

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS' LEADER
BEHAVIOR AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF CHANGES
UNDER CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

By

EUGENE HOWSON FRANKLIN
"

Bachelor of Arts
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas
1956

Master of Education
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas
1966

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
December, 1974

MAY 11 1976

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS' LEADER
BEHAVIOR AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF CHANGES
UNDER CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth H. Davis

Thesis Adviser
Earl R. Anderson

Russell D. Brown

Larry M. Perkins

N. N. Durkin

Dean of the Graduate College

938619

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not have been possible without the cooperation of the teachers and principals of the schools that took part in the study.

The writer wishes to acknowledge the support and help he received from his graduate committee: Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Dr. Russell Dobson, Dr. Carl Anderson, and Dr. Larry Perkins.

A sincere thanks to Dr. St. Clair, thesis adviser, for his unrelenting support and encouragement throughout the research.

A special thanks to Joyce, my wife, whose kind words: "There is always room at the top," provided the impetus for the writer to attempt this endeavor.

A very special thanks to my daughter, Denise, and my son, Ronald, for understanding and accepting in a very positive manner why Dad had to be away.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Hypotheses	4
Definition of Terms	5
Theoretical Framework	6
Assumptions of the Study	7
Limitations of the Study	8
Significance of the Study	8
Organization of the Study	9
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
Power-Shift	10
Role of Principal Under Contractual Agreement	18
Summary	23
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	24
The Sample	24
The Procedure	26
The Instrumentation	27
The Research Design	31
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	32
Hypothesis One	32
Hypothesis Two	32
Hypothesis Three	33
Hypothesis Four	33
Additional Analysis	39
Summary	42
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	44
Summary of the Study	44
Conclusions of the Study	46
Implications of the Study	47
Recommendations	50
Further Considerations	51

Chapter	Page
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
APPENDIX A - INITIAL AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS TO PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY	56
APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENTATION PACKETS FOR THE STUDY	61
APPENDIX C - LETTERS REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE THE INSTRUMENTS	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Distribution of Principals by Level of Preparation	26
II. Professional Experience of the Principals in the District	26
III. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) for the LBDQ and the Lutz Opinionnaire	34
IV. Raw Scores for LBDQ and Lutz Opinionnaire	35
V. Means and Standard Deviation for LBDQ and Lutz Opinionnaire	36
VI. Frequencies and Percentages for LBDQ	38
VII. Frequencies and Percentages for Lutz Opinionnaire	38
VIII. Raw Scores of Quadrant I Principals on Two Factors of the LBDQ and Two Factors of the Lutz Opinionnaire	41
IX. Raw Scores of Quadrant III Principals on Two Factors of the LBDQ and Two Factors of the Lutz Opinionnaire	41
X. Point-Biserial Correlation Coefficient for Quadrant I and Quadrant III of the LBDQ and Two Factors of the Lutz Opinionnaire	42

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The scope of collective negotiations between teachers' organizations and boards of education has broadened from negotiating salaries and working conditions to demands from teachers for greater participation in the decision-making process. Teachers have desired and attempted for many years to be involved in determining educational policy of the schools. Their efforts were often thwarted, ignored or they participated in relative insignificant matters. Whatever contributions the teachers made on educational matters, they were largely at the whim of the administration. As a result, much of their participation was perfunctory or it consisted of getting consensus from teachers for already approved decisions by the administration. In short, the teachers were used to approve and implement policy for which they had very little input.

As Fenwick (1972) suggested, teachers in most school systems have been power dependent for many years in the authority structure of the school system. By using their concerted efforts, the threat of strikes, work stoppage, and sanction, they are changing their position from a complete dependent one to a more balanced relationship.

Adams (1965) stated that teachers, after being deliberately left out of the decision-making process for years, are demanding from their

employers their rightful place in the decision-making process in the matters of educational policy.

Perhaps the most succinct statement concerning the position of teachers' organizations on being involved in decision-making was made by Shanker:

Teachers do not want the power to be heard and then turned down: they have long been listened to and consulted. No matter how hard teachers have argued and demonstrated and reasoned, there has always been a point at which the principal could say, "No." If they then appealed to the superintendent and the school board, the power to affirm or reject has been in the administration. Now teachers are demanding for themselves the equivalent power to say "No." This power intends to insure decision-making in consort, by working things out together (1969, p. 79).

Corwin (1970) stated that the teachers' organizations are trying to achieve equalization of power in the school system. In a study of nearly 2,000 teachers in 28 high schools in a five state area, he reported the most frequently discussed dispute was the conflict between teachers and administrators over authority problems. Over 70 per cent of the teachers involved in the study believed that they should have the authority to make major educational decisions.

Boyan (1969) stated that teachers have been reading and hearing about greater participation in the decision-making process. He said because they liked what they have been reading and hearing, they are moving in that direction.

In effect, then, it appears that collective negotiation is the vehicle that teachers used to change the formal authority structure of the school system. It is this change in the authority structure or the power-shift which has become a major source of concern for many principals. According to Watson (1966) this power shift has emerged as a source of conflict between administrators and teachers. Because

of the new power position of teachers, some doubt has been expressed as to whether the principalship is still a viable leadership position or not.

Redfern (1969) acknowledged that collective negotiations have brought new and significant changes in the decision-making process. These changes, according to Redfern (1969), affect most school principals and raise doubts for many of them concerning their prerogatives. He made the following observations concerning the principal's new position as an educational leader.

Individual principals may feel reduced in stature and importance. If so, this may be primarily a phenomenon of a given situation. It is not a reduction of the principalship as a position. What is called for is a new kind of principal--one who is able not only to survive but also to surmount turmoil and conflict, one who has the ability to tolerate frustration, embrace innovation, and accept change without feeling diminished. The issue for the principalship is one of adjustment and reallocation of responsibilities--not diminution of leadership importance (p. 59).

Bennion (1969) made the following comments concerning the new teacher--principal relationship:

Teachers are going to be involved in one way or the other. The critical questions are: In what ways are they going to be involved? What will the roles and relationships be? How will the decision-making process in education be affected as a result of a greater teacher involvement? How will the role of the principal be affected by the increasing influence of teachers (p. 59)?

Statement of the Problem

There is little empirical evidence focusing upon the new teacher-principal relationship. The problem investigated in this study will attempt to focus upon the different ways that principals react to

negotiations and their perception of the influence of negotiations upon their role as principals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to (1) determine what changes principals perceive in administering a school under the new teacher-principal relationship, and (2) determine if principals with different leader behavior as reflected on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire will perceive the changes differently.

Hypotheses

H₁ - There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

H₂ - There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

H₃ - There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

H₄ - There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

Definition of Terms

Teachers' Organization. The term used in this study refers to either the American Federation of Teachers and its affiliate units, or the National Association and its state and local units.

Negotiations. "A process whereby employees as a group and their employer make offers and counter-offers in good faith on the conditions of their employment relationship for the purpose of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement" (Lieberman and Moskow, 1966, p. 1).

Contract. A contract is a written agreement between the employees' organization which represents the teachers and the employer, the board of education.

Leadership. Chase (1953) defined leadership as the function performed by a person in terms of influencing group decision and action by way of contributions to the attainment of group goals and satisfactions. Since the principal is the designated leader in the school, this study will focus upon his leadership behavior.

Leader Behavior. Leader behavior has been operationally defined by Stogdill (1957) as scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ-Ideal was used to describe the behavior of the ideal principal or was considered a description of how a principal should behave and the LBDQ-Real was used to describe the actual principal or was considered a description of how the principal does behave. Halpin (1966) examined two basic dimension of the LBDQ. The first dimension is Initiating Structure, which refers to the leader's behavior delineating the relationship between himself and members of the group, in trying to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure.

The second dimension is Consideration, which refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and his staff.

Perception. For the purpose of this study, perception is defined as a selective process in which a person tends to see things as they fit into his past experience.

Authority. Blau and Scott (1960) define authority as the ability of one person to evoke compliance from a group to a command or a directive. Two criteria of authority are voluntary compliance and suspension of judgment in advance of the command.

Power. Blau and Scott (1960) define power as the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his will despite resistance.

Theoretical Framework

In the study of leadership behavior, most group theorists stress two dimensions of leader behavior: the institutional dimension where the goals of the organization take precedent over any other consideration and the personal dimension where the individual needs are emphasized more than the organizational goals. Among the theorists who espouse such conceptual framework are Gutzels-Guba (1958)--Nomothetic versus Idiographic; Etzioni (1961)--Instrumental versus Expressive; and Halpin (1966)--Initiating Structure and Consideration. In most studies using these concepts, the leader behavior seems to be reflected somewhere along the continuum which ranges from supporting institutional goals to focusing on individual needs.

Since most principals reflect a leader behavior that is either

based on authority (that is role oriented) or based on a collegial relationship (people oriented) or both, Halpin's conceptual model of leader behavior was used in this study.

The rationale for this theoretical framework is that collective negotiations appear to be changing the authority structure of the public school systems. The position which seems to be under the most stress is that of the principal. The new authority structure will have some affect on the role of the principal. That is, some new type of principal-teacher relationship will be developed. And the kind of relationship which develops will be contingent upon the leader behavior exhibited by the principal. Principals who exhibit one type of leader behavior might find that they have to make some changes, while principals who exhibit another kind of behavior may not have to make adjustments because their behavior will lead to the kind of teacher-principal relationship dictated by negotiations. It is believed that the difference in leadership behavior as reflected on the scores of the LBDQ will also be reflected in the principal's perception of changes in his decision-making process and his perception of changes in his administrative functions being altered and/or deleted under the negotiated contract.

This theoretical framework forms the basis for the hypotheses which were stated earlier in the study.

Assumptions of the Study

There are three assumptions pertinent to this study: (1) It is assumed that the responses to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire by the teachers reflect their true feelings. (2) It is assumed that the principals' responses to the questionnaire reflect their true

perceptions of the conditions working under the contractual agreement.

(3) It is further assumed that the process of randomization will result in an accurate representation of the population.

Limitations of the Study

The sample in this study is limited to one school district in Kansas. It was limited to the principals who were serving in that role in the school district for six years or more. Further, the principal had to have worked in the same building at least two years. Teachers used in the sample must have worked with this principal for at least two years. These two limitations caused many principals and teachers to be eliminated from the study. Generalizations made beyond this population must be made with caution.

Significance of the Study

It appears that collective negotiations is becoming a way of life in the public school systems. In order to prevent the image of public education from suffering in the public's eye and in order to prevent further internal strife and conflict between principals and teachers, it is necessary to ascertain what kind of leader behavior can function under the contractual agreement and satisfy the terms of the contract. To the extent that the principal establishes a behavioral pattern which will satisfy teachers, conflict will be minimal. As Bennion stated, the major concern for educators is that of building a working relationship between teachers and administrators that will allow each participant to make the best contribution possible, "and avoid divisive conflicts which

still sap the energies of all participants and paralyze school systems" (1969, p. 82).

The significance of this study lies in the identification of perceived changes in principals' behavior so that initial steps might be taken (later) to improve working relations with teachers under contractual agreement. Hopefully, this study can provide the superintendents with useful data for further selection of principals, can show the need for in-service training to enable administrators to adjust to this new relationship, and to make superintendents and school boards aware of the need for principals' input into negotiations.

Organization of the Study

A general description of the problem under investigation has been presented in this chapter. The problem involved a determination of perceived changes by principals in their decision-making process and perceived changes by principals concerning deletion or alteration of their administrative function under contractual agreement. Definitions were provided for terms relative to this study. Hypotheses were stated concerning the problem, considering both the perception of principals and their leader behavior.

A review of the literature concerning the role, authority, and function of the principal working under negotiated contracts is presented in Chapter II. A description of the sample population, a description of the instrumentation, and the procedure utilized in the study are presented in Chapter III. In Chapter IV an analysis of the data is presented. A brief summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further study are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is an examination of the major development of the power shift between teachers and principals caused by collective negotiations as well as an overview of the research focusing upon the subject.

Power-Shift

Collective negotiations between teachers' organizations and boards of education had been going on for several years before literature and research appeared focusing upon the role of the principal administering a school under contractual agreement. As the collective activity of teachers' organizations increased and as they began to get results from their demands for bilateral decisions on educational matters, literature appeared examining the new power alignment. Specifically, the literature began to examine the role of the principal in the new power structure.

Describing the role of the principal working under contractual agreements, Cunningham (1969) stated the positions of the teachers and the board of education are clear under the new power alignment, but the position of the principal is not. As a result, many principals feel uncertain about the new relationship; it has become a source of deep unrest and caused many frustrations for many of them.

Lutz, Kleinman, Evans (1967) stated that the power distribution

was among teachers, superintendents, and boards of education. They suggested that the role of the principal is an unrealistic one under contractual conditions.

The principal is...the one who operates from a powerless base; has been stripped of most of his leadership role by the central administration; and does not participate in most decision-making that affects his building staff. Furthermore, he is out of the mainstream of the organizational life, being neither a part of the administration oligarchy, nor the teacher collectivity (p. 82).

Cunningham (1969) said that the polarization between the superintendent and teachers has made the principal the man in the middle.

He went on to say:

The spectre of the two negotiating parties, neither of which represents the principals, reaching accord by swapping such things as work rules which have been the principal's prerogative until now, is the source of increased frustration, if not panic, for the building administrator (p. 257).

Commenting on "the man in the middle," Myers (1973) stated that this position places the principal in quite a dilemma. He explained the dilemma in the following way. While the principal is a part of the administration, he must be able to work effectively with teachers. This dilemma is intensified during a strike. If he supports the administration he jeopardizes his working relationship with his teachers. On the other hand, if he supports the teachers, he risks losing the support of the man who can fire him. Hatch (1971) blamed the central administration for the demise of the principalship. He also stated that the fact that the principal's role was not a legally defined one contributed to the role being in a state of uncertainty. Wagstaff (1973) agreed that the fact the role of the principal was not legally defined is one source of the current problems. He added that the past actions

of principals, superintendents and academicians have also contributed to the principal's loss of status.

Shils and Whittier (1968) stated that the new relationship has caused many principals to feel that while they still have the responsibility for running the school, they do not have the authority to do so. Wagstaff (1973), making a similar observation, commented the principal is expected to operate a good school without the authority to use his greatest resources--the teachers. Redfern (1969) stated that as boards of education fail to think things through, they could very well accelerate the erosion of the principal's right to administer and manage his school.

Donovan (1971) acknowledged that negotiations changed the professional status of principals. Because of negotiated contracts, the principal can no longer make personnel assignments or develop policy based upon his personal whims. Instead, he must make assignments and develop programs and policies which comply with the provisions of the contract agreement. His decisions, then, must not be made until he has consulted his staff. Donovan (1971) made the following observations about the new situation that principals are facing:

New conditions do require a different sense of proportion in the running of a school and make it necessary for a principal to realize that he is but one of a number of people interested in the school problem.... (p. 44).

Observing that the principalship is an old and honored administrative position that pre-dates the superintendent and has always been considered a vital link in the educational system, Wagstaff (1973) stated that the position is being severely squeezed. He commented that many writers have labeled the position as "ailing", "bordering on

extinction", and "anachronistic" (p. 40). Fenwick (1968) stated that the principal is in "troubled waters" because of the mounting pressures on the school systems. He said that because of the pressures, the role of the principal could be reduced to that of a "figure head." Fenwick further stated that the new power alignment has been a severe shock to many principals. The fact that many of them realize their impotence under the new power alignment has also caused serious psychological effect on them. Redfern described their behavior as one of dismay and confusion.

Shannon (1970) believed the new relationship between teachers and the principal has ended the principal's role as "super teacher" and "daddy." The change in role is due to the fact that teachers will look more to their own group for professional growth and to the professional organization for protection. He also said that the principal's role as a change agent will be limited because of the restrictions in the contract.

Hatch (1971) indicated that the days of the "benevolent despot" are over. The principal under the new relationship will have to develop a model of leadership that will facilitate staff participation in decisions affecting the school.

Redfern (1969) acknowledged that collective negotiations is widening the gulf between teachers and principals. He disagreed with the notion that collective negotiations would destroy the working relationship between teachers and principals. He did suggest that collective negotiations created a new process of educational decision-making. He viewed the change in the new teacher-principal relationship as one which demands re-evaluating administrative prerogatives, finding

meaningful ways for making cooperative decisions, and finding more appropriate ways for utilizing teachers and other staff members so they can contribute to the educational process more than they have before. Redfern did predict that the educational leadership role of the principal would decrease under the new relationship as the managerial role increased. Erickson (1965) also stated that the role of the principal is changing rather than declining. He, too, predicted that the principal's role as the instructional leader will decrease.

Bennion (1969) agreed with others concerning the principal role as an instructional leader. He attributed this to several reasons. One is because knowledge is increasing at such a rapid pace, the curriculum has become more sophisticated and specialized. Secondly, the principal is finding it quite taxing to keep up with the rapid changes in his field, he hardly has time or energy to keep up with the changes in other fields. Thirdly, when the principal leaves the classroom, he loses some of the feelings for the teaching-learning process. Fourthly, it does not take the principal long to realize that his administrative role places him in a different world--"a world of meetings, reports, budgeting, building maintenance, and parents..." (Bennion, 1969, p. 84).

✓ The principal cannot adequately perform the function of instructional leadership or headmaster in the sense of being the master teacher. When the commitment is made to become an administrator, the principal moves into a new professional world which requires new professional skills and competencies and a different orientation than that of a teacher (Bennion, 1965, p. 85).

In an interview with elementary and secondary principals, concerning working under contractual agreements, Cunningham (1969) reported that many principals felt that negotiations was a fight for

survival and the ones who suffered most were the principals because they were not represented at the negotiating table. The principals insisted that they must have authority commensurate with their responsibility to do their job, otherwise, they would have problems meeting their responsibilities. Only two principals of the ones interviewed by Cunningham saw positive results developing from the new teacher-principal relationship.

During the interview, Cunningham stated that a theoretical framework emerged which is germane to the principals' reaction to the new power alignment in the schools. He said the theoretical framework came from Rokeach's book, The Open and Closed Mind. According to Cunningham, people who possess "open" belief systems are characterized as viewing authority in terms of its cognitive correctness and consistency with reliable information about the world. People who possess "closed" belief systems view authority as absolute. He said that while principals expressed various views toward collective negotiations, they tended to reflect beliefs which placed them on one end of the continuum or the other. Examples of principals' reactions to negotiated contracts were given by Cunningham. He reported that one principal admitted an inability, as well as little desire to cope with the change in the control structure of the school. His response to the new power alignment was "I was appointed to run this school and just can't accept giving away my authority to teachers. I'll get out first" (Cunningham, 1969, p. 263). The principals who reflected an open belief system believed that contracts developed from collective negotiations would enlarge their role and would permit them to routinize many details that had previously been handled by the more

time consuming method of individual consideration. These principals believed that their time could be better spent with more important concerns of educational leadership such as developing collegial methods of attacking educational problems in the school and community involvement in the development of educational programs (Cunningham, 1969, p. 243). When asked how they felt about having to work under contractual rules and procedures, their responses were, "teachers will be bound by the rules, too," and that "a bargaining contract can only result in a more uniform handling of problems from which we will all benefit" (Cunningham, 1969, p. 263).

Boyan (1969) stated that many principals see teachers involved more and more in establishing rules and regulations which they must administer. Teachers are also gaining the right to monitor the principals' behavior while the principals feel that they are losing the right to monitor the teachers. He described the principals as being perplexed and vexed at the new power alignment.

Schroeder and Reisert (1968) reported, in a study dealing with teacher-principal relationship under contractual agreement, that principals felt that the contract agreements have reduced their discretionary authority, affected their role as an instructional leader, and have deteriorated their leadership abilities with their staff. They further reported that the principals not only felt that negotiations had weakened the relationship between them and the teachers, but it had caused the relationship to deteriorate between teachers and teachers, and between the school and the community. The principals also stated that the central office, teachers' organization and the board of education made agreements without thinking about them

and without thinking about the consequences the agreement will have on them doing their jobs. In a similar study, Love (1967) reported that collective negotiations increased the teachers' input into the decision-making process of the school system and enhanced their power base. His findings indicated that teachers' organizations were influencing policy in the area of personnel, but they were making less progress influencing policy in the educational area. Love added that many principals are under some added pressure and difficulty because of collective negotiations. But most of them viewed collective negotiations as being helpful in making them more aware of teachers' rights and especially helpful in making principals cognizant of their own limitations by making them operate under a common rule (Love, 1968, p. 99). Lutz and Evans (1968) reported in a study concerning contractual agreements that principals perceived the negotiated contract as restricting their leadership prerogatives.

Redfern (1969) stated that collective negotiations has caused a power shift in teacher-principal relationship. He stated that it appears that the educational hierarchy is confused and dismayed by the power struggle. He made the following observation concerning the new power-shift.

Principals and other administrators would be wiser to accommodate themselves to changes in working relationships. The re-allocation of power in educational decision-making more properly means a more effective division of responsibility and authority among teachers, principals, other administrators, and supervisors. It is the best application of the best expertise available to a given problem.
The allocation of more power to teachers does not necessarily mean a surrender of a like amount to the other components of the decision-making process (p. 59).

Watson (1969) agreed that collective negotiation agreements grant more power to teachers. He predicted that the trend would continue until a complete revision in the authority structure has been achieved. He pointed out that people in the authority position often distributed power and control on an informal basis. He indicated that the relentless pressures exerted by teachers' organizations on state legislatures would ultimately formalize the authority relationship. It is this formal relationship which caused a power shift among the hierarchical levels in school systems. He added that one of the effects of this power-shift has been the principal's loss of power and discretionary authority.

Role of Principal Under Contractual Agreement

The traditional role of the principal appears to be a thing of the past. The principal, traditionally, has been considered as the educational leader of the school. In this role, he was expected to provide participation in community activities and many other educational activities (Lutz, 1967). Redfern (1969) noted that as an administrative arm of the system, the principal had the responsibilities of implementing administrative policies at the local building, interpreting the purposes and objectives of the school system, and expediting and coordinating the program of the school system. In addition, principals, traditionally, had been given the responsibility for the following activities: Assignment of teachers placed in their building; preparation of teaching schedules; assigning teachers to committees; developing daily operational policies and procedures; administering control and discipline over students; assigning extra-curricular duties, determining

class size; and conducting faculty meetings (Redfern, 1969, Watson, 1968, Perry and Wildman, 1966).

The collective activity of teachers which is directed at modifying the authority structure of the school system is rapidly changing the role of the principal. Teachers, although they once accepted this role of the principal, are no longer satisfied with this arrangement. As Redfern (1969) pointed out,

Teachers are insisting on the right to negotiate many of the matters which affect the daily operations of the school; to negotiate directly with top school officials; to negotiate through their freely chosen representative (p. 52).

It is the demands by teachers' organizations for a larger role in the decision-making process of the school; the demands for participation in making the rules and regulations; and the demands to monitor the principal's performance which has brought teachers' organizations into direct confrontation with the authority structure of the school (Boyan, 1966). It appears that the principalship is receiving the greatest impact from this negotiation. One reason for the principal's position being affected so much by collective negotiations was explained by Fenwick. He stated that it appeared to be difficult for principals to realize that it was their own position which supports the old autocratic organization, provides it with stability and serves as a barrier to democratization and reform.

By continuing to withdraw towards entrenched positions and away from teachers' demands to be involved in the decision-making process, principals fall into the trap of defending the status quo and abandoning any claim for leadership. By denying the necessity for changing themselves, they preserve the rigor mortis of the educational bureaucracy (Fenwick, 1968, p. 159).

To insure that the role of the principalship remains a viable one, Fenwick recommended two approaches: First, the principals must establish a partnership relationship with teachers. This partnership must include decision-making in areas of school policies, curriculum, and teachers' evaluation. The teacher-principal relationship as described by Fenwick has been called a participatory model and participatory technique by Hatch (1971) and Brain (1971) respectively. The second approach recommended by Fenwick was the use of differentiated staffing. He viewed differentiating staffing as a vehicle for providing teachers with varying competencies a way to serve the school in different capacities; creating a collegial atmosphere among students, staff, and administrators; and ending the authoritarian structure of the educational bureaucracy which interferes with democratic participation by teachers in the decision-making process of the school. Utilizing these two approaches, the role of the principal under negotiated contracts becomes one of a skilled social manager.

The competence of the changed principal will be measured in the interpersonal skills with which he works with a team of teacher specialists. These are the real "change agents" of education. The principal is responsible, then, for the quality of professional relations within the social system of the school. He is an intergroup specialist. Relations of a staff will be made collegial and highly interrelated by the principal's coordination. That he should be able to do this without reverting to coercion, fear, or paternalism suggests the quality of preparation he will need (Fenwick, 1968, p. 161).

Lewis (1965) agreed that principals fail to see the larger problems because they spend too much time defending the status quo. While exerting so much effort defending their old position, he said they are missing an excellent opportunity to provide the leadership that present

conditions demand. He suggested that teachers and principals should work together to establish educational goals which will be understood and accepted by all. With teachers participating more in educational decisions, Lewis stated that the need for agreement on educational goals has never been greater. The role of the principal, according to him, should be one of helping the group arrive at mutually determined educational goals. Interaction among all members is necessary if everyone is going to make maximum contribution toward achieving organizational goals. In order to facilitate the kind of interaction which will permit teachers to participate effectively as individuals, as well as in groups, open communications must be established. "This means not only communication of facts; it means communications of feelings, of attitudes, and of wishes--in other words informal as well as formal communications" (Lewis, 1965, p. 12). Under the new teacher-principal relationship, it is the function of the principal to initiate the actions which will lead to the proper communication within his school (Lewis, 1965).

Erickson (1965) stated that the new role of the principal will be that of a "strategic coordinator". He explained the function in the following way:

This implies that rationally and artfully combining of the discrete human and material components of a school and its community to form a functioning whole, an educational instrument for a particular group of students at a particular juncture of time (p. 16).

Under the new teacher-principal relationship, Bennion suggested that the principal's new role in helping the instructional program should be in exerting his efforts and powers to create conditions in which effective teaching and learning can take place. According to

Bennion, the principal could make available adequate facilities, provide proper resources, make in-service training available, develop and keep a positive relationship with parents, and interpret the school unit's needs to the central office administration. Bennion added that all of these activities make a major impact on the quality of the educational program. He made the following comment about the way the principal can contribute to the instructional program.

In order to play this role, the principal must be a thoughtful and reflective student of education who is aware of the major movements and thrusts in education. His questions should cause teachers to examine their teaching behavior and to explore new possibilities for enhancing the learning process. He should be able to bring teachers together in professional dialogue and cooperative endeavors that promote professional growth and more effective use of teacher skills. He should be willing to share the risk of uncertainty of change and innovation by encouraging and supporting teachers who are willing to try something different (Bennion, 1969, p. 86).

Redfern (1967) said the role of the principal working under negotiated contracts will change considerably. He defined the new role of the principal as an implementor and coordinator of rules and regulations established by a committee rather than by the central administration. The principal's new role could be that of a member of a decision-making committee, according to Redfern.

More involvement in the negotiating process is often recommended as one of the new roles or functions of the principal. Some of the recommendations are made on the basis that the principal will lose if he is not involved (Wagstaff, 1973), (Epstein, 1969). Evidence of this kind of activity taking place especially in large school districts was reported by Love (1968) and Watson (1968). Instead of losing some of their discretionary authority and administrative prerogatives, the

principals found ways to maintain them through their negotiation units (Love, 1968). Others are made on the basis that the educational process will be better served by the principals' involvement in negotiations (Bennion, 1969), (Hatch, 1971), (Watson, 1968), and (Redfern, 1969). Bennion's comments seemed to express the major concern when he stated that the decisions made at the negotiation table will have a lasting affect on the education program. They would be better decisions if they included the wisdom, experience, and perspective of the principals.

Summary

The literature suggests that negotiations have resulted in a change in the authority structure of the school. This change in the authority structure has caused a shift in power between principal and teachers and ultimately has emerged as a conflict between the two groups.

With the change in the authority structure, a new kind of teacher-principal relationship has emerged. This relationship appears to dictate a new role for the building principal. It suggests that the principal must develop a leadership built on collegial authority rather than authority of position.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research procedure used in the study. A description of the design and the sample used is included in this chapter as well as a description of the instruments utilized and the statistical procedures followed.

The Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from a population of all principals and teachers employed in one school district in Kansas. Principals were not included in the sample if they had not been a principal in the district for at least six years and/or had not been a principal in their present building at least two years. These limitations were established, as indicated earlier in the study, because principals who served in the district less than six years would not have had the experience as building principal in the district prior to the beginning of negotiations. Therefore, it would be impossible for them to give their perceptions of any changes in their behavior since negotiations. Also, if the principal had worked in a building for less than two years, it would be difficult for a teacher to accurately describe his leader behavior. The latter reason also explains the rationale for excluding teachers from the study who had not worked for the principal at least two years. The total number of principals

eligible for the study was 61. The principal sample consisted of 30 principals selected at random utilizing a table of random numbers (Popham, 1967). Once the principals were selected for the study, the teacher population was identified. Six teachers for each principal were chosen by random selection from their faculty's roster utilizing a table of random numbers (Popham, 1967).

Twenty seven responses were received from a possible 30 making a 90.0 per cent return from the principals. A total of 130 responses was received from a possible 162 making a 72.2 per cent return from the teachers.

The sample distribution by age categories was as follows:

Age	Number	Per Cent
30-39	2	7.0
40-49	11	41.0
50-59	7	26.0
60-65	7	<u>26.0</u>
		100.0

The sample of principals included three females and 27 males. The distribution of the respondents among grade levels was as follows:

	Elementary	Secondary
Male	11	13
Female	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	14	13

Presented in Table I is a breakdown of the levels of preparation of the principals in the sample. Table II shows the total number of professional years of experience the principals have in the district.

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY
LEVEL OF PREPARATION

Degree	Number of Principals	Per Cent of Principals
Masters + 15	0	.0
Masters + 30	16	59.3
Ed.S.	4	14.8
Ed.D.	7	25.9
Total	27	100.0

TABLE II
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE ON THE
PRINCIPALS IN THE DISTRICT

Years as Principal	Number of Principals	Per Cent of Principals
6-10	15	55.6
11-15	2	7.4
16-20	6	22.2
Over 20	4	14.8
Total	27	100.0

The Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was granted by the district's
Director of Research.

After the 30 principals were chosen, the questionnaire (see Appendix B) with a cover letter was sent to each one asking him to participate in the study and to respond by a specified date (see Appendix A). When the specified date expired, a telephone call was made to each principal who had not responded. Only one principal indicated that he did not wish to participate; two others did not respond to the instrument provided.

Once the 27 principals had responded, the LBDQ (see Appendix B) with cover sheet (see Appendix A) was sent to the 162 teachers requesting their participation in the study. They were asked to respond by a certain date. Following the waiting period, follow-up letters were sent to all teachers, again asking them to respond by a specific date. When the second waiting period was over, a second follow-up letter was sent to all six teachers in schools where at least four responses had not been received. Four respondents were required because that number reflects the minimum number of ratings each leader should have using the LBDQ (Halpin, 1957). All data were gathered during the spring semester of the 1973-1974 school year.

The Instrumentation

Leader Behavior Measure

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was the instrument used to describe the leader behavior of the principals in the study. The instrument was developed as a part of the Ohio State Leadership Studies. These studies approached the study of leadership by examining and measuring the behavior of leaders rather than identifying the

personality traits of leaders (Stogdill, 1957). Originally, the LBDQ was developed by Hemphill and Coons, but it was later modified for use in the educational setting and conceptualized along two basic dimensions by Halpin and Winer (Stogdill, 1957, pp. 6-73). Since this modification many studies of leader behavior have utilized the LBDQ. This instrument has been used to describe the actual perceived leader behavior of persons in leadership positions as well as the ideal or expected behaviors of those leaders. The estimated reliability by the split-half method is .83 of the Initiating Structure scores and .92 for the Consideration scores (Halpin, 1957, p. 6). The LBDQ has proven to be effective in discriminating between the two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior in a large number of studies.

The form of the LBDQ utilized for this study contains 40 items, 15 of which relate to the Consideration dimension, 15 relate to the Initiating Structure dimension, and 10 are "buffer" items. The total instrument (see Appendix B) was used in this study.

All of the Likert scales of the instrument were assigned a zero to four value. Possible responses were "always," "often," "occasionally," "seldom," or "never." Twenty-seven of the items were scored four for "always" to zero for "never." Three of the items: 12, 18, and 20 were scored zero for "always" to four for "never."

The Opinionnaire

The opinionnaire was developed by Lutz et.al. to be used in a study done under the auspices of the Center for Urban Education in New York. The opinionnaire was designed to measure the principals' perceptions of the contract's effect on their own leadership and to measure the

teachers' perceptions of the contract's effect on the principals' leadership (Lutz, 1967, p. 10). Three professors of educational administration were solicited to write 30 different questions relating to ten areas of educational leadership which would elicit responses about the effect of the union contract upon these areas. Included among the topics were initiating of structure and consideration, protection against outside influences, protection against interference by the administration and innovations. After a period of one month, each question was put in a file and drawn by lot. One by one, each question was evaluated to ascertain whether it applied to some topic area. Two of the three professors had to agree or the question was discarded. This procedure resulted in a questionnaire of 59 questions. From these 59 questions, two questionnaires were developed, one eliciting the principals' perception of the contract's effect on their own behavior and one eliciting the teachers' perception of the contract's effect on the principal's behavior. The questionnaires were administered to a group of 95 principals and 100 teachers in Philadelphia. Using the data from this group, a factor analysis was conducted on each item on both questionnaires. Two factors emerged. Lutz described them in the following way. Factor I measured the principal's perception of changes in his ability to operate in the school as a result of the contractual agreement. Factor II measured the principals' perception of changes in his ability to allow the teachers to operate in the school as a result of the contractual agreement. The questions which loaded .45 or higher on a factor for both teachers and principals were used for the final questionnaire. The present form of the teachers' questionnaire, consisting of 38 items, was sent to 5,000 teachers with approximately

2,000 responding. The present form of the principals' questionnaire was sent to 800 principals with 533 responding (Lutz, 1968, p. 10). In this study only the principals' questionnaire was used.

All of the Likert scales of the instrument was assigned a one to five value. Possible responses were "strongly agree," "agree," "no opinion," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." Nineteen of the items were scored one for "strongly agree" to five for "strongly disagree." The remaining 11 items: 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 15, 21, 22, 25, 27, and 28 were scored five for "strongly agree" to one for "strongly disagree."

As was pointed out earlier in the study, the purpose was to (1) determine what changes principals perceive in administering a school under the new teacher-principal relationship, and (2) determine if principals with different leader behavior as reflected on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire will perceive the changes differently. The opinionnaire was used in the study to measure the principals' perceptions. The LBDQ was used in the study to measure their leader behavior. When all questionnaires were received, they were scored and tabulated. The means by principal and the total population were computed for the LBDQ scores on the dimension of Initiating Structure and Consideration. The principal's total score on the opinionnaire was used to determine his perceptions of the changes in administering a school under contractual agreements.

Using the principal's score (his perception) as measured by the questionnaire and his leader behavior scores as measured by the LBDQ, a statistical analysis was run using the Pearson's Correlation Coefficient.

The Research Design

This study was designed to measure the relationship between the leader behavior of principals and the principals' perceived behavior changes under contractual agreements. The Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was selected for the statistical analysis. Correlations were run to test each hypothesis. The $p < .05$ level of probability was selected as the level at which results were considered significant.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the data that were gathered to test the hypotheses in the study. The researcher adopted the $p < .05$ probability level of significance.

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis One: There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

The Pearson r coefficient of correlation computed to measure this relationship yielded a $r = .35$ (Table III), which is not significant at the $p < .05$ level of confidence. Therefore, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. This result indicates that the relationship between consideration, as a leader behavior, and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations was not statistically significant.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception

of changes in their ability to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

Data for Hypothesis Two yielded a Pearson $r = .16$ (Table III). This coefficient of correlation is not significant at the $p < .05$ level. Therefore, null Hypothesis Two cannot be rejected. These data indicate that the relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the schools was not statistically significant.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

Data for Hypothesis Three yielded a Pearson $r = .14$ (Table III). Because this statistic is not significant at the $p < .05$ level of confidence, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. These data indicate that the relationship between Initiating Structure, as a leader behavior and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations was not statistically significant.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the school as a result of negotiations.

The Pearson r computed for data to test Hypothesis Four yielded a $r = .12$ (Table III). This coefficient of correlation is not significant at the $p .05$ level. Therefore, Hypothesis Four cannot be rejected. These data indicate that the relationship between Initiating Structure, as principals' leader behavior, and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations was not statistically significant.

TABLE III
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION
COEFFICIENT (R) FOR LBDQ AND
LUTZ OPINIONNAIRE

	LBDQ	
	Consideration	Initiating Structure
ability to operate the schools	.14	.12
ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools (Lutz)	.35	.16

Analysis of Table IV indicates that principals who were rated high on the Consideration dimension by teachers (LBDQ) tended to

perceive themselves as high in their ability to operate the schools under contractual agreements. All 27 principals perceived themselves as higher on their ability to operate in the schools under negotiated contracts than on their ability to allow teachers to operate. These directional differences, as well as differences in the amplitude of the ratings, are also reflected in the means and standard deviations for these factors (Table V). Standard deviations for these two factors of the LBDQ indicate that there was also greater variability in the ratings on Consideration (6.31) as compared to Initiating Structure (5.19). In contrast, principals' perception (Lutz Opinionnaire) indicate greater differences in both central tendency and variability than were found in teachers ratings (LBDQ). The mean of the ability to let teachers operate in the schools factor on the Lutz instrument was 36.19 while the mean for the ability to operate in the schools was 45.56. The standard deviation for the ability to operate in the schools dimension was 4.25 as compared to 6.39 for the ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools.

TABLE IV
RAW SCORES FOR LBDQ AND LUTZ OPINIONNAIRE

Code	LBDQ		LUTZ	
	Consideration	Initiating Structure	Ability to allow teachers operate in the schools	Ability to operate in the schools
01	35	34	37	50
02	49	44	40	51
03	39	35	30	39

TABLE IV (Continued)

04	50	41	44	59
05	47	41	40	48
06	42	37	35	36
07	42	41	40	46
08	42	40	32	41
*09				
10	41	41	38	48
11	48	43	39	49
*12				
13	45	41	33	37
14	47	38	39	42
*15				
16	30	38	40	54
17	28	31	28	45
18	42	38	33	42
19	40	43	39	50
20	35	34	38	41
21	33	27	39	47
22	40	36	31	35
23	41	42	33	46
24	38	44	42	51
25	25	39	30	37
26	43	48	34	43
27	40	37	36	46
28	41	38	37	59
29	38	37	30	40
30	32	24	40	48

*Did not respond

TABLE V

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION

<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
LBDQ		
Consideration	39.74	6.31
Initiating Structure	38.22	5.19
Lutz Opinionnaire		
Consideration	36.19	4.25
Initiating Structure	45.56	6.39

An analysis of teachers' ratings of principals is presented in Table VI. This analysis indicates that 13 of the 27 or 48% of the principals were rated by teachers as high above the means on Initiating Structure while 14 of 27 or 52% were rated as below the means on Consideration. Seventeen or 62.5% of the principals were rated high on the Consideration factor. Eleven of the 27 principals (40.5%) were rated by teachers as high on both Consideration and Initiating Structure. Eight (30%) were rated low on both dimensions. Two of the principals (7.5%) were rated as low on Consideration, but high on Initiating Structure, while six (22%) were rated as high on Consideration, but low on Initiating Structure.

An analysis of principals' perception (Lutz Opinionnaire) is presented in Table VII. These data indicate that 15 of the 27 principals (55.5%) perceived themselves as high on the ability to operate the schools under contractual agreement (Initiating Structure) while 12 or 44.5% perceived themselves as low in the ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools under contractual agreement (Consideration).

Thirteen (48%) of the principals perceived themselves as high on both the ability to operate in the school under contractual agreements, while ten principals (37%) perceived themselves as low on both dimensions. Of the remaining four principals, two (7.5%) perceived themselves as high on the ability to operate the schools, but low on the ability to allow teachers to operate. Two principals (7.5%) perceived themselves as low in the ability to operate in the schools, but high in their ability to allow teachers to operate.

TABLE VI
 FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES FOR LBDQ

		Consideration		
Initiating Structure		N = 2	N = 11	
		7.5%	40.5%	
				Mean
		N = 8	N = 11	
	30%	40.5%		
				Mean

TABLE VII
 FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES FOR LUTZ
 OPINIONNAIRE ABILITY TO ALLOW
 TEACHERS TO OPERATE IN
 THE SCHOOLS

Ability to operate in the school		N = 2	N = 13	
		7.5%	48%	
				Mean
		N = 10	N = 2	
	37%	7.5%		
				Mean

Comparison of the breakdowns across the two test instruments

(Table VI and Table VII) indicate that while 15 (55.5%) of the principals perceived themselves as high in the ability to operate their schools, only 13 or 48% were rated high on the comparable, Initiating Structure, dimension by teachers. Thirteen principals (48%) perceived themselves as high in both their ability to operate their schools and their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools while 11 (40.5%) received similar ratings by teachers. Ten principals (37%) perceived themselves as low on both of these dimensions, while eight (30%) were rated by teachers as low on both factors. Two principals (7.5%) perceived themselves as high in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools, but low in their ability to operate in the schools under contractual agreements. Six principals (22%) were rated by teachers as high on Consideration and low on Initiating Structure. Two principals (7.5%) perceived themselves as low in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools, but high in their ability to operate their schools. Two principals (7.5%) were rated as low on Consideration and high on Initiating Structure.

Additional Analysis

Halpin utilized a quadrant to analyze his data and to define both groups. He identified the group in quadrant I which was above the means on Initiating Structure and Consideration as the most effective leaders. The group in quadrant III which was below the means on Initiating Structure and Consideration as the least effective leaders. The groups in quadrants II and IV as in the middle range of effectiveness (Halpin, 1966, p. 104).

An analysis of the data (Tables VIII and IX) on the principals in Quadrant I and Quadrant III of the LBDQ indicates that principals who were rated above the means on both leader behavior dimensions and principals who were rated below the means on both leader behavior dimensions tended to perceive themselves as higher on their ability to operate in the school than on their abilities to allow teachers to operate in the school. Both groups of principals were rated higher on the Consideration dimension than they were on the Initiating Structure dimension.

The Point-biserial correlation coefficient r (Table X) for principals rated above the means on both leader behavior dimensions and the principals rated below the means on both leader behavior dimensions and Factor I of the Lutz Opinionnaire (ability to operate in the schools) was .14. This relationship was not statistically significant. The Point-biserial correlation coefficient r computed for these two dimensions of the LBDQ and Factor II of the Lutz Opinionnaire (ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools) was .25. Although this correlation coefficient indicated a low-positive relationship between these dimensions and Factor II of the Lutz instrument, it was not statistically significant.

TABLE VIII

RAW SCORES OF QUADRANT I (HIGH-HIGH) PRINCIPALS
ON TWO FACTORS OF THE LBDQ AND TWO
FACTORS OF THE LUTZ OPINIONNAIRE

LBDQ		Lutz Opinionnaire	
Initiating Structure	Consideration	Factor I	Factor II
44	49	51	40
41	50	59	44
41	47	48	40
41	42	46	40
40	42	41	32
41	41	48	38
43	48	49	39
41	45	37	33
43	40	50	39
42	41	46	33
48	43	43	34

TABLE IX

RAW SCORES OF QUADRANT III (LOW-LOW) PRINCIPALS
ON TWO FACTORS OF THE LBDQ AND TWO
FACTORS OF THE LUTZ OPINIONNAIRE

LBDQ		Lutz Opinionnaire	
Initiating Structure	Consideration	Factor I	Factor II
34	35	50	37
35	39	39	30
38	30	54	40
31	28	45	28
34	35	41	38
27	33	47	39
37	38	40	30
24	32	48	40

TABLE X
 POINT-BISERIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR
 QUADRANT I (HIGH-HIGH) AND QUADRANT III
 (LOW-LOW) OF THE LBDQ AND TWO FACTORS
 OF THE LUTZ OPINIONNAIRE

Lutz Factor	Correlation Coefficient r
I. Ability to Operate Schools	.14
II. Ability to Allow Teachers to Operate in Schools	.25

Summary

Presented in this chapter are the results of correlations used to test the hypotheses in the study. The first hypothesis was not rejected in that there was no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in a school as a result of negotiations. The second hypothesis was not rejected in that there was no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in schools as a result of negotiations. The third hypothesis was not rejected in that there was no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations. The fourth hypothesis was not rejected in that there were no significant

relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the school as a result of negotiations.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first part of this final chapter contains a brief summary of the research including the findings. The second part contains conclusions made from the findings as well as implications drawn from those conclusions. The last section focuses on recommendations for further study.

Summary of the Study

The focus of this study was on the role of the principal administering a school under contractual agreements. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to determine what changes principals perceived in administering a school under the new teacher-principal relationship, and to determine if principals with different leader behavior as reflected on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire would perceive the changes differently.

The sample for this study was drawn from a population of all principals and teachers employed in one school district in Kansas. A total response of 27 principals and 130 teachers was received in the study. The principals' perception was measured by their score on the opinionnaire. The principals' leader behavior was measured by the teachers' responses using the LBDQ.

The following hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r).

Hypothesis One: There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations.

Analysis of the data generated by this study indicates that none of the relationships hypothesized were statistically significant. Hypothesis One was not rejected in that there was no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in a school as a result of negotiations. The second hypothesis was not rejected in that there was no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in schools as a result of

negotiations. The third hypothesis was not rejected in that there was no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the schools as a result of negotiations. Hypothesis Four was not rejected in that there was no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Initiating Structure) and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in the school as a result of negotiations.

Conclusions of the Study

No conclusive evidence was discovered to indicate collective negotiations had any significant effect on the decision-making functions of the principals. The findings of the study appear to refute ^{refute} statements by writers in the field of collective negotiations. As reported in Chapter II, some writers suggested that collective negotiations contracts did not adequately reflect the need of principals and as a result, the principals would be hampered in carrying out their administrative functions. This study revealed that the principals did not perceive that they had been affected in their decision-making or their administrative functions related to the internal management of the school.

Since all four hypotheses were not rejected, this seems to suggest that there is statistically no significant relationship between principals' leader behavior and principals' perception of changes in their ability to operate in school as a result of the negotiated contract. However, it must be remembered that while there was no statistically significant relationship, there was some relationship.

Guilford (1956) stated that one interpretation of the size of correlation depends upon how it is used. In effect, relationship is largely relative. Guilford provided the following guidelines for assessing the strength of any given relationship:

Less than .20	slight, almost negligible relationship
.20 - .40	low correlation; definite but small relationship
.40 - .70	moderate correlation, substantial relationship
.70 - .90	high correlation; marked relationship
.90 - 1.00	very high correlation, very dependable relationship (Guilford, 1956, p. 145).

A review of the correlations of the four hypotheses reveals the following: hypothesis one, $r = .35$; hypothesis two, $r = .16$; hypothesis three, $r = .15$; hypothesis four, $r = .12$. Therefore, there is a chance that there is a low, but non-significant relationship between principals' leader behavior (Consideration) and their perception of changes in their ability to allow teachers to operate in the school as a result of negotiations (H:1).

Implications of the Study

The study seems to suggest that there is no statistically significant relationship between principals' leader behavior and their perception of changes in their ability to operate in the school or in their ability to allow the teachers to operate in the school.

Data in Chapter IV tended to show a pattern between the two variables (leader behavior and perception). As was pointed out in Chapter IV, Tables VI and VII, the principals who were rated high on

both leader behavior dimensions and the principals who were rated low on both dimensions tended to perceive themselves higher on their ability to operate in the school than on their ability to allow teachers to operate in the school. Both groups of principals were rated higher on Consideration than they were on Initiating Structure by the teachers' responses.

This apparent paradox implies that Initiating Structure and Consideration are no longer adequate instruments for measuring leader behavior. A partial answer to this paradox might be that the negotiation process has so defined the parameters for the behavior of teachers and principals that the structure is already established. As a result, the principals have learned to operate within this new relationship. This could certainly be the case since negotiations have been going on in the district for six years. If this were true, it would explain the lower ratings that the principals received by the teachers on the Initiating Structure dimension. This appears to indicate that the teachers do not see the principal functioning in this role because the structure has already been defined. This would certainly support the observation made by Cunningham (1969) who stated that many principals felt that negotiated contracts would make rules that everybody had to live with. He added that the contract would settle many of the small time-consuming issues which prevented the principal from attending to the larger issues of the school. Love (1968) made similar observations.

In addition to implications that the role of both teachers and principals already tightly defined by the contract, and that Initiating Structure and Consideration might not be valid dimensions for measuring

leader behavior under contractual agreements, another implication is found from this apparent paradox that relates to Chapter II. It has been stated that the role of the principal under the new teacher-principal relationship would be that of an implementor, coordinator, or a social manager. If this is the new role of the principal, this would explain his lower perception of changes in his ability to allow teachers to operate in the school. What is implicit in this lower perception is that he has little or nothing to say about how or what the teachers do. The teachers' perception of the principal as a coordinator or implementor would be different. Similarly, this would support the higher ratings that teachers gave them on the Consideration dimension and the lower rating on the Initiating Structure dimension.

In Chapter II it was suggested by Wagstaff (1973) and Epstein (1969) that principals get involved in negotiations in order to protect their own vested interest. Love (1968) reported that principals were becoming more involved in negotiations in larger districts through their own negotiations unit. Since the principals in the study are involved in negotiations, this might explain why the principals do not perceive changes in their ability to operate in the school. Maybe they protected themselves through negotiations.

Although collective negotiations have appeared to change the traditional authority structure of the public school, they appear to have structured a new relationship that allows the principal to operate in the school.

Recommendations

Several studies germane to this subject appear to be applicable as a result of this study. The first recommendation is to use the LBDQ to identify the principals' leader behavior. Using a specific set of questions, interview the principals and then compare their responses with their leader behavior. The second recommendation is to replicate the study using a larger sample in a school district that has been negotiating one to three years. The third recommendation is to do a study using open and closed mindedness or the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale to measure one variable and get the principals' response to specific questions by interviewing or by using open ended questions. The fourth recommendation is to replicate the study with a larger sample using the elementary and secondary principals as separate groups and compare them on the same variables. The last recommendation is to use the Lutz instrument with teachers and principals as separate groups and compare them on some other variable or variables.

In summary, the findings and conclusions of this study do not support the current educational literature concerning the principals' perceived loss of administrative authority as a result of collective negotiations. How and to what extent collective negotiations have effected the role of the principal was not clearly established in the study. Nor was there evidence in the findings to support a new kind of authority (collegial, participatory) relationship between teachers and principals working under negotiated contracts. More research focusing on these specific variables might provide further information.

Further Considerations

As stated earlier, the significance of this study lies in the identification of perceived changes in principals' behavior so that initial steps might be taken (later) to improve working relations with teachers under contractual agreement. A further significance was to provide the superintendent with useful data for further selection of principals; to show the need for in-service training to enable principals to adjust to this new relationship; and to make superintendents and boards of education aware of the need for the principals' input into negotiations.

The study shows no significant relationship between the principals' perceptions and their leader behavior. There were no clear indications revealed in the study concerning principals' selection or the need for in-service training. Further research focusing upon these subjects might provide some useful information to superintendents and boards of education.

If the implications made earlier in the study are valid, it may be surmised that the study appears to support the professional literature on the importance of having principals involved in collective negotiations.

It appears that it was this involvement in negotiations which prevented the principals from losing their administrative and their discretionary authority. Hence, the perception of some principals that no changes due to negotiations in their ability to operate in the school resulted from their involvement in the process.

A further consideration is that the district has been involved in collective negotiations for six years. Perhaps, the principals have adjusted to this new arrangement and perceived collective negotiations as not affecting their ability to operate.

While principals' selection is a major concern for superintendents and while in-service training can help to make principals aware of their new rôle under negotiated contracts, it appears that principals' involvement in collective negotiations is the most important variable.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bennion, John W. "The Teacher and the Principal in Curriculum Development." Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969.
- Blau, Peter M., and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Study. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1960.
- Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher and the Authority Structure of the School." Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas and the Council for Educational Administration, 1966, pp. 1-21.
- Brain, George G. "Professional Negotiations and the Elementary School Principal." Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969.
- Corwin, Ronald G. Staff Conflicts in Public Schools. Cooperative Research Project Number 2637. Columbus, Ohio: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio State University, 1968.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship." Theory into Practices, 7 (April, 1968), pp. 62-70.
- Donovan, Bernard E. "Negotiations: Ten Years Later." National Association Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, 55 (December, 1971), pp. 40-48.
- Downie, N. M. and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row Publishing Company, 1965.
- Epstein, Benjamin. "A Principal Shares some Thoughts on the New Era of Collective Negotiation in Public Education." The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education. Eds. Patrick W. Carlton and Harold I. Goodwin. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Company, 1969, pp. 113-124.
- Erickson, Donald A. "Changes in the Principalship: Cause for Jubilation or Despair." Elementary School Principal, 44 (April, 1965), pp. 16-20.
- Fenwick, English. "The Ailing Principalship." Phi Delta Kappan, L (November, 1968), pp. 158-161.

- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Halpin, Andrew W. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1957.
- Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Hatch, Terrance E. "The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations." National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, 55 (December, 1971), pp. 26-39.
- Lewis, Arthur J. "The Future of the Elementary School Principalship." Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington, D. C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1965, pp. 3-14.
- Lieberman, Myron and Michael H. Maskow. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.
- Love, Thomas M. "The Impact of Teacher Negotiations on School System Decision-Making." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1968.)
- Lutz, Frank W. and Seymour Evans. "The Union Contract and Principal Leadership in New York City Schools." New York City, New York: Center for Urban Education, 1968.
- Lutz, Frank W., Kleinman, Lon and Seymour Evans. Grievances and Their Resolution. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1967.
- Myers, Donald A. Teacher Power: Professionalization and Collective Bargaining. Boston: Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Company, 1973.
- Perry, Charles A. and Wesley A. Wildman. "A Survey of Collective Activity Among Public School Teachers." Educational Administration Quarterly, II (Winter), pp. 131-167.
- Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Redfern, George B. "Negotiation Changes Principal Teacher Relationship." Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969.
- Schroeder, William A. and E. John. "Teacher Unrest and the Principal: Pointers for Principals Series." Bulletin No. 2. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana Association of Elementary School Principals, December, 1968.

- Shannon, Thomas A. "The Principal's Management Role in Collective Negotiations, Grievances, and Strikes." Journal of Secondary Education, 45 (February, 1974), pp. 51-56.
- Shils, Edward B., and C. Taylor Whittier. Teachers, Administrators, and Collective Bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.
- Stogdill, Ralph M., and Alvin E. Coons Eds. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. RESEARCH MONOGRAPH Number 88. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
- Wagstaff, Lonnie H. "Unionize Principals - You May Be Next." National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, 59 (November, 1973), pp. 40-47.
- Watson, Bernard G. "The Principal: Forgotten Man in Negotiations." Administrators Notebook, XV (October, 1966), p. 2.

APPENDIX A

INITIAL AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS TO
PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

March 29, 1974

.Dear

I am a graduate student at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. As a candidate for the Ed.D. Degree in Educational Administration, I am conducting a research on Negotiations. My subject is an "Investigation of Perceived Behavior Changes by Principals Working Under Negotiated Contracts." A random selection of principals in the _____ Public Schools was taken from the directory in the personnel division. Your name was selected from a district wide sample.

I would like to request that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped, return envelope provided for your convenience by April 12, 1974. Some of the teachers in your building will also be requested to complete a form.

Let me assure you that your responses and those of the teachers will remain confidential. Neither you nor the school will be identified in the study. Approval for this study to be conducted in the _____ School System has been granted by the District's research council. Therefore, please feel free to respond to all of the items on the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for giving your time to this study. Your responses are sincerely appreciated and, hopefully, they will contribute to a better understanding of the principal's behavior working under negotiated contracts.

Sincerely,

Eugene H. Franklin

April 18, 1974

Dear

I am a graduate student at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. As a candidate for the Ed.D. Degree in Educational Administration, I am conducting research on Negotiations. My subject is an "Investigation of Perceived Behavior Changes by Principals Working Under Negotiated Contracts." Your name was randomly selected from your school's directory.

I would like to request that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped, return envelope provided for your convenience by April 26, 1974.

Let me assure you that your responses to the questionnaire will remain confidential. Neither you nor the school will be identified in the study. Approval for this study to be conducted in the _____ School System has been granted by the District's research council. Therefore, please feel free to respond to all of the items on the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for giving your time to this study. Your responses are sincerely appreciated and, hopefully, they will contribute to a better understanding of principals' behavior working under negotiated contracts.

Sincerely,

Eugene H. Franklin

May 1, 1974

Dear

On April 18, 1974, you received a questionnaire from me concerning the leader behavior of your principal. Due to your busy schedule, you could have either misplaced or forgotten about the questionnaire. Therefore, I am sending you another one. Would you be kind enough to respond to it and return it to me in the self addressed, stamped envelope by May 10, 1974.

If you have already responded to the questionnaire and mailed it to me, please disregard this letter. Since there is no way for me to tell who has responded, it is necessary to write all teachers who are involved in the study.

Sincerely,

Eugene H. Franklin

May 15, 1974

Dear

You undoubtedly feel that because you did not respond to the questionnaire by the two previous deadlines that it is too late! Let me assure you that it is not.

I would appreciate you taking a few minutes from your hectic schedule to respond to the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me by May 23, 1974.

If you have already responded to the questionnaire and mailed it to me, please disregard this letter. Since there is no way for me to tell who has responded, it is necessary to write all teachers who are involved in the study.

Sincerely,

Eugene H. Franklin

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTATION PACKETS FOR THE STUDY

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS:

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
- d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A - Always

B - Often

C - Occasionally

D - Seldom

E - Never

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. He does personal favors for staff members. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 2. He makes his attitudes clear to the staff. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 3. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the staff. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 4. He tries out his new ideas with the staff. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 5. He acts as the real leader of the staff. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 6. He is easy to understand. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 7. He rules with an iron hand. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 8. He finds time to listen to staff members. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 9. He criticizes poor work. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 10. He gives advance notice of changes. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 11. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 12. He keeps to himself. | A | B | C | D | E |

13. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual staff members. A B C D E
14. He assigns staff members to particular tasks. A B C D E
15. He is the spokesman of the staff. A B C D E
16. He schedules the work to be done. A B C D E
17. He maintains definite standards of performance. A B C D E
18. He refuses to explain his actions. A B C D E
19. He keeps the staff informed. A B C D E
20. He acts without consulting the staff. A B C D E
21. He backs up the members in their actions. A B C D E
22. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. A B C D E
23. He treats all staff members as his equals. A B C D E
24. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. A B C D E
25. He gets what he asks for from his superiors. A B C D E
26. He is willing to make changes. A B C D E
27. He makes sure that his part of the organization is understood by staff members. A B C D E
28. He is friendly and approachable. A B C D E
29. He asks that staff members follow standard rules and regulations. A B C D E
30. He fails to take necessary action. A B C D E
31. He makes staff members feel at ease when talking with them. A B C D E
32. He lets staff members know what is expected of them. A B C D E
33. He speaks as the representative of the staff. A B C D E
34. He puts suggestions made by the staff into operation. A B C D E
35. He sees to it that staff members are working up to capacity. A B C D E
36. He lets other people take away his leadership with the staff. A B C D E

37. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the staff members. A B C D E
38. He gets staff approval in important matters before going ahead. A B C D E
39. He sees to it that the work of staff members is coordinated. A B C D E
40. He keeps the staff working together as a team. A B C D E

*Code is for computational purposes only.

SCORING KEY FOR CONSIDERATION

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Never</u>
1	4	3	2	1	0
3	4	3	2	1	0
6	4	3	2	1	0
8	4	3	2	1	0
12	0	1	2	3	4
13	4	3	2	1	0
18	0	1	2	3	4
20	0	1	2	3	4
21	4	3	2	1	0
23	4	3	2	1	0
26	4	3	2	1	0
28	4	3	2	1	0
31	4	3	2	1	0
34	4	3	2	1	0
38	4	3	2	1	0

SCORING KEY FOR INITIATING STRUCTURE

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Occasionally</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Never</u>
2	4	3	2	1	0
4	4	3	2	1	0
7	4	3	2	1	0
9	4	3	2	1	0
11	4	3	2	1	0
14	4	3	2	1	0
16	4	3	2	1	0
17	4	3	2	1	0
22	4	3	2	1	0
24	4	3	2	1	0
27	4	3	2	1	0
29	4	3	2	1	0
32	4	3	2	1	0
35	4	3	2	1	0
39	4	3	2	1	0

	SA	A	NO	D	SD
29. I feel it is easier for me to provide ways for teachers to initiate ideas.					
30. I feel it is less possible for teachers in this school to introduce new ideas in their teaching plans.					
31. I feel staff meetings provide for less mutual communication.					
32. I feel I am more willing to accept other points of view.					
33. I feel I am less able to provide opportunities for teachers to transmit suggestions, comments, and opinions regarding the teaching function.					
34. I feel I am less able to suggest new educational ideas to teachers.					
35. I feel I am seldom able to make suggestions to improve teaching that are based on a recent personal observation.					
36. I feel it is easier to deal with complaints of teachers about my subordinate administrators interfering in their teaching tasks.					
37. I am less disposed to support teachers who are criticized by irate parents.					
38. I feel it is more difficult to deal with complaints of teachers about central office supervisors interference with their teaching tasks.					

*The code used on this questionnaire is for computational purposes only.

SCORING KEY FOR FACTOR I OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Factor I: Ability to Operate in the School

Item	Rating	SA	A	NO	D	SD
1		1	2	3	4	5
3		1	2	3	4	5
6		1	2	3	4	5
10		1	2	3	4	5
11		5	4	3	2	1
14		1	2	3	4	5
15		5	4	3	2	1
17		1	2	3	4	5
18		1	2	3	4	5
19		1	2	3	4	5
21		5	4	3	2	1
22		5	4	3	2	1
23		1	2	3	4	5
27		5	4	3	2	1
28		5	4	3	2	1
30		1	2	3	4	5
31		1	2	3	4	5

SCORING KEY FOR FACTOR II OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Factor II: Ability to Allow Teachers to Operate in the School

Item	Rating	SA	A	NO	D	SD
2		5	4	3	2	1
4		5	4	3	2	1
5		1	2	3	4	5
7		5	4	3	2	1
8		5	4	3	2	1
9		1	2	3	4	5
12		1	2	3	4	5
13		1	2	3	4	5
16		1	2	3	4	5
20		1	2	3	4	5
24		1	2	3	4	5
25		5	4	3	2	1
26		1	2	3	4	5
29		5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX C

LETTERS REQUESTING PERMISSION
TO USE THE INSTRUMENTS

102 Gundersen Hall
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

March 28, 1974

Dr. Frank W. Lutz
Head, Department of
Educational Policy Study
College of Education
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Dear Sir:

My doctoral study in the area of negotiations, entitled "Investigation of Perceived Behavior Changes by Principals Working Under Negotiated Contracts," requires the use of the opinionnaire used by you in your study "The Union Contract and Principal Leadership in New York City Schools."

May I please request permission to use this instrument for my research purposes?

Sincerely yours,

Eugene H. Franklin

March 28, 1974

Dr. Ralph Stogdill
Bureau of Business Research
College of Commerce and Administration
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dear Sir:

My doctoral study in the area of negotiations entitled "Investigation of Perceived Behavior Changes by Principals Working Under Negotiated Contracts," requires the use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

May I please request permission to use this instrument for my research purposes?

Sincerely yours,

Eugene H. Franklin

VITA

Eugene Howson Franklin

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS' LEADER BEHAVIOR AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF CHANGES UNDER CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in DeQueen, Arkansas, August 23, 1933, the son of Mr. and Mrs. James L. Franklin, married to Joyce L. Franklin.

Education: Attended DeQueen Public Schools in DeQueen, Arkansas; graduated from Sevier County High School, Lockesburg, Arkansas in 1952. Attended Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, 1952-54. Attended Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas, 1954-56, receiving a B. A. degree in English in 1956; received the Master of Education degree in Educational Administration at Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas, 1966. Completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in December, 1974.

Professional Experience: Teacher of Language Arts and Social Studies at Mathewson Junior High School in Wichita, Kansas, 1962-66; Assistant Principal at Mathewson Junior High School, Wichita, Kansas, 1966-68; Assistant Principal at Wichita High School Southeast, Wichita, Kansas, 1970-73; Graduate Assistant in the College of Education Extension Department 1973-74.