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ABSTRACT

The Secondary School Principal's Role in Professional Negotiations as Perceived by Representatives of Utah's Educational Enterprise

by

Paul H. Lefavor, Doctor of Education

Utah State University, 1970

Major Professor: Dr. Terrance E. Hatch
Department: Educational Administration

The objective of this study was to examine the extent to which congruent role expectations on 50 selected variables were held for the secondary school principal about his role in professional administration and in collective negotiations by representatives of Utah's educational enterprise. The selected variables describe certain possible functions performed by the principal and were subgrouped into nine topic headings that were tested by use of the null hypothesis method. The nine topic variables were: (A) Instruction and Curriculum Development, (B) Personnel Staffing and Placement, (C) Pupil Arrangement and Control, (D) Public Relations, (E) School Building Management and Finance, (F) The Negotiations Process, (G) Grievance Procedure, (H) Related Impasse Action, and (I) Association Membership.

The respondents in this study included all secondary school principals, presidents of local boards of education, presidents of local teachers' associations,
superintendents of local school districts, and a stratified random sample of secondary school teachers from each of Utah's forty school districts. The respondents responded to an original instrument, "The Principal's Role Expectation Scale," based on a weighted 5-point Likert scale used to determine role congruency.

The statistical instruments used to determine the per cent and amount of agreement between and among the responding groups on the 50 selected variables included an analysis of variance technique, the F Test, Duncan's New Multiple Range Test and Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus. The statistics provided descriptive data about the principal's expected role performance on the nine null hypothesis as well as each of the 50 selected variables.

Findings and Conclusions

1. Each hypothesis produced a significant statistical difference among the responses of the responding groups as they perceived the role of the secondary school principal in professional administration and collective negotiations. Therefore, each hypothesis was rejected.

2. Although there was a significant difference among the responding groups pertaining to the secondary school principal's perceived professional administration roles, there was a high per cent of consensus within the responding groups about these roles. It was also apparent that there was a
higher percent of consensus within the responding groups about the principal's professional administration roles than there was about his negotiation roles.

3. There was no statistically significant difference among the responding rural and urban segments of Utah's educational enterprise about the secondary school principal's professional administration and negotiation roles.

4. There was a high percent of consensus within most groups pertaining to the secondary school principal's negotiation roles. However, the consensus scores and mean value responses indicated several areas of divergent points of view both within and between the responding groups.

5. Areas of incongruity between the related principal's professional administration roles and his collective negotiation roles may be presumed to indicate paradox and they are reported in the conclusions beyond the statistical analysis.

It may be concluded from this study that there was a high percent of consensus within the responding groups about the secondary school principal's professional management roles and that his role in collective negotiations is still uncertain. The principal's professional administrative role appears subject to change and that the responding groups may have a great amount of influence on the direction of his future role expectations unless he himself becomes more active as a participant in the negotiations process.
CHAPTER I

NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The Introduction

This study investigated some of the dimensions and conflicts of the secondary school principal's professional role and his role in negotiations. Roles are filled by people and people act in terms of expectations arising from various groups and in terms of commitments to organizational structures. The school principal is a major actor in the educational arena and participates in many ways as a result of the expectations issued from the different segments of the social system in which he operates.

Because the secondary school principal plays an important role in the educational enterprise, it is important to study the emerging trends of negotiations as it relates to the facets of principal-staff relationships. The principal's primary goal is to exercise professional leadership in the development and advancement of proposals which promote the educational growth of the child. Thus, the principal is concerned along with his associates in the gathering of data, the developing of salary schedules, the promoting of curriculum projects and the defining of working conditions in order to enhance the child's educational development.
The principal's relationship to such diverse managerial situations, the now passe unilateral teacher acceptance of the *status quo*, salary schedules, curriculum projects and working conditions exemplified the need to re-evaluate the circumstances in which the principal participates. Teacher groups have decided to utilize institutionalized-dissent organizations to accomplish their desired ends. These organizations whether designated as associations or unions use the process (known as professional negotiations or collective bargaining) to achieve their desired objectives. The rapid development of this process in the public sector which includes the educational enterprise has left many unanswered questions.

Teacher-School Board agreements are now in the second or third generation and have been developed with little or no involvement of school principals. Some policy decisions have been made between teacher groups and Boards of Education that directly affect the operation of the school, the principal's role and his ability to carry out his functions. Such items as class size, curriculum content and grievance procedures are being negotiated. Thus, the principal is often affected in relationships to his staff and other incumbents of the educational enterprise by decisions which are made without his participation.
Review of Literature

Greenman (1939) indicated that in the private sector, the foreman had lost some of his prestige because of the fact that contract decisions were made without their representatives at the bargaining table. Thus, the possibility exists of unions and management destroying the authority of the foreman by processing grievances, welfare issues, job descriptions, etc., at a higher level. It is also postulated by some that the aforementioned condition may develop with the principal in his function as he relates to his staff, subordinates and superordinates.

School administrators have been, in general, pleased with the ever increasing competence of the teacher. Teachers are now better prepared in the subjects they teach and they possess improved ability in teaching techniques and managerial control methods. Administrators are not so sure, however, about the demands teachers are making to become more involved in decisions about school programs as well as their own welfare issues. Thus, many people are now wondering what the long-range effects of this new teacher aggressiveness will have upon the profession and/or the society as a whole.

Negotiations, thus far, have brought about some perplexing problems for the school administrator, particularly the building principal. What stand is the principal of a school to take when teacher groups seek to negotiate directly with the Board of Education not only on salary and welfare matters but on virtually all aspects of school organization and management? Does the
principal "in action and deed" become an assistant to the superintendent? Does he become a representative of the teachers? Is he to become a consultant to both the Board of Education and the teacher groups? Will he be in a minority group without representation or will he serve some other role that is not presently defined? McPeek (1967), concluded in an Ohio study concerning the position of the school principal in collective negotiations that:

(1) The Ohio Federation of Teachers endorses both teacher groups and principals groups, (2) The Ohio Education Association considers the principal as a teacher in some instances and as management in others, and (3) Principals demonstrated greater identification with superintendents and boards of education than they did with teacher groups.

The aforementioned implications and especially the problem of teacher groups negotiating agreements directly with Boards of Educations without principal involvement on either side indicates the severity of the present arrangements. Principals are presently charged with the responsibility to create and sustain a professional climate of operational procedures in their schools. Principals are also charged with the responsibility to use the full creative capacities of all the employees under their jurisdiction for the attainment of educational objectives. But--the apparent strained relationships, divergent views and individualistic actions seem to have developed incongruent situations.
Getzels and Guba (1954), in a model which has since been expanded and refined by themselves and others and discussed in detail in Getzels, Liphom and Campbell (1968), stated that role conflict varies as a function of incompatibility of expectations for the role. This paradigmatic presentation illustrates that behavior is altered by the perceived expectations placed on the role. To the extent an individual meets the role expectations, he meets with approval. However, if one does not meet the perceived role expectations, he is subject to disapproval.

This model assumes that observed behavior in a social system involves both a nomothetic and an idographic dimension which can be thought of as being conceptually independent but which are phenomenally interactive. The nomothetic dimension of the model deals with institutional goals, and the idographic dimension describes the values held by the individual and his needs-disposition. Behavior, therefore, may be depicted as a function of the two analytic elements: (1) Institution, role and expectations, which collectively form the nomothetic dimension of an activity and (2) individual, personality and needs-disposition which collectively form the idographic dimension.

The sub-publics who have an interest in a social institution define the role, which constitutes the dynamic aspects of the position or the offices within the institution, as well as the prestige attached to them. The role, then, establishes the behavioral tone for a given position i.e., the expectations held for an incumbent of the role. Role expectations consist of certain rights, obligations, and privileges which delineate the acceptable frame of action for an incumbent filling a position.
The idographic dimension of group action is concerned with the personality of the role of the incumbent. Personality is, of course, imbeded within the larger framework of an individual's biological and philosophical dimensions, which may be considered as enlarged denominators of the original model. One's personality determines his psychological needs, which interact to determine his needs-dispositions. These needs are the major determinates of the personal expectations of the incumbent of a given organizational role.

Thus, satisfaction gained by an incumbent from his participation in a given role is determined by the congruence or lack of congruence between his values and needs and the expectations held for the role by others. The incumbent, consequently, will perceive a situation to be satisfactory or unsatisfactory by the extent to which his needs-dispositions are congruent with the expectations for the role. Within the aforementioned theory, one can generalize that incongruence between role and role expectations may lead to administrative inefficiency, loss of productivity and, if extremely severe, failure by both the individual and the institution. Since teachers, superintendents, school board presidents and principals, themselves, appear to differ in their expectations for the principal, the performance of the principal and the program in the school may be affected.

Companion studies at Colorado State College by Moellenberg (1966), Chappel (1966) and Herbertson (1966) were conducted to determine how school board members, superintendents, and teacher groups perceived teacher negotiations and the role to be played by the superintendent in this process.
No clear definition of the superintendent's role was given. It was found, however, that the most important factor in the negotiations process is the willingness of administrators to work with teachers. It was concluded, that in the negotiations process, it is important for the superintendent to work closely with representatives of teachers, and it is vital for him to foster interpersonal relationships and peer acceptance. After studying opinions of teachers and administrators in the negotiations process, Clark (1965) concluded that it is questionable whether the superintendent can continue to perform the traditional role of serving both the school board and the classroom teachers in collective negotiations.

In an attempt to define the status and position of the principal in the negotiation process, Epstein (1965) stated, "As principals we are very much a part of what goes on around the negotiating table, therefore, it is sound policy that we should be there and be heard. We have too many contributions to make to boards, the superintendent, the teachers, the schools--and too much is at stake to be away from the proceedings." Epstein (1969) reaffirms this statement and in positive language asserts that some matters which are administrative perogatives should not be subject to negotiations.

Rhodes and Long (1967) point out that collective negotiations have sharpened the distinction between administrators and teachers. They say the principal's role in middle management is particularly in need of close analysis in the changed environment within the public school system. Even
though Epstein, Rhodes and Long offer concrete and logical suggestions as to what the principal's role might be, the authors do not support their suggestions with research findings.

A study of the public school principal by Garver (1967) indicated that the principal did not perceive collective bargaining as being especially harmful nor detrimental to public education. Garver did, however, question seriously the impact of collective bargaining on the role of the principal. In what way this impact would specifically effect that role was not researched.

In an unpublished doctoral study by Thompson (1968), it was indicated that principals had considerable decision-making authority in their buildings, and that this authority did not have to be shared on a collegial basis with the teachers. Thus, the present school management model resembled a hierarchial model rather than a collegial one. However, the attitudes toward sharing with teachers the perogatives now held by principals is in a state of change. The study showed that board members are reluctant to have the principals digress from their unilateral decision-making position in which the superintendents and principals generally tended to agree. But--teachers were far more desirous to share the perogatives of the principal. A further analysis of the study showed that teachers were not too interested in decisions requiring the exercise of judgement and discretion as they are in increasing their own security against what they consider capricious abuses of their conditions of employment i.e., to substitute for absent teachers, to be assigned arbitrarily to lunch hour supervision and to have inequalities in class size.
The Need for the Study

Since the emergence of teacher strikes as a significant means for teachers to gain recognition and meet their welfare demands, the school principal has been faced with the dilemma of professional negotiations. The advent of professional negotiations has been speculated as removing the principal from his central position of leadership in the educational enterprise. With professional negotiations, has also come the addition of conflicting points of view from not only national organizations but also from state and local teacher associations.

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) supports the position that the school superintendent should play a "dual role" in professional negotiations by serving, as a fact-finding agent for both the teachers' organization and the school board. This position was confirmed at the 1961 national convention and reaffirmed in 1965. Although this does not appear to be the role being played by the superintendent, the Association's position tends to be a guide for both the superintendents and the principals or else it leads to conflicts in action and philosophy.

The National School Board Association (NSBA) under the direction of Harold Webb at their 1964 convention, made this declaration, "We are against collective negotiations and professional bargaining." The declaration affirmed at the 1965 convention that the policy of the NSBA firmly opposes legislation mandating mediation with teacher groups. These policies tend to establish the
NSBA's position about the retention of local and state controls and also its perception on how local and state boards should accept and discharge their responsibilities. To the NSBA, part of this responsibility is constitutional and legislated authority and this authority may not be delegated to others. Thus, the principal as management should not be a representative of the teachers, as viewed by the NSBA.

Epstein (1965) states that it is the policy of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) to support the right of teachers to pursue professional negotiations with their school boards and if exclusive recognition rights between boards of education and teachers are established, that boards of education should allow for minority group hearings. He also states that it is the policy of NASSP that it is advisable for the superintendent to be the chief negotiator for the board of education and that under no circumstances should the superintendent be denied active participation. However, he did not state or indicate a specific negotiation role for the secondary school principal.

In 1967, the Denver Classroom Teachers' Association (an affiliate of the Colorado Education Association and the National Education Association) completed a collective bargaining agreement with School District Number One, in the City and County of Denver and the State of Colorado which excludes all administrators (thus, principals) from their organization and established exclusive recognition rights for teachers. In part, the Agreement (1967, p. 8-9), states . . . "The board has recognized the association as the exclusive
representative of all members of the teaching staff of Denver Public Schools except the following: speech correctionist, supervising teachers, coordinators, principals, assistant principals, supervisors, directors . . ."

The NEA proposed and passed at its 1968 convention to include the AASA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the NASSP and other groups as departments. Each department has now submitted a new constitution to the NEA for its approval. The NAESP became an affiliate organization with the NEA while the NASSP and the AASA became associate organizations, thus reserving a more independent position. In March of 1968, NEA President, Braulio Alonso, himself a principal, cautioned the NASSP members about becoming disassociated from the teachers' organizations when he said "the secondary principal must understand that today's teachers and schools are changing and he (the principal) must change with them." Mr. Alonso contends that in every case where the principals have not supported teacher demands, the principals have been the losers.

Many state legislatures have passed laws which make collective bargaining mandatory. Some of these laws provide for units of collective bargaining which may recognize the principals' group as being separate from teachers' groups and other laws prohibit more than one unit of bargaining.

The concern noted is that some teacher associations or unions exclude administrators from their organization while other teacher organizations retain administrators within their group. Differences of philosophy about the
membership position of administrators range from the possible concept that the teachers' majority rule as an exclusive bargaining unit can dominate administrative desires by retaining the administrator within the ranks of the teachers' organization to the control of the administrators by boards of education under the concept that the administrator is a legal arm of the board of education. At present, school administrators are not only caught in the middle but they have not come to agreement on their position and as a result are being forced to make a decision as to their association membership. Some are electing to remain in the teacher organizations, others are forming their own representative groups, while others are by being non-committal electing to be quasi neutral. Thus, while state laws appear to provide a voice for different groups within the educational enterprise, the school principal is found vying for an opportunity to promote his own welfare issues and his reasonings on how schools should operate.

The above citations indicate conflicting points of view pertaining to the role expectations of the secondary school principal by local, state and national organizations. This study is, therefore, needed to provide additional information which will help clarify the principal's role in administrative functions. Of prime importance, as pointed out by Getzels and Guba (1954), is the need of allocating and integrating roles and facilities in order to achieve the goals of a social system. The process of professional negotiations appears to possess some inherent features that tend to clarify, integrate, and allocate role expectations of its actors.
It was hoped that by the analysis of the perceived role of the principal in the various aspects as they related to negotiations that the performance of the secondary school principal would be enhanced and that those who affect his role expectations would be facilitated in such a way that role and role expectation congruency would become more synonymous.

The Background of the Study

The comparatively recent vigorous action taken by teacher groups to negotiate collectively with boards of education and to engage in sanctions and work stoppages has probably caused greater incongruency in the role expectations held by the reference groups for the principal. When issues in the bargaining process become polarized, the school board is likely to wish the principal to represent their position, while the teachers expect him to side with them.

It is inaccurate to assume that the NEA resolution on professional negotiations adopted by the NEA Denver convention in 1962 was the first expression by professional associations of the demand for collective rights of teachers. However, this resolution appears to be the first official policy pronouncement using the term professional negotiations. In 1961, a resolution was adopted on "Teacher-Board of Education Relationships" and as early as the 1960 NEA convention attempts were made to stimulate professional negotiations. A resolution was presented to endorse the principle of "representative negotiations by teachers with their governing boards" calling for the appointment of mediators drawn from members of the profession. It was debated, but it failed to pass.
Glass (1967) indicated that in 1957, the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) had a very negligible organization and that it could only afford one organizer to recruit members in the entire United States east of Nebraska. Today, the AFT is powerful enough to shut down many of America's largest school systems. The same strong influence and power has developed with state and local affiliates of the NEA in that they can now virtually close the schools of an entire state as occurred in Florida during the 1967-68 school year.

Stinnet et al. (1966) stated that Executive Order 10988, issued in 1962, by the President of the United States assured the right of employee organizations to collective bargaining in the federal service. Subsequently, a number of states enacted legislation on a similarly comprehensive basis. These measures helped strengthen the principle that employee organizations and professional negotiations are not incompatible with public administration. Public employee organizations then increased their efforts to secure recognition and the right to professional negotiations.

Teacher strikes prior to 1966 were sporadic and infrequent. During the 26 years from 1940 to 1966, a total of 129 teacher work stoppages occurred, but only 35 of these work stoppages were recorded in the decade immediately prior to 1966. In 1966, there was a sudden increase in teacher strikes. Thirty-three teacher work stoppages were recorded that year and an additional 11 were recorded during the first three months of 1967. This increase in strike activity indicates the growing tendency among teachers and their organizations to
take direct action. It also reflects a remarkable upsurge in the volume of professional negotiation demands and confrontations with public officials.

In Utah, professional negotiations emerged in the spring of 1963, when the governor did not recommend and the legislature failed to provide a substantial increase in money to promote education. As a result, the teachers' association withheld the signing of contracts until the latter part of August in 1963 as a protest to the above inaction. When the governor refused to call a special session of the legislature to raise the needed funds that were requested by the Governor's School Study Committee in the spring of 1964, the Utah Education Association (UEA) took further action. In May of 1964, the UEA's House of Delegates asked the NEA to invoke sanctions against the State of Utah. It was allowed by NEA and the teachers called what became known as a two-day professional recess. During this professional recess, the conflict in Utah over the role of administrators, particularly that of the principal, in professional negotiations emerged as a primary concern. Some other principals, at the request of school boards tried to conduct school without teachers; some other principals carried banners in support of the teachers, while other principals attempted to remain neutral. Since then, many local associations have pressed and received exclusive bargaining rights with their boards of education, excluded principals from membership in local associations and both teacher groups and school boards have ignored the principal in the negotiations process. Thus, in the space of six years, professional negotiations in Utah have emerged as a critical concern to the educational system, and the role of the principal in this vital process is still unsettled.
Statement of the Problem

The process of professional negotiations between employees and boards of education is developing new dimensions in solving welfare and policy issues. Major conflicts are caused in this process by failure to clarify the roles of the negotiating participants. The problem, therefore, is that the role of the secondary school principal is the least clearly defined and the related conflicts may affect his productive performance.

The Purpose of the Study

The school principal is often referred to as the key person in the effective functioning of the educational enterprise at the building level and there is some consensus among educators concerning his administrative role. A report by Cronin (1967) from the Harvard Center for field studies indicated that the principal has significant leadership responsibilities in: (1) personnel staffing and placement, (2) instruction and curriculum development, (3) pupil arrangement and control, and (4) public relations. Other leaders in the field of education such as Jacobsen and Reavis (1956), Hansford (1961) and Miller (1967) have also confirmed the aforementioned roles as being of prime importance to the leadership position of the school principal.

Though educational writers agree on the broad areas in which the principal has responsibility, there appear to be differences pertaining to what is expected of him in the performance of his duties. Cheal (1958) found that the
expectations for principals held by superintendents, teachers, and others with respect to such areas as instruction, discipline, staff personnel and public relations differed considerably. In a similar study, Moser (1957) found that the superintendent wanted dynamic, forceful initiating action from the principal while the teachers expected him to keep things on an even keel, to cater to individual needs of subordinates, and to defend them from unfair demands from top management. These findings have indicated that the principal's behavior is viewed differently by superiors and subordinates.

It is, therefore, the purpose of this study to investigate the extent to which congruent role expectations for the secondary school principal exist in his professional role and his role in collective negotiations as perceived by representatives of Utah's educational enterprise.
CHAPTER II

METHOD OF THE STUDY

Design of the Study

The study provides data on the perceptions of 435 individuals representing five groups from Utah’s educational enterprise (School Board Presidents, District Superintendents, Local Association Presidents, Secondary School Principals, and Secondary School Teachers) concerning the perceived role of the Secondary School Principal in collective negotiations as related with the perceived role for the principal in the administration of the secondary school. Specifically, the following number of persons participated from each group:

1. thirty-seven school board presidents,
2. thirty-eight district superintendents,
3. thirty-eight local association presidents,
4. 154 secondary school principals
5. 168 secondary school teachers.

An instrument, "The Principal’s Role Expectation Scale," was developed which provided data about the perceived expected professional and collective negotiation roles of the secondary school principal.

Leik’s Measure of Ordinal Consensus was used to arrive at a Consensus Score (CS) and to determine the degree of consensus within each of the groups. A Mean Value was also computed on the responses of the instrument as weighted (1) Absolutely Must Not (AMN), (2) Preferably Should Not (PSN), (3) May or
May Not (MMN), (4) Preferably Should (PS) and (5) Absolutely Must (AM) and compared descriptively with Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus.

An analysis of variance was used to test for differences among the groups. Where a significant F ratio was found, using the .05 level of significance, the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was also utilized. This test is designed to locate differences between paired groups.

**Hypotheses and Questions to be Answered**

The process of collective negotiations between employees and school boards is restructuring the roles played by various reference groups in the educational enterprise. In negotiations, major conflicts result because of failure to clarify the roles of various participants. The role to be played by the secondary school principal, since he is particularly subject to conflicts in expectations among reference groups, has become difficult to define. Principals, in some instances, represent teachers' associations on negotiation teams and in others they represent the board of education. In other words, there appears to be no clear-cut expectation among groups on the principal's role in negotiations. It is possible that this obscurity is related to the fact that there is likewise no general agreement concerning his expected professional role.

Therefore, this study was designed to answer the following question and test the nine null hypotheses which follow:
Question:

Do the following nine hypotheses provide descriptive data which may indicate a difference in the perceived professional and negotiation role expectations held by the reference groups for secondary school principals?

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to instruction and curriculum development.

2. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to personnel staffing and placement.

3. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to pupil arrangement and control.

4. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to public relations.

5. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as
defined by the "Principal's Role Expectations Scale" as it relates to school building management and finance.

6. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiation role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to his participation in the negotiation process.

7. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiation role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to the grievance procedure.

8. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary principal's professional negotiation role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectations Scale" as it relates to action taken by the principal during an impasse.

9. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiation role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to membership in professional associations.

The Sample of the Study

There are forty school districts in the state of Utah, each governed by a board of education and a superintendent as chief administrator. Each board of education elects one member from its board to act as its president.
These school systems include 166 secondary schools in which 5,410 secondary school teachers were employed during the 1968-69 school year. In addition, the personnel within each school district established among its membership a local education association which was an affiliate of the UEA and the NEA. Each local education association elected one member from its group to act as its president.

A general urban-rural arrangement concept based on the geography and the population of the state of Utah for the forty school districts has been accepted. The urban school districts were designated as those districts geographically located along the base of the Wasatch Mountain Range which was called the Wasatch Front. The designated urban school districts included the following: Davis County School District, Salt Lake City School District, Granite School District, Murray City School District, Alpine School District, Provo City School District, Jordan School District, Ogden City School District, and Weber County School District. The remainder of Utah's forty public school districts, for the purpose of this study, were designated as rural school districts.

The sample of this study included all:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. President of local School Boards of Education</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Superintendent of local School Districts</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presidents of local Education Associations</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Secondary School Principals</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUB-TOTAL                                          286
A stratified sample of Secondary School Teachers from the forty school districts included:

5. Secondary School Teachers 200

TOTAL SUBJECTS 486

Selection of the subjects

The total population of Utah's local school board of education presidents, local education association presidents, local district school superintendents, and secondary school principals were used for this study. A modified random sample of the categories as classified (urban men, urban women, rural men, and rural women) was made of the secondary school teachers. The total population of Utah's public secondary school teachers equaled 5,410 for the 1968-69 school year. Included in this sample were 3,375 secondary men teachers and 2,035 secondary women teachers. Of Utah's public secondary school teachers, 62.4 per cent were men and 37.6 per cent were women. There were 3,834 classified as urban teachers and in this category 2,311 were secondary men teachers or 60.3 per cent and 1,512 were secondary women teachers or 39.7 per cent. From the teacher sample, 1,576 secondary teachers were classified as rural secondary teachers and in this category, 1,064 were secondary men teachers or 67.5 per cent and 511 were secondary women teachers or 32.5 per cent. The subjects for the secondary teacher sample for this study were then chosen by a random number sample technique following the percentages calculated for each category. The
subjects sampled were as follows: 86 secondary urban men teachers, 56 secondary urban women teachers, 39 secondary rural men teachers, and 19 secondary rural women teachers.

**Instrumentation**

"The Principal's Role Expectation Scale" (see Appendix E) required the respondent to focus on a single evaluative standard which might be applied to the principalship. The advantage is that this technique allowed for investigation of consensus on a number of role segments. It contained 50 items, each of which described a role which the principal may or may not be expected to perform in the management of the school or in collective negotiations. Some items covered general aspects of his role; for example, "should the principal participate with other personnel in developing the philosophy of the school district?" Others are much more specific; for example, "should the principal select the teacher representative to serve on the grievance committee in his school?" All questions, however, dealt with various roles in which the principal may participate.

Since the principal is considered a professional in the education hierarchy, there is an extensive body of literature describing the job of the principal and the relationships which should exist between him and incumbents filling other positions in the educational enterprise. The expectation items were selected after an examination of the literature on the principalship. "The Principal's Role Expectation Scale" was pre-tested in graduate courses and discussed in
doctoral seminars. It was also reviewed by professors in educational administration at Utah State University and by State Department of Public Instruction personnel of the State of Utah. The instrument was then administered to a group of educators in a school district in another state. As a consequence, the first set of role expectation items was refined considerably.

The instrument is patterned after the one used by Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958), to determine role congruency for superintendents and provides for a Measure of Ordinal Consensus by Leik (1966), commonly used in sociological and psychological studies of role expectations and/or behavior of incumbent positions in social systems. It is made up of a series of expectation statements on which the subjects are asked to indicate to what extent the principal should perform a specified role identified in the item. The available response items in the role expectation instrument were:

A. Absolutely Must Not - AMN (1)  B. Preferably Should Not - PSN (2)
C. May or May Not - MMN (3)  D. Preferably Should - PS (4), and
E. Absolutely Must - AM (5).

The five expectation response categories used were weighted in the following order (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) so that the MEAN response for each item could be determined for each responding group. The instrument was divided into two sections of randomly arranged items. The first section pertained to the principal's professional role and the second section pertained to his role in the professional negotiations. The professional role scale is sub-grouped into five areas which are: (1) Instruction and curriculum, (2) Personnel staffing
and placement, (3) Pupil arrangement and control, (4) Public relations, and (5) School building management and finance. The professional negotiations scale was sub-grouped into four areas which are: (1) Negotiations process, (2) Grievance procedure, (3) Impasse action, and (4) Membership in professional associations.

These sub-scales yielded mean scores for analysis of group congruency in role expectations.

Collection of Data

Approval for cooperation in the study was given by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, by the executive boards of the Utah Association of Secondary School Principals, the Utah School Boards Association, the Utah Society of School Superintendents, the Utah Association of Local Education Association Presidents and the Department of Administrators and Supervisors of the UEA.

"The Principal's Role Expectation Scale" utilized for the purpose of this study was first mailed to the total sample of 486 subjects on April 4, 1969. A reminder letter was mailed to non-respondents on April 23, 1969. "The Principal's Role Expectation Scale" was again mailed to non-respondents on May 15, 1969. Personal telephone calls were then made during the week of May 23, 1969, to those who had not by this date responded to the instrument. During the week of June 1, 1969, personal visits were made to some non-respondents to collect the instrument.
Method of Analysis

To test the differences proposed by each of the nine hypotheses, the analysis of variance technique was used and an F ratio computed with a minimum of .05 level of significance.

The analysis of variance is a technique used for testing for differences among two or more means. A computed mean was calculated for each group of respondents for each of the nine hypotheses as well as for each individual question sub-grouped under the main hypotheses.

When a significance was found among the responding groups, the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was applied to each hypothesis and each question to determine which pair of means for the responding groups were significantly different.

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus was also utilized to evaluate the lack of dispersion or the degree of consensus made on the series of alternatives to the items of the instrument by the respondents within groups.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Descriptive Data

The subjects of this study represented five groups of educational participants from the state of Utah. Group one consisted of 40 local school board presidents. Group two consisted of 40 district superintendents. The third group was made up of 40 local teacher association presidents. The fourth group consisted of 166 secondary school principals. Group five was composed of 200 secondary school teachers representing each Utah school district on a stratified sample basis.

Subjects were chosen from all five of the aforementioned educational groups on the assumption that this study would provide a comparative view about the secondary school principals' professional and negotiation roles. It was also assumed that the study may establish greater role congruency expectations for secondary school principals which may contribute to a more efficient school management system.

The investigator sent "The Principal's Role Expectation Scale" to 486 individuals throughout the state of Utah. Of that number, 443 returned the instrument. Eight of the returned instruments were incomplete and, therefore, non-usable. The return consisted of 91 per cent of the total mailing to the
original respondents. The number and per cent of instrument returns completed and received by each group is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Instrument return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent groups</th>
<th>Original number</th>
<th>Total return</th>
<th>Per cent %</th>
<th>Completed return</th>
<th>Per cent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Board Presidents</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Superintendents</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Association Presidents</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principals</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire which was completed by the participants consisted of 50 role expectation items (see Appendix E) identified as important in defining the roles the various reference groups held for the principal.

Nine categories were sub-grouped into two major classifications which helped to define and analyze the principal's role expectation in regards to his professional administration and collective negotiations roles. The items were organized into nine major categories and randomly dispersed throughout the instrument.
The data were analyzed with the aid of the computer in terms of differences regarding the role performance the respondents expected of secondary school principals and the degree of consensus about these expectations within responding groups.

Testing of the Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to assess the degree of congruency among the responding groups and the degree of consensus within the groups about the secondary school principals' professional and collective negotiation role expectations.

An analysis of variance technique was used to test for principal role expectation differences held by the various reference groups. The F test was applied at the .05 per cent level of significance. A computed F score below the .05 level was considered non-significant. The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was applied when a significance was found among the responding groups to determine which pairs of means were significantly different. A test of consensus within groups was computed on the secondary school principals' role expectations using Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus. A computed consensus score above 50 per cent was ascribed to mean consensus within a particular educational group.

Hypothesis number 1

The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to Instruction and Curriculum.

The principal's role expectation items that related to instruction and curriculum
as measured by the Principal's Role Expectation Scale were significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

This hypothesis was tested by using an analysis of variance technique. An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F of 14.93 was computed (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the instruction and curriculum role expectations held for the secondary school principal as measured by "The Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups at the .01 level of significance. A further analysis of the items designated under instruction and curriculum showed that each item was also significantly different among the responding groups at the .01 level of significance.

Table 2. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the eight items categorized as instruction and curriculum development in terms of the expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>9.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>19.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>17.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>12.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>9.60**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level of significance.
The results of the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test revealed that the only matched pairs where there were not significant range differences about the principal's role as it related to this hypothesis were between the following groups: (1) School board presidents and principals, (2) Superintendents and principals and (3) Association presidents and the teachers. Each of the remaining ten matched pairs showed a significant range difference.

Table 3. Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under instruction and curriculum development using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Group &amp; Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30.32)</td>
<td><strong>1.96</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>1.56</strong>*</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.46*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32.29)</td>
<td><strong>3.53</strong>*</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td><strong>3.43</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.76)</td>
<td><strong>2.49</strong>*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31.25)</td>
<td><strong>2.39</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

*Significant range difference at the .05 level.

Note: Least significant Range Differences

1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5 2-3 2-4 2-5 3-5 3-5 4-5
1.43 1.43 1.08 1.06 1.50 1.07 1.15 1.16 1.06 0.69

The study indicates that when school board presidents and superintendents were matched with principals about the principal's expected role, there was no significant range difference between the groups. However, there was a significant range difference between school board presidents and superintendents about these
same role expectations. In light of this analysis, teachers and the teachers' association presidents appeared to have like expectations for principals but other comparisons of these groups, even when matched with the principals' group produced significant range differences.

The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was used to analyze each of the eight items under instruction and curriculum. Of the 80 possible matched pair combinations, 37 were significantly different. The analysis of the 32 possible groups paired with the principals produced 23 significant range differences (Table 4). Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus as computed on the principal's expected role for instruction and curriculum showed an average consensus score for each item above 65.8 per cent. The lowest of the average mean value responses was 3.08 and compared with the high consensus scores may indicate a tendency for the groups to perceive the principal as preferably performing the roles as outlined by the specific role items. However, a close observation of the tabulated results showed a difference of consensus between the groups. The difference appeared to be between May or May Not and the Absolute Must role expectation. The areas of discernible differences were (1) Rural teachers who had a high degree of consensus that the principal preferably should not determine the extra-curricular activities of the students, and the other educational groups who perceived the principal as determining this facet of the school curriculum; (2) Urban school board presidents who had a high degree of consensus that principals preferably should not determine the elective courses taught in the school and the other educational groups who
Table 4. Comparison between five educational groups (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of eight items under instruction and curriculum development using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Be involved in formulating the philosophy and objectives of the school district.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Provide appropriate roles for teachers to play in developing policies for the school.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determine the overall organizational pattern of the school (graded, multi-graded, etc.).</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Be responsible for the planning and development of the school curriculum.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Role Items</td>
<td>Group Comparison</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>LSR Value</td>
<td>(.05) Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Continued</td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Determine teacher-</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupil ratio for each</td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual classroom.</td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Be responsible for</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum planning</td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and development for</td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the improvement of</td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction in the</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school.</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Determine elective</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses that will be</td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught in the school.</td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>38.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Determine what</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student school extra-</td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curricular activities</td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be conducted</td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the school.</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on eight selected secondary principal professional role expectation items categorized as instruction and curriculum development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Instruction and Curriculum Role Expectation Items</th>
<th>(7) C.S.</th>
<th>M.V.</th>
<th>(26) C.S.</th>
<th>M.V.</th>
<th>(2) C.S.</th>
<th>M.V.</th>
<th>(18) C.S.</th>
<th>M.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Bd. Pres.</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Instruction and Curriculum Role Expectation Items</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(19)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Prin.</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.S. = Consensus scores in per cent.
M.V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular time.
perceived the principal as determining this facet of curriculum (Table 5).

Although a descriptive evaluation of hypothesis number 1 may indicate that there was a significant difference among the responding groups pertaining to the perceived role expectations of the secondary school principal as they related to instruction and curriculum, this difference varied in degree and the tendency of the groups appeared to expect the principal to perform the related role items.

**Hypothesis number 2**

The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to Personnel Staffing and Placement. The principal's role expectation items that related to personnel staffing and placement as measured by the Principal's Role Expectation Scale were significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F of 20.38 was computed (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the personnel staffing and placement role expectations held for secondary school principals, as measured by the Principal's Role Expectation Scale, were significantly different among the responding groups at the .01 level of significance. A further analysis of the individual items designated under personnel staffing and placement showed that six of the seven items were significant at the .01 level of significance and one item was significant at .05 level of significance.
Table 6. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the seven items categorized as personnel staffing and placement in terms of the expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>6.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>7.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>14.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>13.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>13.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.99**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.
**Significant at the .01 level of significance.

The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test showed that seven of the ten possible matched pairs had significant range differences at the .05 level of significance. The three matched pairs that did not have significant range differences about the principal's personnel staffing and placement roles were:

1. School board presidents and association presidents,
2. School board presidents and secondary teachers,
3. Association presidents and secondary teachers (Table 7).

Of the 70 possible matched pair combinations for each of the seven items, 33 combinations of matched pairs were significantly different. There were 28 possible pairings with the secondary principals' group and 12 of these pairings had computed scores showing a significant range difference. Nine of
Table 7. Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under personnel staffing and placement using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational group &amp; mean</th>
<th>1 (30.32)</th>
<th>2 (32.29)</th>
<th>3 (28.76)</th>
<th>4 (31.25)</th>
<th>5 (28.86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.97*</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>4.35*</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
<td>1.39*</td>
<td>1.92*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

*Significant range difference at the .05 level.

Note: Least Significant Range Differences

1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5 2-3 2-4 2-5 3-4 3-5 4-5
1.78 1.65 1.46 1.36 1.73 1.29 1.28 1.41 1.28 0.84

the 12 significant range differences were between the secondary principals' group and the secondary teachers or the local association presidents (Table 8).

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus showed that the average per cent of consensus on the seven selected items was not above 72.8 per cent and not below 60.9 per cent. This high degree of consensus was also correlated with the mean value responses which approached 5.00 or the absolutely must performance on "The Principal's Role Expectation Scale." The degree of significant difference among the responding groups appeared to be between the preferably should response expectation and the absolutely must response expectation. No consensus score for any group was below 54.6 per cent and no average mean value response was below 3.12. Two items received 100 per cent consensus from
Table 8. Comparison between five educational groups (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of seven items under personnel staffing and placement using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be involved with the district staff in the selection of teachers to be employed in his building.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign teachers in his building to their specific teaching duties.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign teachers in his building to special non-teaching assignments as club sponsorship and lunchroom supervision.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the teaching proficiency of each teacher under his supervision.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>(.05) Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continued</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Recommend teachers</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(under his supervision) for</td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure or dismissal.</td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Recruit and assign</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substitute teachers in his</td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school.</td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interpret the feelings</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and needs of all employees</td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under his direction to the</td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superintendent and</td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the board of education.</td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
urban school board presidents and urban superintendents with a mean value of 5.00 (absolutely must). These items indicated that the role of the principal must include the evaluation of teachers and the reporting of staff feelings to the board of education. However, urban association presidents and urban secondary school teachers indicated a more neutral position in these categories with mean value scores of 3.88 and 3.28, respectively. The response for these groups was nearer to the may or may not role expectation than the other responding groups (Table 9).

A descriptive analysis of hypothesis number 2 may indicate that although there was a significant difference among the responding groups, the mean value response placed the principal's expected role in personnel staffing and placement between the preferably should and the absolutely must. There was also a high degree of consensus by all groups which appeared to favor the principal's involvement with the district staff in the selection of teachers to be employed in his building.

However, one could assume from this study that there is more incongruity between principals and teacher groups about the principal's personnel staffing placement role expectations than between the principal and other responding educational groups.

Hypothesis number 3

The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to Pupil Arrangement and Control. The principal's role expectation items that related to pupil arrangement and control as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were
Table 9. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on seven selected secondary principal professional role expectation items categorized as personnel staffing and placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Personnel Staffing and Placement Role Expectation Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Bd. Pres.</td>
<td>70.3 4.00 62.2 4.24 73.0 4.45 70.3 4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>75.0 42.5 64.5 4.25 75.0 4.25 81.3 4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>69.0 4.06 62.0 4.24 75.9 4.51 86.3 4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>72.4 4.39 81.6 4.63 85.5 4.71 92.1 4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>75.0 4.50 100.0 5.00 87.5 4.75 100.0 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>75.0 4.36 76.7 4.53 85.0 4.70 90.0 4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>72.4 4.18 63.2 4.15 73.7 4.10 65.9 3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>83.4 4.66 83.4 4.66 89.0 4.22 55.6 4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>74.2 4.03 62.1 4.00 69.0 4.06 69.0 3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>79.6 4.59 83.8 4.67 77.0 4.53 78.3 4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>77.9 4.55 83.3 4.76 79.6 4.76 78.0 3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>81.2 4.62 79.2 4.58 75.3 4.50 78.6 4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>74.1 4.48 66.4 4.32 60.7 3.88 64.6 4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>76.4 4.52 65.7 4.29 59.8 3.73 65.3 4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>69.0 4.38 70.0 4.40 63.0 4.22 67.0 3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>72.8 4.45 72.8 4.45 62.9 4.25 68.9 3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Personnel Staffing and Placement Role Expectation Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12) C.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.S. = Consensus scores in per cent.
M.V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular item.
significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F ratio of 6.84 was obtained (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the pupil arrangement and control role expectations held for the secondary school principal as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups at the .05 level of significance.

An examination of the four items designated under pupil arrangement and control revealed that three items were significant at the .01 level of significance and that there was no significant difference among the responding groups for item number 16. Item number 16 was related to the principal's role in determining student grooming and dress standards. Because there was no significant difference among the responding groups on item number 16, the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was not applied (Table 10).

The application of the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test to items number 10, 13, and 22 showed a significant range difference between the following groups: (1) School board presidents and principals, (2) Superintendents and association presidents, (3) Superintendents and teachers, (4) Association presidents and principals and (5) Principals and teachers (Table 11).

It may be assumed from this study that the principal's role preferably should include the determining of student grooming and dress standards. The average consensus score for this item was 65.6 per cent and the average mean
Table 10. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the four items categorized as pupil arrangement and control in terms of the expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>5.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>5.26**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level of significance.

Table 11. Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under pupil arrangement and control using the Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational group &amp; mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.32)</td>
<td>(32.29)</td>
<td>(28.76)</td>
<td>(31.25)</td>
<td>(28.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.47*</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

*Significant range difference at the .05 level.

Note: Least Significant Range Differences.

1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5 2-3 2-4 2-5 3-4 3-5 4-5
1.03 1.03 0.77 0.77 1.08 0.76 0.82 0.83 0.76 0.49
value response was 3.91 or a response that approached preferably should (Table 13).

The 16 possible matched pairs with secondary school principals revealed five significant range differences. Three of the range differences were between teachers and principals. One range difference was between association presidents and principals and the other range difference was between principals and school board presidents. One could assume for this hypothesis that there was a high degree of congruency among the groups pertaining to the principal's role expectations on pupil arrangement and control (Table 12).

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus showed that the average consensus scores were not above 78.1 per cent and not below 64.7 per cent. The average mean value responses for the same items were between 3.86 and 4.57. One may assume that the responding groups favored the principal's role as one that preferably should determine the items listed under pupil arrangement and control. It was revealed by some of the responding educational groups that it was the role of the principal to be responsible for the general conduct and discipline of the students in his building. Urban school superintendents, for example, responded with 100 per cent consensus that principals must be responsible for the general conduct and discipline of students in their buildings, item number 32. Urban school board presidents gave item number 10 dealing with student grading, the lowest mean value response of any group. It was 3.50 with a consensus score of 68.8 per cent. Although the response may be assumed to indicate
Table 12. Comparison between five educational groups (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of four items under pupil arrangement and control using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>((.05)) Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Determine the grooming and dress standards of students attending his school.</td>
<td>No significant difference among the responding groups. Thus, the Duncan's Multiple Range Test was not performed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Be responsible for general conduct and discipline of students in his school.</td>
<td>4 - 1 0.04 0.25 NS</td>
<td>4 - 2 0.24 0.27 NS</td>
<td>4 - 3 0.33 0.27 S</td>
<td>4 - 5 0.20 0.15 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Be responsible for temporary suspension of students from his school.</td>
<td>4 - 1 0.36 0.30 NS</td>
<td>4 - 2 0.03 0.27 NS</td>
<td>4 - 3 0.18 0.27 NS</td>
<td>4 - 5 0.34 0.18 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establish the school's philosophy on student grading and reporting to parents.</td>
<td>4 - 1 0.57 0.38 S</td>
<td>4 - 2 0.09 0.33 NS</td>
<td>4 - 3 0.41 0.36 S</td>
<td>4 - 5 0.39 0.21 S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on four selected secondary principal professional role expectation items categorized as pupil arrangement and control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Pupil Arrangement and Control Role Expectation Items</th>
<th>(16)</th>
<th>(22)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
<td>C.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Bd. Pres.</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.S. = Consensus scores in per cent.
M.V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular item.
that the principal's role preferably should be one which established a school philosophy and grading system, urban school board presidents appeared to indicate that someone other than the principal may be responsible for determining the school's philosophy on grading.

A descriptive evaluation of hypothesis number 3 gives no indication that the principal should not be involved in pupil arrangement and control. It also appeared that for the items of this hypothesis where there were significant differences among the responding groups, the differences were in terms of the degree of principal involvement rather than no involvement.

Hypothesis number 4

The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to Public Relations. The principal's role expectation items that related to public relations as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F of 5.15 was computed (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the public relations role expectations held for the secondary school principal as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups at the .05 level of significance.

An item analysis provided statistics which indicated that there was no significant difference among the responding groups for item number 24. It indicated that the role of the principal should include the responsibility of explaining the philosophy of the school district to the faculty and patrons of his school.
The consensus scores were between 72.5 and 100 per cent with an average of 77.1 per cent. The mean value responses were between 4.34 and 5.00 with an average of 4.54. Item number 3 was significant at the .05 level of significance and item number 5 was significant at the .01 level of significance.

Table 14. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the three items categorized as public relations in terms of expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>9.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.94*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level of significance.  
**Significant at the .01 level of significance.

The application of the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test showed that the significant range differences were between the following responding groups: (1) School board presidents and superintendents, (2) School board presidents and principals, (3) School board presidents and teachers, (4) Association presidents and principals, (5) Association presidents and teachers. School board presidents produced significant range differences for items number 3 and 5 as they related the expected public relation roles for the secondary principal with each responding group except the local teachers' association presidents. The association presidents, however, showed a significant range
difference between themselves and the responding principals' and the teachers' groups.

Table 15. Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants
(1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under public relations using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational group &amp; mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.32)</td>
<td>(32.29)</td>
<td>(28.76)</td>
<td>(31.25)</td>
<td>(28.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.66*</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.92*</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10*</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
*Significant range difference at the .05 level.

Note: Least Significant Range Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>2-5</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were eight possible matched pairs that directly involved the principal. Three of the pairings produced significant range differences. Two of the range differences were between the principals and the school board presidents and one was between the principals and the local association president (Table 16).

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus showed that the average per cent of consensus of the three selected items was not below 66.2 per cent and not above 77.1 per cent. The average mean value response for each item was calculated between 3.85 and 4.54 (Table 17).
Table 16. Comparison between five educational groups (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of 3 items under public relations using Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Explain school districts’ philosophy to the faculty and to the patrons of his school.</td>
<td>No significant difference among the responding groups, thus, the Duncan’s Multiple Range Test was not performed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Involve the community in determining school policies, planning programs and evaluating achievement of the school.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make written and oral reports to the board of education and the public about school on purposes, programs and achievements of the school.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on three selected secondary principal professional role expectation items categorized as public relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Public Relations Role Expectation Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24) C. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Bd. Pres.</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. S. = Consensus scores in per cent.
M. V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular time.
A descriptive evaluation of hypothesis number 4 may indicate that although there was a significant difference among the responding groups to the perceived role expectations of the secondary school principal as it related to public relations, one could assume from this study that the principal preferably should perform these roles. There was no indication that the principal should not be involved in public relations or that it was not his responsibility.

Hypothesis number 5

The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to School Building Management and Finance. The principal's role expectation items that related to school building management and finance as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F of 5.59 was computed (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the school building management and finance role expectations held for the secondary school principal as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups at the .05 level of significance.

An analysis of the F ratios for each item revealed that three of the four items were significant at the .01 level of significance and one item was significant at the .05 level of significance (Table 18).
Five of the matched pairs produced a significant range difference as a result of the application of the Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test. They were: (1) Superintendents and school board presidents, (2) Superintendents and association presidents, (3) Superintendents and teachers, (4) Association presidents and principals and (5) Principals and teachers (Table 19).

The item analysis of the four items in this category showed that item 21 was not significantly different among the responding groups as the groups were compared with the principals. This item pertained to the principal’s expected role performance of recommending the budget for his school. All responding groups perceived this role as one of the principal's responsibilities. The average consensus score was 79.8 per cent and the mean value response was 4.45. The urban school superintendents had the lowest consensus score on this item. It was 62.5 per cent and they also produced the lowest mean value response. It was 4.25. Only two of the matched pairs, from the total of 12 which directly compared the secondary school principals with the other groups, showed significant range differences and both significant range differences were for item 8. These differences were between the principals and the teachers and between the principals and the association presidents. Item number 8 related the principal’s responsibility for the expenditure of funds allocated to his building. The tendency of the mean value responses from each of the responding groups was toward the absolutely must performance role expectation for the secondary school principal.

The significant range difference for these items appeared to be between the rural and urban segments of the responding groups. The urban association
Table 18. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the four items categorized as school building management and finance in terms of the expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>6.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>12.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.71*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level of significance.  
**Significant at the .05 level of significance.

Table 19. Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under school building management and finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational group &amp; mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.32)</td>
<td>(32.29)</td>
<td>(28.76)</td>
<td>(31.25)</td>
<td>(28.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 | 1.02* | 0.23 | 0.51 | 0.41 |
2 | 1.26* | 0.52 | 1.44* |
3 | 0.74* | 0.17 |
4 |       | 0.92* |

Alpha = .05  
*Significant range differences at the .05 level.  

Note: Least Significant Range Differences  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>2-5</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presidents and the rural school principals registered high consensus scores, 88.9 and 90.3 per cent, respectively. These consensus scores were higher than the segments of principals, teachers, and association presidents (Table 20).

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus showed that the average per cent of consensus for the four selected items was not below 66.8 per cent and not above 79.9 per cent. The averages of the mean value responses ranged between 4.33 and 4.60 (Table 21).

A descriptive evaluation of hypothesis number 5 may indicate that although there were significant differences among the responding groups to the perceived role expectations held for the secondary school principal as they related to school building management and finance, one may assume from this study that the secondary principal preferably should perform these functions.

Hypothesis number 6

The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to the Negotiations Process.
The principal's role expectation items that related to the negotiations process as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F of 6.95 was computed (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the negotiation role expectations held for the secondary school principal as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups at the .01 level of
Table 20. Comparison between five educational groups (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of four items under school building management and finance using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Recommend the budget for his school.</td>
<td>No significant difference among the responding groups, thus, the Duncan's Multiple Range Test was not performed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Be responsible for the expenditure of funds allocated to his school.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Account for student-body fees and other school funds.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Be responsible for the maintenance and operation of the school facilities to which he is assigned.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on four selected secondary principal professional role expectation items categorized as school building management and finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>School Building Management and Finance Role Expectation Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.S.  M.V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>71.7  4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>64.5  4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>74.0  4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>72.4  4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>75.0  4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>83.4  4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>72.5  4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>75.4  4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>77.3  4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>76.2  4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>75.0  4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. S. = Consensus score in percent.
M. V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular item.
significance. An item analysis of the ten items pertaining to the negotiations process revealed that nine of the items were significant at .01 level of significance and item number 32 was not significant.

Table 22. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the 10 items categorized as the negotiation process in terms of the expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>9.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>16.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>6.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>19.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>9.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>20.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>11.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>7.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>6.07**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level of significance.

Item 32 referred to the principal’s expected role as a liaison person between the board of education and the teachers’ association. All groups with a fair degree of consensus indicated that the principal preferably should not perform the role as a liaison person between the board of education and the teachers’ association. The average consensus scores was 46.7 per cent and the average mean value response was 2.51. The consensus score was not as
high on this item as it was on the item of the other categories. However, it approached 50 per cent consensus.

The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was performed on this hypothesis and four of the 10 matched pairs had significant range differences. They were:

1. School board presidents and principals,
2. Superintendents and principals,
3. Association presidents and principals and
4. Teachers and principals.

The analysis revealed that no matched pairs had significant range differences on this hypothesis except as each group was compared with the secondary principals.

Table 23. Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under the negotiations process using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational group &amp; mean</th>
<th>1 (30.32)</th>
<th>2 (32.29)</th>
<th>3 (28.76)</th>
<th>4 (31.25)</th>
<th>5 (28.86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.82*</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.44*</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85*</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
*Significant range differences at the .05 level.

Note: Least Significant Range Differences:
1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5 2-3 2-4 2-5 3-4 3-5 4-5
2.30 2.18 1.88 1.72 2.36 1.71 1.70 1.90 1.79 1.11

An analysis of each question by the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test showed that of the 36 possible matched pairs as they were compared with the principal's group, 23 produced significant range differences. Each group as it was compared
with the principals' group produced five or more significant range differences (Table 24).

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus showed that the average per cent of consensus on the 10 selected items was not below 46.7 per cent and not above 96.0 per cent. The average mean value response ranged from 1.08 to 4.26 on the 10 items pertaining to the negotiations process (Table 25).

Each particular group when compared with the principals' group indicated a significant range difference. Thus, for this hypothesis, each item was analyzed independently.

**Item number 46.** The school principal should resist measures which if negotiated would reduce the authority he needs to carry out his duties and responsibilities. The average consensus score on this item was 68.5 per cent and the average mean value response was 4.00. The range comparison between the principals and the superintendents was not significant. Each of the other group comparisons produced significant range differences. The principals' average consensus score was higher than the consensus scores of the other groups and the principals' mean value response may indicate a higher degree of resistance to measures that would reduce his authority. It may be assumed from this study that although the responding groups had lower consensus scores and lower mean values responses than the secondary school principals, the respondent groups perceived the principals in a role where they preferably should resist measures that reduce their authority.
Table 24. Comparison between five educational groups, (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of 10 items under the negotiation process using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>(.05) Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Serve as a liason person between board of education and teachers' association.</td>
<td>No significant difference among the responding groups, thus, the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was not performed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Resist measures which if negotiated would reduce the authority he needs to carry out his duties and responsibilities.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Represent the principal's association as a separate unit in collective negotiations.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Be a &quot;bystander&quot; with no involvement in the negotiation process.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Role Items</td>
<td>Group Comparison</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>LSR Value</td>
<td>( . 05) Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Be a member of the team representing the teachers' association in collective negotiations.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Be a member of the team representing the board of education in collective negotiations with teachers.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Be a consultant to the board of education during negotiations.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Role Items</td>
<td>Group Comparison</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>LSR Value</td>
<td>(.05) Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48. Be a consultant to the teachers' association during negotiations.</strong></td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **27. Be a consultant to both the board of education and the teachers' representatives during negotiations.** | 4 - 1 | 0.95 | 0.51 | S |
|                                                                 | 4 - 2 | 0.66 | 0.49 | S |
|                                                                 | 4 - 3 | 0.53 | 0.45 | S |
|                                                                 | 4 - 5 | 0.60 | 0.29 | S |
|                                                                 | 3 - 5 | 0.08 | 0.45 | NS |
|                                                                 | 3 - 2 | 0.13 | 0.61 | NS |
|                                                                 | 3 - 1 | 0.42 | 0.63 | NS |
|                                                                 | 5 - 2 | 0.06 | 0.45 | NS |
|                                                                 | 5 - 1 | 0.35 | 0.48 | NS |
|                                                                 | 2 - 1 | 0.28 | 0.58 | NS |

| **38. Keep all school publics informed on issues under consideration in professional negotiations.** | 4 - 1 | 0.65 | 0.43 | S |
|                                                                 | 4 - 2 | 0.34 | 0.39 | NS |
|                                                                 | 4 - 3 | 0.39 | 0.41 | NS |
|                                                                 | 4 - 5 | 0.16 | 0.24 | NS |
|                                                                 | 5 - 2 | 0.51 | 0.41 | S |
|                                                                 | 5 - 3 | 0.56 | 0.43 | S |
|                                                                 | 5 - 1 | 0.82 | 0.44 | S |
|                                                                 | 2 - 3 | 0.05 | 0.50 | NS |
|                                                                 | 2 - 1 | 0.31 | 0.53 | NS |
|                                                                 | 3 - 1 | 0.26 | 0.50 | NS |
Table 25. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on 10 selected secondary principal negotiation role expectation items categorized as the negotiation's process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>The Negotiation's Process Role Expectation Items</th>
<th>(32)</th>
<th>(46)</th>
<th>(36)</th>
<th>(41)</th>
<th>(39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Bd. Pres.</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Groups</td>
<td>The Negotiation's Process Role Expectation Items</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Bd. Pres.</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C, S. = Consensus scores in per cent.
M, V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular time.
**Item number 36.** The principal should represent the principal's association as a separate unit in collective negotiations. The average consensus score was 74.1 per cent and the average mean value response was 1.49. The analysis of this item for each of the responding groups indicated that the principal preferably should not represent the principals' association as a separate unit in collective negotiations. Each group responded with 100 per cent consensus either with the absolutely must not or a preferably should not response. Each urban group indicated that the principal absolutely must not perform this role and all rural groups indicated that the principal preferably should not perform this role. Thus, the significant difference among the responding groups was between the degree of expected principal role performance of absolutely must not and preferably should not.

**Item number 41.** The principal should be a "bystander" with no involvement in the negotiation process. The average consensus score on this item was 70.1 per cent and the average mean value response was 3.80. A significant range difference was found between the principals and the school board presidents and also between the principals and the teachers from the matched pair comparisons. The principals' consensus score (75.1) and their average mean value response (4.06) were higher than the similar responses of the other responding groups. One may conclude from this study that the responding educational groups did not perceive principals as active in the negotiations process as they, the principals themselves, perceived their involvement. The average mean value response may be assumed to indicate that principals may or may not be involved in the negotiations process.
Item number 39. The principal should be a member of the team representing the teachers' association in collective negotiations. The average consensus score on this item was 93.2 per cent and the average mean value response was 1.15. Each of the four matched pair range comparisons as compared with the principals' group were significant at the .05 per cent level of significance. The significance appeared to be as a result of the principals' absolute response. There was a 100 per cent principal consensus that the principal absolutely must not be a member of the teachers' negotiating team. The other matched pair comparisons also produced very high consensus scores ranging from 81.9 per cent to 100 per cent. No mean value response was above 1.37. One could assume from this study that the principal absolutely must not be a member of the teachers' negotiating team.

Item number 49. The principal should be a member of the team representing the board of education in collective negotiations with teachers. The average consensus score on this item was 65.5 per cent and the average mean value response was 4.26. Three of the matched pair comparisons had significant range differences. The range comparison between the principals and the school board presidents was not significant. However, there was a significant range difference between principals and superintendents, association presidents and secondary teachers. Although there was a significant range difference between each of these groups, one may assume from this study that principals were perceived by the responding groups as preferably being members of the school board's negotiating team. Urban school superintendents indicated with
100 per cent consensus that principals absolutely must be members of the school board's negotiating team.

**Item number 42.** The principal should be a consultant to the board of education during negotiations. The average consensus score on this item was 69.6 per cent and the average mean value response was 3.85. Three of the four matched pairs compared with the principals' group produced significant range differences. The range difference between the principals and the school board presidents was not significant. The statistics also indicated that there was a higher degree of consensus within the principals' group than within the other responding groups. The mean value responses for this item may be assumed to indicate that principals preferably should be consultants to boards of education. The responses of urban school district superintendents, however, may be assumed to indicate that they perceived the principal's role as being consultant to the board of education only under particular circumstances. The statistical evidence may indicate that as the size of a school district increases, the involvement of principals in the negotiations process, particularly the consultant role, decreases. (See specific conclusions, items 6, 7, and 8, pages 115-116.)

**Item number 48.** The principal should be a consultant to the teachers' association. The average consensus score on this item was 79.1 per cent and the average mean value response was 4.59. The matched pairs showed that there was a significant range difference between the principals and the school board presidents and also between principals and superintendents. The mean
value responses for each group were not above 4.86 and not below 4.10. The consensus scores provided a range between 62.1 per cent and 93.4 per cent. Although there was a significant difference among the groups, it may be assumed from this study that the principal preferably should be a consultant to the teachers' association.

**Item number 27.** The school principal should be a consultant to both the board of education and the teachers' representatives during negotiations. The average consensus score on this item was 46.7 per cent with an average mean value response of 2.96. Each of the four matched pairs produced significant range differences at the .05 level of significance. The average mean value response approached the may or may not response by the responding groups but the response scores appeared to indicate that the principals preferably should not be consultants to the board of education and the teachers' representatives. The principals, however, perceived their role as preferably being a consultant to the board of education and the teachers' representatives during the process of negotiations. The consensus scores ranged from a low of 36.3 per cent from the rural school board presidents to a high of 63.8 per cent from the rural association presidents.

**Item number 38.** The school principal should keep all school publics informed on issues under consideration in professional negotiations. The average consensus score on this item was 96.0 per cent and the average mean value response was 1.09. Of the principal matched pair range comparisons, only the comparison between school board presidents and principals produced a significant
range difference. An analysis of the consensus scores and the mean value responses from each group indicated that the principal absolutely must not perform the role of informant to all publics on issues under consideration in collective negotiations.

A descriptive evaluation of hypothesis number 6 may indicate that although there was a significant difference among the responding groups, there were several areas of both congruence and incongruity about the principal's role in the collective negotiations process. Areas in which the statistics produced similar responses among the responding groups were on the questions which related to the principal as representing his association as a separate unit in collective negotiations, the principal's role as an informant to all publics on negotiation issues, the principal's role as being a member of the teachers' negotiation team, the principal's role to resist measures that reduce his authority, the principal's role to be a consultant to the teachers' association, the principal's role to be a member of the school board's negotiations team, and the principal's role as a "bystander" in the negotiations process.

One may assume from this study that the respondents feel that the secondary school principal preferably should (a) be a member of the school board's negotiations team, (b) be a consultant to the teachers' association during negotiations, and (c) resist measures that reduce the authority he needs to carry out his duties and responsibilities.

One may assume from this study that the respondents, feel that the principal may or may not be a "bystander" during the negotiations process.
It may also be assumed from items number 27, 32, 48, and 49 of this study that the responding groups perceived the principal as a consultant to the board of education or to the teachers' association but not to both organizations during the negotiations process.

Items number 36 and 46 presented results that may indicate role incongruity. The responses to these questions indicated that the principal should resist measures which reduce his authority to carry out his responsibilities and that he should not be represented by the principals' association as a separate negotiating unit. It appears that this may be a paradox (see conclusions beyond the statistical analysis--pages 117-120).

**Hypothesis number 7**

**The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to the Grievance Procedure.**

The principal's role expectation items that related to the grievance procedures as measured by the Principal's Role Expectation Scale were significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F of 2.73 was computed (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the grievance procedure role expectations of the secondary school principal as measured by the Principal's Role Expectation Scale were significantly different among the responding groups at the .05 level of significance. An item analysis of the items relating to the grievance procedures produced F ratios on eight of the nine items that were significant at the .01 level of significance and one item, number 31, was not significant.
Table 26. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the nine items categorized as grievance procedures in terms of the expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>6.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>6.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>7.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>10.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>5.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>9.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>5.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level of significance

Table 27. Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under grievance procedures using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational group &amp; mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30.32)</td>
<td>(32.29)</td>
<td>(28.76)</td>
<td>(31.25)</td>
<td>(28.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44*</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
<td>3.65*</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
*Significant range differences at the .05 level.
Note: Least Significant Range Differences
1-2  1-3  1-4  1-5  2-3  2-4  2-5  3-4  3-5  4-5
2.13 2.02 1.78 1.73 2.01 1.67 1.57 1.73 1.66 0.98
Application of the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test produced results that indicated significant range differences between each of the responding groups as they were compared with school board presidents. There were no significant range differences between other comparisons of the responding groups.

The item analysis of range differences for the responding groups other than those between the principals and the school board presidents showed four paired comparisons with principals that were significant at the .05 level. The comparisons were between principals and the superintendents in three of the four categories and between the principals and the teachers in the other category (Table 28).

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus showed that the average consensus scores on the nine selected items under grievance procedures were not above 66.8 per cent and not below 38.0 per cent. The average of the mean value responses ranged from a low of 1.99 to a high of 4.22 depending on the particular item.

**Item number 37.** The school principal should provide an election system for determining teacher representation on the grievance committee in his school. The average mean value response may have indicated that the principal preferably should not provide for this activity. Teachers and association presidents appeared to agree with the finding. However, the principals' and school board presidents' responses indicated that the principal may or may not be responsible for this task.

**Item number 30.** The principal should be responsible for organizing a faculty committee on grievances for his school. The average mean value
Table 28. Comparison between five educational groups (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of nine items under grievance procedure using Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Provide an election system for determining teacher representation on the grievance committee in his school.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Be responsible for organizing a faculty committee on grievances for his school.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Select teacher representatives to serve on the grievance committee. No significant difference among the responding groups, thus, the Duncan's Multiple Range Test was not performed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Item</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>(.05) Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 28. Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Serve on a district wide grievance committee representing the teacher's association.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Serve on a district wide grievance committee representing the principal's association.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Serve on a district wide grievance committee representing the board of education.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group (05)</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>(.05) Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Be involved in all stages of the grievance process between a teacher or teachers in his school and the board of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 47. Be bound to carry out negotiated agreements made between the board of education and teachers' representatives though he was not represented in the negotiations process. |
| 4 - 1 |
| 4 - 2 |
| 4 - 3 |
| 4 - 4 |
| 4 - 5 |
| 2 - 1 |
| 2 - 2 |
| 2 - 3 |
| 2 - 4 |
| 2 - 5 |
| 1 - 1 |
| 1 - 2 |
| 1 - 3 |
| 1 - 4 |
| 1 - 5 |
| 3 - 1 |
| 3 - 2 |
| 3 - 3 |
| 3 - 4 |

| 35. Have no responsibility in determining membership on a teachers' grievance committee. |
| 4 - 1 |
| 4 - 2 |
| 4 - 3 |
| 4 - 4 |
| 4 - 5 |
| 5 - 1 |
| 5 - 2 |
| 5 - 3 |
| 5 - 4 |
| 5 - 5 |
| 3 - 1 |
| 3 - 2 |
| 3 - 3 |
| 3 - 4 |
| 3 - 5 |
| 2 - 1 |
| 2 - 2 |
| 2 - 3 |
| 2 - 4 |
| 2 - 5 |
response was 3.08. The mean value response indicated that principals may or may not perform this function. The school board presidents' and the superintendents' responses appeared to indicate that principals preferably should not be involved with this responsibility. Principals, association presidents and teachers indicated that the principal may or may not perform this task.

**Item number 31.** The principal should select the teacher representatives to serve on the grievance committee. The mean value response revealed that there was no significant difference among the responding groups and they inferred that the principal preferably should not perform this task.

**Item number 28.** The principal should serve on a district-wide grievance committee representing the teachers' association. The average mean value response was 2.32. It may be assumed from this response that principals preferably should not serve on this committee. Principals appeared to agree with the findings but the urban teachers' association presidents inferred by their responses that principals may or may not serve on a district-wide grievance committee representing the teachers' association.

**Item number 34.** The principal should serve on a district-wide grievance committee representing the principal's association. Each responding group, with the exception of school board presidents inferred that the principal preferably should serve on a distinct grievance committee representing the principals' association. School board presidents indicated that the principal may or may not serve or be represented by this particular committee.
Item number 50. The principal should serve on a district-wide grievance committee representing the board of education. The average mean value response indicated that principals preferably should serve in this capacity.

Item number 40. The principal should be involved in all stages of the grievance process between a teacher or teachers in his school and the board of education. The mean value response revealed that the principal preferably should not assume total involvement in this process.

Item number 47. The principal should be bound to carry out negotiated agreements made between the board of education and the teachers' representatives though he was not represented in the negotiations process. It may be assumed from this study that the principal preferably should perform those tasks on which agreement is reached between boards of education and teachers' associations.

Item number 35. The principal should have no responsibility in determining membership on a teachers' grievance committee. This question and the response involved a double negative in grammatical structure and its consideration was eliminated (Table 29).

A descriptive evaluation of hypothesis number 7 may indicate that although there were significant differences among the responding groups, the significant differences were primarily between each of the responding groups and the school board presidents as computed by the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test.

An evaluation of each item appeared to indicate that principals and school board presidents tended to agree on the general role expectations of the
Table 29. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on nine selected secondary principal negotiation role expectation items categorized as grievance procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Grievance Procedure Role Expectation Items</th>
<th>(37)</th>
<th>(30)</th>
<th>(31)</th>
<th>(28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
<td>C.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Grievance Procedure Role Expectation Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.S., M.V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Bd. Pres.</td>
<td>62.2 3.06  56.8 3.62  78.4 1.83  56.8 3.62  100.0 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>62.5 3.25  62.5 3.50  93.8 2.12  50.0 3.50  100.0 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>62.1 3.00  55.2 3.65  74.2 1.75  58.1 3.65  100.0 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>69.9 3.60  63.2 4.00  93.4 2.86  81.6 4.63  100.0 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>62.5 3.50  63.0 4.00  88.0 4.75  63.0 4.75  100.0 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>71.7 3.63  63.4 4.00  93.4 2.86  80.0 4.60  100.0 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres</td>
<td>61.8 3.50  65.8 3.68  75.0 1.92  69.8 4.38  100.0 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>72.3 4.11  72.4 3.88  89.0 1.77  77.8 4.55  100.0 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>67.4 3.34  63.8 3.62  70.7 1.96  67.3 4.34  100.0 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>66.3 3.18  71.1 4.09  85.7 2.72  71.4 4.23  100.0 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>72.0 3.96  72.0 4.03  91.9 2.81  74.7 4.14  100.0 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>60.4 3.70  70.1 4.15  80.5 2.61  68.2 4.32  100.0 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>61.3 3.51  60.7 3.70  69.4 1.81  64.3 4.09  100.0 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>58.5 3.52  62.4 3.71  69.8 1.18  64.5 4.15  100.0 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>70.0 3.48  58.0 3.68  68.0 1.76  64.0 3.96  100.0 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>38.0 3.59  64.8 3.85  66.8 2.23  66.6 4.17  61.0 4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.S. = Consensus scores in per cent.
M.V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular item.
secondary school principal in grievance procedures. The significant differences appeared primarily between the degrees of role performance expectation of preferably should not and absolutely must not.

Hypothesis number 8

The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to Impasse Action. The principal's role expectation items that related to impasse action as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F of 10.98 was computed (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the impasse action role expectations of the secondary school principal as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" was significantly different among the responding groups at the .01 level of significance.

The analysis of each item categorized under impasse action revealed that each item was significant at the .01 level of significance.

Table 30. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the three items categorized as impasse action in terms of the expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>41.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>24.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>37.06**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level of significance.
The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test revealed that only two of the 10 possible comparisons did not have significant range differences at the .05 level of significance. These two comparisons were between (1) School board presidents and superintendents and (2) Association presidents and teachers (Table 31).

Table 31: Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under impasse action using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational group &amp; mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.32)</td>
<td>(32.29)</td>
<td>(28.76)</td>
<td>(31.25)</td>
<td>(28.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
<td>1.23*</td>
<td>2.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.55*</td>
<td>1.49*</td>
<td>2.38*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.06*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
*Significant range differences at the .05 level.

Note: Least Significant Range Differences.
1-2 1-3 1-4 1-5 2-3 2-4 2-5 3-4 3-5 4-5
0.92 0.99 0.72 0.76 1.01 0.75 0.77 0.75 0.71 0.44

The item analysis of the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test revealed that of the 12 possible matched pairs between the principals and the other responding groups, there were 10 with significant range differences.

Item number 43. The principal should refuse to open and conduct his school unless state certified teachers are employed in the case of a teacher
impasse which involves the withholding of services. There was a significant
difference among the responding groups on this item. However, the consensus
scores and the mean value responses may be assumed to indicate that each of
the responding groups perceived the role of the principal as one which preferably
should refuse to open and conduct his school unless state certified teachers are
employed in the case of a teacher impasse (Table 33).

Item number 29. The principal should manage and direct the operation
of his school in the case of a negotiations impasse with substitute teachers when
ordered by the board of education. The response to this item revealed agreement
with no significant difference between principals and school board presidents or
between principals and superintendents. Significant range difference scores
were produced, however, between principals and teacher association presidents
and between principals and teachers (Table 32).

Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus showed that the average consensus
score of the responding groups to item 29 was 38.0 per cent. The statistics
also revealed a lower consensus within the teachers and teacher association
presidents' groups than within the principals', superintendents' and school
board presidents' groups. One may assume from this study that there is a
high degree of difference within and among the responding groups to this item.

The low consensus scores produced by the teachers' and association
presidents' groups may invalidate possible conclusions made from the mean
value responses. However, high consensus scores were obtained from the
principals, the superintendents and the school board presidents. Their
Table 32. Comparison between five educational groups (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of three items under impasse action using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>(.05) Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Refuse to open and conduct his school</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unless state certified teachers are employed in the case of a teacher impasse.</td>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Manage and direct the operation of his school in the case of a negotiations impasse when ordered by the board of education to staff the school with substitute teachers.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. When there is a teacher-school board impasse in negotiations and teachers withhold service the principal should withhold his services also.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on three selected secondary principal negotiation role expectation items categorized as impasse action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Impasse Action Role Expectation Item</th>
<th>(43)</th>
<th>(29)</th>
<th>(33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M.V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.S. = Consensus scores in percent.
M.V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular item.
responses may be assumed to indicate that the principal absolutely must manage and direct the operations of his school with substitute teachers in the case of a negotiations impasse. One may assume that there is little consensus within the association presidents' and secondary school teachers' groups for this item.

**Item number 33.** When there is a teacher-school board impasse in negotiations and teachers withhold services, the principal should also withhold his services. The response to this item revealed that school board presidents, superintendents and principals agreed that principals preferably should not withhold their services. The teachers and the teachers' association presidents appeared to agree that principals may or may not withhold their services.

An evaluation of this hypothesis appeared to indicate incongruity among the responding groups (see conclusion, number 5, page 119).

**Hypothesis number 9**

**The Principal's Role Expectations Relating to Association Membership.**
The principal's role expectation items that related to association membership as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

An F ratio of 2.39 was necessary for the null hypothesis to be rejected and an F ratio of 7.93 was computed (see Appendix A). Therefore, one can assume from this study that the association membership role expectations of the secondary school principal as measured by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" were significantly different among the responding groups
at the .01 level of significance.

Each item designated under the category of association membership was significant at the .01 level of significance (Table 34).

Table 34. Comparison of means of five educational groups on the two items categorized as association membership in terms of the expected degree of principal performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>10.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>13.06**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level of significance.

The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test showed that six of the 10 matched pairs had significant range differences at the .05 level of significance. The four comparisons that did not have significant range differences were between:

(1) School board presidents and superintendents, (2) Superintendents and principals, (3) Superintendents and teachers and (4) Principals and teachers (Table 35).

The item analysis of the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test produced eight possible comparisons with the secondary principals' groups. Five of the comparisons produced significant range differences at the .05 level of significance. Significant range differences were found between (1) Principals and the superintendents and (2) Principals and the association presidents for each of the items. A significant range difference was also obtained between the principals and the superintendents on item number 42 (Table 36).
Table 35. Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of the items under association membership using the Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational group &amp; mean</th>
<th>1 (30.32)</th>
<th>2 (32.29)</th>
<th>3 (28.76)</th>
<th>4 (31.25)</th>
<th>5 (28.86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.16*</td>
<td>1.61*</td>
<td>1.36*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.26*</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.54*</td>
<td>1.79*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05  *Significant range differences at the .05 level.
Note: Least Significant Range Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>2-5</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. Comparison between five educational groups (1. School board presidents, 2. District superintendents, 3. Association presidents, 4. Secondary school principals, 5. Secondary school teachers) on the importance of two items under association membership using Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Role Items</th>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>LSR Value</th>
<th>(.05) Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have the right to be a member of the local teachers’ association.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a member of the local teachers’ association.</td>
<td>4 - 1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 1</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus showed that the average mean response for each item approached 4.00 which may be interpreted to indicate that principals preferably should have the right and be members of the local teachers' association. An evaluation of the consensus scores and the mean value responses indicated that there were significant range differences between each group and the secondary school principals. Although there were significant differences between the groups, it was apparent that responding groups favored the principal as being a member of the teachers' association. For example, there was a significant range difference between the secondary school principals and the superintendents on item number 44 that the principal should be a member of local teachers' association. The superintendents' consensus scores were above 90 per cent, whereas, the principals' consensus scores were below 79.0 per cent. The principals' mean value response was near 4.50, whereas, the superintendents' mean value response was near 4.80. A 100 per cent consensus score was computed for urban school superintendents with a mean value response of 5.00. From this study, one could assume that urban school superintendents expect secondary school principals to be members of the local teachers' association. It is apparent from an analysis of the statistics of this hypothesis that the only divergent point of view came from the school board presidents. Their responses to item number 45 appeared to indicate that the secondary school principals under certain circumstances should not have the right to join the local teachers' association (Table 37).
Table 37. Consensus scores and mean values for five groups of educational participants on two selected secondary principal negotiation role expectation items categorized as association membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Association Membership Role Expectation Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45) C.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Supt.</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Pres.</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Princp.</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Teacher</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.S. = Consensus Scores in per cent.
M.V. = Mean values as weighted for the response to the particular item.
A descriptive evaluation of hypothesis number 9 may indicate that although there was a significant difference among the responding groups, one may assume from this study that the secondary school principal's role preferably should include being a member of the local teachers' association.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem

The problem at the outset of this study was that the professional negotiations role of the secondary school principal is the least clearly defined and the related conflicts may affect his productive performance.

The purposes of the study

The purposes of this study was threefold: The first was to determine if there were significant differences among the five responding Utah educational groups (school board presidents, district superintendents, local teacher association presidents, secondary school principals, and secondary school teachers) as they perceived the role of the secondary school principal in professional administration and collective negotiations. The study determined if the differences existed between secondary school principals and school board presidents, between secondary school principals and superintendents, between secondary school principals and local teacher association presidents, and between secondary school principals and secondary school teachers.
The second purpose explored if there was consensus within each educational group and to what degree each group expected the secondary school principal to perform a specific function.

The third purpose was to determine if significant differences existed among the urban and rural segments of the responding groups.

In an attempt to accomplish these purposes, the following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to instruction and curriculum development.

2. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to personnel staffing and placement.

3. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to pupil arrangement and control.

4. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to public relations.
5. There are no significant differences among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to school building management and finance.

6. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiation role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to his participation in the negotiation process.

7. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiation role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to grievance procedures.

8. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary principal's professional negotiation role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to action taken by the principal during an impasse.

9. There is no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiation role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it relates to membership in professional associations.

Procedures

The data were gathered from 486 individuals representing five groups of Utah's educational enterprise. The groups were selected from each of Utah's
forty local school districts. An instrument, "The Principal's Role Expectation Scale," was developed which provided data about the perceived expected professional and collective negotiations roles of the secondary school principal. Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus was used to arrive at a Consensus Score (CS) and to determine the percent of consensus within each of the groups. A weighted mean value was also computed on the alternative response options. An analysis of variance was used to test for differences among groups. Where a significant F ratio was found, using the .05 level of significance, the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was applied. This test is designated to locate differences between paired groups.

Findings

Principal's professional role

Instruction and curriculum development. The first null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to instruction and curriculum development, was rejected. It was determined that a significant difference at the .01 level existed among the mean scores of the responding groups. Although there was a significant difference among the responding groups, it was evident from further analysis by use of Leik's Measure of Ordinal Consensus, the mean value responses and Duncan's New Multiple Range Test that the general tendency of the groups was to expect principals to perform the related curriculum and development
roles. However, a few segments of the responding groups produced response scores that may be assumed to indicate divergent role expectations for the secondary school principal. School board presidents preferred on item 7 to limit the amount of a school principal's involvement in formulating the philosophy and objectives of a school district by indicating that someone else may at times be responsible for this function. Each of the other responding groups preferred to place this prerogative on the secondary school principal. Another area in which principals possibly should not have total responsibility as inferred by school board presidents, particularly urban board presidents, was on item number 19. This item referred to the principal's responsibility to determine the elective courses taught in his school. However, the other responding groups agreed that this should be the prerogative of the principal. Rural secondary school teachers may be assumed to infer by their responses to item number 6 that principals should not be the agent responsible at all times for the determination of student extracurricular activities in his school. However, other responding groups indicated that this preferably should be the function of the secondary school principal.

**Personnel staffing and placement.** The second null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to personnel staffing and placement, was rejected. The difference was at the .05 level of significance. A more complete statistical analysis revealed that the general tendency of the responding groups indicated
that the principal preferably should perform the related personnel staff and placement functions. It should be noted on item number 20 that there was almost total agreement among urban superintendents, urban association presidents and urban secondary school principals that the principal preferably should assign teachers in his building to their specific teaching duties. However, there was some incongruity between urban secondary school teachers and most principals about the principal's role to assign teachers to their special non-teaching duties such as lunch room supervision. The urban secondary school teachers' response indicated that it may or may not be the responsibility of the secondary school principal to assign teachers to special non-teaching assignments such as lunch room supervision (item number 15) but each of the other responding groups indicated that this preferably should be included as one of the principal's functions. But, the responses of the rural secondary school teachers and almost all of the association presidents may be assumed to indicate that the secondary school principal should assign teachers in his building to the special non-teaching assignments such as lunch room supervision. Although it may be assumed that the tendency of the responses to item number 14 indicated that the principal preferably should be responsible to recruit and assign substitute teachers in his school, there was a difference between the responses from the urban and rural respondent groups. Most urban respondents of this study may be assumed to indicate that someone else other than the principal should recruit and assign substitute teachers but most rural respondents and
almost all superintendents tended to agree that this preferably should be a function of the secondary school principal.

**Pupil arrangement and control.** The third null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to pupil arrangement and control, was rejected. The difference was at the .05 level of significance. The significant difference among the responding groups for this hypothesis appeared to be between the classification on the response continuum of preferably should--PS--and absolutely must--AM--performance role expectations of the secondary school principals. However, it may be assumed from this study that the principals' role should include (a) the determination of student grooming and dress standards and (b) the general conduct and discipline of students in their buildings.

**Public relations.** The fourth null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to public relations, was rejected. The difference was at the .05 level of significance. There was no significant difference among the responding groups on item number 24 which revealed that the principal preferably should be responsible for explaining the school district's philosophy to the faculty and to the patrons of his school. Although there was a significant difference among the responding groups, it was indicated by all but the school
board presidents that the principal preferably should perform the related public relations role. The school board presidents' response inferred on item number 5 that principals should not be responsible at all times for involving the community in determining policies, planning programs and evaluating achievement of the school.

School building management and finance. The fifth null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to school building management and finance, was rejected. The difference was at the .01 level of significance. Although there was a significant difference among the responding groups, it may be stated that the principal preferably should perform the school building and finance functions as tested by this hypothesis.

Principal's negotiation role

The negotiations process. The sixth null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiations role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to his participation in the negotiations process, was rejected. Nine of the items were significant at the .01 level of significance. Item number 32 was not significant but responses indicated that the principal preferably should not serve as a liaison person between the board of education and the teachers' association in the communication of vital information during the negotiations process.
Each of the responding groups as they were compared with the principals' group on the other nine principal negotiation role items produced significant range differences and the results are reported as follows: Each of the responding groups indicated on item number 46 that the principal preferably should resist measures which if negotiated would reduce the authority he needs to carry out his duties and responsibilities. There was general agreement among the responding groups on item number 36 that the principal preferably should not represent the principals' association as a separate unit in collective negotiations. The responses from each of the responding groups, including the principals', appeared to indicate that the principal absolutely must not perform this particular function. The tendency of the scores from the responding groups to item number 41 indicated that the secondary school principals preferably should be a "bystander" with no involvement in the negotiations process. However, urban secondary school teachers seemed to indicate that the principal preferably should not be a "bystander." The superintendents, however, inferred from their responses that the principal's function in this area was conditional--he may or may not be a "bystander." Item number 39 produced scores which indicated almost total agreement and consensus from the responding groups that the principal absolutely must not be a member of the team representing the teachers' association in collective negotiations. Each of the responding groups agreed that the principal preferably should be a member of the team representing the board of education in collective negotiations with teachers, item number 49. However, urban school superintendents responded
to this item with 100 per cent consensus that the secondary school principal absolutely must perform this role. All groups with the exception of the superintendents tended to agree that the principal preferably should be a consultant to the board of education, item number 42, during the negotiations process. Urban superintendents indicated that the principal may or may not perform this particular role. Each of the responding groups agreed on item number 48 that the principal preferably should be a consultant to the teachers' association during negotiations. The tendency of each group's response may be assumed to indicate that the principal absolutely must perform this role as part of his responsibility. The tendency of the responding groups to item number 27, should the principal be a consultant to both the board of education and the teachers' representatives during negotiations may be assumed to indicate that the principal preferably should not perform this function. However, the principals' group response tended to indicate that the principal perceived his role as one that preferably should include being a consultant to both the board of education and the teachers' representatives during negotiations. There was almost total agreement and consensus on the scores from each responding group to item number 38 that the secondary school principal absolutely must not inform all school publics on issues under consideration in professional negotiations (Refer to conclusions for areas of congruency and incongruity, pages 112-114, 115-120.)

Grievance procedures. The seventh null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the
secondary school principal's professional negotiations role as defined by the 
"Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to the grievance procedures, 
was rejected. It was determined that there was a significant difference on eight 
of the nine items at the .01 level of significance.

The responses from each of the responding groups to item number 34 
appeared to indicate that the particular circumstances may dictate whether or 
not principals should serve on a district-wide grievance committee represent-
ing the principal's association. However, each of the responding groups appeared 
to indicate on item number 50 that principals preferably should serve on a district-
wide grievance committee representing the board of education. Each of the respond-
ing groups with the exception of the urban association presidents responded to 
item number 28 with an inference that the principal preferably should serve on a district-
wide grievance committee representing the teachers' association. Urban association presidents inferred that the principal may or may not serve 
in this capacity. School board presidents, superintendents, and principals 
tended to agree on item number 37 that the principal's role preferably should 
include the function of providing an election system for determining teacher 
representation on the grievance committee in his school. Association presidents 
and secondary school teachers generally agreed that the principal preferably 
should not perform this function. The responses to item number 30 indicated 
that superintendents and school board presidents perceived that the principal 
preferably should not be responsible for organizing a faculty grievance committee 
in his school. Principals, association presidents and secondary school teachers
responded to the same item with the inference that principals may or may not include this responsibility as one of their functions. Item number 31 produced responses that were not significantly different. The responding groups indicated that the principal should not select the teacher representatives to serve on the grievance committee in his school. Each of the responding groups inferred by their responses to item number 40 that the principal should not be involved in all stages of the grievance process between a teacher or teachers in his school and the board of education. Each of the responding groups generally agreed to item number 47 that secondary school principals preferably should be bound to carry out negotiated agreements made between the board of education and teachers' representatives though he, the principal, was not represented in the negotiations process.

Impasse action. The eighth null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiations role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to action taken by the principal during an impasse was rejected. The difference was at the .01 level of significance. It was also indicated by each of the responding groups that the principal preferably should refuse to open and conduct his school unless state certified teachers are employed in the case of a teacher impasse which involves the withholding of services, item number 49. One may assume from this study, item number 29, that there was a lack of consensus within the responding secondary school teachers' and association presidents' groups about the
principal's responsibility to manage and direct the operation of his school in the case of negotiations impasse which involves the withholding of services by teachers when the board of education orders the schools to be staffed by substitute teachers. School board presidents, superintendents, and principals may be assumed to have indicated that the principal's role preferably should be one which includes the management and direction of his school under such circumstances. School superintendents may be assumed to have inferred from their responses to item number 33 that the principal absolutely must not withhold his service during a teacher-school board negotiations impasse when teachers withhold their services. School board presidents along with principals inferred by their responses that principals preferably should not withhold their services under such conditions. Secondary school teachers and association presidents inferred by their responses that principals may or may not withhold their services. One could assume, however, that the teacher groups' response scores were polarized in the direction which would mean that the principal preferably should withhold his services along with teachers during a teacher-school board impasse.

**Association membership.** The ninth null hypothesis that there was no significant difference among the responding groups in the perception of the secondary school principal's professional negotiations role as defined by the "Principal's Role Expectation Scale" as it related to membership in professional associations, was rejected. The difference was at the .01 level of significance. Although there was a significant difference among the responding groups, it may
be assumed from this study, item numbers 44 and 45 which received general agreement from each of the responding groups indicated that the secondary school principal's role preferably should include that of not only having the right to be a member of the local teachers' association but that he, the principal, should be a member of the teachers' organization.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following conclusions were reached:

General conclusions

1. Each hypothesis produced a significant statistical difference among the responding groups as they perceived the secondary school principal's professional administration and collective negotiation roles. Therefore, each hypothesis was rejected.

2. Although there was a significant difference among the responding groups pertaining to the secondary school principal's perceived professional administration roles, there was a high per cent of consensus within the responding groups about these roles. It was also apparent that there was a higher per cent of consensus within the responding groups about the principal's professional administration roles than there was about his negotiation roles.

3. There was no statistically significant difference among the responding rural and urban segments of Utah's educational enterprise about the secondary school principal's professional administration and negotiations roles.
4. There was a high per cent of consensus within most groups pertaining to the secondary school principal's negotiation roles. However, the consensus scores and the mean value responses indicated several areas of divergent points of view both within and between the responding groups. However, in other areas, congruency was found.

5. Some areas of incongruency between the related principal's professional administration roles and his collective negotiation roles may be presumed to indicate paradoxes (see conclusions beyond the statistical analysis, pages 117-120.

Specific conclusions—areas of agreement

Principal's professional role

1. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for providing appropriate roles for teachers to play in developing policies for the school.

2. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for determining the overall organizational pattern of the school (graded, multi-graded, departmentalization, self-contained, etc.).

3. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for the planning and development of the school curriculum.

4. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for determining the teacher-pupil ratio for each individual classroom.
5. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for curriculum planning and development for the improvement of instruction in the school.

6. There was general agreement that the principal should be involved with the district staff in the selection of teachers to be employed in his school.

7. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for assigning teachers in his building to their specific teaching duties.

8. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for evaluating teaching proficiency of each teacher under his supervision.

9. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for recommending teachers under his supervision for tenure or dismissal.

10. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for interpreting the feelings and needs of all employees under his direction to the superintendent and the board of education.

11. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for determining the grooming and dress standards of students attending his school.

12. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for the general conduct and discipline of the students in his school.

13. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for the temporary suspension of students from his school.

14. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for establishing the school's philosophy on student grading and reporting to parents.
15. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for explaining the school district's philosophy to the faculty and to the patrons of his school.

16. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for making written and oral reports to the board of education and to the public on the purposes, programs and achievements of the school.

17. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for recommending the budget for his school.

18. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for the expenditure of funds allocated to his school.

19. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible to account for studentbody fees and other school funds.

20. There was general agreement that the principal should be responsible for the maintenance and operation of the school facilities to which he is assigned.

Principal's negotiation role

21. There was general agreement that the principal should not serve as a liason person between the board of education and the teachers' association in the communication of vital information during negotiations.

22. There was general agreement that the principal should resist measures which if negotiated would reduce the authority he needs to carry out his duties and responsibilities.
23. There was general agreement that the principal should not represent the principals' association as a separate unit in collective negotiations.

24. There was general agreement that the principal should not be a member of the team representing the teachers' association in collective negotiations.

25. There was general agreement that the principal should be a member of the team representing the board of education in collective negotiations with teachers.

26. There was general agreement that the principal should be a consultant to the teachers' association during negotiations.

27. There was general agreement that the principal should not keep all school publics informed in issues under consideration in professional negotiations.

28. There was general agreement that the principal may or may not serve on a district-wide grievance committee representing the principal's association.

29. There was general agreement that the principal should serve on a district-wide grievance committee representing the board of education.

30. There was general agreement that the principal should not select the teacher representatives to serve on the grievance committee in his school.

31. There was general agreement that the principal should not be involved in all stages of the grievance process between a teacher or teachers in his school and the board of education.
32. There was general agreement that the principal should be bound to carry out negotiated agreements made between the board of education and teachers' representatives though he was not represented in the negotiations process.

33. There was general agreement that the principal should refuse to open and conduct his school unless state certified teachers are employed in the case of a teacher impasse which involves the withholding of services.

34. There was general agreement that the principal could and preferably should be a member of the local teachers' association.

Specific conclusions—areas of incongruity

Principal's professional role

1. School board presidents preferred to limit principal involvement in formulating the philosophy and objectives of the school district. The responses of the school board presidents indicated that the principal preferably should be involved in this process but the consensus score was not high within the school board presidents' group. However, each of the other responding groups gave an affirmative response that principals should be involved in this process.

2. School board presidents inferred that principals preferably should not be responsible for determining the elective courses taught in his school. The other responding groups indicated that this should be the prerogative of the principal.
3. Rural secondary school teachers indicated that the principal should not at all times be responsible for determining what student extra-curricular activities should be conducted in the school. The other responding groups preferred to convey this prerogative to the principal.

4. Urban secondary school teachers tended to infer that the principal preferably should not be responsible to assign teachers in his building to special non-teaching assignments such as lunch-room supervision, club sponsorship, etc. However, each of the other responding groups indicated that this preferably should be one of the principal's functions.

5. Urban segments with the exception of superintendents of each responding group indicated that someone other than the principal should be responsible for recruiting and assigning substitute teachers in his school. Rural segments and most superintendents of the responding groups indicated that the principal should carry out this task.

6. School board presidents indicated that the principals preferably should not at all times be responsible to involve the community in determining policies, planning programs and evaluating achievement of the school. However, the other responding groups did indicate that this preferably should be the responsibility of the school principal.

Principal's negotiation role

7. Urban superintendents appeared to indicate that the principals may or may not serve as consultants to the board of education during
negotiations. However, the other responding groups indicated that the principal preferably should function in this capacity.

8. Secondary school principals tended to agree that their role may include being a consultant to both the board of education and the teachers' representatives during negotiations. However, the other responding groups indicated that the principal preferably should not function in this capacity. The consensus scores of each group were either slightly below or slightly above 50 per cent which may indicate a lack of consensus within each of the responding groups to this particular function of the secondary school principal.

9. Local association presidents indicated that the principal may or may not serve on a district-wide grievance committee representing the teachers' association. However, the other responding groups indicated that the principal preferably should not serve in this capacity.

10. School board presidents, superintendents, and principals indicated that the principal's role preferably should include providing for an election system for determining teacher representation on the grievance committee in his school. However, association presidents and teachers indicated that the principal preferably should not be responsible to carry out this function.

11. Principals, association presidents and teachers indicated that the principal may or may not be responsible for organizing a faculty committee on grievances for his school. However, school board presidents and superintendents indicated that the principal preferably should not perform this function.
12. School board presidents, superintendents, and principals agreed that when there is a teacher-school board impasse in negotiations and teachers withhold their services, the principal should not withhold his service. However, association presidents and teachers indicated that the principal may determine the action he takes relative to the particular circumstances.

13. School board presidents, superintendents and principals indicated that principals should manage and direct the operation of their schools in the case of a negotiation impasse which involves the withholding of services by teachers when the board of education orders the schools to be staffed by substitute teachers. Local association presidents appeared to indicate that the specific situation may dictate what course of action principals may take by responding that the principal may or may not manage his school. Teachers, however, indicated that principals should withhold their services. Low consensus scores were recorded for the teachers' and the association presidents' groups inferring a lack of consensus within these two groups.

Conclusions beyond the statistical analysis—apparent areas of paradox

1. There appeared to be general agreement that the principal should be responsible for determining the grooming and dress standards of students attending his school, for establishing his school's philosophy on student grading and reporting to parents, and also for the planning and development of his school's curriculum. However, school board presidents appeared to limit the school principal's involvement in formulating the philosophy and objectives
of the school district. One may assume that student appearance, individual school curriculum and a school's grading system is directly influenced by the school district's philosophy and objectives. It, therefore, seems reasonable to allow principal involvement in formulating district objectives and philosophies or possibly reduce principal effectiveness with incongruent role expectations.

2. There appeared to be general agreement among the responding groups that the principal should be responsible for such items as determining the classroom pupil-teacher ratio, the organizational pattern of the school and the general conduct and discipline of the students in his school. There also appeared to be general agreement among the responding groups that the principal should be bound to carry out negotiated agreements made between the board of education and the teachers' representatives even though he was not represented in the negotiations process. Recent negotiation agreements between teachers' organizations and boards of education have resulted in changes in the classroom pupil-teacher ratio, teacher welfare issues pertaining to working hours, and conditions which directly affect the ability of the principal to carry out his prescribed duties such as being responsible for the general conduct and discipline of the students of his school. It may be assumed that the principal's responsibility is in direct relationship to his involvement in the decision-making process and that a contradiction exists between the prescribed administrative role expectations of the principal and his ability to influence the negotiations process.
3. One may assume from this study that urban secondary school teachers expect someone other than the teacher to be assigned to special non-teaching duties, such as lunch-room supervision and club sponsorship and that teachers do not expect the principal to be responsible to fill these assignments or assign teachers to these duties. There was general agreement, however, among the responding groups that the principal should not represent the principal's association as a separate unit in collective negotiations. Thus, it appears feasible under such circumstances, even though the principal may assume the role of consultant to the board of education, that added non-administrative responsibilities will become his duties without collective representation. If the added non-administrative duties are not inconsistent with the responsibilities of the principal, then there is no inconsistency. However, if these duties become inconsistent with the responsibilities of the principal, there is an apparent paradox in the responses of the responding groups.

4. There was general agreement among the responding groups that the principal should not be a consultant to the board of education and the teachers' representatives during the negotiations process. However, in separate items where the function of a principal may be assumed to be a consultant to either the board of education or the teachers' representatives, each item received separate general agreement from the responding groups that principals should perform a consultant role. One may assume that there is an apparent paradox to the expected role performance of the principal as it
may relate to his possible consultant functions during negotiations. If this is not correct, the responding groups must be assumed to expect the principal to be a consultant to one of the two groups during the negotiations process.

5. There appeared to be general agreement among the responding groups that the principal should refuse to open and conduct his school unless state certified teachers are employed in his school in the case of a teacher impasse which involves the withholding of services. However, the responding groups also agreed that the school principal should manage and direct the operation of his school in the case of a negotiations impasse which involves the withholding of services by teachers when the board of education orders the school to be staffed by substitute teachers. One may assume that during a teacher-board of education impasse in negotiations that state certified teachers would not be available and that substitute teachers, unless specially authorized by the state, would not meet the state's teaching certificate requirements. The inferred situation probably would present a severe amount of unreconcilable dissonance among representatives of the responding groups and place the principal in an untenable position.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the data from this study, the conclusions reached from the statistical treatment of the data and the review of the related research, the following recommendations are made:
1. A similar study should be made to include a sampling of the elementary school personnel of Utah's educational enterprise. Such a study may provide insights as to dichotomies that may exist between secondary and elementary personnel.

2. A similar study should be made to include the sampling of both elementary and secondary personnel of the educational family in other states or combination of states.

2. "The Principal's Role Expectation Scale" should be updated and refined. The instrument should be based on the professional administration and collective negotiation practices in existence in the area being sampled.

4. A research project might be considered to explore the perceptions among state department personnel, parent-teacher associations, labor leaders, university professors, legislators, community business leaders and lay citizens about the principal's expected negotiations roles.

5. Other points on which this study did not explore involved the relationship between age, experience, and sex. A larger group sampling in further research might clarify areas of incongruity and agreement.

6. The results of this study have implications for administrative training programs. Universities and colleges should be concerned with current labor movements of collective bargaining and how the principal's role in this area relates to his school functions.
7. Comprehensive studies may be undertaken to explore the organizational structures and administrative patterns in school systems in order to develop principal role models that relate to the principal's functions in the professional negotiations process.
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APPENDIXES
## Appendix A

Comparison of the means of five groups of educational participants of nine major categories of secondary principal role expectation items in relation to the degree of expected performance as perceived by the participants using the analysis of variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Expectation Categories</th>
<th>School Board Presidents</th>
<th>District Superintendents</th>
<th>Association Presidents</th>
<th>Secondary Principals</th>
<th>Secondary Teachers</th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Curriculum Dev.</td>
<td>30.32</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>14.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Staffing and Place</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>32.97</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>31.05</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>20.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Arrangement and Control</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>6.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>5.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Build. Management and Finance</td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>5.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Negotiations Process</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>6.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Procedures</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>2.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impasse Action</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>10.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Membership</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.93**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alpha = .05  df = 4/434  R:F = 2.39  **Alpha = .01  df = 4/434  R:F = 3.36
Appendix B

Cover Letter

April 23, 1969

A "Principal's Role Expectation" questionnaire was mailed to you on April 4, 1969, from the Department of Educational Administration.

The purpose of the questionnaire was to provide data for a research study designed to identify the professional role and the role in collective negotiations of the school principal.

It is realized that this is an extremely busy time of the year for public school personnel. However, since the success of this study is dependent upon your response, please take time to complete and return the questionnaire. If by chance the previous correspondence did not reach you, let me know and I will forward another instrument.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and participation.

Sincerely yours,

Terrance E. Hatch
Professor of Education

TEH/bh
Dear

The principal is a key person in determining the quality of education in a school system. In his position it is important that he have excellent interpersonal relations with teachers, the central office staff, the superintendent and the Board of Education. There is much concern among principals and others about these relationships in light of recent developments in the negotiations process. In particular the principal's role is not always clear. We would like your help in indicating: (1) What you think his professional role should be; and (2) what his role in negotiations should be. All individual responses will be kept confidential. At no time will an individual or school district be identified.

This study has the endorsement of the executive boards of the Utah Society of Superintendents, School Boards Association, the State Department of Public Instruction, the Local Presidents and Executive Council of Department Administration and Supervisors of U.E.A., the Elementary and Secondary Principal's Associations.

Sincerely yours,

Terrance E. Hatch
Professor of Education
Utah State University

Please check the appropriate column and go on to next page.

51. **Age**
   - Under 25
   - 26-35
   - 36-50
   - 51 and over

52. **Marital Status**
   - Single
   - Married
   - Divorced
   - Widow
   - Widower

53. **Sex**
   - Male
   - Female

54. **Experience**
   - Total years as a superintendent
   - Total years as a principal
   - Total years as a teacher
   - Total years educational experience
55. **School Size** (Teacher or Principal Check appropriate one.)

   Elementary student population  
   - up to 200  
   - 201-400  
   - 401-up  

   Secondary student population  
   - up to 300  
   - 301-500  
   - 501-1000  
   - 1001-up
Appendix D

Respondent Data Sheet: School Board President

Name_________________________ Occupation_________________________

School District________________

Dear

The principal is a key person in determining the quality of education in a school system. In his position it is important that he have excellent interpersonal relations with teachers, the central office staff, the superintendent and the Board of Education. There is much concern among principals and others about these relationships in light of recent developments in the negotiations process. In particular the principal’s role is not always clear. We would like your help in indicating: (1) what you think his professional role should be; and (2) what his role in negotiations should be. All individual responses will be kept confidential. At no time will an individual or school district be identified.

This study has the endorsement of the executive boards of the Utah Society of Superintendents, School Boards Association, The State Department of Public Instruction, the Local Presidents and Executive Council of Department Administration and Supervisors of U.E.A., The Elementary and Secondary Principals’ Associations.

Sincerely yours,

Terrance E. Hatch
Professor of Education
Utah State University

Please check the appropriate column and go on to next page.

51. Age

52. Sex

| Under 25 | Male |
| 26-35 |
| 36-50 |
| 51 and over |
| Female |

53. Experience

Total years as a member of the Board of Education _______
Appendix E

Principals Role Expectation Scale

Directions: Please indicate the degree of involvement, authority, or responsibility (though he may delegate it) the principal should have in relationship to the management of the school to which he is assigned.

Place an (X) in the appropriate column.

NOTE: Please MARK EACH item for both the elementary principal (EP) and the secondary principal (SP) even though you may consider the role to be the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY: AMN - Absolutely Must Not; PSN - Preferably Should Not; MMN - May or May Not; PS - Preferably Should; AM - Absolutely Must</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ITEMS: |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD:     | AMN | PSN | MMN | PS | AM |
| Sample: Teach in the classroom at least one period per day each month | EP | SP |
| 1. Be responsible for determining the teacher-pupil ratio for each individual classroom | EP | SP |
| 2. Be responsible for determining the overall organizational pattern of the school: (graded, multi-grade, departmentalization, self-contained, etc.) | EP | SP |
| 3. Be responsible for making written and oral reports to the board of education and to the public on the purposes, programs and achievements of the school. | EP | SP |
| 4. Be responsible for evaluating teaching proficiency of each teacher under his supervision. | EP | SP |
| 5. Be responsible for involving the community in determining policies, planning programs and evaluating achievement of the school | EP | SP |
| 6. Be responsible for determining what student extracurricular activities should be conducted in the school. | EP | SP |

Please return to:
Dr. T. E. Hatch
Dept. of Ed. Ad.
Utah State Univ.
Logan, Utah 84321
THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD:

7. Be involved in formulating the philosophy and objectives of the school district.
   AMN

8. Be responsible for the expenditure of funds allocated to his school.
   PSN

9. Be responsible for interpreting the feelings and needs of all employees under his direction to the superintendent and board of education.
   MMN

10. Be responsible for establishing the school's philosophy on student grading and reporting to parents.
    PS

11. Be responsible for curriculum planning and development for the improvement of instruction in the school.
    AM

12. Be responsible for recommending teachers under his supervision for tenure or dismissal.
    PS

13. Be responsible for temporary suspension of students from his school.
    AM

14. Be responsible for recruiting and assigning substitute teachers in his school.
    PS

15. Be responsible for assigning teachers in his building to special non-teaching assignments such as lunchroom supervision, club sponsorship, etc.
    PS

16. Be responsible for determining the grooming and dress standards of students attending his school.
    AM

17. Be responsible for the maintenance and operation of the school facilities to which he is assigned.
    PS

18. Be responsible for the planning and development of the school curriculum.
    AM

19. Be responsible for determining what elective courses will be taught in his school.
    PS

20. Be responsible for assigning teachers in his building to their specific teaching duties.
    AM

21. Be responsible for recommending the budget for his school.
    PS

22. Be responsible for the general conduct and discipline of the students in his school.
    AM
KEY: AMN - Absolutely Must Not; PSN - Preferably Should Not; MMN - May or May Not; PS - Preferably Should; AM - Absolutely Must.

ITEMS:

THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMN</th>
<th>PSN</th>
<th>MMN</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Be involved with the district staff in the selection of teachers to be employed in his school.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Be responsible for explaining the school district's philosophy to the faculty and to the patrons of his school.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Be responsible to account for student body fees and other school funds.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Be responsible for providing appropriate roles for teachers to play in developing policies for the school.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEGOTIATION ROLE

Consider what you believe to be the school principal's role in the operation of his school as indicated in the above questions and then respond to what degree he should or should not be involved in the following areas of professional negotiations.

KEY: AMN - Absolutely Must Not; PSN - Preferably Should Not; MMN - May or May Not; PS - Preferably Should; AM - Absolutely Must.

ITEMS:

THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMN</th>
<th>PSN</th>
<th>MMN</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Be a consultant to both the board of education and the teacher's representatives during negotiations.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Serve on a district wide grievance committee representing the teachers' association.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Manage and direct the operation of his school in the case of a negotiations impasse which involves the withholding of services by teachers when the board of education orders the schools to be staffed by substitute teachers.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Be responsible for organizing a faculty committee on grievances for his school.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Select the teacher representatives to serve on the grievance committee in his school.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Serve as a liaison person between the board of education and the teachers' association in the communication of vital information during negotiations.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AMN</th>
<th>PSN</th>
<th>MMN</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. When there is a teacher-school board impasse in negotiations and teachers withhold service the principal should withhold his services also.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Serve on a district wide grievance committee representing the principal's association</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Have no responsibility in determining membership on a teacher's grievance committee.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Represent the principal's association as a separate unit in collective negotiations.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Be responsible for providing an election system for determining teacher representation on the grievance committee in his school.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Keep all school publics informed on the issues under consideration in professional negotiations.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Be a member of the team representing the teachers' association in collective negotiations.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Be involved in all stages of the grievance process between a teacher or teachers in his school and the board of education.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Be a &quot;bystander&quot; with no involvement in the negotiation process.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Be a consultant to the Board of Education during negotiations.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Refuse to open and conduct his school unless state certified teachers are employed in the case of a teacher impasse which involves the withholding of services.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Be a member of the local teachers' association.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Have the right to be a member of the local teachers' association.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Resist measures which if negotiated would reduce the authority he needs to carry out his duties and responsibilities.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**KEY:** AMN - Absolutely Must Not; PSN - Preferably Should Not; MMN - May or May Not; PS - Preferably Should; AM - Absolutely Must.

**ITEMS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SHOULD:</th>
<th>AMN</th>
<th>PSN</th>
<th>MMN</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. Be bound to carry out negotiated agreements made between the board of education and teacher's representatives though he was not represented in the negotiations process.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Be a consultant to the teachers' association during negotiations.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Be a member of the team representing the board of education in collective negotiations with teachers.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Serve on a district wide grievance committee representing the board of education.</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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