

NORTH CENTRAL KANSAS SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTION
OF THEIR ROLES IN NEGOTIATION

by

ROSS BRYAN BALLARD

B. S., Kansas State University, 1961

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1968

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
5268
R
168
B256
1.2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A special expression of gratitude is extended to Dr. O. K. O'Fallon, Professor of Education, who served as major instructor, academic advisor, and committee chairman, for his guidance and encouragement throughout the author's graduate training at Kansas State University.

The author would also like to convey his appreciation to the other members of his committee; Dr. J. H. Littrell, Professor of Education, and Dr. E. S. Bagley, Professor of Economics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
I. Statement of the Problem	2
II. Design and Procedure	2
III. Limitations	3
THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AS DESCRIBED IN THE LITERATURE ..	4
THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AS THE PRACTITIONER SEES IT	13
I. Interpretation of Interviews	13
II. Comparison with Literature	25
III. Impressions from Interviews	26
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	29
BIBLIOGRAPHY	31
APPENDIX	35

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Where Does the Request for the Superintendent to Become Involved in the Negotiating Process Come From?	14
II. Where Do the Items Considered for Negotiation Originate?	16
III. Which of the Following Items Have You Negotiated if Negotiation is Defined as Problems Brought Before the School Board?	18
IV. Do You Consider Any Area of the Curriculum Eligible for Negotiation?	21
V. When Do the Teachers Search Out Your Opinion on Issues to Negotiate?	22
VI. Who Decides What Can Be Negotiated in the Contract?	23
VII. When Teachers Go Before the Board On Matters to be Negotiated in the Contract, are You Always Present?	23
VIII. When You are Involved in a Negotiating Process and Know the Demands of Teachers and the Board are not in Agreement, What do You Do?	24

INTRODUCTION

It is apparent that the current decade will see a number of developments in American public education. One of these is the militance among the nation's school teachers. They are no longer content to operate in the classroom alone. Teachers want a hand in the organization of a more efficient communication system. It is obvious they want to have a stronger voice in determining teacher conditions. The method that is being used to gain this stronger voice is negotiation. At the present time there is some question whether negotiation should be mandatory or voluntary. In either case it has presented a dilemma for the superintendents of school systems. Five possible roles of the superintendent in the negotiating process are defined by Heim as the dual role, the single or managerial, the unfixed or pragmatic, the leader of the professional teaching staff, and no role.¹

There are indications that the role of the superintendant is not at this time fixed. His decisions and actions may vary from one year to the next. It is not even certain that he can or will play the same role from one situation to another. The role of the superintendent in negotiation may change as the demands of the teachers change, as the school board changes, and as the issue being discussed is changed. The position taken will depend on the individual superintendent and what he feels will best solve the problems of a specific case.

¹Max O. Heim. "A Study of What Selected Respondents Think the Role of the Superintendent Should Be in the Negotiation Process," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1967, pp. 47-74.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was: (1) to define the role of the superintendent as described in the literature; (2) to determine the role of the superintendent in negotiation in North Central Kansas schools; and (3) to compare the two roles.

II. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

In Kansas on November 1, 1967, seventy-three school districts had local agreements on teacher-administrator-board relationships. Of these seventy-three school districts with such an agreement, fourteen were selected to be used in the study sample. All school districts which had a local agreement on November 1, 1967, as shown by the list published by the Kansas State Teachers Association, and which were within a sixty-mile radius of Manhattan, Kansas were included in the study. Using these criteria, fourteen districts were found to be eligible for study. These ranged in size from districts with 1369 pupils to districts with 24,867 pupils.

The interview method was used to obtain data. The instrument used covered such areas as: request for the superintendent to become involved in the negotiating process, items considered for negotiation, items negotiated, the curriculum in negotiation, authority to decide what can be negotiated, and the superintendent's role when demands of teachers and school board are not in agreement. The instrument is shown in the Appendix. An interview schedule was set up and each superintendent from a sample school was questioned individually. The interview was designed and carried out so that comparable and usable answers could be obtained.

The questions were structured so that yes or no answers could be given. All superintendents in the chosen sample group were very cooperative and were more than willing to try to define their roles in negotiation. Many elaborated on the role of the superintendent and how his position was changing. The described role of the superintendents is based on the results of the interviews with the superintendents. No attempt was made to interview other persons in the district in order to compare opinions on the superintendent's duties.

After each interview was completed, a few notes were made concerning the interviewer's impression of each superintendent's role. These impressions were used to show variations and individual interpretations found.

At the completion of interview schedule, a summary was made of all the opinions so that trends could be determined.

III. LIMITATIONS

Every study of this nature has some limitations. First, time and finances limited the study to fourteen school districts. This small sample is not enough to support sophisticated statistical conclusions. However, a limited picture of the role of the superintendent could be drawn.

Second, the superintendents interviewed had to define their own roles. This, being a subjective and very personal evaluation for each to make, might well present a different picture than those held by the school board, the PTA, or the teaching staff. The superintendent may also have been influenced by what the literature infers his duties should be, and by what he would have liked his role to be.

Third, there was the problem of communication or of having the questions interpreted in the same way by all respondents. There was always the possibility that the same question could be answered from a point of different understanding by the person being interviewed. Every effort was made to avoid this.

Finally, what was true yesterday may not be true today. Events are causing rapid changes in the educational system. It can only be said that the study refers to a particular situation at a given time.

THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT AS DESCRIBED IN THE LITERATURE

Much has been written about the role of the superintendent in a negotiated contract. Few aspects of professional negotiation have been debated and discussed as much as this. With the increase in teacher militancy and teacher insistence upon a share in educational decision-making, the superintendent is going to have to assume a new role of authority. Traditionally he has been the executive officer of the board of education and leader of the teaching staff. Can he serve in this dual capacity? Is the superintendent going to have to take sides and be either the executive officer of the board or the spokesman for the teachers? Maybe there is no role for him at all? A review of the literature identified several different roles he could assume.

The whole problem of negotiation is confusing. In a coast-to-coast examination of labor relations among teachers, administrators, and school boards, Martin Buskin found:

In Maryland, a superintendent acknowledges matter-of-factly that the word "negotiations" cannot be found in state laws applying to teachers. But, in Michigan, teacher associations

can and do bring charges against school boards, accusing them of "failing to bargain in good faith."

In Virginia, a superintendent reports that after three years of negotiation his district became the first in the state to sign a professional negotiations agreement with a teachers' group. But in Michigan, professional organizers boast of having more than 350 agreements signed within one year. In Illinois, a superintendent confesses that he had to urge his teachers to form a professional association. But in California, a highly organized state teachers' group provides all its members with detailed instructions on the intricacies of the negotiation process.²

These are some of the contrasts that can be found in the status of negotiations over the country. It is understandable that the role of the superintendent may be just as confusing. It will change from one area to the other. As the teachers gain more power and become organized, the superintendent will have to make some change. Buskin, vice-president of the Education Writers Association and education editor of Newsday, also writes in an article published in Nation's Schools:

For the superintendent, the handwriting on the conference wall shows that he must take an active role in seeking comprehensive legislation attuned to the conditions of his state and its educational problems. The challenge is to avoid the bitterness of a power struggle and the unwanted role of the confused man in the middle.³

The National Education Association feels the superintendent should play a dual role; that is, he should be spokesman for the teachers and executive officer of the board. The resolution on Professional Negotiation and Grievance Procedures, passed by the 1967 NEA representative assembly, states:

² Martin Buskin, "Where Superintendents Fit in Teacher-Labor Disputes," Nation's Schools. (March 1967), p. 79.

³ Ibid., p. 164.

Recognizing the legal authority of the board of education, the administrative function of the superintendent, and the competencies of other professional personnel, the National Education Association believes that matters of mutual concern should be viewed as a joint responsibility. The cooperative development of policies is a professional approach which recognizes that the school board, superintendent or administration, and the teaching staff have significantly different contributions to make in the development of educational policies and procedures.⁴

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) also believes the superintendent should play a dual role. In its publication, Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff, the AASA States:

The effective professional superintendent of schools confidently and courageously serves as advisor to the board, as chief administrator of the schools, as devoted leader of his professional associates, and as a staunch defender of the overriding rights of children to the best education possible.⁵

The AASA in another publication, School Administrators View Professional Negotiation, states:

The superintendent should play a significant role in professional negotiation, his basic obligation being to the welfare of the pupils and to leadership in the formulation of sound educational policy. He should be an independent third party in the negotiation process. He should review each proposal in light of its effect upon students and work closely with both the board and the staff representative in an attempt to reach agreement in the best interest of the educational program. His position as leader of the staff and executive officer of board requires this.⁶

⁴NEA Representative Assembly, "Professional Negotiation and Grievance Procedures, NEA Journal, LVI (October, 1967), p. 39.

⁵American Association of School Administrators, Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent and Staff, (Washington, D.C. 1963), p. 12.

⁶American Association of School Administrators, School Administrators View Professional Negotiation, (Washington, D.C. 1966), p. 54.

This dual role concept has received much space in the literature because of the stress from the National Education Association. Reference to the dual role of the superintendent was made by the Department of Classroom Teachers publication, Classroom Teachers Speak on Professional Negotiations, it states:

The superintendent has a dual role in professional negotiations. He is both a member of the profession and the executive agent of the board. His role and responsibility to each must be clearly identified.⁷

It seems clear that the National Education Association and Department of Classroom Teachers see the role of the superintendent in the same light. Both see him as playing a dual role.

The National School Boards Association's views, though different, are not entirely incompatible with those of other national organizations. The NSBA places the superintendent in a functional role of working with and between both parties. In a resolution concerning "Teacher-Superintendent-Board Relations" the NSBA stated it's policy:

...Policies whereby the superintendent as administrative officer of the board shows where he can function as a channel and interpreter of teachers concerns to the board and the board responsibilities and concerns to the teacher. Direct hearings with the board should be arranged through the superintendent if this proves inadequate....⁸

The superintendent's function as "channel and interpreter," as set forth by the NSBA, may not be all that is desired by the NEA and its affiliates although it does place the superintendent in a dual capacity.

⁷Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association, Classroom Teachers Speak on Professional Negotiation, (Washington, D.C. 1963), p. 16.

⁸National School Boards Association, "Resolution on Teacher-Superintendent-Board Relations," Adopted April, 1963.

James A. van Zwoll, advocates that the superintendent be the leader and spokesman of the certificated teaching staff. He reasons that the superintendent was once a teacher and, therefore, is still part of the professional staff. He stated in his book:

The two chief parties to possible collective agreement or joint action relative to school operation are the employer and the employee, i.e., the board of education on one hand and the employed executive agents (all employees) on the other. In view of the essential unity of the executive group in the school situation, the role of the administrator is logically that of chief advocate for his executive family in terms of the needs voiced by its members.⁹

On the other hand, Lieberman and Maskow support the idea that the superintendent can only be the executive officer of the board in the negotiating process. They state:

Administrators cannot encourage the staff to adopt and press demands which the board opposes. Superintendents are appointed by boards of education. They serve as the chief adviser to the board and the chief administrative officer of the school system. In the latter capacity, they are the chief representative or executive agent of the board, and no one questions this. Why, then, should there be any questions that the superintendent is the representative of the school board in collective negotiations.¹⁰

This role of the superintendent has also received much support in print.

It is sometimes referred to as a single or managerial role. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) is an advocate of this position. Dr. Harry Becker, superintendent of schools in Norwalk, Connecticut writes, "AFT affiliated organizations think of the superintendent as a management

⁹James A. van Zwoll, School Personnel Administration, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1964, p. 218.

¹⁰M. Lieberman and M. H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers, Rand McNally & Co., Chicago, 1966, p. 374.

person who serves his employers, namely the board.¹¹

This role as executive officer of the board representing management only, in negotiation is also supported by Calvin Grieder, professor of school administration at the University of Colorado. He makes the point that for years the superintendent has been the executive officer of the board, and in some states the position is so defined by law.

It is becoming apparent that the superintendent's proper role is to represent management, i.e., the board of education, and through it, the public. He cannot be the go-between...the man in the middle between teaching personnel, other employee groups, and the board of education.¹²

Grieder says the superintendent should not stand alone but is the leader of a management team. This division of management and employee groups is not meant to cause antagonism. This integrative approach should have a unifying effect and help bring the two groups together. All groups should keep in view the goals of the school system. Charles H. Wilson, book review editor for Nation's Schools and a former superintendent of schools, agrees that negotiation proceedings may bring both sides closer together. He remarks:

But some of the finest professional discussions I have ever heard accompanied our hard-slugging battles over hours, wages, and working conditions. In the end both sides of the table had a renewed respect for the other.¹³

¹¹H. A. Becker, "The Role of School Administrators in Professional Negotiations," American School Board Journal, (May, 1965), p. 9.

¹²Calvin Grieder, "Superintendents Can't Face Union Bargaining Teams Alone," Nation's Schools, (July 1966), p. 6.

¹³Charles H. Wilson, "Superintendents Wonder: How Should We Negotiate," Nation's Schools, (November 1966), p. 26.

Van Miller also supports the idea that the superintendent is the executive officer of the board and always represents its views. He remarks, "Because the board is a board only when in session, the superintendent stands in its place at all other times."¹⁴

Another view of the superintendent would be that of a neutral resource person. He would assist both sides in trying to reach an agreement. This is the role that Campbell, Cunningham, and McPhee would see him playing most of the time. They see him formally recognized as the chief executive of the school board with the function of administering policy that the school board has formulated. But, because the teachers and board hold different expectations of the superintendent, many times he is caught in the middle. Campbell and partners say this is the case in many attempts at negotiation on salary and other areas. About this problem they make the statement:

In most cases the superintendent can become the spokesman for neither group. Instead, he may, with good fortune, become an agent to assist each group in understanding the position and reasoning of the other; he may see that relevant facts are made available to both groups, and he may actually evolve some recommended solutions not initially acceptable to either group.¹⁵

The National Education Association research division divided the role of the superintendent into seven categories: (1) negotiator with full authority, (2) negotiator with limited authority, (3) advisor to negotiators for school board only, (4) advisor to negotiators for school

¹⁴Van Miller, The Public Administration of American School Systems, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1965, p. 157.

¹⁵Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, 1965, pp. 209-10.

board and teachers, (5) neutral resource person, (6) non participant, and (7) other. Over half of the superintendents considered themselves advisors to the negotiators. Just over a third considered themselves negotiators.¹⁶

It was not until this decade that educators began to feel the pressure from teacher strikes. It was for this reason that states started setting up guidelines for boards, administrators, and teachers to follow in the negotiation process. The dual role of the superintendent seems to be the most accepted principle in these guidelines. Kansas made no exception to this assumption that the superintendent should play a dual role in negotiation. In the "Guidelines for Strengthening Teacher-Administrator-Board Relationships in Kansas" the Kansas Association of School Boards and Kansas State Teachers Association set forth the principle:

The role of the superintendent of schools is of utmost importance because he must function both as the chief administrator for the board and as head of the professional staff. With this dual role goes the responsibility for leadership. The superintendent's leadership should result in mutual respect between the board and the professional staff. It should result also in steps by which differences can be resolved.¹⁷

These Guidelines are advisory and not mandatory in nature. The Guidelines call for initial conferences to take place between the official staff organization and the superintendent of schools. They also call for

¹⁶The Superintendents Role in Negotiation," NEA Research Bulletin, (October, 1967), p. 84.

¹⁷Kansas Association of School Boards and Kansas State Teachers Association, Guidelines for Strengthening Teacher-Administrator-Board Relationships in Kansas, (Topeka, Kansas 1965), p. 10.

impartial fact finding in those instances in which boards and associations are not able to resolve differences together.

Thus, a review of the literature reveals five different concepts of the role of the superintendent in the negotiating process: (1) The dual role, which describes the superintendent as spokesman for the teachers and as executive officer of the board. In this role he would be an advisor to negotiators for the board and teachers. (2) The concept that the superintendent plays a single role of leader of the professional staff and that he represents the teachers in the negotiating process. (3) The single or managerial role which identifies the superintendent as the executive officer of the board. He is employed by the board to take its side in the negotiating process. He is not a spokesman for the teachers. In this role he would be advisor to negotiators for school board only. (4) The role of a neutral resource person is one in which the superintendent would not be assigned any specific role but would act as the need arose. (5) The concept that the superintendent plays no role in the negotiating process and is a non participant.

The primary problem of this study was to determine what role the superintendent plays in Kansas in the negotiation process. It is hoped that the results of the study will prove to be valuable to individuals who are currently, or soon will be, involved in the negotiating process. By understanding the role played by the superintendent both sides may have a better knowledge of procedures in the negotiating process.

THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT
AS THE PRACTITIONER SEES IT

I. INTERPRETATION OF INTERVIEWS

In actual practice the role does not necessarily develop along the lines suggested by the literature, which gives the impression that teacher-school board negotiation is a labor-union type transaction with each side having a different philosophy on how the business should be operated. Such was not the case in the districts where the interviews were taken for this study. There are those who think that formal negotiation of the labor-union type is the only way to improve the teaching profession. There is little doubt that in some areas negotiation is a formal, demanding type of relationship. However, where teachers, administrators, and school boards set up carefully considered policies and effective lines of communication, negotiation can be the cooperative operation that it appears to be in the school districts represented in the interviews. In the sample studied negotiation was a cooperative interaction with no outside help brought in to make demands for either side. It was viewed as a team working together with the same interests. The lines of communication were kept open, and many problems were avoided. In one case the teachers had never gone before the school board to make a request. In all cases the teachers were identified to be free to talk with the superintendent, and the school boards were willing to cooperate. There was no evidence of delayed or limited education because of negotiation. In the districts where interviews were taken there were no real problems with teacher militancy or with labor tactics. These conclusions

were drawn from the impressions communicated on how negotiations operated in the districts studied.

It is important to remember the level at which negotiations were operated in the districts where interviews were made. When it was mentioned that preparation periods were negotiated in the contract, this did not mean that teachers made demands the school board was not in agreement with. It meant that preparation periods had come up before the school board, and some policy had been worked out through agreement. A negotiated item simply meant one that had been presented to the school board for consideration. If negotiation had been defined as the school board on one side of an issue and the teachers on the other, with legal representation for both sides, very few items would have been considered. The results from the interviews are reported in terms of this approach.

TABLE I

WHERE DOES THE REQUEST FOR THE SUPERINTENDENT TO BECOME INVOLVED IN THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS COME FROM?

Requesting groups	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
1.1 Community groups	1	13
1.2 School Board	6	8
1.3 Teachers organizations	14	0

The representatives of fourteen districts replied that teachers organizations were active in getting the process started. It involved having an association meeting, deciding on issues to be included in the contract, and then going to the superintendent to get the process started.

This does not mean teachers always had their meetings before going to the superintendent, but it was not until after these meetings that a course of action was set. A written request was not always necessary in order to have a hearing with the board. Hearings seemed to depend on the issue and how formal the request was to be. In most cases the request was written.

In six of the districts the school board started the action. It was requested that teachers come before the board with their suggestions. This especially was the case with salaries. A certain time would be set up for the teachers to present their views. The action by the board was always recorded in the minutes.

One district reported that some other group started the process, and that was a PTA organization. It was a request to add more sections of a certain class so that the teacher-pupil ratio would be lowered. In this case it was a negotiated item.

It can be seen that the teachers were the most active group in getting the process started. A school board played an active role in starting the process in a few instances.

As would be expected the items to be negotiated generally originated from the teachers; but principals, superintendents, and school boards were also involved. One district superintendent did respond that teachers did not originate a single item to be negotiated. He stated that all items for negotiation were originated in his office. He would ask the teachers to draw up policies covering certain areas but the procedure was never reversed. The usual procedure was in the other direction and teachers made requests to the superintendent and board for negotiation on certain items.

TABLE II
WHERE DO THE ITEMS CONSIDERED FOR NEGOTIATION ORIGINATE?

Originators of items for negotiation	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
2.1 Teachers	13	1
2.2 Principals	12	2
2.3 Superintendents	11	3
2.4 School Board	8	6
2.5 Other	1	13

In twelve cases principals were involved with the teachers on committees and in organizations. In two cases it was stated the principals did not get involved but were affected by what the teachers accomplished. Eleven superintendents answered they originated ideas for negotiation. Such items included concerns which the teachers had forgotten or that the superintendent felt should be included so the district could compete on the market for teachers.

In eight cases the school board made suggestions on items they felt should be included in the contract. These items were primarily related to policy covering procedures for various leave requirements. In one case, as mentioned earlier, the request came from an outside group.

In keeping with the reported evidence it was concluded that the channels of communication were still open. All groups still seemed free to make negotiation requests and originate ideas for negotiation. The fact that so many school boards and superintendents were still making

suggestions on items to be negotiated indicated there was a feeling of cooperation and concern for common goals.

Time was spent in trying to discover what had been negotiated to indicate how much negotiation had taken place in North Central Kansas, and to gain information on the role of the superintendent by discussing such items. Each superintendent would usually elaborate on the items and his position on each. It was hard to get consistent answers to the questions or ones that would be valid in all cases because of the different understanding of what was meant by negotiation.

All fourteen districts reported salary negotiation. This item would come the nearest to being formally negotiated as defined in the literature. Included was negotiation on minimum salary, increments for additional training, increments for experience, and compensation for extracurricular duties.

Teaching conditions were negotiated in ten of the fourteen districts. Five districts negotiated on class size, four on teaching hours, two on teacher facilities, three on special teachers, none on central registration, four on preparation periods, two on cafeteria duty, one on accident benefits, and none on central placement. Teaching conditions were considered negotiated if one or more of the items listed above were subjects for consideration. If a district did not negotiate teaching conditions it meant the district did not discuss during negotiation any of the items above.

Teacher assignments were negotiated in three districts of the sample. The extent of negotiation on teacher assignment was whether or not teachers would be assigned in their major areas of preparation.

TABLE III

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS HAVE YOU NEGOTIATED IF NEGOTIATION IS DEFINED AS PROBLEMS BROUGHT BEFORE THE SCHOOL BOARD?

Items	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
3.1 Salaries	14	0
3.11 minimum salary	14	0
3.12 increments for additional training	14	0
3.13 increments for additional experience	14	0
3.14 compensation for extracurricular duties	14	0
3.2 Teaching conditions	10	4
3.21 class size	5	9
3.22 teaching hours	4	10
3.23 teacher facilities	2	12
3.24 special teachers	3	11
3.25 central registration	0	14
3.26 preparation periods	4	10
3.27 cafeteria duty	2	12
3.28 accident benefits	1	13
3.29 central placement	0	14
3.3 Teacher assignments	3	11
3.4 Transfers	0	14
3.5 Promotions	1	13
3.6 Summer school	0	14
3.7 Protection of teachers	0	14
3.71 assistance in assault cases	0	14
3.72 legal counsel	0	14
3.73 compensation for lost time	0	14
3.8 Leave pay	13	1
3.81 sick leave	13	1
3.82 absence prior to or after holidays	0	14
3.83 maternity leave	2	12
3.84 exchange teacher leave	3	11
3.85 sabbatical leave	2	12
3.86 peace corps leave	0	14
3.87 return after leave of absence	1	13
3.88 personal leave	9	5

TABLE III (continued)

Items	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
3.9 Procedures for handling grievances	13	1
3.10 Procedures involving questions of ethical conduct	4	10
3.11 Dues deduction	4	10
3.12 Military service credit	1	13
3.13 Double increment	1	13

This was reported to be just a matter of including an item in the written policy.

Transfers were not negotiated in any of the districts where interviews were taken, nor were summer school assignment or protection of teachers. Promotions were agreed upon in one district. In most districts there were policies to cover such items but they had not come up for negotiation. Protection of teachers was one area where no problems had developed. Each superintendent seemed happy, relieved, or proud that this had not been a problem. A few mentioned that legal counsel was available, if needed.

Leave pay was an important negotiated item. Next to salary this was the most active item in the negotiation process as defined. Leave pay included all areas of leave and all but one district reported negotiating on the various types of leave pay. One district was reported to have a policy on some types of leave but the question had never come up before the school board for negotiation. Sick leave was the most popular

type of leave negotiated. Thirteen of the districts had negotiated sick leave. Nine of the districts were reported to have negotiated relative to personal leave. The other types of leave negotiated and the number reporting to have negotiated were: maternity leave, two districts; exchange teachers leave, three districts; peace corps leave, no districts; and return after leave of absence, one district. It can be seen from this summary that sick leave and personal leave were the only areas of leave negotiated by a large number of districts. Other than these two areas of leave only two or three districts reported having any activity in the other areas.

Procedures for handling grievances were negotiated in all but one district. This process included setting up the policies that would cover teacher-administration-board relations. It was reported that by developing guidelines many problems could be avoided. If the lines of communication were kept open through defined policy, the administrators felt they could anticipate problems and prevent them from becoming points for negotiation.

Procedures for handling questions of ethical conduct were discussed in negotiation in four districts. Most administrators did not feel this was a problem yet. Dues deduction was negotiated in four districts. Most admitted they had some form of dues deduction but it had never been negotiated. Only one district reported negotiating on military service credit, and only one district negotiated double increment in the salary schedule. The double increment problem came up in one district to get all teachers back on scale after it had changed its policy on prior service credit. Military service credit was seen as a coming problem with more teachers being drafted.

TABLE IV

DO YOU CONSIDER ANY AREA OF THE CURRICULUM ELIGIBLE FOR NEGOTIATION?

Item	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
4.1 Curriculum was negotiated	3	11

Curriculum was included under a heading of its own in the instrument because of its nature. Curriculum was not the type of item that was negotiated in the same sense as the other items above were debated. It was found to have been discussed in teacher meetings by subject field, brought to the superintendent, and then to the school board for approval. In some cases this process reversed or started at another point. For example, the school board or superintendent may suggest some area to include in the curriculum, and then the teachers may make recommendations on how it can be added. Law requires that certain things be included, by its nature curriculum is not the same type of negotiable item. However, in three districts it was reported that it was negotiated in the same sense that the other problems had been. The elements involved were additional vocational courses, group guidance, and text book adoption. It was felt the districts had actually negotiated on these items.

TABLE V

WHEN DO THE TEACHERS SEARCH OUT YOUR OPINION ON ISSUES TO NEGOTIATE?

Teachers sought opinion on issues	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
6.1 After their association meetings	14	0
6.2 Before their association meetings	10	4
6.3 After first meeting with board	0	14
6.4 Before first meeting with board	14	0
6.5 Other	0	14

All fourteen district superintendents reported the teachers came to them after their first association meeting on contracts. This did not mean they did not come at any other time because in ten cases the teachers searched out the superintendent's advice before their meeting.

Who decides what can be negotiated seemed to be a hard question for the superintendents to answer because of the nature of negotiation in the districts where interviews were taken. The way policy is written in most districts any item may be brought up that is thought by either side to be important. Authority actually resided with both sides.

TABLE VI
WHO DECIDES WHAT CAN BE NEGOTIATED IN THE CONTRACT?

Decision-maker	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
7.1 Board	14	0
7.2 Superintendent	1	13
7.3 Principals	0	14
7.4 Teachers	2	12
7.5 Other	0	14

All fourteen districts included in the study were reported to identify the board as the final authority on what would be negotiated and made the final decisions in all cases. In some policies there were provisions for a mediator in case of an impasse. Two district representatives did mention that the teachers also had authority to decide what could be negotiated.

TABLE VII
WHEN TEACHERS GO BEFORE THE BOARD ON MATTERS TO BE NEGOTIATED
IN THE CONTRACT - ARE YOU ALWAYS PRESENT?

	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
8.1 Superintendent is present at board meetings when teachers make requests	14	0

It was reported from all districts that the superintendent was present at board meetings when teachers made requests. There was no

indication that the teachers would ever go before the board without the superintendent being present. This fact would seem to indicate that the superintendent always played some sort of an active role.

TABLE VIII

WHEN YOU ARE INVOLVED IN A NEGOTIATING PROCESS
AND KNOW THE DEMANDS OF TEACHERS AND THE BOARD
ARE NOT IN AGREEMENT, WHAT DO YOU DO?

Action taken	Total replies - 14	
	Yes	No
8.1 Always take the side of the teachers	0	14
8.2 Take the side of the teachers only when I see facts that way	7	7
8.3 Always take the side of the board	4	10
8.4 Take side of the board only when I see facts that way	7	7
8.5 Always represent both sides	3	11
8.6 Represent both sides as far as I can	7	7
8.7 Neutral resource person	0	14
8.8 Do not get involved	0	14
8.9 Other	0	14

This last question was designed to determine what the superintendent would do when he knew the demands of the school board and teachers are not in agreement. It was interesting to note that not one reporting superintendent felt he played the part of a neutral resource person or was completely inactive. In fact, all indicated they played a very active part, but the way this active part was played did vary. Four administrators indicated they represented management or were always on the side

of the board. They felt their job was to represent the board in the negotiation process. The respondents all said they would help the teachers as far as they could, but when it came to "hard-nose" negotiation they would have to be with the board.

Seven of the superintendents interviewed stated they would play a modified dual role or would represent both sides as far as they could but would move to one side or the other depending on the issue. This was identified to mean they would find the facts and then represent the side they felt the facts supported. Three reported that they played what could be called a true dual role; they would never align themselves with one side or the other, but would always represent both sides. This meant that in all issues they would not take sides but would let each side know how the other was thinking. They would let the teachers know how the school board felt toward an issue and vice versa. It was different from the modified dual because they would never take either side of an issue. There was not one superintendent who felt he would represent the teachers in all cases. It was reported by one superintendent that he felt he came close to playing this role of representing the teachers, but as he indicated he would always represent both sides.

II. COMPARISON WITH LITERATURE

The literature shows the role of the superintendent in negotiation to be in one of the following: (1) a dual role where he always represents both sides, (2) a managerial role where he always represents the board of education, (3) a single role as leader of the professional staff where he always represents the teachers, (4) a neutral resource role

where he only gets involved when asked by either side, and (5) an inactive role where he never gets involved in the negotiation process.

Results of the interviews showed the superintendents role to be: (1) a dual role where he always represented both sides, (2) a modified dual role where he represented both sides up to a point, and (3) a managerial role where he represented the board of education. The interviews did not show the superintendent to be neutral resource person, an inactive person, or a representative of the professional staff.

The differences were: (1) the dual role was a combination, managerial and teacher representative. The superintendent did not always stay in the middle but would represent one side or the other depending on the issue. A few did play the dual role as described in the literature. (2) the managerial role was almost dual rather than managerial because the superintendent would help the teachers formulate ideas. The literature did not describe management in the role of suggesting. The role of the superintendent in negotiation in North Central Kansas was found to be different than that defined in the literature because negotiation had not developed into the complicated process described in the literature.

III. IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS

In the process of interviewing the superintendents these thoughts emerged as points of interest and concern. First, negotiation is not the same process in Kansas as described in the literature. In North Central Kansas it is a cooperative type interaction with both sides working towards a common goal. The philosophy of the school board and

professional staff are not always conflicting points of view. The demands of the teachers are not always in disagreement with the board's point of view. There is not always a battle with one side against the other but more of a team effort. It can not be described as a labor union type conflict as the literature would lead one to believe. In the districts where interviews were taken, negotiation seemed to be more of an informal process with both sides trying to cooperate.

The superintendents may have had a prejudiced view of their operations, but the type of items negotiated in districts represented indicate that their views were probably comparable to relations described in the literature. The only items that were really negotiated at a level compared to that described in the literature were salaries and sick leave. The two sides were not always in disagreement, but problems had to be worked out.

Second, although this role of cooperation was reported to be very prevalent, it seemed to be changing. Almost every superintendent interviewed indicated it was getting harder to play the dual role and keep both sides happy. As the teachers became more militant and the demands became greater, the superintendent was being forced to be the board's man. When this condition arrives, the superintendent felt he would no longer be able to maintain the cooperative attitude and the open channels of communication. He could see his role becoming one of a manager, and he will no longer be a man of education. It will be a business executive job and far removed from any contact with children. This type of position was described to be the result of larger districts as well as teacher militancy, but teacher militancy was felt to be the important

cause. Teachers were described as becoming better organized and electing their own leaders or going outside for help in leadership.

Third, when groups come from outside to express their views, trouble or misunderstanding results. Outside groups do not understand the problems and history of the area. They don't seem to realize that what worked in one place will not work in all places. The superintendents felt that if districts were left to solve their own problems, much less conflict would arise. The impression was given that the teachers were getting restless. They were starting to look around for new ideas that have worked in other areas.

Finally, it was felt that much could be learned from the experience of others, and many problems could be avoided. Because policies have been developed for teacher-administrator-board relations, the superintendents believed conflicts that have erupted in other areas could be avoided. Both sides will have to appreciate the problems of others. This may be done if the lines of communication are left open as outlined in the policies. But, it was believed problems are forthcoming if more action is not taken in the future. It was hoped that adoption of definite policies would help to avoid conflict in North Central Kansas.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It was found the literature defined five distinct roles for the superintendent in negotiation: (1) dual role, (2) managerial role, (3) representative of professional staff, (4) neutral resource person, and (5) inactive role. The dual role received the most support from the greatest number of organizations, NEA, AASA, DCT, and NSBA. The study found the primary role of the superintendent to be a dual role but modified somewhat from that described in the literature. In practice the superintendent represented both sides up to a point, but when he realized that agreement was not probable he would represent one side or the other depending on which side his convictions and the facts supported. This could be called a modified dual role. A few superintendents did play a true dual role or represented both sides as the middle man throughout negotiation processes.

The managerial role or representative of the board of education was found to be taken by a few superintendents, but it was in a modified form also. The superintendent always represented the board when negotiations got to the point of hard bargaining but he was reported as helping both sides as far as he could. He would help the teachers formulate ideas with which the board would not be in full agreement. The superintendent would not do this in the managerial role as described in the literature. The superintendent, as represented by the sample, was not identified as a neutral resource, inactive, or representative of the professional staff.

The teachers were reported to be the primary originators of items to be negotiated and of requesting negotiations, but the superintendent and school board were found to participate in a more active role in these two areas of requesting negotiations and originating items to negotiate than the literature described. The school board and superintendents were reported as originating many items for negotiation.

A great number of items were not reported to have been negotiated. Salaries, sick leave, and procedures for handling grievances were the only items that have received much attention through negotiation in North Central Kansas. Teaching conditions of some type had been negotiated in most districts but only to a small extent.

In conclusion it can be stated that negotiation has not reached the same status in the area studied as it has in some parts of the country. The teachers are not as militant and are not making as many demands as in some areas of the country. The superintendents interviewed identified with the cooperative teacher-board-administration relationship that has existed but can see it changing as the teachers become more militant.

In order to verify or check the results of this study a replication of the work using interviews with principals and school board members of the area is recommended. It would also be interesting to run the interviews again in a few years to determine what changes have been made.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Campbell, Roald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McFhee. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc., 1965.
- Lane, Willard R., Ronald G. Corwin, and William G. Monahan. Foundations of Educational Administration, A Behavioral Analysis. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Lieberman, Myron, and M. H. Moskow. Collective Negotiations for Teachers. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.
- Miller, Van. The Public Administration of American School Systems. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.
- Sachs, Benjamin M. Educational Administration A Behavioral Approach. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.
- Stinnett, T. M., Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha S. Ware. Professional Negotiation in Public Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.
- Stoops, Emery, and M. L. Rafferty, Jr. Practices and Trends in School Administration. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1961.
- Strayer, George D., and N. L. Engelhardt. Problems in Educational Administration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia, University, 1925.
- van Zwoll, James A. School Personnel Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Inc., 1964.
- Wilson, Robert E. Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Book Inc., 1966.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES,
AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- American Association of School Administrators. School Administrators View Professional Negotiation. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

American Association of School Administrators. Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Teachers Negotiate With Their Boards. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

C. PERIODICALS

American Association of School Administrators. "Professional Negotiation Growth and Progress: Reported From School Administrators," Education Digest, 32:12-15, April, 1967.

Batchelder, Richard. "Unionism Versus Professionalism in Teaching," National Education Association Journal, 54:33, April, 1966.

Becker, H. A. "The Role of School Administrators in Professional Negotiations," American School Board Journal, 48:18-20, May, 1966.

Bell, H. "Role of the Superintendent in the Small District," Phi Delta Kappan, 46:167-69, December, 1964.

Blankenship, A. H. "Role of the Superintendent in Teacher Negotiations," Theory Into Practice, 4:70-74, April, 1965.

Brickman, W. W. "Public School Superintendent and His Knowledge: Review of Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools," School and Society, 93:263, May, 1965.

Buskin, Martin. "Where Superintendents Fit in Teacher-Labor Disputes," Nation's Schools, 79:79-81, March, 1967.

_____. "How Schoolmen are Handling the Hot Cues: Integration, Innovation, Negotiation," School Management, 11:59-69, June, 1967.

Campbell, Roald F. "Superintendent: His Role and Professional Status," Teachers College Record, 65:671-679, May, 1964.

DeBruin, H. G. "Professional Negotiation in School Administration," Education, 87:171-173, November, 1966.

Doherty, R. E. "The Law and Collective Bargaining for Teachers," Teachers College Record, 68:1-12, October, 1966.

Garber, Lee C. "How to Free Superintendents From Negotiation Hazards," Nation's Schools, 77, p. 139, March, 1966.

- Garber, Lee O. "These Ten Legal Principles Control Collective Bargaining," Nation's Schools, 76:67, September, 1965.
- Godine, M. R. "The Administrator's Emerging Role," Phi Delta Kappan, 47:251, January, 1966.
- Grieder, Calvin. "Superintendents Can't Face Union Bargaining Teams Alone," Nation's Schools, 78:6, July, 1966.
- Gross, Calvin, "Ways to Deal With the New Teachers Militancy," Phi Delta Kappan, 45:147-151.
- Kedrovsky, Vladimir. "Negotiations: Key to Agreement from the Viewpoint of Teachers," Minnesota Journal of Education, 47:13-14, October, 1960.
- Kennedy, E. D. "Role of School Executive," Michigan Education Journal, 43:18-19, January, 1966.
- Lieberman, Myron. "Collective Negotiation: Status and Trends," American School Board Journal, 155:7-10, October, 1967.
- Moffitt, F. J. "Superintendents Must Find Ways to Keep Their School," Nation's Schools, 78:10, August, 1966.
- _____. "For Teachers, Superintendents Are No Longer in the Groups," Nation's Schools, 78:10, August, 1966.
- Moorman, J. M. "Worries of the Superintendent," American School Board Journal, 152:32, March, 1966.
- National Education Association Field Staff. "The Marvelous Potential of Professional Negotiation," National Education Association Journal, November, 1967.
- National Education Association Representative Assembly, "Professional Negotiation and Grievance Procedures," National Education Association Journal, 56:38-39, October, 1967.
- Nolte, M. C. "Teachers Face Boards of Education Across the Bargaining Table, Legally," American School Board Journal, 150:10-12, June, 1965.
- Olson, Allen Dale. "Principal and Professional Negotiation," National Elementary Principal, 45:31-32, April, 1967.
- Openlander, Stuart L. "How Districts Can Organize Themselves Before Negotiations With Employees Start," Nation's Schools, 80:99-100, September, 1967.

- Pullen, T. G. "Superintendents Authority Undermined," American School Board Journal, 153:12-16, November, 1966.
- Rhoades, E. "How to Negotiate With Your Teachers Without Surrendering," School Management, 10:110-14, September, 1966.
- Rice, A. H. "Boards Ask Superintendent: For Us or Against Us?" Nation's Schools, 76:16, July, 1965.
- _____. "Why Teachers Do Not Accept Superintendents As Spokesman: Review of the Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools," Nation's Schools, 75:36, April, 1965.
- Selden, David. "Principals-The Real Men in the Middle," American Teacher, 51:13, November, 1966.
- Turnbough, Roy C. "How to Set Teacher Negotiation Policy," Nation's Schools, 77:134, March, 1966.
- Unruh, Adolph. "Negotiation and the Role of the Superintendent," Education Forum, 29:165-69, January, 1965.
- Wilson, Charles F. "Whose Man is the Superintendent?" Phi Delta Kappan, 48:156-57, December, 1966.
- Wilson, Charles H. "Administrators Should be Servants of Teachers," Michigan Education Journal, 42:16-17, December, 1964.
- _____. "Superintendents Wonder: How Should We Negotiate?" Nation's Schools, 78:26, November, 1966.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Where does the request for the superintendent to become involved in the negotiating process come from?

1.1 Community groups- Yes _____ No _____
if yes, what groups- _____

1.2 School Board- Yes _____ No _____
if yes, is the action recorded in the board minutes- Yes _____
No _____

1.3 Teachers organizations- Yes _____ No _____
if yes, is the request written- Yes _____ No _____

2. Where do the items considered for negotiation originate?

2.1 Teachers- Yes _____ No _____

2.2 Principals- Yes _____ No _____

2.3 Superintendents- Yes _____ No _____

2.4 Board- Yes _____ No _____

2.5 Other _____

3. Which of the following items have you negotiated if negotiation is defined as problems brought before the school board?

3.1 Salaries- Yes _____ No _____

3.11 minimum salary- Yes _____ No _____

3.12 increments for additional training- Yes _____ No _____

3.13 increments for additional experience- Yes _____ No _____

3.14 compensation for extracurricular duties- Yes _____ No _____

3.2 Teaching conditions- Yes _____ No _____

3.21 class size- Yes _____ No _____

3.22 teaching hours- Yes _____ No _____

3.23 teacher facilities- Yes _____ No _____

- 3.24 special teachers- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.25 central registration- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.26 preparation periods- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.27 cafeteria duty- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.28 accident benefits- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.29 central placement- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.3 Teacher assignments- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.4 Transfers- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.5 Promotions- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.6 Summer school- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.7 Protection of teachers- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.71 assistance in assault cases- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.72 legal counsel- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.73 compensation for lost time- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.8 Leave pay- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.81 sick leave- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.82 absences prior to or after holidays- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.83 maternity leave- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.84 exchange teacher leave- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.85 sabbatical leave- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.86 peace corps leave- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.87 return after leave of absence- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.88 personal leave- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.9 Procedures for handling grievances- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.10 Procedures involving questions of ethical conduct- Yes_____ No_____
- 3.11 Dues deduction- Yes_____ No_____

- 3.12 Military service credit- Yes _____ No _____
- 3.13 Double increment- Yes _____ No _____
4. Has any area of the curriculum been negotiated? Yes _____ No _____
if yes, what areas _____
5. When do the teachers search out your opinion on issues to negotiate?
- 5.1 After their association meetings- Yes _____ No _____
- 5.2 Before their association meetings- Yes _____ No _____
- 5.3 After first meeting with board- Yes _____ No _____
- 5.4 Before first meeting with board- Yes _____ No _____
- 5.5 Other _____
6. Who would you say has the authority to decide what can be negotiated in the contract?
- 6.1 Board- Yes _____ No _____
- 6.2 Superintendent- Yes _____ No _____
- 6.3 Principals- Yes _____ No _____
- 6.4 Teachers- Yes _____ No _____
- 6.5 Other _____
7. When teachers go before the board on matters to be negotiated in the contract, are you always present? Yes _____ No _____
if no, when are you not present _____
8. When you are involved in a negotiating process and know the demands of teachers and the board are not in agreement, what do you do?
- 8.1 Always take the side of the teachers- Yes _____ No _____
- 8.2 Take the side of the teachers only when I see facts that way- Yes _____ No _____

- 8.3 Always take the side of the board- Yes_____ No_____
- 8.4 Take side of the board only when I see facts that way- Yes_____ No_____
- 8.5 Always represent both sides- Yes_____ No_____
- 8.6 Represent both sides as far as I can- Yes_____ No_____
- 8.7 Neutral resource person- Yes_____ No_____
- 8.8 Do not get involved- Yes_____ No_____
- 8.9 Other_____

NORTH CENTRAL KANSAS SUPERINTENDENTS' PERCEPTION
OF THEIR ROLES IN NEGOTIATION

by

ROSS BRYAN BALLARD

B. S., Kansas State University, 1961

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1968

The purpose of this study was: (1) to define the role of the superintendent as described in the literature; (2) to determine the role of the superintendent in negotiation in North Central Kansas schools; and (3) to compare the two roles.

In Kansas on November 1, 1967, seventy-three school districts had local agreements on teacher-administrator-board relationships. Of these seventy-three school districts with such an agreement, fourteen were selected to be used in the study sample. All school districts which had a local agreement on November 1, 1967, as shown by the list published by the Kansas State Teachers Association, and which were within a sixty mile radius of Manhattan were included in the study. Using these criteria, fourteen districts were found to be eligible for study.

The interview method was used to obtain data. The interview was designed and carried out so that comparable and usable answers could be obtained. The questions were structured so that yes or no answers could be given. The described role of the superintendents is based on the results of the interviews with the superintendents. No attempt was made to interview other persons in the district in order to compare opinions on the superintendent's duties.

It was found the literature defined five distinct roles for the superintendent in negotiation: (1) dual role, (2) managerial role, (3) representative of professional staff, (4) neutral resource person, and (5) inactive role. The dual role received the most support from the greatest number of organizations, National Education Association, American Association of School Administrators, Department of Classroom

Teachers, and National School Board Association. It was found from the study that the primary role of the superintendent was dual but modified somewhat from that described in the literature. A few superintendents did play a true dual role or represented both sides as the middle man throughout negotiation process. The managerial role or representative of the board of education was found to be taken by a few superintendents, but it was in a modified form also. The superintendent, as represented by the sample, was not identified as neutral resource, inactive, or representative of the professional staff.

The teachers were reported to be the primary originators of items to be negotiated and of requesting negotiations, but the superintendent and school board were found to participate in a more active role in these two areas of requesting negotiations and originating items to negotiate than the literature described. The school board and superintendents were reported as originating many items for negotiation.

A great number of items were not reported to have been negotiated. Salaries, sick leave, and procedures for handling grievances were the only items that received much attention through negotiation in North Central Kansas. Teaching conditions of some type had been negotiated in most districts but only to a small extent.

Negotiation has not reached the same status in the area studied as it has in some parts of the country as identified in the literature. The teachers were not as militant and were not making as many demands as the literature represented. The superintendents interviewed identified with the cooperative teacher-board-administration relationship that has existed but can see it changing as the teachers become more militant.

In order to varify or check the results of this study a replication of the work using interviews with principals and school board members of the area is recommended. It would also be interesting to run the interviews again in a few years to determine what changes had been made.