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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The public schools of America constantly faced dramatic changes in organizational structure. One problem which caused schools to change their educational programming was the declining birth rate which resulted in declining enrollment. Leggert (1978) estimated that the 1974 number of fourteen to seventeen year-olds in the United States which was 19,000,000 would drop to 14,000,000 by 1985 and to 12,500,000 by 1990. Jascourt (1978) noted that the decrease in school enrollment triggered educational policy choices made by school boards. One of these choices was the relocation of teachers. He also stated that teachers who retained their jobs with the decline in student enrollment might work under materially different circumstances.

Teachers need to be prepared to examine the rate of change in the occupational field, to be aware of current educational practices, and to have knowledge of the future goals required of classroom students (Packlam, 1977). The subject of orienting organizational employees, such as teachers, in preparation for change was addressed by Hamilton (1975) stating that most people within an organization wanted, at the onset, to know two things. First, they wanted to know where they would fit in the new plan. Second, they wanted to know how the new plan would affect their ability to do their work.
As one prepared teachers to adjust to new expectations the process involved two primary considerations: (1) helping them to change to the alternative job assignment and (2) developing in them the capacity for continuing adaptability (Basil and Cook, 1974). Preparing teachers for change should have included the possibility of lateral job movement within the organization. A building principal, along with the teachers, was often involved in the change process. The process by which teachers decided on lateral job changes was the focus of this research project.

The Problem

Lateral job changes for teachers were necessary as a result of dramatic changes, such as declining enrollment in the public schools. Hickrod (1976) states that patterns of organizational life for schools with declining enrollment should include staff reductions rather than staff recruitment and planning for fewer students rather than for more students.

Teachers must be prepared to accept lateral job change. How were teachers prepared for lateral job change? How were administrators orienting teachers to prepare for the dramatic change in jobs? These questions had not been adequately answered in the literature. Therefore, teachers who had made recent job changes were surveyed to find out how they decided to make the change. School administrators who
had faculty making lateral job changes were asked how the orientation for the change was provided.

**Purposes and Objectives of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to analyze the way teachers had decided on lateral job change. More specifically:

A. A thorough review of the literature was conducted dealing with personnel development as it related to lateral employee position change requirements in educational and business environments.

B. Teachers who had made recent lateral job changes were asked how they decided to make the change.

C. School administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked why the teacher made the change and how the teacher decided to make the change.

D. A comparison between teachers who had made recent lateral job changes and school administrators who had faculty make lateral job changes was conducted.

**Method of Research**

Data was obtained for purposes of this study in the following manner: Personnel directors of Unified School
District Number 308, Hutchinson; Unified School District Number 383, Manhattan; Unified School District Number 305, Salina; and Unified School District Number 475, Junction City were contacted for a personal conference with the researcher. The purpose of this conference was to obtain a list of all the teachers in the district who had moved laterally within the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 school years and to obtain permission for carrying out the research project in the districts. Principals of teachers who had made lateral job changes were contacted for purposes of arranging conferences with these teachers and principals. Teachers were contacted for appointments with the researcher for the purpose of obtaining data for the study. The answers given by teachers and principals as to why there were lateral job moves were recorded. One hundred forty teachers and their principals served as the sample. Some principals had more than one teacher in the sample.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of the study were as follows:

1. The study was limited to the following four school districts in Kansas: Unified School District Number 308, Hutchinson; Unified School District Number 383, Manhattan; Unified School District Number 305, Salina; Unified School District Number 475, Junction City.
City. The reason for this limitation was to use districts which provided the potential for a sample of significant size.

2. The study was limited to teachers who had moved laterally during the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 school years.

3. The study did not include out-of-district transfer teachers or principals.

**Definition of Terms**

- **Lateral job movement:** A job change by a teacher from one teaching position to another teaching position where the teacher and the previous administrator were still in the district and where there had not been a large increase in the pay of the teacher due to the job change.

- **Teacher:** A certified staff member teaching a specific subject or grade in a public school.

- **Administrator:** The principal or immediate supervisor before the lateral job movement.

- **Elementary School Teachers:** Staff members teaching students in grades kindergarten through six.

- **Secondary School Teachers:** Staff members teaching students in grades seven through twelve.

- **Demographic Information:** Basic data of teachers for the statistical study of the population.
Open Ended Question: An inquiry including no correct or incorrect numerical answers and allowing maximum participant response.

Assumptions of the Study

Assumptions of the study included:

1. It was assumed that teachers and principals gave the correct answers to why there were lateral job movements and did not falsify any information.

2. It was assumed that the instrument correctly identified the information needed for the study.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The format of this study is as follows: Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature related to initial employment and interview procedures as they pertained to the lateral job movement of employees, job movement in government, job movement in business and industrial environments, and job movement in education.

Chapter 3 provides information regarding the sample, sample size, instrumentation, reliability, validity, the instrument, administration of the instrument, hypotheses, and method of analysis.

Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the findings of the study.
Chapter 5 provides a summary and the conclusions of the study.
The review of the literature concentrated on those
general relevant areas which had reference to lateral job
movement. These areas included the initial employment and
interview procedures, business and industrial programs with
reference to retraining and personnel development programs,
job movement in government, and job movement in education.

Initial Employment and Interview Procedures

Jensen (1975) stated that it was through the initial
interview that the potential skills of the employee could
be examined to the organizational needs for the present and
the future. Two studies in the literature endorsed the
need for theory regarding prediction of the possible suc-
cess of the initial interview (Shoop, 1975; and Schmitt,
1976).

It was the purpose of a research project by Shoop
(1975) to determine if selection theory predicted better
than present theory. To establish the links between the
postulates and selection theory and the real world of selec-
tion decisions, a selective score model was used. In ef-
flect, the model produced a range of scores for the appli-
cants with the highest score maximizing the satisfaction of
the decision-makers. A positive correlation between selec-
tion score and satisfaction of the decision-makers was hypothesized. The design consisted of four separate studies. The selection score was computed for each of the applicants in the four group studies. These selection scores were analyzed to test the postulates of selection theory. The results of the study confirmed that selection theory predicted who was selected, and selection theory predicted who was selected better than present theory.

In a similar study regarding theory, Schmitt (1976) did an extensive research of the literature examining the general traits needed by the interviewer for positive prediction in an interview situation. The conclusions of the research indicated that there were several viable conclusions that could be made regarding selection theory. The conclusions indicated that: the use of a structured interview guide would improve interviewer reliability; knowing the requirements of the job would help the interviewee; interview training to avoid bias in rating might be appropriate though not much effort had been directed towards this problem; the interviewee was forming an impression of the interviewer and even when he/she was not an acceptable candidate the interview might be employed effectively as a public relations tool. Further conclusions indicated that: interpersonal skills and motivation were evaluated best by the interview; allowing the applicant time to talk would make rapid first impressions less likely and provided a
larger behavior sample; interview training with minorities might increase the ability to relate, though again, this training rarely existed and had never been evaluated; attention should be directed to an evaluation of the purpose of the interview; and research should be directed to determining what variables were reliable, validly and uniquely assessed in the selection interview and that research could be conducted best with the cooperation of personnel interviews.

While the previous two studies dealt with theory of prediction, another study (Jablin, 1975) examined the selection problems of the interview that would likely arise in an organization operating under the management philosophy of contingency theory. Contingency theory was described as an indication that there was no best form of organizational theory that could be applied to all organizations. Jablin concluded that a structured interview had greater validity than an unstructured interview. Results indicated that personal relations and motivation to work were consistent factors considered by interviewers in the decision-making process and seemed to have high predictive ability. The two main conclusions to the study were that tests and interviews seemed to have appreciable validity, but validity varied from situation to situation; the validity of interviewer predictions usually increased with a decrease in the number of traits rated.

In examining reliability and validity in relationship
to the interview situation two major problems arose: the amount of structure to be used and the specificfness of an appropriate criterion (Walsh, 1975). Generally, the personnel interview structured around a carefully perceived and systematic procedure would enhance the level of staff selection (Smith, 1972). Research by Shoemake (1974) confirmed that the development of a teacher selection interview system would be productive to certain criteria in predicting teacher success.

Expanding on methods of developing a reliable and valid teacher selection interview method, Smouse (1975) sought to discern whether or not the personal interview added a precise measure to the prediction of teacher performance. A major goal of the research was to ascertain the interviewer's capability of precisely predicting a definitive degree of success for a teacher through the means of a personal interview. A total of 470 first year United States Dependants Schools (European Area) teachers were hired in the United States for employment during the 1974-1975 school year. Findings of the project were as follows: interviewers rated a significantly higher number of teachers as being far above standard and above standard than did the principals; principals rated more than twice as many teachers as being standard than did the interviewers; an analysis of the data pertaining to the ratings of all teachers compared to the ratings of these same teachers by the princi-
pals revealed a significant difference. The conclusion of the study indicated that the majority of teachers who received the highest rating from the interviewers were rated lower by the principals. It was recommended that a more patterned or structured interview process be devised and initiated so that subsequent interviews would be better standardized and more valid.

Interviews can be structured to measure one or more qualities of the potential teacher depending on the needs of the district. The purpose of research carried out by Simmons (1976) was to test the Teacher Perceiver Interview as an instrument that would select vocational agriculture instructors that developed positive rapport with their students. A random sample of 45 vocational agriculture instructors was selected out of a total of 138 teachers in the state of Nebraska. Data from 42 teachers, their vocational agriculture students (numbering 1,882) and one administrator from each school were reported in the findings. A Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was conducted between the teacher's score, the student evaluation scores, and the administrator evaluation score. An analysis of variance was calculated between the vocational agriculture instructors and the secondary male instructors included in the normative sample compiled by Selection Research, Inc. Findings of the study indicated that the Teacher Perceiver Interview Instrument was positively correlated with the Teach-
er Perceiver Student Questionnaire and the Teacher Advocate
Administrator Questionnaire. Vocational agriculture in-
structors were significantly different in the scores re-
ceived on the Teacher Perceiver Interview from the secondary
male instructors included in the normative sample.

Personnel selection quite often was subjective in
nature, having as its base, certain value judgments in the
mind of the decision-maker (Harrick, 1974). The reason for
leaving a job and the opportunities provided by a new job
were two of the most frequent concerns of employees consid-
ering a job change (Harlan, Kerr and Kerr, 1977). These
concerns inferred that individual traits may determine the
success of the job applicant.

There appeared to be at least four types of nonverbal
cues (traits) related to a candidate's behavior from which
interviewers were likely to draw inferences from the candi-
date (Hatfield, 1978). These included body language (e.g.,
gesture, posture, eye behavior), appearance (e.g., clothes,
height and weight, general attractiveness), touching be-
havior (e.g., handshakes), and proxemics (e.g., physical
distance between interactants, seating arrangements).

Race and sex also are traits of the potential employee,
and these traits were the focus of a research project by
Smith (1977). The study identified and described the rela-
tionship of screening committee members' race and sex to
rankings they would give applicants for a prestigious posi-


tion in public education and the relationship of race and sex to the rankings which applicants would receive for such a position. The investigation was conducted by having each of 140 participants in the study screen applicants for a position labeled Regional Commissioner of Education. Subjects were not told that they were involved in a study or that the applicants and the position of Regional Commissioner were fictitious. Such a position was used in the study because it represented the kind of job to which Blacks and women had minimal success. In order to determine if applicants with identical qualifications would be ranked equally with other such qualified applicants regardless of race or sex, it was necessary to have each applicant evaluated when associated with the identical job qualifications previously held by one of the applicants. The following patterns were identified: neither sex was favored by preferential resume rankings; the rankings and resumes of Black applicants were ranked significantly higher than those of White applicants; White applicants received higher rankings from White respondents than from Black respondents, and Black applicants were favored with higher rankings from Black respondents than from White respondents; female applicants were favored with rankings from female respondents that were significantly higher than those given by male respondents; Black, female respondents were found to vary significantly from the other respondent groups; and in general,
the findings indicated that each group in the study demonstrated a bias favoring applicants of the same racial membership as their own. Similar conclusions were reached by Brugnoli (1976) while studying racial bias in the use of work samples for personnel selection.

All applicants, regardless of sex or race, were looking for indications from the prospective employer regarding hiring practices (Retts, 1973). Poole (1974) found that it was not uncommon for districts to have specific objectives in mind when setting up the employment interview and to reject those applicants who did not indicate that their teaching methods would be acceptable to the district. One method of helping the prospective teacher to gain valuable experience in an interview situation was to train him/her in an interview situation at the university level by setting up actual interviews and teaching the job applicant what to expect in the interview situation (Haber, 1974). The interviewee must have specific knowledge of the needs of the potential employer and the knowledge of building and applying strategies for initial cognitive skills (Bowen, 1973). Gillian (1974) suggested that the very relationship between self-acceptance and acceptance by others in an employee-selection situation must be positively correlated in order for the applicant to have any kind of success in the interview.

In the interview, the job applicant often contemplates
the possibility of invasion of privacy (Rosenbaum, 1971). Using a 66 item questionnaire, the research subjected 1,392 people to a series of questions including family background and influences, personal data, interests and values, financial status, and social qualities. Findings indicated that operational definitions of invasion of privacy varied by subgroups of the job applicant population. This type of probing indicated that the effects of interpersonal performance in a simulated selection interview was one way of training the interviewee to anticipate the questions of the interviewer (Young, 1977). This assumed that the person doing the interview had the proper training in the area of what constitutes invasion of privacy (Oran, 1977).

The previous studies concentrated on the needs of the interviewee. Several research findings are available on techniques available to the interviewer. Early personnel research concentrated on correlating objective test scores with criterion measures. Clinical prediction techniques were considered inferior, a position to which many psychologists took exception (Welker, 1977). Gildersleeve (1976) inferred that interviewing techniques could be grouped into four separate actions: motivating the respondent, building confidence, examining respondent behavior, and examining the actions of the interviewer.

Expanding on the need for examination of interviewer techniques, Menne, McCarthy and Meene (1976) set out to
examine a systems approach to the content validation of employee selection procedures. The research project stressed that there were two important elements to the systems approach. First, there was a precise set of procedures, essentially the same for all job classes, that the personnel analyst followed to implement the content validation strategy. Second, the personnel analyst received extensive computer-based clerical support throughout the procedural steps in the process. Content validity documentation on 669 job classes, covering 15,000 positions in two years and utilizing over 5,000 subject experts was the basis of developing and using the systems approach. The work was carried out by the Merit Department of the state of Iowa. From the start it was evident that as a result of individualized training, reading, and professional development, there was a lack of definite and consistent meaning in the selection terminology utilized by the team members. Therefore, "Job Analysis Guidelines" was developed to define, explain, and standardize the terminology. Three distinctive types of computer support provided the personnel analysts implementing the systems approach to content validation: management-information-type reports, computer scoring and analysis of objectively scored examinations administered using optically scanned answer sheets, and computer-assisted test construction using a computer-readable item bank.

The above study confirmed the usefulness of the compu-
ter to assist in large research projects. Warren (1978) also pointed out the need for readily compiling and assessing information in a study examining criterion-related validity of the decision-making process. However, valid and reliable information could be gathered by examining small numbers of participants when researching interviewer techniques in a formalized setting (Ross, 1974).

Interviewer and interviewee actions could both be examined by recording the conversation on a video-tape. After reviewing the literature, Toler (1975) concluded that there was a strong need to investigate the comparative effectiveness of programmed instruction, cued-video-tape modeling, and behavioral feedback on the acquisition of interview skills. As part of a Pre-Instructional Information Questionnaire 301 female undergraduate education majors completed Part I of the Hidden Figures Test. Students who achieved scores in either the upper or lower 15% of the distribution were selected as possible subjects. From this pool of students (N=90) 60 randomly selected subjects were classified as independent (N=30) or field dependent (N=30). Thirty subjects from each classification of the intervening variable were randomly assigned to an experimental condition. At the conclusion of the research project it was inferred that adding behavioral feedback to the instructional methods increased their effectiveness in teaching confrontations. Also, the results suggested that programmed in-
struction was more effective than cue-video-tape modeling in teaching confrontations.

In a similar study King (1976) examined video playback as it provided the validation of self-esteem and body esteem in a job interview. Subjects were 87 females enrolled in a junior-level educational psychology course. All subjects participated as job applicants in a 10 minute video-tape job interview session and completed several statistical measures to insure the validity of the research. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of three feedback conditions which followed the interview session. These were video-playback-solitary, video-playback-counselor discussion, and counselor discussion. Self-esteem and body appearance satisfaction ratings both correlated significantly with performance expectations, but self-esteem was found to be significantly more predictive. Prefeedback performance of self-ratings and postfeedback performance of self-ratings were significantly related to self-esteem for subjects in each of the three feedback conditions.

Emphasis in the business environment on proper interviewing techniques centered on four main aspects: the resume, the job-seeking letter, a listing of potential interview questions as perceived by the interviewer, and minimum qualifications (Boris, 1978). These aspects were developed as part of the examination of an earlier study by Berger (1977) in which selection decision, the interview,
plan, resume analysis, skills profile, the job description, and the vacancy were established as functions of the interview process.

One method of predicting success is to examine successful people in the field. The development of an interview process for the selection of life insurance sales managers was researched by Loesch (1974). The managerial characteristics of successful salesmen were used to develop a structured interview and a rating scale. The rating obtained by the subjects was compared to an effectiveness criterion consisting of a percent increase in premium over two years. Then a rank-order correlation technique was used to compare ratings on the structured interview to the effectiveness criterion. Conclusions indicated that the managerial characteristics developed through interviews with highly successful salesmen appeared to be validated through a high consensus with other studies relating to managerial selection. Agency success was not an adequate measure of effectiveness criterions, and there needed to be maximum effort of the use of clinical information in this type of investigation. Research findings by Spiceland (1977), and Johnson (1978) confirmed the validity of examining the traits of successful people in the field to help management predict the success of organizational employees or potential employees.

The business environment rarely has to worry about recruitment, however, this has been a problem in education.
Taibl (1973) stated when recruitment was utilized, the desirability of a particular employment situation might vary according to the perceptions established during the employment interview.

Recruitment was not the problem in larger school districts that it was in smaller school districts. In larger school districts, research indicated that the personal interview was the single most important technique in the teacher employment process. The technique was preferred over the use of the academic record and letters of reference. Interviews usually emphasized traits (Sproul, 1972). It was assumed that the effectiveness of training programs could be examined through the development and validation of an evaluation system in these larger school districts.

Closely related to success in the job interview was the climate of the organization. Lewis (1978) examined the relationship between the perceptions of principals and their teachers in schools concerning the selection process for professional staff and the organizational climate of the school. The sample for the study was composed of 46 elementary schools in the suburban Boston area. The Occupational Climate Description Questionnaire was administered in the sample schools with the principal and an average of five teachers completing the questionnaire in each school. Several conclusions were researched based on the findings. They were as follows: perceptions about a process in a
school were related to the climate of the school; schools characterized by non-congruence of perception between the principal and teachers about a process in the school had high subtest scores on the Occupational Climate Description Questionnaire subtest of hinderance indicating a dissatisfaction with the teachers in the school; schools characterized by congruence of perceptions between the principal and the teachers about a process in the school had high subtest scores of thrust and consideration indicating good principal-teacher relationships in the school; and school principals should be aware of the importance of their own and their teachers' perceptions about processes in their school and the relationship between those perceptions and the morale of the school.

Interview criterion measures varied according to the interviewer and philosophy of the district in the research findings of Dederick (1974). Borovicka (1973) suggested that nonverbal behavior was deemed to be crucial among prospective teachers during face-to-face interviews. There was also the suggestion that educational decision-making applied to teacher personnel selection could be predicted (Merritt, 1971; and Lasher, 1976).

At the university level, research findings indicated that it was in the initial interview that the potential employer first assessed the possibility of the value of the candidate to the organization (Warthen, 1978).
In examining those general relevant areas in business and government which had reference to lateral job movement it could be inferred that these organizations had similar techniques as education when examining the initial hiring and possibility of job movement within the company.

Job Movement in Business

The chance of success in the world of business could be dependent upon the tools possessed by the applicant before the first job. This infers prediction. Prediction was the focus of a research project by Franz (1974). Social psychological factors influencing success in job training were the focus of the study. Emphasizing the heterogeneity of those in a job training project, the study focused on the relationships between social characteristics (e.g., race, sex, work and educational history) of trainees and their behavior in the program and on the job following training. Subjects were 391 trainees in the Concentrated Employment Program in a midwestern city of 100,000. They were studied while in training and for one year following job placement. Race, age, sex and length of employment prior to CEP entrance were most strongly related to program completion. Trainees between 21 and 34 years were more likely to finish training than those older or younger. Men were more successful in training than women. The most consistent factor affecting length of employment was age.
In a related study, Hubbard (1974) examined future achievement orientations, job training, and economic success. The research had a fourfold purpose: described the concept on future orientation; developed measures of future constructs; determined the impact of background labor-markets-job training of future orientations; and evaluated the validity of the measures as predictors of training outcomes and economic success. A sample of 165 men was interviewed at one of four points in an MDTA institutional job training program in Western Michigan after application, at the beginning, near completion, and six months to a year after graduation from the program. Two years later 115 of these respondents were re-interviewed. It was concluded that the initial measures of motive and planning components were not associated with background, previous employment, labor market, or amount of training experience. The connection of immediate activity and future goals seemed to be critical for the success of program graduates. Graduates who were not placed in training related jobs not only did better economically but also maintained higher levels of future achievement orientation.

Workers with few financial benefits often did not have the benefit of looking forward to any future achievement. A project by Yoder (1972) examined participation in selected programs and activities from the perspective of the rural poor by using the concept of perceived relevance as a pre-
dictor of the political, job training and organizational participation of those with little income. Perceived relevance was described as the perception that an individual had of both his/her own needs and the relevance of present opportunities to meeting those needs. For this study the program and activity areas examined were political involvement, job training and voluntary organizations. Data were taken from the information collected for the Rural Negative Income Tax Experiment being conducted by the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin. The findings indicated that perceived relevance as measured in the study was an important but not necessarily better predictor of participation than the other variables, and it was not equally useful for all groups or areas considered in the study. Most forms of participation required both a certain level of education and a degree of initiative not usually exhibited by disadvantaged people. Findings indicated that adult educators and those working with low income people needed to consider how relevant the programs and their content were from the perspective of the poor person.

Research indicated that knowledge of job possibilities was essential to possible job movement. Dudley's (1978) contention was that the more accurate an individual's image of an occupation the more likely the individual would make a career decision that would be both beneficial and satisfactory to both the employee and the employer. Results in-
dicated that students did not know the requirements of the studied occupations. Accounting was by far the best known vocation. The concept that knowledge of the requirements of business occupations increased as the student progressed through school found some support in the increase of knowledge that was demonstrated for accounting, industrial sales, personnel management, retailing management, and sales management. LeBold (1977) and Bisconti (1978) confirmed the research findings of Dudley. LeBold examined the Purdue Interest Questionnaire in relationship to an interest inventory to assist engineering students in their career planning, and Bisconti researched the area of who would succeed as college graduates in the occupation of business executives.

A specific method of preparing business personnel for job retraining is through on-the-job training. An investigation by Henke (1971) examined the relationship between success and failure at on-the-job training for disadvantaged at San Antonio, Texas. The population consisted of all the enrollees (N=150) in one training facility of a contractor with the city concentrated employment program. The results of the study indicated that when considering prospective disadvantaged subjects for training and employment, counselors needed to look closely at personal characteristics. Most emphasis should not be placed on economic considerations. In a more specific area, Tiernor (1977) examined
the effects of on-the-job training of part-time hospital employees on components of productivity. Task procedures were developed for six trayline positions based on position description, job routines, observation of the task, and discussion with part-time trayline employees. One task listing was developed and used for all six positions. The hospital selected for the research was a 285 bed, privately operated, short-term general hospital. Research indicated that it was difficult to identify and control variables that affected the changes since analysis of the data used to measure the effects of the training indicated that variables other than training affected the components of productivity. The data should be evaluated in terms of the actual differences in labor, time, costs, and employee satisfaction and not only in terms of statistically significant differences.

On-the-job training could be studied at both the professional and non-professional levels. Hayes (1973) examined on-the-job training at the non-professional level. An experimental study examining the self-concept and effectiveness of resident assistants in routine on-the-job training and in a special training program utilizing encounters was the focus of the Hayes research. The study was concerned with the degree of change in self-concept and the effectiveness level of resident assistants and was tested through application of a repeated measures design. The results of the study indicated that the resident assistant process might be
quite adequate even though it was an entirely subjective process. Initial effectiveness scores for resident assistants were high. At the professional level, human capital investments by scientists and engineers regarding on-the-job training and job information was the focus of research carried out by Cook (1977). A model was used to answer whether workers maximized earnings by establishing careers within a given firm or through interfirm mobility or by some optimal tradeoff between those two alternative measures of career advancement. The multiple regression model showed that logarithmic earnings (controlling for education and experience) were lower for those who changed jobs. Cook concluded that the traditionally defined proxies for investments in on-the-job training and job information were inappropriate for measuring the actual returns to such investments. Using unemployment periods as examples of full-time job search proved to be especially meaningless.

Seniority could be directly related to on-the-job training earlier in the employee's professional career. Ross (1971) considered the firm's decision regarding provisions of on-the-job training to a work-force distinguished by seniority or age and the market determination, simultaneously, of the wage-training-seniority structure. The research confirmed the belief that wage determination in an industrial setting was directly related to on-the-job training. Brendler (1977) confirmed that finding. The Brendler
study examined the effect of employee retention on the demand for on-the-job training. A model showed the effect of employee retention on the demand for both human and physical capital. It also detailed how employee retention was affected by industry structure, employee characteristics, and the presence of unions. An analysis of employee retention produced the proposition that employee retention at the industrial level was directly related to the extent of unionization, the seniority provisions of the union contracts, the average age of a firm's employees, the specificity of the employee's skills, and the number of firms in the industry. It was also found that employee retention was inversely related to the tendency of unions to have as members persons who were employed in only one industry. The importance of on-the-job training in business was confirmed earlier by the research findings of Gainer (1972).

In the past many of the employees in the business environment which were used for research purposes were men (Miranda, 1976). It had been increasingly clear that women were starting to take an even bigger role in the business environment in the future. More specific, the purpose of a research project by Mellon (1975) was to investigate the relationship between work motivation and employment success with implications for disadvantaged black females in job training programs. Subjects were 118 disadvantaged black females who participated in four federally supported job
training programs in Houston, Texas. A modified version of Graen's instrumentality-expectancy model of work motivation provided the theoretical foundation. Research results were consistent with prior findings examining the relationship of work motivation variables with employment success. It was concluded that the general lack of relationship could be attributed to the inadequacy of instrumentality-expectancy theory for explaining the work motivation of the disadvantaged black female.

At the non-professional level, Wilson (1979) compared women employed in clerical positions at the National Institute of Health who had indicated a decision to seek voluntary career change by making an application to a formal career change program (Stride) with women co-workers who had never applied for such a program. The sample consisted of randomly selected study groups of 25 and 20. The participants were then administered the study instruments in a formal group setting. The study data supported the conclusion that a program such as Stride was significantly less attractive to women clerical workers resembling a non-applying group. It was further concluded that high aspiration was a critical ingredient for women clerical workers seeking formal career change.

At the university level, McLain (1979) made an assessment of needs of adult women returning to higher education. The research was carried out at Springfield Technical Com-
munity College, Springfield, Massachusetts. The population, graduates non-persisters, and current students consisted of 686 adult women. The method used to collect the data was a mailed questionnaire. Several conclusions were drawn as a result of the study. Although adult women returned to college with goals, they felt the need of some form of career development assistance. Adult women who withdrew were usually divorced, but planned to return to school sometime in the future. Adult women needed help in the areas of assistance in study skills, child care, group orientation, and support groups. On the basis of the findings a model was developed to provide women students with help in some of these areas. The study inferred that women returning to college did so partially out of personal self-fulfillment expectancies.

Schaffer (1978) earlier had made a study to examine the degree of self-fulfillment a woman experienced within her career goals and her awareness of her own potential. One hundred subjects including women working in banks, manufacturing companies, and a large public school district in a metropolitan area. The instrument used to gather information was the Attitude Toward Women Survey which was altered to a Likert Scale format. Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: the types of roles working women assumed in life tended to be affected by the way they felt about themselves; the attitudes toward
roles working women assumed in their lives did not affect their career achievement; age did not make a difference in the way a working woman felt about herself, the types of roles she selected, or attitudes toward career achievement; business women seemed to have a strong self-concept and were sensitive to the roles they assumed and the relationship of each to career achievement; women in public urban education had a strong self-concept, but did not assume roles in relationship to career abilities - this could possibly be because many teachers preferred to stay in the classroom and teach and did not aspire to administrative positions; women in banks did not tend to have a strong self-concept; and there tended to be a new type of woman emerging, and she tended to have androgynous characteristics.

The above studies indicated that women may need retraining if they wished to move within the company. Retraining also might be necessary for men to move within the business environment. Retraining efforts and labor force status as they related to differential effects of selected demographic variables were the focus of research and study by Abrahamson (1970). This study dealt with the Manpower Development and Training Act experience in one state (New Mexico) during a 1½-year period. The sample consisted of 1,097 personnel and was limited to those who completed institutional type training programs. Selected independent variables were sex, age, and grades completed. They also
were treated against each other as intervening variables in addition to marital status, prior labor force status, years employed and females to the influencing of intervening variants in each labor force status. Those intervening categories of each independent variable were examined together with each category of the dependent variable labor force status. High employed rates were most consistently represented by 13 or more grades completed, marital status, three to nine years' previous employment and prior labor force status of employed. Deviations existed within some of the categorizations; however, the resultant groupings were speculatively shown to possess common within-group traits.

The previous study emphasized individual traits. Collingwood (1970) assessed the differential effects of large and small group training and retraining on the long-term retention of facilitative communication. A large and small group of subjects received 10 hours of training to communicate at high levels of empathy, respect, genuineness and concreteness. All dependent variables consisted of subjects responding in writing to taped client stimulus expressions. It appeared that the scale contained unequal intervals with the upper scale points representing higher difficulty levels for trainees both to reach and to consolidate. A wide-ranging study in the same area was conducted by Buck (1972) to investigate retention and retraining strategies. Research was conducted through a case study in which the ob-
jective was to explore alternatives to the AT and T Policy of retraining its employees in the System First Aid and Personal Safety Course every five years. To assess the long-term retention levels produced by the course, a criterion measure of first aid knowledge divided into subscales was developed. Findings of the testing did not produce the high and consistent levels of proficiency claimed during its validation. However, the following three retraining strategies were explored: retraining every n years; retraining when proficiency reached a minimal percentage; and retraining when the average proficiency reached a minimal percentage. The analysis indicated that moderate increases in the five-year time interval between retraining would result in little decrease in the expected average proficiency levels. Research by Belding (1972) and Brubaker (1976) supported the findings of the previous studies.

Retraining inferred the possibility of training and transfer. The primary variable of work carried out by Schoenike (1974) was to identify attitudes toward job training as held by vocational students in training and by employed graduates. Attitudes toward four major areas of job training were identified in the research: occupational skill; occupational knowledge; occupational work habits; and occupational work relationships. All data were collected from secondary vocational students and employed graduates by means of a questionnaire. The major results of the study
inferred: the attitude formed toward job training upon completion of a vocational program would remain unchanged for at least a year after graduation for those graduates who were employed full-time; trainees and employed graduates either enrolled or graduated from an elective vocational job training program possessed attitudes which viewed job training as valuable in relationship to employment; trainees and employed graduates held higher attitude values toward job training areas related to occupational skill and occupational knowledge than they held toward the job training areas related to occupational work habits and occupational work relationships; whether a trainee or employed graduate had part-time experience had little effect on attitudes held toward job training. Training and transfer as viable methods of providing the possibility for job movement was verified by other research findings (McMahon, 1971; Hodgson, 1972; Dickinson, 1974; Weimar, 1975; Camp, 1976; Smith, 1976; Stewart, 1978; and Levine, 1979).

The rapid changes in the 1970's required a new type of professional in the personnel field (Mitchell, 1974). This meant that managers must be resource people pointing toward mutual employee-employer objectives (Mee, 1976). Reflecting on this new professional, Kelso (1976) concluded that the perennial problem was whether to select people to fill pre-designed jobs or to design jobs to use the abilities of existing personnel.
To solve the problem of utilizing the potential of employees, many companies were turning to the computer (Swart and Baldwin, 1971; Wilson, 1975; Johnson and Van Doorn, 1976; Gross and Iacobelli, 1976; Drucker, 1978; and Abbott, 1978). Other research findings concluded that companies were also faced with job design plans to accommodate new technologies (Pearon and Moore, 1972; Clutterbuck, 1975; Warren, 1977; Githens and Elster, 1977; and Ivanovich, McMahon and Streidl, 1978). There was also emphasis in some companies on specifics of training (motivation-Silrer, 1972; divestment-Wallendar, 1973; manpower utilization-Morano, 1974; trans-cultural services-Abinander, 1976; redundancy-Beer, 1976; marketing skills-Quinn, 1976; human resource development-Margoilies, 1977; and minorities-Hall and Albrecht, 1977).

Specifics of training inferred the need for staff development. Mondale (1978) examined the differences in perception in the role of staff development trainers in organizations, a role identified as an emerging vocation. The focus of the research was on sources of stress and strain in the job performance of the teacher. Organizations from which data were drawn were nine long-term care facilities in the state of Texas. The following conclusions were drawn from the study: the role of the staff-development trainer needed further clarification; there was sufficient consensus to delinitate accepted areas of function for the trainer;
knowledge about behavioral sciences and skill at interpersonal communications were important in background and personal qualities needed by the teacher. Specific training effects were often cited in the literature (programs to aid unemployed space professionals-Thompson, 1975; commercial bank competition-Sanderson and Ponting, 1975; effects of occupational shift on family life style-Garrett, 1975; technological change-Barrons, 1975; newspapers-Schurz, 1976; and grouping of skills-Townsend, 1978). Career education was used by some companies as a method for possible job movement (state career education programs-Ferrini, 1977; career education in the arts-Paul, 1977; transfer policies and career education-Gerstmann, 1978; and evaluation of the General Electric Foundation summer institutes on career education and guidance-Pearson, 1979).

In examining the literature it could be inferred that job movement in business probably needed to be examined by looking at the skills of the potential employee, staff development programs, and the needs of the organization.

Job Movement in Government

In government, a major concern in regard to job movement was the fact that management often did not realize that there was a personnel problem and top managers were not utilizing proper two-way communication techniques (Weathersby, 1970).
Expanding on the problem of communication in the governmental sector, Hall (1970) decided to examine the effectiveness of governmental managers with emphasis on trainees. Hall's research concentrated on the personnel managers in governmental training programs, and one conclusion was that trainees must be given the opportunity to practice their new skills, but at the same time must be given a livable wage. Results of the research indicated that in order for training programs to succeed they must have personnel managers who care about the personal lives of each employee. Data indicated that in the past governmental training programs had exploited trainees who gave up on the training and often only trained fully experienced men and women leaving those who needed the training with no marketable skill. The data also indicated that in order for governmental training programs to succeed, a major amount of time must be spent on educating intended employers on the new skills of the governmental employees.

The previous study concentrated on initial training in regard to governmental programs. Long-term training and effectiveness were the focus of a research project designed by the Civil Service Commission (1973). The purpose of this research study was to examine even more closely the effective use of long-term training in order to provide information for managers, supervisors, personnel and training officers. The study concentrated on assisting governmental
officials working under the Governmental Employees Training Act to better understand those unique situations which maximized the learning opportunity for selected employees with high potential. The Civil Service research identified three long-term training situations which it recommended be implemented immediately into governmental action. First, long-term training should be used when the needed knowledge or skills required a comprehensive study program and could not be accomplished by a series of unconnected short-term courses. Second, long-term training should be used when the time span for acquisition of the knowledge or skills was such that a concentrated long-term program was most feasible. Third, long-term training in governmental services should be utilized when the set of knowledge or skills was so complex, so new or so unique, that it could not be readily obtained on a short-term basis from any available agency or interagency or from a non-governmental source. Research results indicated that the nature of long-term training as a substantial investment of both dollar and manpower resources imposed a responsibility on agency management to give special attention to the use of this resource.

The need for both initial training and long-term effectiveness of personnel could be initiated through an on-the-job training program (Gay, 1973). Examining the literature Gay's research indicated that on-the-job training was a type of investment in human capital which had,
from an empirical point of view, been largely ignored by economists. A method of estimating the costs of on-the-job training in military occupations and the relationship of trainee attributes to them were the focus of the research project. The method used was to estimate on-the-job costs and returns to training as a straightforward application of Becker's analysis of investments in job training in which the actual and opportunity productivity of trainees were compared. Estimates were derived for specific individuals providing a unique opportunity to analyze relationships between trainee characteristics and the cost of on-the-job training. The method of estimation was applied to members of the largest United States Air Force occupation specialty-Aircraft Maintenance Specialists. Analysis of the project indicated that schooling was an important determinant of productivity in the specialty studies with an additional year of education associated with a reduction of approximately nine percent on estimated on-the-job training costs. In contrast to findings in civilian earnings studies, civilian job experience was not significantly related to estimated productivity. An analysis of the relationship between trainee's achievement in specialty school and his/her productivity on the job indicated that achievement on performance tests was strongly related to productivity although achievement on written tests was not related to productivity.

The need for both initial training and long-term effec-
tiveness was also the focus of research carried out by Sjogren and Wittman (1974). The researchers developed a training program to prepare 50 individuals to serve as discussion leaders in future training sessions dealing with the principles and standards of the Water Resources Council. Research findings indicated that there were three prime areas which needed attention. These included context implementation emphasizing such information as program development, transactional implementation directed toward describing the procedures of the training program, and outcome analysis focusing on information and attitudes toward the sessions and the program in general and on the acquisition of knowledge by the participants.

The above studies indicated the need for initial skills and long-term training for effective personnel development programs. Initial skills included applicant assessment concentrating on the short-term and long-term probability of success of the applicant. Training programs could not be developed if there was not first an all-out effort to recruit personnel so that they could be developed. So the Report of the Comptroller General of the United States (1976) was issued to clarify this problem. The governmental study set up a research program to examine the problems, progress, and actions needed for the future regarding the recruitment and retraining of federal physicians and dentists. This study was directed by the Veteran's Administration, Depart-
ment of Defense, and Public Health Service due to the problem of poor recruitment of physicians. The research findings indicated that the General Accounting Office was satisfied with the recruitment and retraining programs currently being utilized and was by itself part of the overall problem. As a result of the research project the Comptroller General of the United States made several recommendations to the Congress based on the findings of the study. The two main recommendations were that the director of the Office of Management and Budget should develop a uniform compensation plan for all federal physicians and dentists and included in this plan should be methods for comparing and adjusting pay and benefits, and the Comptroller of the United States required that within one year the director should submit to the Congress a report of the results of its activities, together with its recommendations, including proposed implementing legislation and cost estimates. The Uniform Compensation Plan was developed as a result of the research findings of the study.

If proper personnel development plans were not utilized the results could be unemployment for the employee. Ventre and Sullivan (1972) studied the careers of 185 previously unemployed professionals from aerospace and defense industries and documented research findings following the completion of a month-long orientation to Urban Affairs. Seventy percent of the persons competing in the program were profes-
sionally employed eight months later. According to the researchers, the rate of completion was normal. But 60% of those at work were in the public service, a ratio that far exceeded professional personnel going into local governmental occupations. Most of the unassisted public agencies reported satisfactory or better performance from their recent hires who were now working. Results of the project indicated that the preparedness of the hiring agency to accommodate innovated management techniques was the most valid prediction of successful skills adaptation. Few significant relations were found between background attributes such as age, education, and industrial experience of the professionals and either their rate of placement or their successful performance once placed. The orientation offered cognitive and attitudinal changes in the participants, but particularly educational technique was found to be universally favored. Results of the project outcomes were tentatively asserted owing to the abbreviated period normally available for monitoring and of the even shorter period of actual on-the-job experience of successfully placed program participants.

The need for assessing the potential of unemployed workers was expanded by Thompson (1977) while researching the government's role in the retraining of unemployed workers during nonrecession periods. A deviation from the ideal competitive world of economics was discovered and led to
economically inefficient retraining program decisions which called for a special kind of project to induce efficient retraining decisions. The deviation was extended to such environments as non-retraining programs and revealed that there was a bias in the current United States unemployment compensation system toward job search activities but against retraining. This bias had resulted in an overly large rate of unemployment in normal times, and it could be corrected by extending the employment compensation system to support worker retraining as well as job search. The option of retraining generally was not available to individuals who were collecting unemployment compensation in the United States. Research findings indicated that the amount of retraining by women relative to men workers would likely be greater if the policy proposed was adopted. Improving the allocation between search and retraining had the added feature of reducing the unemployment rate as conventionally measured in this country. Conclusions of the research pointed out that in periods of nonrecessionary activity, the United States Government should subsidize retraining in the same manner as job search by way of the unemployment compensation system. The retraining subsidy to a person who was faced with a reduced demand for his/her services from the current job should be about the same order of magnitude as the job-search subsidy provided by the unemployment compensation system. The subsidy should support both institutional and on-the-job re-
training and be available to both men and women. Recommendations of the research advised the Public Employment Service administer the retraining subsidy as it did the subsidy to job search. Results indicated that the percentage increase in retraining by women workers would likely exceed that of men workers if the proposed policy were adopted.

The above studies reflected research findings available in the literature regarding job movement at the federal governmental level. At the local level of government, Caress (1978) researched personnel assessment by examining staff utilization of mayors in major American cities. One of the findings was that the number of technically sophisticated issues confronting mayors had increased significantly to oblige the mayors to make extensive use of their staffs. This might call for retraining. There was an indication of four basic models of mayor-staff relations. In the Initiator Model the mayor personally formulated virtually all policies. Staff members had a lot of discretion. The Controller model had the mayor also formulating the policies, but provided for little discretionay power on the part of the staffs. Mediator mayors provided the staff with the freedom to develop most policies with the mayor acting as judge regarding proposals which were to be implemented. Conciliator mayors were affected by the outside political environment. The mayor attempted to accommodate the demands of certain powerful interest groups. Results of the study
indicated that the use of staffs by mayors depended entirely on which model of mayor-staff relations was utilized. Maximum use of staff potential was available under those models which allowed for a large amount of employee input into the major decisions of the chief administrative officer of the city.

In reviewing the literature available regarding job movement in the government sector it could be contemplated that initial training skills, personnel development programs, and availability of skill utilization all played an important role in maximizing the talents of the employee.

**Education**

If personnel in education are going to move laterally there must be some type of development program available to prepare them for their new position. The purpose of this section is to examine what had been done in the area of personnel development in education.

Schools were faced with declining enrollment. In examining education with respect to less, not more students, Rettes (1979) developed and tested a model to determine the impact of declining enrollment upon staff development in the public schools. A stratified sample survey was administered in a large suburban school district to determine the formal, professional-growth activities over a year. The subjects in the sample indicated the number and amount of
time spent in three kinds of formal, professional-growth activities. These included college courses, inservice education workshops sponsored by the school district, and attendance at professional conferences. Rettes found that there was a statistically significant difference (.001) between teacher preparation in formal, professional-growth activities by age. Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference (.001) of teacher preparation in formal, professional-growth activities according to degree status. There was no evidence found to support the theory that there was an interaction between age and degree level status relative to participation in formal, professional-growth activities. Rettes concluded that the vitality of the educational institution in a declining enrollment era would decrease unless ways were found by educational decision-makers to offset some of the reduced tendency of staff to participate in formal, professional-growth activities.

Declining enrollment also faced universities. Shoyts (1979) examined the assessment of indices for minimum allocation of faculty positions for academic programs at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Specific goals of the study were to identify the necessary items to be incorporated in the decision-making process for instructional faculty staffing and determine which items discriminate among the instructional programs offered by departments. Data analysis consisted of frequency tabulations, cross-
tabulations, and the chi square test for significant differences for 33 variables each rated for the categories of instruction (Master's programs, Bachelor's programs, and service instruction to non-majors). The study provided a concept which could be used to determine the extent of resources needed for proposed new programs and whether they could be provided. However, the primary emphasis of the research was to provide the conceptual framework for defining a minimum, but academically legitimate, program in terms of numbers of courses and specializations needed and how many faculty were needed to offer the courses over and above student enrollments.

Junior colleges had a similar problem with regard to declining enrollment. Blue (1979) researched a study of perceived need deficiencies of public community/junior college faculty members in the state of Texas. The purpose of the research was to determine the perceived deficiencies in Texas public junior colleges. The data for the study were obtained by the administration of a questionnaire. The resulting data were subjected to appropriate statistical techniques in order to assess the findings in terms of their impact upon the intent of the study. Results of the study indicated statistically significant differences on the security, social, and autonomy scales but not on the esteem and self-actualization scales (Maslow's theory of motivation was used as the conceptual framework).
Relating to staff development, Anderson (1977) examined the problem of ascertaining the status of morale among teachers of the twelve regular comprehensive high schools of the San Diego Unified School District. It was hypothesized that staff development was related to potential counseling services offered to teachers. The sample consisted of 136 randomly selected teachers. The hypotheses of the study were tested by the chi square test of independence. Research conclusions indicated that a significant relationship existed between teacher morale and expressed need for counseling services, between low morale and desire for employment counseling, and between knowledge of physical violence on the school grounds and desire for security counseling. No relationship was found between low morale and having been physically attacked or having been denied a transfer.

The above studies indicated that school staffing was an integral part of teacher mobility possibilities. To expand on that concept, Brett (1979) suggested that there were alternatives to layoffs in education. Brett's research sought alternatives available to educational administrators in California which could be used to forsee or minimize layoffs in order to maintain a valid educational environment. Twenty-seven districts served as the sample. Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: most schools waited too long to implement practices that would have eliminated layoffs; districts effected a savings
of approximately $100,000 in personnel and support services for each school closed; worksharing, though common in non-educational personnel practices, was used in only one school. The study confirmed that school staffing was related to potential staff reductions.

Several studies cited in the literature suggested that teacher preparation was related to staff development and/or the potential of lateral job movement. Williams (1978) examined this concept in relationship to prospective English teachers. An aim of the study was to investigate the degree to which selected college and university English departments of member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Preparation were preparing prospective English teachers to teach literature in a multicultural society. Findings of the study indicated that both predominately White and predominately Black English departments offered little or no coverage of multicultural literature with little change in English departments due to the inclusion of multicultural literature. Findings of the research project indicated that there needed to be an investigation of departments of special studies that might be providing exposure to multicultural literature and that a study of Black, Chicano and Native American authors should be implemented in university level courses for use by prospective English instructors.

English teachers were not the only professionals who
had potential problems in the area of proper curriculum preparation. Research by Baker (1977) indicated that the prospective teacher in industrial arts was having the same type of problem. Findings of the Baker study pointed out the need for preservice indoctrination (during the practice teaching experience) for trade and industrial teachers. The study noted that once this knowledge had been exposed to the potential teacher it needed to be expanded for teachers in the field through constant inservice education.

The two previous studies focused on specific teaching fields. Research findings were available that indicated inconsistencies in preparing teachers to be thoroughly prepared to enter the job market. An investigation of intercultural transmission of work values in teacher retraining situations by Buck (1973) confirmed this hypothesis. The Buck research questioned whether and under what conditions contact with individuals from a different cultural tradition led to the acquisition of behavior that was characteristic of the culture and if this behavior needed to be examined in teacher preparation. Using a sample of 158 teachers, the study reflected that in the course of extended contact with the cultural participants teachers did acquire values relating to the characteristics of the personnel used for the study. Retraining was also examined by Christenson (1977) as it related to inconsistencies in preparing teachers. In this research evidence indicated that specific roles or core
functions of personnel going into a different educational specialty were the best method of eliminating inconsistencies before a job change was made.

Several studies in the literature confirmed the hypothesis that specific educational processes were directly responsible for possible job transfer or retraining. Dieker (1978) pointed out that it was the curriculum which would make or break the prospective teacher. The emphasis was on maximum curricular offerings at the university level with evaluation of teacher preparation through interdepartmental relationships. A 1978 study by Dropkin put emphasis on openness rather than curriculum. The contention was that through school-community relationships there would develop the potential for change in the public schools. Nichols and Persons (1979) came to the most practical research conclusion in that research findings indicated it was job creation which provided the basis for practical retraining possibilities. While the above studies differed in hypotheses the research findings did indicate that job retraining could be examined by researching a specific resource.

While the universities had a major responsibility to prepare prospective teachers, the local school district had an equally important role in educating the teachers of the district to be prepared for possible lateral job movement and staff development. Clamp's (1978) findings substantiated the belief that in-service education was necessary
for staff development. Selected aspects of in-service training programs in South Carolina were examined. The sample consisted of 92 superintendents. Based on the findings as suggested by the results of a questionnaire, the following conclusions were inferred: in-service educational programs were available to many schools in the sample area; employees of the various school districts provided, by far, more in-service training for their own professional staffs than did any other classification of individuals, agencies, or institutions; lack of time was chosen overwhelmingly as the chief constraint to providing additional in-service training.

Other research findings verified the need for in-service training. Babl (1978) looked at the value of selected experiences as perceived by tenured and non-tenured teachers. Results indicated that both tenured and non-tenured teacher groups agreed with the perceptions of the value of selected in-service experiences. Both groups felt teacher involvement in the purposes, activities, and methods of evaluation was imperative. Released time to participate was the most important factor surveyed. Berrier (1979) proposed that in-service education was a necessity for keeping teachers informed on the legal aspects of faculty employment with emphasis on tenure, contracts, and dismissal. Work was carried out in the community colleges and technical institutes of North Carolina. The study included examination of court
cases, faculty contracts, procedural manuals, and unpublished documents used in community colleges and technical institutions. The sample consisted of 57 schools in those areas. The most important finding was that presidents of institutions which had tenure/de facto plans had a more positive attitude toward tenure than those who did not have such plans. Perhaps the major importance of in-service education can be summarized by the work of Townsend (1979). The research procedure used in that particular study consisted of a case study paradigm using ethnographic research techniques. The purposes of the study were to determine the extent to which teachers exhibited new knowledge and attitudes in their classrooms as a result of a clinical in-service teacher education model and to identify and describe factors which facilitated or impeded the extent to which transfer from in-service setting to classroom setting occurred. The primary finding of the Townsend investigation reflected the degree to which in-service content was based on teachers' perceived needs and appeared to influence the degree to which teachers applied new knowledge, skills, and attitudes in their classrooms.

In-service training was one method of providing staff development. Another method was through retraining. The design, implementation, and evaluation of a retraining program for secondary counselors was the focus of research carried out by Boylan (1973). Results of that study in-
dicated that counselors benefited from a program designed to upgrade their personal and professional skills, and existing guidance programs in many schools were inadequate and should be redesigned if the personal professional needs of the counselors were to be utilized.

The previous study concentrated on a specific type of educator (counselor). There were several studies cited in the literature which concentrated on more general areas of retraining in the field of education. Emphasis in these studies was quite varied. Buchanan (1979) put his observation on participation in a career decision-making program by obtaining predictors from an analysis of readily available data. Goble and Porter (1977) examined the changing role of the teacher with international perspectives. Mann (1978) studied change as it affected the retraining of teachers. Uslander (1978) proposed guidelines for teachers who wanted retraining with the idea of going into a substantially different vocational field.

Career education was proposed by Wallick (1977) as the solution to staff development rather than retraining by itself. By using 50 attitudinal statements concerning the career education concept, it was concluded: career education was more useful than other educational innovations; career education could eliminate the dual school system; guidance personnel should share the responsibility for the career education implementation; pre-service education programs
should take precedence over in-service education programs; there was a need for a major overhaul of teacher education programs in order to incorporate career education; career education was more important than basic academic skills.

Career education was also emphasized at the university level. Baldwin (1979), through an interview procedure, concluded that differences in some faculty attributes (states in the professional life) lent support to the construct that adults did change significantly over time. The data revealed that faculty interests in some areas (e.g., research) gradually decreased as other interests (e.g., college-wide service) increased. Career education was examined in the literature by looking at specific points of reference. Examples included research findings of vocational education (Facklam, 1977), outreach programs (Farran and Yanofsky, 1972), comprehensive career guidance, postsecondary and adult programs (Moore and Miller, 1977), and educational reform with emphasis on anticipating the future needs of educators (Rubin, 1970). A revealing fact of career education potential was proposed by Muller (1970). After extensive research it was found that at least in one college (Harris Teacher's College) career education paid off as indicated by the 92% of that college's graduates who remained in education for their entire professional career. The research findings also indicated that women would be more likely than men to remain in teaching.
Other studies put emphasis on career education during the professional career (Nelson, 1975). A number of studies were cited in reference to specific teaching areas and the work being done in those areas with reference to career education, in-service education, and retraining.

The central theme of Aichele (1972) was that the National Advisory Committee on Mathematical Education could be a major source of information for career education involving mathematics teachers. It was contended that the curriculum was the basis for critical issues and trends in the mathematics teacher education. Similarly, Schultz (1979) examined the need for preparing math teachers. The research included the involvement of 95 students, primarily freshman and sophomore women at Ohio State University who had demonstrated competency in high school mathematics. A combination of project staff and consultants was used in the study. Conclusions of the study were: study in instruction and math content should be coordinated; programs in preparing teachers to teach math should be upgraded by consulting mathematics faculties, educational faculties, and public school personnel; school experience should be included in the coordinated content-methods instruction; programs in teacher training in mathematics should contain a minimum number of courses.

Reflecting on English, Kilby (1978) concentrated efforts in the area of a career education program for English
education majors. A concern was found for two primary problems in career developmental possibilities involving students majoring in English education; lack of career education and career guidance for English education majors and the development of majors in English and English education by students who chose alternative majors. Three significant trends were cited: English and English education majors were underemployed and underclassified; there was a decline in the number of people going into English and English education as a vocation; there was a need for vocationally relevant courses for these personnel.

In the area of science, Spradlin (1978) made a study of change in the science teaching behavior in the classroom following involvement in institute training or retraining programs. Conclusions indicated that to maintain quality science instruction it was necessary to have science teachers up-to-date in content knowledge, teaching strategies, and curriculum development. It was inferred that these could best be accomplished through in-service institutes.

Studies were also cited with emphasis on research findings in the area of social science teachers (Tucker and Joyce, 1979), and skilled women in non-traditional vocational education programs (Kane, 1977).

Reflecting on job movement in education it can be inferred that declining enrollment, staff development, curriculum preparation, in-service education, and career education
all aided the possibility of successful lateral job movement.

Summary

In reviewing the literature emphasis was put on the initial interview in education, business, and government to examine the potential skills of the employee as they related to the possibility of employment with the organization. Prediction was important because the organization needed to know if the selection of the applicant could be dependent upon factors deemed necessary by the organization for training purposes. Reliability and validity of interview techniques were deemed essential. Individual traits of the potential employee were often the key to his/her employment. Research findings were available to help both the interviewer and the interviewee in the formal interview setting.

In the business community the organization put emphasis on the tools possessed by the applicant before the first job. This inferred that business preferred applicants who had minimal skills before employment with maximum job movement within the company dependent upon the talent of the individual employee. Business used on-the-job training as one method of preparing employees for job retraining. This was true at both the professional and non-professional levels. Women were becoming more important in the business world, and the literature cited several examples of job movement possibilities for women. Companies were still
faced with the perennial problem of whether to select personnel for pre-designed jobs or to design jobs to use the abilities and talents of employees within the organization. Business did put priority on staff development programs, but not necessarily all companies used the same type of staff development.

In government, communication was cited as a major problem in relationship to job movement possibilities. People employed in government often were not aware of job possibilities due to no communication from the organizational leaders. The importance of long-term and short-term training was cited in research findings. Unemployment was a bigger problem in government than in education and business due to federal financing restrictions. There was a trend to keep unemployment minimal in the government due to programs that emphasized retraining, transferral of traits to new positions, and preparing for a civilian position after governmental service. Research findings with emphasis on job movement possibilities were cited at the local and federal government levels.

The major problem facing education was declining enrollment. Fewer students meant less teachers. If personnel in education were going to move laterally, development programs must have been available to them for preparing for a possible job change. Preparing teachers for new positions could be through course work at a university or through per-
sonnel development programs within the local school dis-
trict. The literature verified the need for in-service
training. Teachers could become aware of career possibil-
ities through career education, but they could not wait too
long to prepare for a new position or the result would have
been unemployment.

Government, business, and education were all faced with
the problem of how best to prepare employees for possible
job movement within the organization. Research findings in-
dicated that these agencies did care about their employees
and were making an attempt to utilize the talents of the
employees with maximum benefits for the employees and the
employer.
CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

Method of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the way teachers decided on lateral job changes. Teachers who had made recent job changes were surveyed to determine their reasons for changing positions. School administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked how the orientation for the change was provided.

This chapter includes information regarding the sample, sample size, instrumentation, reliability, validity, instrument, administration of the instrument, hypotheses, and method of analysis.

Selecting the Sample

The sample was limited to the following four school districts in Kansas: Unified School District Number 308, Hutchinson; Unified School District Number 383, Manhattan; Unified School District Number 305, Salina; Unified School District Number 475, Junction City. All teachers from the above districts who had moved laterally during the school years of 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 were considered a part of the sample. One hundred forty teachers and their principals took part in the project. Since some principals had more than one teacher taking part in the research project,
45 principals participated in individual conferences.

**Instrumentation**

Little research had been reported in the literature concerning job movement. In conducting a literature search no existing instrument was found already developed for researching the topic. An open-ended instrument was developed to serve as a research tool in an interview situation (see Appendix A). Standardized information was collected from a predetermined population. Each item on the instrument was developed to measure a specific aspect of the hypotheses or objectives.

Borg (1971) defended the use of the interview for research purposes and stated that the direct verbal interaction between the researcher and respondent was unique to an interview situation. Borg also stated that the prime advantage to data collection in an interview situation was the adaptability for the researcher and respondent. An open-ended instrument used in an interview situation could not be described as experimental research, but was instead ex post facto research. Roscoe (1975) defined ex post facto research as research in which the independent variable was selected rather than manipulated by the researcher. Roscoe defended the use of ex post facto research and stated that it was subjected to the same kind of statistical analysis as experimental research.
Converse and Schuman (1974) listed several important factors to be followed using a research instrument in an interview situation: the respondent should be asked for his/her opinions, not feelings; there should be a lack of emotionality in the questions; there should be a formality in the very style of the question-wording that reduced spontaneous expression; there should be a one-to-one situation, not group responses; the tone of the interviewer should be ultrarealistic. The instrument developed by the author consisted of five demographic questions to be asked of teachers and a series of 10 open-ended questions to be asked of teachers and principals (see Appendix A).

Reliability

Borg (1971) disclosed that in educational measurements reliability might be defined as the level of consistency of the instrument which might infer prediction. As with other instruments using ex post facto research methods and where there were no correct or incorrect answers, prediction of scores was not a purpose of reliability in this study. Opinions were recorded for research purposes. It was not possible to predict scores for non-participants based on opinions of other participants in the study. Roscoe (1975) stated that the greater the number of items in a test the more reliable the test. The open-ended instrument was developed to give research participants maximum latitude in re-
sponding to the reasons for lateral job movement.

Validity

Kimble (1978) defined validity as the measure of accuracy of the instrument. In most research validity could be tested through examining raw scores by using acceptable research formulas. Because of the nature of this study, a formula could not be used for testing validity because the answers given to why teachers moved laterally could not be put into categories of correct and incorrect answers. Roscoe divulged that when research involved operational definitions (non-raw scores) the trait being measured was not observable, but was instead observable phenomena. Roscoe noted that when the researcher recorded the observable phenomena conclusions could be drawn with respect to the unobservable behavior.

There are various approaches to testing validity. The type of validity used in this research is construct validity. Van Dalen (1966) defined construct validity as research in which the researcher was interested in understanding the nature of the properties being measured. Construct validity was not only an appraisal of the instrument, but also an assessment of the hypotheses. Due to the nature of this research (ex post facto research) raw scores were not used to test the construct validity of the instrument. What was used instead was the extent to which the instrument was
consistent with the hypotheses. This was one kind of construct validity (Van Dalen, 1966).

The best method of insuring construct validity for this instrument was to insure the questions on the instrument were relevant. In order to accomplish this insurance a panel of experts was used to examine the questions on the instrument. The panel consisted of university instructors at Kansas State University who were chosen for their research expertise. The panel was asked to review the instrument and make constructive criticism to enhance the construct validity, content value, and ease of administration. The instrument was revised according to the suggestions submitted by the panel.

Instrument

The instrument used for purposes of this research project was an open-ended instrument. The instrument was administered in a one-to-one situation with teachers and principals. Teachers and principals were interviewed separately. The questions on the instrument were read by the researcher to the participants. Teachers were interviewed in their own classroom, and principals were interviewed in the offices. The responses given by teachers and principals to the questions were recorded by the researcher on a separate sheet per participant. The researcher recorded no information while teachers and principals were answering the questions,
and all participants were given the chance to see and verify the correctness of their responses as recorded by the researcher at the conclusion of the personal interviews. The responses of teachers and principals were confidential. The average length of each interview varied from 5 to 10 minutes per participant. The reason for this variation was that some participants wished to expand on their answers while other participants answered the questions with a limited response.

All teachers were asked a series of five demographic questions and 10 opended questions (see Appendix A). Principals were not asked any demographic questions, but were asked the same 10 openended questions asked of teachers (see Appendix A). All completed instruments were coded for research purposes. The code numbers were recorded so that the researcher could verify any individual response sheet.

In order to complete the research project, the past job title and building changes were needed from each individual teacher. This information was obtained from the central office of each district participating in the project. This information was recorded on each individual teacher response sheet. Individual teachers were asked to verify this information. The information obtained from each central office regarding past job titles and building changes was verified by all individual teachers. The information regarding current job titles, past job titles, and building changes of
teachers were all recorded under demographic question number 5 on the individual response sheets.

For purposes of analyzing the data, there were no teachers who had a Ph.D. or Ed.D., so there were three categories in demographic question number 4 instead of four categories. For purposes of analyzing the data, past positions of teachers were categorized into five separate responses for demographic question number 5. These categories were developed after the teachers responded to the question, and teachers were not asked to classify their past teaching position into one of the categories. The specific categories were: elementary lower grades (kindergarten through third grade); elementary upper grades (fourth grade through sixth grade); elementary specialty (all non-graded classroom teachers); secondary academic (basic required subjects); secondary specialty (elective courses).

**Administration of the Instrument**

Administration of the instrument was divided into three separate phases: obtaining permission for approval of the project and obtaining basic information from district central office personnel directors; setting up individual conferences with teachers and principals through each building principal; collecting the data by arranging for individual interviews with teachers and principals.

The first phase of the administration of the instrument
was to obtain permission for approval of the project and obtaining basic information from district central office personnel directors. This phase was accomplished in the following manner. The researcher called and made arrangements for a personal conference with the personnel directors of Unified School District Number 308, Hutchinson (April 3, 1979); Unified School District Number 383, Manhattan (April 3, 1979); Unified School District Number 305, Salina (April 4, 1979); Unified School District Number 475, Junction City (April 2, 1979). During this conference the researcher provided the personnel directors with the basic information of the research project. Each personnel director was read a letter which introduced the researcher, the nature of the project, and the requirements of the local school district to participate in the research project (see Appendix B). Each personnel director was also given a copy of a letter to be given to building principals to explain the research project (see Appendix C). Personnel directors were also given a copy of a letter to be read to all teachers regarding the nature of the research project (see Appendix D). A prospectus was also given to all personnel directors to explain the specifics of the research project (see Appendix E). On the interview dates with the researcher, all personnel directors approved the project for the specific districts.

Another part of the first phase of the administration
of the instrument was obtaining information from district personnel directors to complete the research project. This was accomplished in the following manner. The researcher made arrangements with personnel directors to come back to the central office and obtain a list of teachers who moved laterally in the districts and their past principals under the guidelines of the research project. The researcher obtained a list of research participants from the personnel directors of: Unified School District Number 308, Hutchinson (April 8, 1979); Unified School District Number 383, Manhattan (April 9, 1979); Unified School District Number 305, Salina (April 10, 1979); Unified School District Number 475, Junction City (April 5, 1979). Lists provided the researcher by personnel directors included the following information: name of the teacher, name of the past principal, present school of the teacher, past school of the teacher, present school of the principal, past school of the principal, past teaching position of the teacher, and present teaching position of the teacher. There were several errors in the listings. Teachers and principals on the lists who did not meet the project requirements were not interviewed. Each district had errors on the central office listings: Unified School District Number 308, Hutchinson, had seven names of teachers who did not make a lateral job change according to the requirements of the project and two names of teachers who were no longer in the district; Unified
School District Number 383, Manhattan, had two names of teachers who moved during the 1976-1977 school year; Unified School District Number 305, Salina, had four names of teachers who did not make a lateral job change according to the requirements of the project and two names of teachers who had moved during the 1976-1977 school year; Unified School District Number 475, Junction City, had six names of teachers who did not make a lateral job change according to the requirements of the project and two names of teachers who were no longer in the district. All other teachers and principals on the central office listings were correctly identified. A total of 140 teachers and 45 different principals took part in the research project. A breakdown of teachers and principals by districts is as follows: Unified School District Number 308, Hutchinson, had 24 teachers and 9 different principals; Unified School District Number 383, Manhattan, had 47 teachers and 10 different principals; Unified School District Number 305, Salina, had 43 teachers and 17 principals; Unified School District Number 475, Junction City, had 26 teachers and 9 different principals. All teachers correctly identified on the district listings took part in the research project. At the second meeting of the personnel directors and the researcher, district central office personnel were requested to inform all building principals in writing that the research project had been approved by the central office. At this meeting the research-
er obtained a map of each district with the street addresses and location of individual buildings.

The second phase of the administration of the instrument was to schedule individual conferences with teachers and principals through each building principal. This phase of the research project was accomplished in the following manner. The researcher met with individual principals to arrange for the scheduling of conferences. Dates of contacting building principals and individual conferences were as follows: Unified School District Number 308, Hutchinson (contact with principals for scheduling conferences on April 8, 1979, and individual conferences with teachers and principals on April 13, April 16, April 18, April 20, April 26, and April 27, 1979); Unified School District Number 383, Manhattan (contact with principals for scheduling conferences on April 9, 1979, and individual conferences with teachers and principals on April 10, April 30, May 1, May 3, and May 4, 1979); Unified School District Number 305, Salina (contact with principals for scheduling conferences on April 10, 1979, and individual conferences with teachers and principals on April 13, April 16, April 17, April 18, and April 20, 1979); Unified School District Number 475, Junction City (contact with principals for scheduling conferences on April 5, 1979, and individual conferences with teachers and principals on April 20, April 23, April 24, April 25, and May 2, 1979. At the conference with the
building principal, the researcher gave each principal a letter which explained the nature of the research project (see Appendix C). All building principals had been notified by central office personnel of the approval of the project in the district. Each building principal was also given a copy of a letter which the researcher was going to read to each teacher to identify the nature of the research project (see Appendix D). All building principals were requested to inform teachers that they would be participating in the research project. The purpose of this request was to let the teachers know ahead of time to prepare for the individual interviews. Conferences with individual teachers were scheduled through the building principal so that no teacher would have to miss a class. This schedule meant that all interviews were scheduled either before school, after school, or during a teacher's preparation period. No interviews were scheduled during the teacher's lunch hour or regular class periods.

The third phase of the administration of the instrument was the individual interviews with teachers and principals. Individual interviews were scheduled in the following manner: after the interview date and time were scheduled, the researcher met with each participant on an individual basis; building principals were read a letter concerning the nature of the research project (see Appendix C) at the initial meeting with the researcher, and teachers were read a letter
concerning the nature of the research project at the time of the individual interviews (see Appendix D); before the interviews, all participants were given a chance to ask any questions regarding the nature of the interview; during the interview the interviewer recorded the responses of teachers and principals only after the participant had been given a chance to answer the question (the researcher made a maximum effort not to record responses while the teacher or principal was speaking); at the conclusion of the interview the teacher or principal was given the chance to see and verify the correctness of their responses as recorded by the researcher. Individual interviews were scheduled with teachers before principals. During the individual interviews, the researcher asked each participant the questions on the instrument (see Appendix A), with no comment from the interviewer unless the teacher or principal did not understand the question in which case the researcher repeated the question with an explanation of the question if necessary. The researcher made no attempt to influence any teacher or principal regarding any responses. The researcher kept all information confidential and did not inform any teacher or principal of any specifics in any other individual conference.

Hypotheses

The specific hypotheses were stated in the null form:
Hypothesis number 1 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement of elementary school and secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis number 2 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school principals.

Hypothesis number 3 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

Hypothesis number 4 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the chronological age of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 5 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement by the sex of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 6 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the teaching experience of the teacher in the district.

Hypothesis number 7 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the educational degree of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 8 stated that there would be no sig-
nificant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the past teaching position of the teacher.

**Hypotheses Testing**

Hypotheses numbers 1, 2, and 3 were tested by the responses given by teachers and principals to openended question number 9. Hypotheses numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 were tested by the responses given by teachers and principals to the demographic questions.

**Method of Analysis**

All responses were tested by the chi-square statistical technique, and all data was analyzed using the .05 level of significance for research purposes.

Categories of responses by teachers and principals when asked why the teacher moved laterally were as follows: teacher requested a change, principal requested a change, declining enrollment, school closed, teacher wanted a different subject, teacher-principal differences, teacher-teacher differences, teacher gained additional hours, and teacher wanted closer to home. These categories were developed after completion of the collection of the individual response sheets, and respondents were not asked to respond specifically to one of the above categories.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The focus of Chapter 4 is an analysis of the responses of teachers and principals when asked why the teacher made a lateral job change. The results contained in this chapter reflect the data collected in the individual interviews.

The chi-square test of significance was the statistical technique used for the analysis. The hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Response to the Instrument

There was 100% response to all questions by teachers and principals. No teacher or administrator refused to respond to any question. Teachers and principals were interviewed in a one-to-one situation, and all teachers and all principals answered all questions asked in the individual interviews. Teachers and principals were interviewed separately. The researcher asked the questions on the open-ended instrument (see Appendix A) and recorded the answers given by teachers and principals on a separate response sheet for each participant in the research project.
Demographic Tables

Demographic tables include information on teachers making lateral job changes by chronological age, sex, teaching experience, educational degree, teaching level, building change, present teaching position, and past teaching position. The information in these tables is a summary of the responses of teachers making a lateral job change to the demographic questions in the individual interviews.
Table 1. Summary of Teachers Making Lateral Job Changes by Chronological Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological Age of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and older</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Summary of Teachers Making Lateral Job Changes by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Summary of Teachers Making Lateral Job Changes by Teaching Experience in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience in the District of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more years</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Teachers</td>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
<td>Percentage of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist's or 30 hours over Master's</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Summary of Teachers Making Lateral Job Changes by Teaching Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Level of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Category of Teachers</td>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
<td>Percentage of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Change</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Building Change</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Summary of Teachers Making Lateral Job Changes by Present Teaching Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Teaching Position of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Elementary (K-3)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Elementary (4-6)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (Specialized)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Academic)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Specialized)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Summary of Teachers Making Lateral Job Changes by Past Teaching Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Teaching Position of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Elementary (K-3)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Elementary (4-6)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (Specialized)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Academic)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Specialized)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses Tables

Tables for hypotheses include data on the reason given for lateral job movement by teachers, principals, teachers and principals, and the reason given for lateral job movement by the chronological age of the teacher, the sex of the teacher, the teaching experience in the district of the teacher, the educational degree of the teacher, and the past teaching position of the teacher.

Hypotheses numbers 1, 2, and 3 were tested by the responses given by teachers and principals to openended question number 9. Hypotheses numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 were tested by the responses given by teachers and principals to the demographic questions.
Hypotheses

The specific hypotheses were stated in the null form:

Hypothesis number 1 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement of elementary school and secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis number 2 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school principals.

Hypothesis number 3 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for teacher lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

Hypothesis number 4 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the chronological age of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 5 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement by the sex of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 6 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the teaching experience in the district of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 7 stated that there would be no sig-
nificant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the educational degree of the teacher.

Hypothesis number 8 stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the past teaching position of the teacher.

Hypothesis Number 1

The association between the reason given for the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers

There was a significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 9), which showed the classification of lateral job change into nine categories of change and two levels of teachers, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 25.8 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus the null hypothesis was rejected.

It could be concluded from this study that the reason for lateral job change was dependent on elementary school and secondary school teachers. The reason given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers were significantly related.
Table 9. Relationship Between the Reason Given for the Lateral Job Change and Elementary School and Secondary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(13.37)</td>
<td>(18.39)%</td>
<td>(20.06)%</td>
<td>(13.37)%</td>
<td>(40.11)%</td>
<td>(.84)%</td>
<td>(5.01)%</td>
<td>(1.67)%</td>
<td>(4.18)%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2.63)%</td>
<td>(3.61)%</td>
<td>(3.94)%</td>
<td>(2.63)%</td>
<td>(7.89)%</td>
<td>(.16)%</td>
<td>(.99)%</td>
<td>(.33)%</td>
<td>(.82)%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 8
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 15.507$
e. Computed $x^2 = 25.84981$

Reject Hypothesis

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher-principal differences, 7. teacher-teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home.

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
Table 9 showed the reasons given for lateral job change by elementary school and secondary school teachers. The reason given the most often by both elementary school and secondary school teachers was the teacher wanted a different subject. At the elementary school level this reason indicated the teacher wanted a different grade level, and at the secondary level this reason indicated the teacher wanted a different teaching assignment. Despite the frequency of responses, elementary school teachers did not have the expected number of responses as did secondary school teachers. While 34 elementary school teachers responded with the teacher wanting a different subject, there was an expected frequency of 40.11 so elementary school teachers did not respond as often as might be expected on this reason. However, 14 secondary school teachers wanted a different subject as the reason for the lateral job movement with an expected frequency of 7.89. This meant that secondary school teachers responded more often than expected on this reason. A total of 34.3% of all elementary school and secondary school teachers responded that they wanted a different subject level or grade. Approximately one out of every three teachers moved laterally because they wanted a different subject or grade level. Since this reason involved 48 out of the 140 teachers, with a computed chi-square statistic of 25.8 and a region of rejection of 15.5, this inferred that elementary school and secondary school teachers did not move
for the same reason especially if that reason was the teacher wanting a different subject or grade level if analyzing the reasons given by the teacher for lateral job movement.

Overall, 17.1% of elementary school and secondary school teachers gave the response declining enrollment as the reason for lateral job change. At the elementary school level 24 teachers (expected frequency of 20.0) stated that declining enrollment was the reason for the lateral job change. However, no secondary school teacher stated that declining enrollment was the reason for the lateral job change. This inferred that declining enrollment had a direct relationship with lateral job movement at the elementary school level, but was not significant at the secondary school level. This meant that elementary school teachers and secondary school teachers had significantly different responses for declining enrollment. Declining enrollment played a significant part in lateral job changes if analyzing the responses of teachers, but it made a difference if the teacher was at the elementary school or secondary school level if that was the reason for the lateral job change.

A total of 16 teachers (11.4%) said that the teacher requesting a change was the primary reason for the lateral job move. However, almost as many secondary school teachers (7) gave that response as elementary school teachers (9) when overall there were 117 elementary school teachers and 23 secondary school teachers moving laterally. This meant
that secondary school teachers responded more often than expected (2.63 expected frequency) and elementary school teachers did not respond as often as expected (13.37 expected frequency).

There were 16 teachers who stated that a school closing was the prime reason for the lateral job change (16 elementary teachers and 0 secondary school teachers). Elementary school teachers inferred that school closings were a significant reason for lateral job movement while secondary school teachers did not see school closings as a reason for moving laterally. If a school closed, there was the assumption that the teacher could stay in the district and go to a different school or go to another district if the teacher wanted to stay in education. The reason for this assumption was that if the school closed, the teacher would have only those two options.

A total of 20 elementary school teachers (18.39 expected frequency) stated that the principal requesting a change was the prime reason for the lateral job change while only 2 secondary school teachers (3.61 expected frequency) gave that response.

Elementary school teachers stated that teacher-principal differences, teacher-teacher differences, teacher gained additional hours, and teacher wanted closer to home were reasons for moving laterally. No secondary school teacher gave any of those reasons.
Hypotheses number 1 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement of elementary school and secondary school teachers. Hypothesis number 1 was rejected.

Hypothesis Number 2

The association between the reason given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was a significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 10), which showed the classification of lateral job change into nine categories of change and the two levels of principals, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 30.9 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus the null hypothesis was rejected.

It could be concluded from this study that the reason given for lateral job change was dependent on elementary school and secondary school principals. The reason given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.
Table 10. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Lateral Job Change and Elementary School and Secondary School Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>(27.58)</td>
<td>(11.70)</td>
<td>(30.09)</td>
<td>(14.21)</td>
<td>(11.70)</td>
<td>(6.69)</td>
<td>(2.51)</td>
<td>(6.69)</td>
<td>(5.85)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>(5.42)</td>
<td>(2.30)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(2.79)</td>
<td>(2.30)</td>
<td>(1.31)</td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td>(1.31)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 8
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 15.507$
e. Computed $x^2 = 30.92554$

Rejected Hypothesis

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher–principal differences, 7. teacher–teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency.
The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
Table 10 showed the reasons given for lateral job change by elementary school and secondary school principals. The reason given the most often by elementary school principals and secondary school principals was declining enrollment. The 35 elementary school principals and one secondary school principal who gave that reason represented a total of 25.7% of the overall total responses. One of the probable reasons for the rejection of the hypothesis (computed $X^2 = 30.9$ with a region of rejection = 15.5) was elementary school principals and secondary school principals having significantly different responses on declining enrollment. This inferred that declining enrollment was more serious at the elementary school level than at the secondary school level if considering the possibility of a lateral job change by a teacher.

A total of 33 principals (18 elementary school principals and 15 secondary school principals) stated that the teacher requesting a change was the prime reason for the lateral job change. This was a significantly different response rate because of the 27.58 expected frequency for elementary school principals and 5.42 expected frequency for secondary school principals. This response represents 23.6% of the total percentage of responses.

Elementary school principals and secondary school principals did not appear to have significantly different responses for principals requesting a change and the teacher
wanting a different subject or level. Eleven elementary school principals (11.7 expected frequency) and three secondary school principals (2.3 expected frequency) stated that the principal requesting a change was the prime reason for the lateral job change (10% of the total responses). Twelve elementary school principals (11.7 expected frequency) and two secondary school principals (2.3 expected frequency) stated that the teacher wanting a different subject was the prime reason for the lateral job change (10% of the total response).

Seventeen elementary school principals and no secondary school principals listed a school closing as the prime reason for the lateral job change. This inferred that there were no school closings at the secondary level for sample participants. School closings were 12.1% of the total overall responses.

Seven elementary school principals and one secondary school principal listed teacher-principal differences. Three elementary school principals and no secondary school principal listed teacher-teacher differences. Seven elementary school principals and one secondary school principal listed the teacher gaining additional hours. Seven elementary school principals and no secondary school principals listed the teacher wanted closer to home.

Hypothesis number 2 stated that there would be no significant difference between the responses given for later-
al job movement according to elementary school and secondary school principals. Hypothesis number 2 was rejected.

Hypothesis Number 3

The association between the reason given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was a significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 11), which showed the classification of lateral job change into nine categories of change and the two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 39.1 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus the null hypothesis was rejected.

It could be concluded from this study that the reason given for lateral job movement was dependent on elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. The reasons given for lateral job movement and elementary school and secondary
Table 11. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Lateral Job Change and Elementary School and Secondary School Teachers and Elementary School and Secondary School Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.5)</td>
<td>(18.0)</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>(16.50)</td>
<td>(31.0)</td>
<td>(4.50)</td>
<td>(4.50)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.5)</td>
<td>(18.0)</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>(16.50)</td>
<td>(31.0)</td>
<td>(4.50)</td>
<td>(4.50)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 8
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 15.507$
e. Computed $x^2 = 39.12888$
   Reject Hypothesis

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher-principal differences, 7. teacher-teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.

Table 11 showed the reasons given for lateral job change by elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. Sixty-two educators (22.1% of the total subjects) stated that the teacher wanting a different subject was the prime reason for the lateral job change. However, out of this total response there were 48 teachers and only 14 principals. On this reason there was a significantly different response rate for teachers and principals. Since the computed chi-square statistic was 39.1 and the region of rejection was 15.5, the response of the teacher wanting a different subject was probably instrumental in rejecting the null hypothesis.

The most common response given by teachers was the teacher wanted a different subject or grade level. The most common response by principals was the teacher requested a change. These two responses were not the same response and could not be interpreted as meaning the same response. The teacher could request a change of teaching assignments and still want the same subject or grade level. This could be accomplished by requesting to go to the same subject or grade level in a different building. Thirty-three principals and only 16 teachers stated that the teacher requested a change. This total represents 17.5% of the total re-
sponses. Again, the null hypothesis was rejected, and one of the probable reasons for the rejection was the significantly different responses by teachers and principals on the importance of the teacher requesting a change.

The second highest percentage of responses (21.4%) was declining enrollment. A total of 24 teachers and 36 principals gave that response with an expected frequency of 30 for each group. Teachers gave that response at a lower expectancy level than did principals.

Teachers and principals appeared to disagree on the principal requesting a change. A total of 22 teachers and 14 principals gave that response. However, teachers and principals did appear to agree on school closings. A total of 16 teachers and 17 principals gave that response.

One teacher and eight principals listed teacher-principal differences. Six teachers and three principals listed teacher-teacher differences. Two teachers and eight principals listed teacher gained additional hours. Five teachers and seven principals listed the teacher wanted closer to home.

Hypothesis number 3 stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for teacher lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. Hypothesis number 3 was rejected.
Hypothesis Number 4

The association between the reason given for the lateral job change and the chronological age of the teacher.

There was no significantly different association between the reason given for the lateral job change and the chronological age of the teacher.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 12), which showed the classification of lateral job change reasons into nine categories of change and the three levels of the chronological age of the teacher, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 16.8 with 16 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 26.2, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number 5

The association between the reason given for the lateral job change and the sex of the teacher.

There was no significantly different association between the reason given for the lateral job change and the sex of the teacher.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table
Table 12. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Lateral Job Change and the Chronological Age of the Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological Age</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and older</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 16
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 26.296$
e. Computed $x^2 = 16.83707$
      Accept Hypothesis

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher-principal differences, 7. teacher-teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
Table 13: Relationship Between the Reason Given for Lateral Job Change and the Sex of the Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.63)</td>
<td>(3.61)</td>
<td>(3.94)</td>
<td>(2.63)</td>
<td>(7.89)</td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.99)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.37)</td>
<td>(18.39)</td>
<td>(20.06)</td>
<td>(13.37)</td>
<td>(40.11)</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td>(5.01)</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>(4.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent  
b. Alpha = .05  
c. df = 8  
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 15.507$  
e. Computed $x^2 = 9.73778$   
    Accept Hypothesis

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher--principal differences, 7. teacher--teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
13), which showed the classification of lateral job change into nine categories of change and the two levels of the sex of the teacher, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 9.7 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number 6

The association between the reason given for lateral job change and the teaching experience of the teacher in the district

There was no significantly different association between the reason given for the lateral job change and the teaching experience of the teacher in the district.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 14), which showed the classification of lateral job change into nine categories of change and the three levels of teaching experience, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 8.2 with 16 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 26.2, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 14. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Lateral Job Change and the Teaching Experience in the District of the Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>0 (.34)</td>
<td>1 (.47)</td>
<td>1 (.52)</td>
<td>0 (.34)</td>
<td>1 (.10)</td>
<td>0 (.02)</td>
<td>0 (.13)</td>
<td>0 (.04)</td>
<td>0 (.11)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>4 (3.32)</td>
<td>3 (4.56)</td>
<td>4 (4.97)</td>
<td>2 (3.32)</td>
<td>11 (9.94)</td>
<td>0 (2.21)</td>
<td>0 (1.24)</td>
<td>3 (1.42)</td>
<td>1 (1.04)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ years</td>
<td>12 (12.34)</td>
<td>18 (16.97)</td>
<td>19 (18.51)</td>
<td>14 (12.34)</td>
<td>36 (37.08)</td>
<td>1 (.77)</td>
<td>3 (4.63)</td>
<td>1 (1.54)</td>
<td>4 (3.85)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H; Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 16
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 26.296$
e. Computed $x^2 = 8.22859$
   Accept Hypothesis

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher-principal differences, 7. teacher-teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
Hypothesis Number 7

The association between the reason given for lateral job change and the educational degree of the teacher.

There was no significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job change and the educational degree of the teacher.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 15), which showed the classification of lateral job change into nine categories of change and the three levels of the educational degree of the teacher, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 24.3 with 16 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 26.2, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number 8

The association between the reason given for lateral job change and the past teaching position of the teacher.

There was no significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job change and the past teaching position of the teacher.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table
Table 15. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Lateral Job Change and the Educational Degree of the Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Degree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.94)</td>
<td>(8.17)</td>
<td>(8.91)</td>
<td>(5.94)</td>
<td>(17.83)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(2.23)</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>(1.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.32)</td>
<td>(10.05)</td>
<td>(10.97)</td>
<td>(7.32)</td>
<td>(21.94)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 hours over MS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(3.77)</td>
<td>(4.12)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(8.23)</td>
<td>(.17)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 16
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 26.296$
e. Computed $x^2 = 24.23018$
   Accept Hypothesis

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher-principal differences, 7. teacher-teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency.
The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
Table 16. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Lateral Job Change and the Past Teaching Position of the Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Position</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.66)</td>
<td>(5.03)</td>
<td>(5.49)</td>
<td>(3.66)</td>
<td>(10.97)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.06)</td>
<td>(8.33)</td>
<td>(9.09)</td>
<td>(6.06)</td>
<td>(18.17)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(2.27)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>(1.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.77)</td>
<td>(5.19)</td>
<td>(5.65)</td>
<td>(3.77)</td>
<td>(11.71)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td>(2.51)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td>(5.49)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Specialty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td>(2.06)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.26)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent       | 11.3 | 15.7 | 17.4 | 11.3 | 34.3 | .7  | 4.3 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 100.0 |

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 32
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 46.194$
e. computed $x^2 = 38.0071$
Accept Hypotheses

Reasons: 1. Teacher requested a change, 2. Principal requested a change, 3. Declining enrollment, 4. School closed, 5. Teacher wanted a different subject, 6. Teacher-Principal differences, 7. Teacher-Teacher differences, 8. Teacher gained additional hours, 9. Closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency.
The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
16), which showed the classification of lateral job changes into nine categories of change and the five levels of the past teaching position of the teacher, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 38.0 with 32 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 46.1, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.
Openended Question Tables

Tables for the openended questions include data on teachers making lateral job changes by initial response, teacher involvement, principal involvement, circumstances, retraining requirements, contact date, teacher feeling, principal feeling, most important reason and other items. The information in these tables is a chi-square of the responses given by teachers and principals to the openended questions in the individual interviews.

Openended Question Number 1

The association between the initial response given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was a significantly different association between the initial response given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 17), which showed the classification of the initial response given for lateral job change into nine categories of initial responses and the two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 37.3 with 8 degrees of freedom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.5)</td>
<td>(19.0)</td>
<td>(29.0)</td>
<td>(16.5)</td>
<td>(31.5)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.5)</td>
<td>(19.0)</td>
<td>(29.0)</td>
<td>(16.5)</td>
<td>(31.5)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 8
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 15.507$
e. Computed $x^2 = 37.3952$
Significant Relationship

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher-principal differences, 7. teacher-teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus there was a significantly different association.

It could be concluded from this study that the initial response given for lateral job change was dependent on elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. The initial response given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.

Table 12 showed the relationship between the initial reason given for the lateral job change and teachers and principals. The most common response by teachers and principals was the teacher wanted a different subject or grade level. A total of 48 teachers (expected frequency of 31.5) and 15 principals (expected frequency of 31.5) said that the teacher wanting a different subject or grade level was the initial reason for the lateral job change. This was a total of 63 responses for that reason of lateral job movement. However, the frequency of response depended on teachers and principals. Teachers responded more than three times as often as principals on this reason for lateral job change. Since this response was 22.5% of the overall total responses, at least part of the probable reason for the statistical significance (computed $X^2 = 37.3$ with a region of rejection $= 15.5$) was due to the significantly different responses of teachers and principals on the importance of the teacher
wanting a different subject or grade level.

A total of 24 teachers (expected frequency of 29) and 34 principals (expected frequency of 29) stated that declining enrollment was the initial reason for the lateral job change. The total of 58 teachers and principals responding with this reason was the second most frequency response. Principals stated that declining enrollment was more of a prime reason for lateral job change than did teachers.

Principals (35) listed teachers requesting a change far more often than the teachers (14). With an expected frequency of 35 for teachers and 35 for principals, this response was probably a part of the reason for the rejection of the hypothesis. A total of 49 teachers and principals said that the teacher requesting a change was the initial reason for the lateral job change, but teachers and principals had significantly different responses for the importance of the teacher requesting a change.

Teachers and principals had significantly different responses for the principal requesting a change (23 teachers and 15 principals with an expected frequency of 19 for each subject group), but did not seem to have significantly different responses on school closings (16 teachers and 17 principals).

Six principals and only one teacher responded with teacher-principal differences. Five teachers and three principals responded with teacher-teacher differences. Two
teachers and eight principals responded with the teacher gained additional hours. Seven teachers and seven principals responded with the teacher wanted closer to home.

The association between the initial response given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals was the focus of openended question number 1. There was a significantly different association between the initial reason given for lateral job change and teachers and principals.

Openended Question Number 2

The association between the amount of teacher involvement in the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was a significantly different association between the amount of teacher involvement in the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 18), which showed the classification of teacher involvement into five levels of involvement and the two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 14.0
Table 18. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Teacher Involvement in the Lateral Job Change and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(66.5)</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
<td>(36.5)</td>
<td>(21.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(66.5)</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
<td>(36.5)</td>
<td>(21.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 4
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 9.488$
e. Computed $x^2 = 14.06800$
   Significant Relationship

Responses: 1. Teacher requested-principal approved, 2. principal requested-teacher involved, 3. principal requested-teacher not involved, 4. central office-teacher involved, 5. central office-teacher not involved

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
with 4 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 9.4, thus there was a significantly different association.

It could be concluded from this study that the amount of teacher involvement in the lateral job change was dependent upon elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. The amount of teacher involvement in the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.

Table 18 showed the relationship between the reason given for teacher involvement in the lateral job change and teachers and principals. One hundred thirty-three subjects (76 teachers and 57 principals) responded that the teacher requested a lateral job change and the principal approved the change. There seemed to be significant difference between the responses of teachers and principals on this item. Both groups had a 66.5 expected frequency, but 19 more teachers than principals gave this response. With a computed chi-square statistic of 14.0 and a region of rejection of 9.4, the 47.5% of the total respondents who stated that the principal approved a teacher request for lateral job change represents almost half of the total responses and was probably a significant reason for the acceptance of the association.
Seventy-three respondents (25 teachers and 48 principals) stated that the central office initiated the job change and the teacher was involved in the change. With an expected frequency of 36.5 for each group (teachers and principals), there seemed to be a significant difference of opinion of teachers and principals on this response.

Teachers and principals seemed to have no significantly different responses on central office initiation of the lateral job move with no teacher approval. A total of 24 teachers and 18 principals gave that response. The significantly different responses on central office initiation with teacher involvement and no significantly different responses on central office initiation with no teacher involvement were probably due to a difference of opinion of teachers and principals on whether the lateral job change was initiated at the central office or at the building level by the teacher or the principal.

A total of 5 teachers and 11 principals stated that the principal requested the lateral job change and the teacher was involved in the change. A total of 10 teachers and 6 principals stated that the principal requested a lateral job change on the part of the teacher and the teacher was not involved in the change.

The association between the amount of teacher involvement in the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and second-
ary school principals was the focus of openended question number 2. There was a significantly different association between the reason given for the teacher involvement in the lateral job change and teachers and principals.

Openended Question Number 3

The association between the amount of principal involvement in the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

There was no significantly different association between the amount of principal involvement in the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 19), which showed the classification of principal involvement into five levels of involvement and the two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 3.3 with 4 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 9.4, thus there was no significantly different association.
Table 19. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Principal Involvement in the Lateral Job Change and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(53.0)</td>
<td>(11.0)</td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
<td>(46.0)</td>
<td>(21.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(53.0)</td>
<td>(11.0)</td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
<td>(46.0)</td>
<td>(21.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. $H$: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 4
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 9.488$
e. Computed $x^2 = 3.39605$
   No Significant Relationship

Responses: 1. teacher requested—principal approved, 2. principal requested—teacher involved, 3. principal requested—teacher not involved, 4. central office—teacher involved, 5. central office—teacher not involved

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
The association between the circumstances of the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

There was a significantly different association between the circumstances of the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 20), which showed the classification of the circumstances of the lateral job change into nine levels of circumstances and two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 45.5 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus there was a significantly different association.

It could be concluded from this study that the circumstances of the lateral job change were dependent on elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. The circumstances of the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.

Table 20 showed the relationship between the reason given for the circumstances surrounding the lateral job
Table 20. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Circumstances Surrounding the Lateral Job Change and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>(46.0)</td>
<td>(34.0)</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
<td>(20.5)</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent 5.4 6.8 2.9 32.9 24.3 8.2 4.6 14.6 .4 100.0

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 8
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 15.507$
e. Computed $x^2 = 45.50452$
Significant Relationship

Reasons: 1. long drive, 2. difference of philosophy, 3. seniority, 4. declining enrollment, 5. teacher needed a challenge, 6. promotion, 7. additional position requirements, 8. district realignment, 9. I do not know

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
change and teachers and principals. The reason given most often by principals (48) was declining enrollment, and teachers appeared to be concerned about declining enrollment (44 teachers). With an expected frequency of 46 responses for each group (teachers and principals) there seemed to be no significantly different responses on the importance of declining enrollment. The most common reason given by teachers (48) was the teacher needed a challenge. However, only 23 principals gave that reason. With a computed chi-square statistic of 45.5 and a region of rejection of 15.5, the disagreement between teachers and principals over the teacher needing a challenge was probably a reason for the acceptance of the association.

In addition to declining enrollment (32.9% total response) the teacher needing a challenge (24.3% total response), the only other response over 10.0% was district realignment (14.6%). Fifteen teachers and 26 principals stated that district realignment was the circumstance surrounding the lateral job change of the teacher.

Eight teachers and seven principals responded with the long drive for the teacher. Nine teachers and 10 principals responded with a difference of philosophy between the teacher and the principal. Five teachers and three principals responded with seniority (inferring that the teacher who made the lateral job change had the most seniority and had first choice of a new job assignment if one was desired
and had the last choice of a new job assignment due to declining enrollment or a school closing. Twenty-three principals and no teachers responded with promotion (this difference inferred that principals thought the lateral job movement was promotion for the teacher and the teacher had a different opinion of the reason for the lateral job move which did not include a promotion). Eleven teachers and two principals responded with additional position requirements for the past teaching position. One principal and no teachers responded with the response of not knowing the circumstances surrounding the lateral job change.

The association between the circumstances of the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals was the focus of openended question number 4. There was a significantly different association between the circumstances surrounding the lateral job change and teachers and principals.

Openended Question Number 5

The association between the reason given for retraining requirements and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was no significantly different association between the reason given for retraining requirements and ele-
Table 21. Relationship Between the Reason Given for Retraining Requirements of the Lateral Job Change and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(114.0)</td>
<td>(15.0)</td>
<td>(11.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(114.0)</td>
<td>(15.0)</td>
<td>(11.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H0: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 2
d. region of rejection $\chi^2 = 5.991$
e. Computed $\chi^2 = 3.1515$
   No Significant Relationship

Responses: 1.no retraining necessary, 2.teacher already had the hours,
           3.teacher had to go back to school

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency.
The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
mentary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 21), which showed the reason given for retraining requirements into three levels of retraining and the two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was .3 with 2 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 5.9, thus there was no significantly different association.

Openedned Question Number 6

The association between the date given for the first contact of notification of the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was no significantly different association between the date given for the first contact of notification of the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 22), which showed the classification of dates into nine levels of dates and the two levels of subjects, one could
Table 22. Relationship Between the Date Given for the First Contact of Notification of the Lateral Job Change and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(20.5)</td>
<td>(65.5)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(22.5)</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(20.5)</td>
<td>(65.5)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(22.5)</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 8
d. Region of rejection $x^2 = 15.507$
e. Computed $x^2 = 15.08797$

No Significant Relationship


Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
see that the chi-square obtained was 15.1 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus there was no significantly different association.

Openended Question Number 7

The association between the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

There was a significantly different association between the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the table (Table 23), which showed the classification of the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change into 10 levels of feeling and the two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square figure obtained was 29.2 with 9 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 16.9, thus there was a significantly different association.

It could be concluded from this study that the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change was dependent upon elementary school and secondary school teachers and
Table 23. Relationship Between the Response of Teacher Feeling Towards the Lateral Job Movement and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(15.5)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(27.5)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(15.5)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(27.5)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 9
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 16.919$
e. Computed $x^2 = 29.23450$
   Significant Relationship

Responses: (1) low feeling to (10) high feeling

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency.
      The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. The feelings of the teacher towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.

Table 23 showed the relationship between feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change and teachers and principals. By far the most common feeling was a 10 (the highest possible feeling inferring a good feeling about the move). A total of 72 teachers and 41 principals gave the maximum feeling response. However, with an expected frequency of 56.5 for both groups (teachers and principals) and with a computed chi-square statistic of 29.2 with a region of rejection of 16.9, a probable reason for the acceptance of the association between the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change and teachers and principals was the significantly different responses on a 10 rating.

Principals were more inclined to give a lower rating than teachers. Nine principals and six teachers gave a seven rating, and 40 principals and only 15 teachers gave an eight rating. However, 17 teachers and 13 principals gave a nine rating.

At the low end of the scale, only four teachers and four principals gave a one rating indicating that few teachers and principals thought the lateral job change was poor. Six principals and no teachers gave a two rating. Seven
principals and three teachers gave a three rating. Four principals and three teachers gave a four rating. Seventeen teachers and 14 principals gave a five rating. Three teachers and two principals gave a six rating.

Two hundred twenty-six teachers and principals out of a total of two hundred eighty gave an 8, 9, or 10 rating indicating that 70.7% of teachers and principals had a very high opinion of the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change. However, teachers and principals had significantly different responses on the ratings within those three categories.

The association between the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals was the focus of openended question number 7. There was a significantly different association between the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change and teachers and principals.

Openended Question Number 8

The association between the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was a significantly different association between
Table 24. Relationship Between the Response of Principal Feeling Towards the Lateral Job Change and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. *H:* Variables are independent
b. *Alpha* = .05
c. *df* = 9
d. Region of rejection $x^2 = 16.919$
e. Computed $x^2 = 45.83315$
    Significant Relationship

Responses: (1) low feeling to (10) high feeling

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 24), which showed the classification of the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change into 10 levels of feeling and the two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 45.8 with 9 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 16.9, thus there was a significantly different association.

It could be concluded from this study that the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change was dependent upon elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. The feelings of the principal towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.

Table 24 showed the relationship the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change and teachers and principals. There were three significant overall percentages of teachers and principals toward the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change.

An overall total of 37.6% of teachers and principals gave a five rating. However, 77 teachers and 28 principals
responded with that rating. With a computed chi-square statistic of 45.8 with a region of rejection of 16.9, the significantly different responses of teachers and principals over a five rating was probably an important reason for the association. The second significant percent was a 10 rating. A total of 39 principals and 25 teachers gave the maximum rating. With an expected frequency of 32 for both groups (teachers and principals), there were significantly different responses on the maximum rating. The other significant percent of total responses was an eight rating. A total of 26 principals and 10 teachers gave that rating. With an expected frequency of 18 for both groups (teachers and principals), there were significantly different responses on the rating of eight.

At the lower end of the scale, only two teachers and five principals gave a one rating indicating that few teachers and principals have an opinion of the principal having a poor feeling towards the lateral job change. Seven teachers and three principals gave a two rating. Five principals and five teachers gave a three rating. Five principals and two teachers gave a four rating.

At the upper end of the scale, only three teachers and one principal gave a six rating. Seven principals and six teachers gave a seven rating. Nineteen principals and five teachers gave a nine rating.

Overall, a total of 124 teachers and principals gave a
rating of nine or higher. In each of the categories of an 8, 9, or 10 rating, more principals than teachers gave the rating response.

The association between the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals was the focus of openended question number 8. There was a significantly different association between the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change and teachers and principals.

Openended Question Number 9

The association between the most important reason for the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was a significantly different association between the most important reason for the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 25), which showed the classification of the most important reason for the lateral job change into nine categories of reasons and the two levels of subjects, one could see that
Table 25. Relationship Between the Most Important Reason Given for Lateral Job Change and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 8
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 15.507$
e. Computed $x^2 = 39.12888$
Significant Relationship

Reasons: 1. teacher requested a change, 2. principal requested a change, 3. declining enrollment, 4. school closed, 5. teacher wanted a different subject, 6. teacher-principal differences, 7. teacher-teacher differences, 8. teacher gained additional hours, 9. closer to home

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
the chi-square obtained was 39.1 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus there was a significantly different association.

It could be concluded from this study that the most important reason for the lateral job change was dependent upon elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. The most important reason for the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.

Table 25 showed the reasons given for lateral job change by elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. Sixty-two educators (22.1% of the total subjects) stated that the teacher wanting a different subject was the prime reason for the lateral job change. However, out of this total response there were 48 teachers and only 14 principals. Since the computed chi-square statistic was 39.1 and the region of rejection was 15.5, the significantly different responses of the teacher wanting a different subject probably was instrumental in the acceptance of the association.

The most common response given by teachers was the teacher wanted a different subject or grade. The most common response given by principals was the teacher requested a change. These two responses were not the same response and could not be interpreted as meaning the same response. The
teacher could request a change of teaching assignments and still want the same subject or grade level. This could be accomplished by requesting to go to the same subject or grade level in a different building. Thirty-three principals and only 16 teachers stated that the teacher requested a change. This total represents 17.5% of the total responses. Again, the significant association seemed to be obtained by the primary reason of the significantly different responses of teachers and principals on the importance of the teacher requesting a change.

The second highest percentage of responses (21.4%) was declining enrollment. A total of 24 teachers and 36 principals listed that response with an expected frequency of 30 for each group. Teachers gave this response at a lower expectancy level than did principals.

Teachers and principals disagreed on the principal requesting a change. A total of 22 teachers and 14 principals gave that response. However, teachers and principals did seem to agree on school closings. A total of 16 teachers and 17 principals gave that response.

One teacher and eight principals listed teacher-principal differences. Six teachers and three principals listed teacher-teacher differences. Two teachers and eight principals listed teacher gained additional hours. Five teachers and seven principals listed the teacher wanted closer to home.
The association between the most important reason for the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals was the focus of openended question number 9. There was a significantly different association between the most important reason given for the lateral job change and teachers and principals.

Openended Question Number 10

The association between the chance to add additional items and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals

There was a significantly different association between the chance to add additional items and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.

This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (Table 26), which showed the classification of additional items into four categories of items and the two levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 28.9 with 3 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 7.8, thus there was a significantly different association.

It could be concluded from this study that the chance
Table 26. Relationship Between the Chance to Add an Additional Response and Teachers and Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73.5)</td>
<td>(46.5)</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
<td>(12.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73.5)</td>
<td>(46.5)</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
<td>(12.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. H: Variables are independent
b. Alpha = .05
c. df = 3
d. region of rejection $x^2 = 7.815$
e. Computed $x^2 = 28.89299$
   Significant Relationship

Responses: 1. none, or no other response, 2. good change, 3. poor change, 4. I did not want to leave (teachers) or I did not want to lose the teacher

Note: The top number in each cell represents the observed frequency. The number in parentheses represents the expected frequency.
to add additional items was dependent upon elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. The chances to add additional items and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals were significantly related.

Table 26 showed the relationship between the chance to add an additional item and teachers and principals. An overall total of 52.4% of teachers and principals chose not to add any additional information to the individual interview. A total of 85 principals and 62 teachers chose not to give any additional information. The only response with a significant overall percentage other than no response was it was a good change. A total of 62 teachers and 31 principals gave that response. With an expected frequency of 73.5 for no response and 46.5 for it was a good change, these two categories were probably responsible for the significant association. With a computed chi-square statistic of 28.9 and a region of rejection of 7.8, the responses of no response and it was a good change probably were responsible for the significant association.

Eleven teachers and five principals stated the lateral job change was poor. Nineteen principals stated that they did not want to lose the teacher, and five teachers stated that they did not want to leave.

The association between the chance to add addition
items and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals was the focus of openended question number 10. There was a significantly different association between the chance to add an additional item and teachers and principals.

Summary of Findings

There was a significant difference between the response given for lateral job movement and elementary and secondary school teachers, elementary school and secondary school principals, and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. There was no significant difference among the responses given for lateral job movement and chronological age, sex, teaching experience in the district, educational degree, and past teaching position.

There was a significantly different association between teachers and principals and initial response, teacher involvement, circumstances, teacher feeling, principal feeling, most important reason for the change, and the chance to add other items. There was no significantly different association between teachers and principals and principal involvement, retraining requirements, and first contact date.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Problem

Lateral job changes for teachers were necessary as a result of dramatic changes, such as declining enrollment in the public schools. Hickrod (1976) stated that patterns of organizational life for schools with declining enrollment should include staff reductions rather than staff recruitment and planning for fewer students rather than for more students.

Teachers must be prepared to accept lateral job change. How were teachers prepared for lateral job change? How were administrators orienting teachers to prepare for the dramatic change in jobs? These questions had not been adequately answered in the literature. Therefore, teachers who had made recent job changes were surveyed to find out how they decided to change. School administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked how the orientation for the change was provided.

Purposes and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the way teachers had decided on lateral job change. More specifically: a thorough review of the literature was conducted dealing with personnel development as it related to lateral employee change requirements in educational and business environments; teach-
ers who had made recent lateral job changes were asked how they decided to change; school administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked why the teacher made the change and how the teacher decided to change; a comparison between teachers who had made recent lateral job changes and school administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes was conducted.

**Procedure**

The sample was limited to the following four school districts in Kansas: Unified School District Number 308, Hutchinson; Unified School District Number 383, Manhattan; Unified School District Number 305, Salina; Unified School District Number 475, Junction City. All teachers from the above districts who have moved laterally during the school years of 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 were considered a part of the sample. One hundred forty teachers and their principals took part in the project. Since some principals had more than one teacher taking part in the research project, 45 principals participated in individual conferences.

Little research had been reported in the literature concerning job movement. In conducting a literature search no existing instrument was found already developed for researching the topic. An open-ended instrument was developed to serve as a research tool in an interview situation (see Appendix A). Standardized information was collected from a
predetermined population. Each item on the instrument was developed to measure a specific aspect of the hypotheses or objectives. As with other instruments using ex post facto research methods and where there were no correct or incorrect answers, prediction of scores was not a purpose of reliability in this study. However, the openended instrument was developed to give research participants maximum latitude in responding to the reasons for lateral job movement. The best method of insuring construct validity for this instrument was to insure the questions on the instrument were relevant. In order to accomplish this insurance a panel of experts was used to examine the questions on the instrument. The panel consisted of university instructors at Kansas State University who were chosen for their research expertise. The panel was asked to review the instrument and make constructive criticism to enhance the construct validity, content value, and ease of administration. The instrument was revised accordingly to the suggestions submitted by the panel.

The instrument used for purposes of this research project was an openended instrument (see Appendix A). The instrument was administered in a one-to-one situation with teachers and principals. Teachers and principals were interviewed separately. The questions on the instrument were read by the researcher to the participants. Teachers were interviewed in their own classroom, and principals were interviewed in the offices. The responses given by teachers and
principals to the questions were recorded by the researcher on a separate sheet per participant. The researcher recorded no information while teachers and principals were answering the questions, and all participants were given the chance to see and verify the correctness of their responses as recorded by the researcher at the conclusion of the personal interviews. The responses of teachers and principals were confidential. The average length of each interview varied from 5 to 10 minutes per participant. The reason for this variation was that some participants wished to expand on their answers while other participants answered the questions with a limited response.

All teachers were asked a series of five demographic questions and ten open-ended questions (see Appendix A). Principals were not asked any demographic questions, but were asked the same ten open-ended questions asked of teachers (see Appendix A). All completed instruments were coded for research purposes.

Administration of the instrument was divided into three separate phases. The first phase was obtaining basic information from district central office personnel directors. The researcher scheduled an initial conference with each of the personnel directors to accomplish this goal. During the initial conference the researcher presented each personnel director with the basic information of the project. Each personnel director was read a letter which introduced the re-
researcher, the nature of the project, and the requirements of the local school district to participate in the research project (see Appendix B). Each personnel director was also given a copy of a letter to be read to building principals to explain the research project (see Appendix C). Personnel directors were also given a copy of a letter to be read to all teachers regarding the nature of the research project (see Appendix D). A prospectus was also given to all personnel directors to explain the specifics of the research project (see Appendix E). On the interview date with the researcher, all personnel directors approved the project for the specific districts. Another part of the first phase of the administration of the instrument was obtaining information from district personnel directors to complete the research project. The researcher made arrangements with personnel directors to come back for a second conference and obtain a list of teachers who had moved laterally in the districts and their past principals under the guidelines of the research project. Lists provided the researcher by personnel directors included the following information: name of the teacher, name of the past principal, present school of the teacher, past school of the teacher, present school of the principal, past school of the principal, past teaching position of the teacher, and present teaching position of the teacher. There were several errors in the listings. Teachers and principals on the lists who did not meet the project requirements were not interviewed. A total
of 140 teachers and 45 different principals took part in the research project. All teachers correctly identified on the district listings took part in the research project.

The second phase of the administration of the instrument was to schedule individual conferences with teachers and principals through each building principal. Since the personnel directors had already informed the building principals of the approval for conducting the research project, the researcher met with individual principals to arrange for the scheduling of conferences. At the conference with the building principal, the researcher gave each principal a letter which explained the nature of the research project (see Appendix C). Each building principal was given a copy of a letter which the researcher was going to read to each teacher to identify the nature of the research project (see Appendix D). All principals were requested to inform teachers that they would be participating in the research project. Conferences with individual teachers were scheduled so that no teacher would have to miss a class.

The third phase of the administration of the instrument was the individual interviews with teachers and principals. Individual interviews were scheduled in the following manner: after the interview date and time were scheduled, the researcher met with each participant on an individual basis; building principals were interviewed in the office and teachers were interviewed in their classrooms; letters (see Ap-
pendices C and D) were read to principals and teachers to explain the specifics of the interview procedure; before the interviews, all participants were given a chance to ask any questions regarding the nature of the interview; during the interview the interviewer recorded responses of teachers and principals only after the participant had been given a chance to answer the question (the researcher made a maximum effort not to record responses while the teacher or principal was speaking; at the conclusion of the interview the teacher or principal was given the chance to see and verify the correctness of his/her responses as recorded by the researcher.

The method of analysis used in this study was the chi-square statistical technique, and all data was analyzed using the .05 level of significance for research purposes.

Results

One hundred forty teachers and their principals took part in the project. Since some principals had more than one teacher taking part in the research project, 45 principals participated in individual interviews.

By chronological age, 4 teachers were between 21 and 24 years (2.9 percent), 34 teachers were between 25 and 29 years (24.3 percent), and 102 teachers were 30 years or older (72.8 percent). Twenty three male teachers (16.4 percent) and one hundred seventeen female teachers (33.6 percent) participated in the individual interviews. A total of 3 teachers (2.1 per-
cent) had been in the district one or two years, 29 teachers (20.7 percent) had been in the district three or four years, and 108 teachers (77.2 percent) had been in the district 5 or more years. Fifty two teachers (37.1 percent) had a Bachelor's Degree, sixty four teachers (45.8 percent) had a Master's Degree, and 24 teachers (17.1 percent) had at least 30 semester hours over the Master's Degree. There were 117 elementary school teachers (83.6 percent) and 23 secondary school teachers (16.4 percent). A total of 91 teachers (65.0 percent) made a building change and 49 teachers (35.0 percent) did not make a building change. A summary of teachers making lateral job changes by present teaching position included: 38 teachers (lower elementary, kindergarten through grade three), 27.1 percent; 36 teachers (upper elementary, grades four through six), 25.8 percent; 43 teachers (elementary, specialized), 30.7 percent; 13 teachers (secondary, academic), 9.3 percent; 10 teachers (secondary, specialized), 7.1 percent. A summary of teachers making lateral job changes by past teaching position included: 32 teachers (lower elementary, kindergarten through grade three), 22.8 percent; 53 teachers (upper elementary, grades four through six), 37.9 percent; 33 teachers (elementary, specialized), 23.6 percent; 16 teachers (secondary, academic), 11.4 percent; 6 teachers (secondary, specialized), 4.3 percent.

**Hypotheses**

The results of the hypotheses testing are as follows:
Hypothesis number one stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement of elementary school and secondary school teachers. This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 9), which showed the classification of lateral job change into 9 categories of change and 2 levels of teachers, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 25.8 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5 percent, thus the null hypotheses was rejected. Actually there were significantly different reasons for elementary school and secondary school teachers pertaining to teachers wanting a different subject. This significantly different association consisted of 34 elementary school teachers and 14 secondary school teachers stating that the reason they moved laterally was the desire for a different subject or grade level. There were significantly different reasons for principals requesting a change (20 elementary school and 2 secondary school teachers), declining enrollment (24 elementary school and no secondary school teachers), and school closings (16 elementary school and no secondary school teachers). Elementary school teachers also named teacher-principal differences, teacher-teacher differences, teacher gained additional hours, and teacher wanted closer to home as reasons for a lateral job change. No secondary school teacher named any of those reasons. The primary reason for the rejection of the hypothesis probably was due to the nine different responses by
elementary school teachers and three different responses by secondary school teachers.

Hypothesis number two stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school principals. This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 10), which showed the classification of lateral job change into 9 categories of change and the 2 levels of principals, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 30.9 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square necessary for significance was 15.5, thus the null hypothesis was rejected. There were significantly different reasons for the principal requesting a change (11 elementary school and 3 secondary school principals), declining enrollment (35 elementary school and 1 secondary school principal), school closings (17 elementary school and no secondary school principals), and the teachers wanting a different subject or grade level (12 elementary school and 2 secondary school principals). The significantly different responses on the above reasons probably were responsible for the rejection of the null hypotheses.

Hypothesis number three stated that there would be no significant difference between the reasons given for teacher lateral job movement according to elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square
test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 11), which showed the classification of lateral job change into 9 categories of change and the 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 39.1 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus the null hypothesis was rejected. Teachers and principals had significantly different reasons for: teacher requested a change (33 principals and 16 teachers), principal requested a change (22 teachers and 14 principals), declining enrollment (36 principals and 24 teachers), and teacher wanted a different subject (48 teachers and 14 principals). The significantly different responses on the above reasons probably were responsible for the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis number four stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the chronological age of the teacher. This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 12), which showed the classification of lateral job change reasons into 9 categories of change and the 3 levels of the chronological age of the teacher, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 16.8 with 16 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 26.2, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis number five stated that there would be no sig-
nificant difference between the reasons given for lateral job movement by the sex of the teacher. This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 13), which showed the classification of lateral job change into 9 categories of change and the 2 levels of the sex of the teacher, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 9.7 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis number six stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the teaching experience of the teacher in the district. This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 14), which showed the classification of lateral job change into 9 categories of change and the 3 levels of teaching experience, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 8.2 with 16 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 26.2, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis number seven stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the educational degree of the teacher. This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 15), which showed the classification of lateral job change into 9 cate-
gories of change and the 3 levels of the educational degree of the teacher, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 24.2 with 16 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 26.2, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis number eight stated that there would be no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the past teaching position of the teacher. This hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 16), which showed the classification of lateral job change into 9 categories of change and the 5 levels of the past teaching position of the teacher, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 38.0 with 32 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 46.1, thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Openended Questions

The results of the openended questions are as follows:

The focus of openended question number one was the association between the initial response given for lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 17), which showed the classification of the initial response given
for lateral job change into 9 categories of initial responses
and the 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-
square obtained was 37.3 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-
square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus there
was a significantly different association. Teachers and
principals had significantly different responses on the teacher requesting a change (35 principals and 14 teachers), declining enrollment (34 principals and 24 teachers), and the teacher wanting a different subject (48 teachers and 15 principals). The significantly different responses on the above reasons probably were responsible for the acceptance of the association.

The focus of openended question number two was the as-
sociation between the amount of teacher involvement in the lat-
eral job change and elementary school and secondary school
teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals.
This association was tested using a chi-square test of inde-
pendence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 18),
which showed the classification of teacher involvement into 5
levels of involvement and the 2 levels of subjects, one could
see that the chi-square obtained was 14.0 with 4 degrees of
freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was
9.4, thus there was a significantly different association.
Teachers and principals had significantly different reasons
for the teacher requesting a move with the approval of the
principal (76 teachers and 57 principals) and the central of-
fice initiating the change with the teacher involved in the change request (48 principals and 25 teachers). The significantly different responses of the above reasons probably were responsible for the acceptance of the association.

The focus of openended question number three was the association between the amount of principal involvement in the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 19), which showed the classification of principal involvement into 5 levels of involvement and the 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 3.3 with 4 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 9.4, thus there was no significantly different association.

The focus of openended question number four was the association between the circumstances of the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 20), which showed the classification of the circumstances and 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 45.5 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus there was a significantly
different association. Teachers and principals had significantly different reasons for the teacher needing a challenge (48 teachers and 20 principals), promotion (23 principals and no teachers), and additional position requirements (26 principals and 11 teachers). The significantly different responses of the above reasons probably were responsible for the acceptance of the association.

The focus of openended question number five was the association between the reason given for retraining requirements and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 21), which showed the reason given for retraining requirements into 3 levels of retraining and the 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 3.3 with 2 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 5.9, thus there was no significantly different association.

The focus of openended question number six was the association between the date given for the first contact of notification of the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 22), which showed the classification of dates into 9 levels of dates and the 2 levels of subjects,
one could see that the chi-square obtained was 15.1 with 8 degrees of freedom. The chi-square necessary for significance was 15.5, thus there was no significantly different association.

The focus of openended question number seven was the association between the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the table (see Table 23), which showed the classification of the feeling of the teacher into 10 levels of feeling and the 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 29.2 with 9 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 16.9, thus there was a significantly different association. Teachers and principals had significantly different reasons on the high markings with principals giving a lower rating than teachers. Forty principals and fifteen principals gave an eight rating, seventeen teachers and thirteen principals gave a nine rating, and seventy two teachers and forty one principals gave a ten rating. The significantly different responses on the high ratings probably were responsible for the acceptance of the association.

The focus of openended question number eight was the association between the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school
teachers and elementary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 24), which showed the classification of the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change into 10 levels of feeling and the 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 45.8 with 9 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 16.9, thus there was a significantly different association. Teachers and principals had significantly different responses for a 5 rating (77 teachers and 28 principals), an 8 rating (10 teachers and 26 principals), a nine rating (5 teachers and 19 principals), or a ten rating (39 principals and 25 teachers). The significantly different responses on the above ratings probably were responsible for the acceptance of the association.

The focus of openended question number nine was the association between the most important reason for the lateral job change and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 25), which showed the classification of the most important reason for the lateral job change into 9 categories of reasons and the 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 39.1 with 8 degrees of freedom.
The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 15.5, thus there was a significantly different association. Teachers and principals had significantly different responses for the following reasons: teacher requested a change (22 teachers and 14 principals), declining enrollment (36 principals and 24 teachers), and teacher wanted a different subject (48 teachers and 14 principals). The significantly different responses on the above reasons probably were responsible for the acceptance of the association.

The focus of openended question number ten was the association between the chance to add additional items and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. This association was tested using a chi-square test of independence. Upon examining the chi-square table (see Table 26), which showed the classification of additional items into 4 categories of items and the 2 levels of subjects, one could see that the chi-square obtained was 28.9 with 3 degrees of freedom. The chi-square figure necessary for significance was 7.8, thus there was a significantly different association. Teachers and principals had significantly different responses for adding no response (85 principals and 62 teachers), a good change (62 teachers and 31 principals), a poor change (11 teachers and 5 principals), and not wishing to see the teacher leave (19 principals and 5 teachers). The significantly different responses on the above reasons probably were responsible for the
acceptance of the association.

Conclusions

Lateral job changes were more common at the elementary school level than at the secondary school level. A total of 117 elementary school teachers and 23 secondary school teachers participated in the research project. One probable reason for this tendency was that elementary school teachers usually are certified "elementary" rather than for a specific subject such as "secondary math," so it may have been easier for elementary school teachers to move laterally than for secondary school teachers.

Lateral job changes were more common for females than for males. A total of 117 females and 23 males took part in the research project. One probable reason for this tendency was the large number of female teachers (117 teachers) who took part in the project. The majority of teachers at the elementary school level were females rather than males as indicated by the research data.

Most teachers who moved laterally had 5 or more years of teaching experience in the district (77.2 percent). This fact indicated that large school districts, such as the districts participating in this research project, did not encourage lateral job movement during the first few years in the district, or there might have been indication that teachers did not have a reason to move laterally within the first four
years in a district as indicated by the reasons given for lateral job movement.

Elementary school teachers seemed to respond significantly different in comparison to secondary school teachers when moving laterally. When examining the research findings, elementary school teachers indicated that they moved laterally due to declining enrollment, school closing, teacher-principal differences, teacher-teacher differences, teacher gained additional hours, and teacher wanted closer to home. No secondary school teacher named any of those reasons. Secondary school teachers responded at a higher rate than expected for the teacher wanting a different subject and for the teacher requesting a change. The data indicated that declining enrollment and school closings were instrumental in lateral job movement at the elementary school level, but were not instrumental at the secondary school level.

The data indicated that elementary school principals and secondary school principals had significantly different reasons for lateral job movement of teachers in their buildings. For instance 35 elementary school principals stated that teachers moved laterally due to declining enrollment, and only 1 secondary school teacher gave that response. Actually, 17 elementary school principals gave school closings as the response for lateral job change, but no secondary school teacher gave that response. The data seemed to indicate that declining enrollment and school closings were in-
instrumental in lateral job change at the elementary school level, but were not instrumental at the secondary school level.

Elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals had significantly different responses for lateral job changes. A major reason seemed to be the response of the teacher wanting a different subject or grade level. A total of 48 teachers and only 14 principals gave that response. This fact indicated that teachers may have wanted to move laterally just to get a different grade or subject, but their principal was unaware of their desires. Another significantly different reason was the teacher requesting a change. A total of 33 principals and only 16 teachers gave that response. This fact indicated that principals felt teachers were requesting a change for the reason of just changing jobs while teachers actually had a different reason for moving laterally.

There was no significant difference among the reasons given for lateral job movement by the chronological age of the teacher, the sex of the teacher, the teaching experience in the district of the teacher, the educational degree of the teacher, or the past teaching position of the teacher. While elementary and secondary school teachers apparently had significantly different reasons for moving laterally, teachers apparently did not have significantly different reasons when comparing their responses for lateral job movement by the variables of chronological age, sex, teaching experience in the
district, educational degree, or past teaching position.

Elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals had significantly different reasons for initial reason given for lateral job change, the amount of involvement by the teacher in the change, the circumstances surrounding the lateral job change, the feeling of the teacher towards the lateral job change, the feeling of the principal towards the lateral job change, the most important reason for the change, and the chance to add additional items to the interview. Since teachers and principals had a significantly different association on the reason for the lateral job move, this might have been a primary reason for the different association on the above items which all were involved directly in the lateral job change of teachers.

Elementary school and secondary school teachers did not have a significantly different association with elementary and secondary school principals on the amount of involvement by the principal in the change, the amount of retraining needed for the lateral job change, and the notification date for the lateral job change. It was interesting to see that teachers and principals had significantly different reasons for the amount of involvement of the teacher in the change, but did not have significantly different reasons for the amount of involvement by the principal in the change. The amount of retraining and the notification date seemed to be more concrete variables than the other variables, and this might
have been one reason for non-significant association between teachers and principals on those variables.

Utility of the Findings

Teachers need to be prepared to examine the rate of change in the occupational field, to be aware of current educational practices, and to have knowledge of the future goals required of classroom students (Facklam, 1977). This study attempted to fill the apparent void in the literature dealing with change as it related to lateral job movement of teachers. By examining teacher lateral job changes in selected public schools in Kansas, this study examined the method in which teachers change jobs within the system by asking teachers and principals for the reason for lateral job change.

This study also examined personnel change requirements in the fields of education, government, business, and industry. The method in which this examination was accomplished was through a review of the relevant literature dealing with employees making job moves, employers having personnel change within the organization, and by examining the initial interview as it relates to personnel development and lateral job changes. Government, business, and education were all faced with the problem of how best to prepare employees for possible job movement within the organization. Research findings indicated that these agencies did care about their employees and were making an attempt to utilize the talents of
the employees with maximum benefits for the employees and the employer.

By interviewing a total of 140 teachers and their past principals (a total of 45 different principals because some principals had more than one teacher move laterally) and asking them for the reason for lateral job change, it could be inferred from the findings of this research project that elementary school and secondary school teachers had significantly different reasons for lateral job movement, elementary school and secondary school principals had significantly different reasons for lateral job movement, and elementary school and secondary school teachers had significantly different reasons for lateral job movement. Research findings indicated that there are significantly different associations for elementary school teachers and secondary school teachers moving laterally, and instrumental in this difference was declining enrollment and school closings at the elementary school level. Those variables probably were the reasons that elementary school and secondary school principals had significantly different reasons for lateral job movement. Teachers and principals had significantly different reasons for lateral job changes due to the reasons of the teacher requesting a change and the teacher wanting a different subject. This significant difference inferred that teachers and principals should do more communicating to keep each other informed of the possibility of lateral job changes.
In summary, through an analysis of the findings of this study, there seemed to be a significantly different association between teachers, principals, and teachers and principals and the reason for lateral job changes by teachers in four of the largest school districts in Kansas.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The focus of this research project was to examine the way teachers decided on lateral job changes. Teachers who had made recent job changes were surveyed to determine their reasons for changing positions. School administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked how the orientation for the change was provided.

The research findings of this project indicated that teachers, principals, and teachers and principals probably did not agree on the reason for the lateral job change of the teacher. However, there were no significantly different reasons given for lateral job movement and the chronological age of the teacher, the sex of the teacher, the teaching experience in the district of the teacher, the educational degree of the teacher, and the past teaching position of the teacher.

If this study were to be replicated, the demographic classifications could be changed to see if there would be significantly different reasons for lateral job movement and
teachers. For instance, only 2.9 percent of the teachers in this study were between the chronological ages of 21 and 24. Age categories could be broadened, especially if investigating teachers in large school districts. While there was a large percentage of females (83.6 percent) taking part in the project, this variable probably would remain constant. Only 3 teachers (2.1 percent) had one or two years of teaching experience in the district. Thus, the teaching experience category could be broadened. The percentage of teachers by educational degree seemed to be an average distribution. There was a large percentage of teachers (83.6 percent) at the elementary level. This category could be expanded by examining only elementary school teachers without examining secondary school teachers. The possibility exists of adding other variables to hypotheses statements. Since a total of 91 teachers (65.0 percent) changed buildings, research could be conducted by examining only those teachers who change buildings in making a lateral job change. The current research project used past teaching position as one of the variables, but it could be possible to use the present teaching position as a variable. Five classifications of teaching positions were used in the current study, so these categories could be reduced or expanded.

The sample base for this research project was four large school districts in Kansas. The study could be duplicated by
using districts other than the ones used in this study, by using a larger number of districts, or by examining teachers who make lateral job changes in one large school district. There probably would be room for investigating lateral job changes in smaller districts, but there would not be the number of teachers available in small districts when compared to other districts for size alone.

In summary, it is hoped that the instrument used in this study can be utilized to provide teachers and principals with a method of examining the reasons for lateral job movement. Also, it is hoped that the results of this study will provide continued investigation and research into the area of lateral job movement.

Specifically in the research area one could conclude: there was a significant difference between the response given for lateral job movement and elementary and secondary school teachers, elementary school and secondary school principals, and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals; there was no significant difference among the responses given for lateral job movement and chronological age, sex, teaching experience in the district, educational degree, and past teaching position; there was a significantly different association between teachers and principals and initial response, teacher involvement, circumstances, teacher feeling, principal feeling, most important reason for the change, and the chance to
add other items; and there was no significantly different association between teachers and principals and principal involvement, retraining requirements, and first contact date.

Specifically in applying this research to personnel management one could: conclude that at the present time there is no organized effort on the part of management to help teachers prepare for lateral job movement; infer that elementary school and secondary school teachers do not move laterally for the same reasons; infer that elementary school and secondary school principals do not believe that their teachers move laterally for the same reasons; infer that elementary and secondary school teachers do not move laterally for the same reasons as documented by their past principal; conclude that additional research is needed in the area of examining the reasons for teacher lateral job movement in the public schools of Kansas; research each of the general areas given by teachers and principals as the primary reason for teacher lateral job movement.

Teacher lateral job movement is a major area that has not been researched in any major way by personnel officers or school administrators.
REFERENCES

Part I: Books, and Pamphlets


LeBold, W. The Purdue Interest Questionnaire—An Interest Inventory to Assist Engineering Students in Their Career Planning. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, 1977.


Thompson, V. Programs to Aid Unemployed Space Professionals: Implications for Life Career Redirection. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1975.


Part II: Periodicals


Hatfield, J. D. "Non-Verbal Cues in the Selection Interview," Personnel Administrator, 1978, 1, 30-37.


Schurz, F. D. "Electronic Newsroom Economics." Newspaper Controller, 1976, 29, 4-10.

Smith, H. "To Make Training Click, Train by Objectives." Sales and Marketing Management, 1976, 117, 44-45.


Wilson, V. R. "From Adding Machines and Rubber Stamps to Teller Terminals Just Swallow Hard and Do It." Bank Systems and Equipment, 1975, 12, 76-79.

Part III: Unpublished Materials


Simmons, J. E. "A Study to Test the Teacher Perceiver Interview as an Instrument That Would Select Vocational Agriculture Instructors That Develop Positive Rapport With Their Students," Doctoral Dissertation, University Microfilms, University of Nebraska, 1976.


Smouse, F. D. "The Personal Interview as a Precise Predictor for Success of Teachers in the United Stated Dependent Schools, European Area," Doctoral Dissertation, University Microfilms, University of Southern California, 1975.

Spradlin, J. D. "A Study of Change in Science Teacher Behavior in the Classroom Following Involvement in Institute Training or Retraining Programs," Doctoral Dissertation, University Microfilms, University of Texas, 1978.


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

(the research instrument which includes demographic information asked of teachers, openended questions asked of teachers, and openended questions asked of principals)
Demographic Information

1. Which of the following categories contains your chronological age?
   - Category One-21 to 24 years
   - Category Two- 25 to 29 years
   - Category Three-30 years and older

2. What is your sex? Male or Female

3. Which of the following categories contains your teaching experience?
   - Category One-one or two years teaching experience in the district
   - Category Two-three or four years teaching experience in the district
   - Category Three-more than four years teaching experience in the district

4. Which of the following contains your formal education?
   - Category One-Bachelor's Degree
   - Category Two-Master's Degree
   - Category Three-Educational Specialist's Degree or a minimum of thirty semester hours over the Master's Degree or Ph.D or Ed.D.

5. What is your current job title?  
   (What is your past job title?)  
   (Was there a building change?)

Openended Questions

1. What were the reasons you changed positions?

2. How were you involved in this change?

3. How was the administration involved in this change?

4. What were the circumstances leading up to this change?

5. What were the retraining requirements for this job movement?

6. At what point for sure did you know that you would be changing positions?

7. On a scale of one (low) to ten (high) how do you feel about this move?

8. On a scale of one (low) to ten (high) how does your past principal feel about this move?

9. Are there any other items that you wish to discuss concerning this position change?
(PRINCIPALS)

1. What were the reasons ____________________ changed positions?

2. How was the teacher involved in the change?

3. How were you involved in this change?

4. What were the circumstances leading up to this change?

5. What were the retraining requirements for this job movement?

6. At what point for sure did the teacher know that he/she would be changing positions?

7. On a scale of one (low) to ten (high) how does the teacher feel about this move?

8. On a scale of one (low) to ten (high) how do you feel about this move?

9. What was the most important reason the teacher changed positions?

10. Are there any other items that you wish to discuss concerning this position change?
APPENDIX B

(the letter given to personnel directors at the initial conference with the researcher to explain the nature of the research project)
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas  
April 1, 1979

Personnel Directors,

This project is concerned with teacher lateral job movement. Teacher lateral job movement is defined as a job change by a teacher from one teaching position to another teaching position where the teacher and the previous administrator are still in the district and where there has not been a large increase in the pay of the teacher due to the job change. An instrument has been developed to determine why teachers move laterally and why their past administrator believes the teacher moved laterally. The results of this study will help to provide information for a research project at Kansas State University.

We are especially interested in obtaining the response of teachers and principals in your district regarding teacher lateral job movement as their answers will contribute significantly towards examining this issue in education. The attached instrument has been tested for validity and reliability. The questions will require approximately ten minutes to answer. All individual responses will become the confidential information of research personnel only.

In order to complete the research project a list of teachers who have moved laterally during the past two school years and their past administrator will be needed from your district. Interviews will be arranged with building principals and teachers at their convenience. A simplified research proposal is also attached to inform you of the overall nature of the project.

Any comments you have concerning this project will be welcomed and answered. We will be pleased to send you a summary of the project results if you so desire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. Oliver  
Kansas State University
APPENDIX C

(the letter given to building principals to the initial conference with the researcher to explain the nature of the research project)
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas
April 1, 1979

Principals,

This project is concerned with teacher lateral job movement. Teacher lateral job movement is defined as a job change by a teacher from one teaching position to another teaching position where the teacher and the previous administrator are still in the district and where there has not been a large increase in the pay of the teacher due to the job change. An instrument has been developed to determine why teachers move laterally and why their past administrator believes the teacher moved laterally. The results of this study will help to provide information for a research project at Kansas State University.

We are especially interested in obtaining your response regarding teacher lateral job movement. The instrument has been tested for validity and reliability. The questions will require approximately ten minutes to answer. All individual responses will become the confidential information of research personnel only.

The personnel director has provided a list of teachers who have moved laterally during the past two school years and their administrators. It will be necessary to schedule individual interviews in intervals of ten minutes for each teacher and each administrator.

Any comments you have concerning this project will be welcomed and answered.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. Oliver
Kansas State University
APPENDIX D

(the letter given to teachers at the individual interview with the researcher to explain the nature of the research project)
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas
April 1, 1979

Teachers,

This project is concerned with teacher lateral job movement. Teacher lateral job movement is defined as a job change by a teacher from one teaching position to another teaching position where the teacher and the previous administrator are still in the district and where there has not been a large increase in the pay of the teacher due to the job change. An instrument has been developed to determine why teachers move laterally and why their past administrator believes the teacher moved laterally. The results of this study will help to provide information for a research project at Kansas State University.

We are especially interested in obtaining your response regarding teacher lateral job movement. The instrument has been tested for validity and reliability. The questions will require approximately ten minutes to answer. All individual responses will become the confidential information of research personnel only.

Any comments you have concerning this project will be welcomed and answered.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. Oliver
Kansas State University
APPENDIX E

(the prospectus given to personnel directors at the initial conference with the researcher to explain the nature of the research project)
PROSPECTUS

Introduction to the Problem
The Problem
Purpose and Objectives of the Study
Method of Research
Limitations of the Study
Definition of Terms
Assumptions of the Study
Method of Study
Selecting the Sample
Reliability
Validity
Instrument
Hypotheses
Method of Analysis
Letter for Personnel Directors
Letters for Principals
Letter for Teachers
Lateral Job Movement Examples
Lateral Job Movement Examples:

Second grade to third grade—same building
Second grade to third grade—different building
Second grade to second grade—different building
Second grade to special education
Second grade to librarian
Second grade to guidance counselor
Special education (EMR) to special education (LD)
Seventh grade English to eighth grade English
Seventh grade English to eleventh grade English
Seventh grade English to second grade
Tenth grade English to seventh grade English
Tenth grade English to eleventh grade English
Tenth grade English to special education
Tenth grade English to guidance counselor
Tenth grade English to librarian
Biology to general science
Fifth grade band to eighth grade band
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Teachers must be prepared to accept lateral job change. How were teachers prepared for lateral job change? How were administrators orienting teachers to prepare for the dramatic change in jobs? These questions had not been adequately answered in the literature. Therefore, teachers who had made recent job changes were surveyed to find out how they decided to change. School administrators who had faculty making lateral job changes were asked how the orientation for the change was provided.

A review of the literature concentrated on those general relevant areas which had reference to lateral job movement: initial employment and interview procedures, business and industrial programs with reference to retraining and personnel development programs, job movement in government, and job movement in education.

The sample was limited to four large school districts in Kansas. All teachers in the districts who had moved laterally during the school years of 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 and their past principals were interviewed. A total of 140 teachers and 45 principals (some principals had more than one teacher participating in the interviews) took part in the research project.

An openended instrument was developed to serve as a research tool in an interview situation. All teachers were asked a series of five demographic questions, but were asked the same ten openended questions asked of teachers.

A series of eight hypotheses were developed and tested at the .05 level of significance. Buy using a chi-square test of independence, it was concluded that there was a significantly different association
between elementary school and secondary school teachers and the reason given for lateral job movement. It was concluded that there was a significantly different association between elementary school and secondary school principals and the reason given for lateral job movement. There was a significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job movement and elementary school and secondary school teachers and elementary school and secondary school principals. However, there was no significantly different association between the reason given for the lateral job change and the chronological age of the teacher, the sex of the teacher, the teaching experience in the district of the teacher, the educational degree of the teacher, and the past teaching position of the teacher.

A total of ten open-ended questions were asked of teachers and principals concerning lateral job movement. It was concluded, through a chi-square test of independence with an alpha equal to .05, that there was a significantly different association between teachers and principals and the initial reason given for the lateral job change, the amount of involvement by the teacher in the change, the circumstances surrounding the change, the feeling of the teacher towards the change, the feeling of the principal towards the change, the most important reason for the change, and the chance to add additional items to the interview. Teachers and principals did not significantly disagree on the amount of involvement by the principal in the change, the amount of retraining needed for the change, and the notification date that there would be a lateral job
change for teacher.

Declining enrollment and school closings were important variables at the elementary school level, but not at the secondary school level.

In summary, through an analysis of the findings of this study, there was a significantly different association between the reason given for lateral job movement and teachers, principals, and teachers and principals.