance in the curriculum	26	20	21	33	48	5
C. Through redistribution of local funds districts compensate for possible imbalance resulting from use of federal funds for selected curriculum areas	49	45	55	40	38	79

L = 101-700; M = 701-1400; H = 1401-higher.

TABLE XL

CURRICULUM BALANCE - PRESENT SITUATION
BY WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. The use of federal funds to stimulate certain curriculum areas, such as mathematics and science, has created an imbalance in the curriculum	25	22	37	22	10	30	29	30	27	29	21	19
B. Specific-purpose federal aid as now effective has not created an imbalance in the curriculum	25	29	22	26	27	46	17	27	27	43	50	27
C. Through redistribution of local funds districts compensate for possible imbalance resulting from use of federal funds for selected curriculum areas	51	49	41	52	63	24	54	43	47	29	29	53

Wealth: L = \$500 - 4,000; M = \$4,001 - 7,000; H = \$7,001 - higher.

Local Support: L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

TABLE XLI
 CURRICULUM BALANCE - PRESENT SITUATION
 BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION
 (Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. The use of federal funds to stimulate certain curriculum areas, such as mathematics and science, has created an imbalance in the curriculum	28	35	20	24	21	14	14	26	19
B. Specific-purpose federal aid as now effective has not created an imbalance in the curriculum	28	19	27	32	32	38	43	34	31
C. Through redistribution of local funds districts compensate for possible imbalance resulting from use of federal funds for selected curriculum areas	44	46	53	44	47	48	43	40	50

Federal Support: L = 0-7%; M = 7-14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE XLII
CURRICULUM BALANCE - PRESENT SITUATION
BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. The use of federal funds to stimulate certain curriculum areas, such as mathematics and science, has created an imbalance in the curriculum	33	22	22	21	25	0	14	13	4	10	8	0
B. Specific-purpose federal aid as now effective has not created an imbalance in the curriculum	23	27	28	31	38	50	17	19	26	29	16	0
C. Through redistribution of local funds, districts compensate for possible imbalance resulting from use of federal funds for selected curriculum areas	44	51	51	48	38	50	69	68	71	61	76	100

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.

Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE XLIII
 CURRICULUM BALANCE - PRESENT SITUATION
 BY TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	<u>Administrators</u>		<u>Board Members</u>	
	Dependent	Independent	Dependent	Independent
A. The use of federal funds to stimulate certain curriculum areas, such as mathematics and science, has created an imbalance in the curriculum	26	28	25	20
B. Specific-purpose federal aid as now effective has not created an imbalance in the curriculum	35	23	45	30
C. Through redistribution of local funds, districts compensate for possible imbalance resulting from use of federal funds for selected curriculum areas	40	49	30	50

TABLE XLIV

CURRICULUM BALANCE - AS SHOULD BE
BY WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Local districts should oppose the use of federal assistance for specific areas of the curriculum because of the curriculum imbalance it has created	9	19	9	4	6	15	7	16	12	7	33	3
B. Local districts should accept federal funds for specific-purpose programs with the assumption that they have not created an imbalance in the curriculum	25	22	12	15	25	30	12	22	21	29	13	25
C. Local districts should redistribute funds at the local level to compensate for possible imbalance caused by use of federal assistance to specific curriculum areas	67	59	79	82	69	55	81	62	67	64	53	71

Wealth: L = \$500 - 4,000; M = \$4,001 - 7,000; H = \$7,001 - higher.

Local Support: L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

TABLE XLV

CURRICULUM BALANCE - AS SHOULD BE
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Local districts should oppose the use of federal assistance for specific areas of the curriculum because of the curriculum imbalance it has created	13	12	9	10	10	5	13	12	0
B. Local districts should accept federal funds for specific-purpose programs with the assumption that they have not created an imbalance in the curriculum	18	18	24	24	25	24	20	24	25
C. Local districts should redistribute funds at the local level to compensate for possible imbalance caused by use of federal assistance to specific curriculum areas	69	71	67	67	65	71	67	65	75

Federal Support: L = 0-7%; M = 7-14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE XLVI

CURRICULUM BALANCE - AS SHOULD BE
BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Local districts should oppose the use of federal assistance for specific areas of the curriculum because of the curriculum imbalance it has created	12	12	11	0	10	8	14	13	4	10	8	0
B. Local districts should accept federal funds for specific-purpose programs with the assumption that they have not created an imbalance in the curriculum	12	19	22	33	31	18	17	20	26	29	16	0
C. Local districts should redistribute funds at the local level to compensate for possible imbalance caused by use of federal assistance to specific curriculum areas	76	69	67	67	59	74	69	68	71	61	76	100

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.

Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE XLVII
 CURRICULUM BALANCE - AS SHOULD BE
 BY ENROLLMENT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Local districts should oppose the use of federal assistance for specific areas of the curriculum because of the curriculum imbalance it has created	15	8	12	13	10	0
B. Local districts should accept federal funds for specific-purpose programs with the assumption that they have not created an imbalance in the curriculum	21	14	17	22	19	11
C. Local districts should redistribute funds at the local level to compensate for possible imbalance caused by use of federal assistance to specific curriculum areas	64	78	71	66	71	90

L = 101-700; M = 701-1,400; H = 1,401 - higher.

TABLE XLVIII

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - PRESENT SITUATION
BY WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Most federal programs of assistance are supervised by the State Department of Education, local districts being directly responsible to the State Department of Education	63	77	68	59	52	49	68	83	65	50	40	57
B. The federal educational agency buarantees that the purposes of its program are fulfilled, and secures evidence of such fulfillment directly from the local level.	2	5	1	15	13	12	5	0	3	14	13	13
C. The administration of federal assistance programs is handled primarily by the local school district	1	0	0	4	13	6	0	0	6	7	20	5
D. The administration of federal assistance programs is being jointly supervised by the state and federal educational agencies . .	33	19	31	22	23	33	27	17	32	29	27	26

Wealth: L = \$500 - 4,000; M = \$4,001 - 7,000; H = \$7,001 - higher.

Local Support: L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

TABLE XLIX

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - PRESENT SITUATION
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Most federal programs of assistance are supervised by the State Department of Education, local districts being directly responsible to the State Department of Education	67	78	63	56	40	57	67	53	53
B. The federal educational agency guarantees that the purposes of its program are fulfilled, and secures evidence of such fulfillment directly from the local level.	3	2	3	10	20	14	13	14	20
C. The administration of federal assistance programs is handled primarily by the local school district	0	0	1	10	5	5	7	10	0
D. The administration of federal assistance programs is being jointly supervised by the state and federal educational agencies . .	30	21	33	24	35	24	13	24	27

Federal Support: L = 0-7%; M = 7-14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE L
 ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - PRESENT SITUATION
 BY AGE AND TENURE
 (Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Most federal programs of assistance are supervised by the State Department of Education, local districts being directly responsible to the State Department of Education	68	75	64	33	41	63	64	71	67	53	54	50
B. The federal educational agency guarantees that the purposes of its program are fulfilled, and secures evidence of such fulfillment directly from the local level.	4	1	3	0	15	12	1	2	0	2	0	0
C. The administration of federal assistance programs is handled primarily by the local school district	0	0	8	0	5	10	18	18	24	31	33	50
D. The administration of federal assistance programs is being jointly supervised by the state and federal educational agencies	28	24	32	67	39	14	17	10	8	15	13	0

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.
 Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE LI
 ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - PRESENT
 SITUATION BY ENROLLMENT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Most federal programs of assistance are supervised by the State Department of Education, local districts being directly responsible to the State Department of Education	71	75	67	69	43	50
B. The federal educational agency guarantees that the purposes of its program are fulfilled, and secures evidence of such fulfillment directly from the local level.	0	0	5	6	19	6
C. The administration of federal assistance programs is handled primarily by the local school district	0	0	0	0	19	6
D. The administration of federal assistance programs is being jointly supervised by the state and federal educational agencies . .	29	25	29	25	19	39

L = 101-700; M = 701-1,400; H = 1,401 - higher.

TABLE LII

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - AS SHOULD BE
BY WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. All federal assistance programs should limit supervision to the state level, responsibility of local districts to be to the State Department of Education only	70	68	62	56	45	61	68	69	66	57	47	55
B. All federal assistance programs to local schools should be administered by the U. S. Office of Education	1	0	1	0	0	30	2	0	1	7	0	0
C. The administration of federal assistance programs should be handled primarily by the local school district, not being directly responsible to the state or federal educational agencies	22	14	21	33	36	27	15	19	20	36	47	27
D. The administration of federal assistance programs should be the joint responsibility of the state and federal educational agencies	8	19	16	11	19	9	15	11	13	0	7	18

Wealth: L = \$500 - 4,000; M = \$4,001 - 7,000; H = \$7,001 - higher.
Local Support: L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

TABLE LIII

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - AS SHOULD BE
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. All federal assistance programs should limit supervision to the state level, responsibility of local districts to be to the State Department of Education only	66	69	66	48	70	52	60	45	80
B. All federal assistance programs to local schools should be administered by the U. S. Office of Education	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0
C. The administration of federal assistance programs should be handled primarily by the local school district, not being directly responsible to the state or federal educational agencies	19	18	20	36	20	33	33	39	7
D. The administration of federal assistance programs should be the joint responsibility of the state and federal educational agencies	14	13	12	14	10	14	7	14	13

Federal Support: L = 0 to 7%; M = 7 to 14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE LIV

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - AS SHOULD BE
BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. All federal assistance programs should limit supervision to the state level, responsibility of local districts to be to the State Department of Education only	64	67	67	67	51	55	64	71	69	53	54	50
B. All federal assistance programs to local schools should be administered by the U. S. Office of Education	0	0	2	0	3	0	1	2	0	2	0	0
C. The administration of federal assistance programs should be handled primarily by the local school district, not being directly responsible to the state or federal educational agencies	24	14	23	33	26	37	18	18	24	31	33	54
D. The administration of federal assistance programs should be the joint responsibility of the state and federal educational agencies	12	19	10	0	21	8	17	10	8	15	13	0

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.

Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE LV
 ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS - AS
 SHOULD BE BY ENROLLMENT
 (Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. All federal assistance programs should limit supervision to the state level, responsibility of local districts to be to the State Department of Education only	74	75	67	56	67	61
B. All federal assistance programs to local schools should be administered by the U. S. Office of Education	1	0	0	0	0	0
C. The administration of federal assistance programs should be handled primarily by the local school district, not being directly responsible to the state or federal educational agencies	13	16	19	28	24	22
D. The administration of federal assistance programs should be the joint responsibility of the state and federal educational agencies	12	10	14	16	10	17

L = 101-700; M = 701-1,400; H = 1,401 - higher.

TABLE LVI

LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - PRESENT SITUATION
BY WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. The local tax burden is so heavy that federal assistance for education has been inevitable	42	36	39	39	26	25	34	36	41	21	13	35
B. Local general acceptance of federal assistance has not led to less local control of our schools	20	19	16	23	32	34	21	22	17	21	33	32
C. Local resistance to federal assistance programs has been essential to continued local control of our schools	2	5	13	4	7	19	8	14	5	7	33	5
D. A. and B.	20	30	20	12	29	13	24	17	24	36	7	17
E. Local community concern for education has been reduced with increased financial assistance from outside the local district	9	3	5	4	3	6	8	6	6	7	7	3
F. A. and E.	8	8	7	19	3	3	5	6	8	7	7	8

Wealth: L = \$500 - 4,000; M = \$4,001 - 7,000; H = \$7,001 - higher.

Local Support: L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

TABLE LVII

LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - PRESENT SITUATION
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. The local tax burden is so heavy that federal assistance for education has been inevitable	32	49	40	22	45	32	21	34	33
B. Local general acceptance of federal assistance has not led to less local control of our schools	21	15	17	34	20	32	43	22	47
C. Local resistance to federal assistance programs has been essential to continued local control of our schools . . .	9	5	5	12	15	0	14	15	0
D. A. and B.	26	21	20	24	10	11	14	16	13
E. Local community concern for education has been reduced with increased financial assistance from outside the local district	4	6	8	4	5	5	0	8	0
F. A. and E.	8	5	9	4	5	21	7	6	7

Federal Support: L = 0 to 7%; M = 7 to 14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE LVIII

LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - PRESENT SITUATION
BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. The local tax burden is so heavy that federal assistance for education has been inevitable	44	39	39	0	29	31	40	40	37	26	40	0
B. Local general acceptance of federal assistance has not led to less local control of our schools	9	12	24	33	26	33	15	22	22	30	32	33
C. Local resistance to federal assistance programs has been essential to continued local control of our schools	17	5	6	0	16	6	6	63	8	12	8	0
D. A. and B.	13	28	20	0	24	15	23	25	18	21	8	33
E. Local community concern for education has been reduced with increased financial assistance from outside the local district	4	8	5	0	3	6	6	6	6	5	4	0
F. A. and E.	13	8	6	67	3	8	10	0	10	7	8	33

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.

Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE LIX

LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - PRESENT
SITUATION BY ENROLLMENT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. The local tax burden is so heavy that federal assistance for education has been inevitable	40	34	55	42	15	22
B. Local general acceptance of federal assistance has not led to less local control of our schools	21	18	15	16	40	50
C. Local resistance to federal assistance programs has been essential to continued local control of our schools . . .	5	4	0	0	15	6
D. A. and B.	21	26	20	29	10	17
E. Local community concern for education has been reduced with increased financial assistance from outside the local district	3	10	8	7	0	0
F. A. and E.	9	8	3	7	20	6

L = 101-700; M = 701-1,400; H = 1,401 - higher.

TABLE LX

LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - AS SHOULD BE
BY WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Because the local tax burden is so great, the community should accept federal assistance for the public schools	29	30	20	26	22	12	22	18	30	21	0	24
B. As federal funds belong to the people, the local community should accept them for specific-purpose programs without concern for federal control	10	6	11	19	13	24	7	11	9	27	13	18
C. The local community should refuse federal funds and make the additional effort to provide for an equivalent program locally.	2	3	7	4	9	9	7	0	4	0	13	3
D. The school officials should involve the community in understanding the purpose of each federal assistance program, in determining the degree of financial aid to the local districts, and in assessing the potential loss of control of the educational program at the local level . . .	16	22	28	11	25	30	32	26	18	29	27	21
E. B. and D.	9	9	1	4	13	12	2	3	8	0	0	14
F. A. and D.	34	30	33	37	19	12	29	43	31	21	27	21

Wealth: L = \$500 - 4,000; M = \$4,001 - 7,000; H = \$7,001 - higher.
Local Support: L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

TABLE LXI

LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - AS SHOULD BE
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Because the local tax burden is so great, the community should accept federal assistance for the public schools	23	35	23	16	25	24	13	24	19
B. As federal funds belong to the people, the local community should accept them for specific-purpose programs without concern for federal control	10	9	8	22	10	19	27	18	13
C. The local community should refuse federal funds and make the additional effort to provide for an equivalent program locally.	9	0	1	8	15	0	0	14	0
D. The school officials should involve the community in understanding the purpose of each federal assistance program, in determining the degree of financial aid to the local districts, and in assessing the potential loss of control of the educational program at the local level . . .	25	14	24	26	15	24	27	22	31
E. B. and D.	3	8	9	14	10	0	7	6	19
F. A. and D.	30	35	35	16	25	33	27	18	19

Federal Support: L = 0-7%; M = 7-14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE LXII

LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - AS SHOULD BE
BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Because the local tax burden is so great, the community should accept federal assistance for the public schools	17	25	29	0	15	24	27	57	27	19	24	0
B. As federal funds belong to the people, the local community should accept them for specific-purpose programs without concern for federal control	21	1	13	33	10	24	8	8	14	19	16	25
C. The local community should refuse federal funds and make the additional effort to provide for an equivalent program locally.	17	2	3	0	5	10	6	3	0	3	20	0
D. The school officials should involve the community in understanding the purpose of each federal assistance program, in determining the degree of financial aid to the local district, and in assessing the potential loss of control of the educational program at the local level	17	29	17	0	33	16	22	22	20	26	12	25
E. B. and D.	4	7	7	0	13	8	5	9	6	10	8	25
F. A. and D.	25	36	32	0	23	18	33	33	33	23	20	25

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.
Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE LXIII

LOCAL RESPONSE TO FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS - AS
SHOULD BE BY ENROLLMENT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Board Members</u>		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Because the local tax burden is so great, the community should accept federal assistance for the public schools	25	22	35	25	5	26
B. As federal funds belong to the people, the local community should accept them for specific-purpose programs without concern for federal control	10	8	8	16	14	16
C. The local community should refuse federal funds and make the additional effort to provide for an equivalent program locally.	2	0	0	6	14	0
D. The school officials should involve the community in understanding the purpose of each federal assistance program, in determining the degree of financial aid to the local districts, and in assessing the potential loss of control of the educational program at the local level	22	28	13	13	33	32
E. B. and D.	6	8	3	16	10	11
F. A. and D.	34	34	43	25	24	16

L = 101-700; M = 701-1,400; H = 1,401 - higher.

TABLE LXIV
 FISCAL POLICY - AS SHOULD BE
 BY ENROLLMENT
 (Data in Percentages)

Statements	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Board Members</u>		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs should result in equalizing educational opportunities between the states	13	28	31	23	14	16
B. The federal government should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the states . .	3	0	2	10	0	11
C. The state legislature and department of education should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state	36	20	19	32	38	16
D. A. and B.	7	8	17	10	10	5
E. A. and C.	41	45	31	26	38	53

L = 101-700; M = 701-1400; H = 1401-higher.

TABLE LXV

FISCAL POLICY - PRESENT SITUATION BY
WEALTH AND LOCAL SUPPORT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Wealth						Local Support					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities between the states	13	13	21	12	24	23	9	21	16	46	14	16
B. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within each state	38	40	31	36	35	20	35	33	37	23	21	33
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education have enacted laws and regulations that provide adequate equalization of educational opportunities within the state	5	11	15	12	17	33	12	0	12	8	36	21
D. A. and B.	22	16	15	24	4	17	24	24	15	15	14	14
E. A. and C.	22	20	18	16	21	7	21	21	20	8	14	16

Wealth: L = \$500 - 4,000; M = \$4,001 - 7,000; H = \$7,001 - higher.

Local Support: L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

TABLE LXVI

FISCAL POLICY - PRESENT SITUATION
BY FEDERAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Federal Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities between the states	20	7	18	18	30	16	23	19	21
B. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within each state	31	38	39	27	25	42	46	26	36
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education have enacted laws and regulations that provide adequate equalization of educational opportunities within the state	16	7	5	33	15	0	8	32	14
D. A. and B.	15	24	17	13	5	26	15	15	7
E. A. and C.	16	24	21	9	25	16	8	9	21

Federal Support: L = 0 to 7%; M = 7 to 14%; H = 14 and higher %.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE LXVII

FISCAL POLICY - PRESENT SITUATION
BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities between the states	22	14	16	33	17	22	13	13	14	19	29	50
B. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within each state	44	41	31	0	31	31	14	10	16	19	19	25
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education have enacted laws and regulations that provide adequate equalization of educational opportunities within the state	9	10	10	0	17	27	7	6	2	7	5	0
D. A. and B.	9	18	20	33	14	13	33	35	50	24	14	0
E. A. and C.	17	17	23	33	22	7	38	37	20	3	33	25

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.
Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE LXVIII
 FISCAL POLICY - PRESENT SITUATION
 BY TYPE OF DISTRICT

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Administrators		Board Members	
	Dependent	Independent	Dependent	Independent
A. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities between the states . . .	22	14	21	20
B. Federal assistance programs have resulted in equalizing educational opportunities within each state . . .	39	36	32	29
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education have enacted laws and regulations that provide adequate equalization of educational opportunities within the state	12	9	26	20
D. A. and B.	15	19	10	15
E. A. and C.	12	12	11	15

TABLE LXIX

FISCAL POLICY - AS SHOULD BE BY
LOCAL SUPPORT AND EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Local Support						Education		
	Administrators			Board Members			Board Members		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs should result in equalizing educational opportunities between the states	15	22	20	21	20	18	20	14	38
B. The federal government should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the states	8	3	3	7	0	7	0	8	0
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state	25	24	33	29	47	31	40	41	19
D. A. and B.	10	14	9	0	7	10	0	12	6
E. A. and C.	43	38	35	43	27	34	40	25	38

Local Support: L = 0-10 mills; M = 11-15 mills; H = 16-20 mills.

Education: L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE LXX

FISCAL POLICY - AS SHOULD BE
BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Statements	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
A. Federal assistance programs should result in equalizing educational opportunities between the states	16	21	19	33	16	20	19	21	19	18	20	25
B. The federal government should be responsible for equalization of educational opportunities within the states	4	2	5	0	3	8	4	3	4	7	4	0
C. The State Legislature and State Department of Education should be responsible for equalizing educational opportunities within the state	44	30	27	0	32	37	33	29	25	37	28	25
D. A. and B.	8	11	10	33	8	6	12	8	8	7	8	25
E. A. and C.	28	36	39	33	42	29	32	40	44	32	40	25

Age: L = less than 35; M = 35-45; H = over 45.

Tenure: L = less than 10; M = 10-20; H = over 20.

TABLE LXXI

PREFERENCE FOR GENERAL FEDERAL AID BY WEALTH

(Data in Percentages)

Question: Would you prefer general federal aid over specific-purpose aid?	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Board Members</u>		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
Yes	84	83	84	74	81	82
No	16	17	16	26	19	18

L = \$500-4,000; M = \$4,001-7,000; H = more than \$7,001.

TABLE LXXII

PREFERENCE FOR GENERAL FEDERAL AID BY ENROLLMENT

(Data in Percentages)

Question: Would you prefer general federal aid over specific-purpose aid?	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Board Members</u>		
	L	M	H	L	M	H
Yes	88	88	88	84	85	79
No	12	12	12	16	15	21

L = 101-700; M = 701-1,400; H = more than 1,401.

TABLE LXXIII

PREFERENCE FOR GENERAL FEDERAL AID BY EDUCATION

(Data in Percentages)

Question: Would you prefer general federal aid over specific-purpose aid?	Board Members		
	L	M	H
Yes	71	84	81
No	29	16	19

L = less than high school; M = high school; H = Bachelor's or higher.

TABLE LXXIV

PREFERENCE FOR GENERAL FEDERAL AID BY AGE AND TENURE

(Data in Percentages)

Question: Would you prefer general federal aid over specific-purpose aid?	Age						Tenure					
	Adm.			Bd. Mem.			Adm.			Bd. Mem.		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
Yes	83	83	88	76	88	75	83	83	88	76	88	75
No	17	17	12	24	12	25	17	17	12	24	12	25

Age: L = less than 35 years; M = 35-45 years; H = over 45 years.

Tenure: L = less than 10 years; M = 10-20 years; H = over 20 years.

VITA 3

John Leonard Martin

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: PERCEPTIONS OF OKLAHOMA EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS AND
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS RELATIVE TO FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT
IN LOCAL EDUCATION

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born Gainsville, Arkansas, June 22, 1937, the son
of C. L. and Marie Martin.

Education: Graduated from Alfalfa High School, Alfalfa, Oklahoma,
in 1955; received the Bachelor of Science degree with a major
in Mathematics from Southwestern State College, Weatherford,
Oklahoma in May 1959; received the Master of Arts degree with
a major in Mathematics from Rutgers, the State University,
New Brunswick, New Jersey, in August, 1962; completed re-
quirements for the Doctor of Education degree in August, 1969.

Professional Experience: Teacher of mathematics and coach in the
schools of Jefferson County, Colorado, from 1959 to 1961 and
from 1962 to 1963; teacher of mathematics and coach in the
schools of Apache, Oklahoma, from 1963 to 1964; superintendent
of Weaver Schools, Frederick, Oklahoma, from 1964 to 1966;
business manager of the Stillwater Schools, Stillwater, Okla-
homa, from 1967 to 1969.

Professional Organizations: Local, state and national educational
associations; Oklahoma Association of School Administrators;
Oklahoma Association of School Business Officials; National
Association of School Business Officials; and Phi Delta Kappa.