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The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between the types and degrees of state legislative political participation used by superintendents and their degree of education, their district size, their districts' geographic location, and the job they held prior to their superintendency. The instrument used to measure the degree and most effective type of political participation used by superintendents was developed by the investigator. This instrument was mailed to 226 of the 531 Michigan public school superintendents in K-12 districts with 214 responding.

The comparison of superintendents employed in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan districts indicated that metropolitan superintendents had a higher degree of political participation. However, no conclusion could be drawn regarding differences in the most effective types of participation.

Four categories of district size were used to compare superintendents' degrees of political participation. The data indicated that as the number of principals in a district increased, the superintendents' participation increased. Although a majority of the smaller districts' superintendents indicated "particularized
"participation" as their most effective method of participation, when
compared to larger districts' superintendents they indicated a more
pronounced use of "voting." Larger districts' superintendents indi­
cated a more pronounced use of "particularized participation."

Three categories of superintendents' prior positions were used
in comparing superintendents' degrees of political participation.
Only the comparison between superintendents whose prior jobs were
nonsuperintendent central office positions and those whose prior jobs
were principals showed a difference. No conclusion could be drawn
regarding the groups' most effective type of participation.

Three categories of education were used to compare the superin­
tendents' degrees of political participation. As the superintend­
ents' education increased the degrees of participation increased.
Although a majority of superintendents with master's indicated "par­
ticularized participation" as most effective, when compared to super­
tendents with specialists and doctorates, they indicated a more
pronounced use of "voting." Even though a majority of superintend­
ents with specialists and doctorates indicated "particularized par­
ticipation" as most effective when compared to superintendents with
master's, they showed a more pronounced use of "campaign participa­
tion."
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

During this century the view of educational leaders' participation in the political arena has changed dramatically. Scribner and Englert (1977) spoke of an American history in which educators reinforced an apolitical myth of involvement while political scientists avoided educational involvement. In the late 1950s, however, political scientists took the lead by addressing many political aspects of education. Eliot (1959) attempted to conceptualize the politics of education. Eliot's work was followed by many others, including Bailey, Frost, Marsh, and Wood (1962); Martin (1962); Masters, Salisbury, and Eliot (1964); Masotti and Lineberry (1976), and Wirt and Kirst (1982), who all discussed politics in education.

Campbell, Cunningham, and McPhee (1965) cited a reason for the resistance of educational leaders to openly involve themselves in politics when they reported that in the public mind, local school districts were set apart from other governmental bodies. Public disdain for associating something as fundamental as education with practical politics perpetuated and reinforced that separation. Medcalf (1983), Black (1983), McGuire (1982-1983), Timmons (1982), Whaples and Waugaman (1982), Holcomb (1981), and Angel (1980) are some who have written articles encouraging educational leaders to get involved
in politics, while at the same time describing effective methods of political participation. Based on the number of articles of this type, it would appear that there are those who still feel the need to encourage and/or educate educational leaders to become involved in politics.

The Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between selected characteristics of Michigan public school superintendents and the types of political participation used to influence members of the state legislature by those superintendents. Scribner and Englert (1977) defined politics as, "the set of interactions that influence and shape the authoritative allocation of values" (p. 22). For the purpose of this study state legislative political participation will be defined as any activity that an individual initiates to attempt to influence members of the state legislature. This narrower definition is based on the more global definition of Scribner and Englert.

Significance of the Problem

Reasons for superintendents to become aware of the need and types of state political participation have been expressed by political scientists and educators. Wirt and Kirst (1982) stated that history has shown the potential for state intervention in local education had gone mostly untapped. However, a growth of state influence never before seen has taken place since the 1960s turning
yesteryear's potential for state intervention into reality. Wirt and Kirst had found that some individuals felt state control had gone too far and that there seemed no way to alter or stop this power shift. Referring to state control over localities, they stated, "some fear that the pendulum may have swung too far. Moreover, there is no counterforce to this growth of nonlocal control" (pp. 147-148).

At the same time that state control of education was increasing, a growing awareness for the need of political participation at the state level by political scientists and educators was surfacing. Eliot (1959) emphasized that educators were forced to engage in political activities "whether they liked it or not" (p. 1035). Martin (1962) stressed the need for an end of the isolation of education from the political world. These thoughts of political participation were contrary to an apolitical myth that Iannaccone (1977) still saw some citizens and educators holding toward the participation of educators in politics. Iannaccone stated, "The belief in the apolitical nature of education is tenaciously held to this day by many school people as well as other citizens" (p. 278). Bailey et al. (1962) specifically challenged the apolitical myth when they wrote, "Education is one of the most thoroughly political enterprises in American life—or for that matter in the life of any society" (p. viii). Bailey et al. went on to speak about the future and said, "The future of public education will not be determined by public need alone. It will be determined by those who can translate public need into public policy—by schoolmen in politics" (p. 108).
Today local public school superintendents have options that range from no political participation and accepting what the state government hands out to getting politically involved to some extent and attempting to influence the state legislators' decisions regarding education. Some examples of varying degrees of participation that superintendents have utilized are: hiring a lobbyist, personal visits with the district's state legislators, phone calls to state legislators, letters written to state legislators, development of political coalitions, encouraging community contact with state legislators, providing information and/or research regarding educational issues for state legislators, and testifying at legislative hearings.

Lutz (1977) had put it succinctly after examining data regarding politics in education over many years when he stated, "The consistency of these data over such an extended period of time indicate that politics and power are components of decision making in education" (p. 33). Lutz (1977) also went on to state he had found that, "Although some still insist that educational policy making and politics should be separate, few, if any, still contend that they are separate" (p. 30). If local superintendents want more state dollars, then they will have to become much more involved in the toil of practical politics. Bailey et al. (1962) alluded to the need to become more involved in politics or face losing support from governmental officials when they stated, "If state aid to education is to continue at its present rate, or is to expand, it will be because
politically active schoolmen have the knowledge and skill to marshall effective political power" (p. vii). Wirt and Kirst (1982) specifically spoke to finances initiating state intervention,

No policy arena better demonstrates the new activism of the states during the 1970s than the dramatic initiatives in school finance. This increased state role in school financing was accomplished by other forms of increased state influence over local policy in many cases. (p. 235)

The prior statements do not indicate that local school authorities are helpless when dealing with the state government, but they do indicate that local school authorities cannot control outcomes as they once could. Wirt (1977), when referring to state support, stated, "what and how much is delivered at the local level, possibly even how it is delivered, are sharply influenced, if not constrained, by state mandate" (p. 185). Wirt's thoughts were reexamined by himself and Kirst (1982). They felt that state legislatures had in effect reduced the discretionary area of decision making that local superintendents and boards of education have had. The feelings that state legislatures had reduced local decision making seemed not to have changed, but only intensified since Bailey et al.'s (1962) study. Over 20 years ago Bailey et al. had said, "The amount a state spends on education is ultimately determined not by the recommendations of the education agencies, but by political decisions taken at the level of the governor and the state legislature" (p. 29). With this in mind it becomes apparent that one method superintendents and boards of education have available to protect or enhance their local control of schools is to interact with members of the state legislature, prior to votes on issues pertaining to their district.
Much has been written regarding the decline in local control of schools and the need for individuals in local education districts to become politically involved. In addition, some had gone further than just identifying the need and made specific suggestions regarding strategies, methods, and implementation of political activities. Educators Kennedy (1981) and K. A. Shaw and Brown (1981), attorney Black (1982), political scientist Berry (1981), and legislators Angel (1980) and Blount (1976) are just a few who have all described effective ways to interact with state legislators. Beavers (1979) supported the need for these types of articles when he wrote, "Not only is it important for the school superintendent to have an understanding of the political arena, but also he must learn how to be successful in influencing state legislators to support educational legislation" (p. 12). Based on the preceding information, an examination of the types and degrees of political participation that superintendents are utilizing might be revealing.

Selected Characteristics of Superintendents

Since superintendents have a variety of options regarding political participation, a study examining the types of political participation utilized by superintendents and characteristics of superintendents and of the school districts that employ those superintendents could be revealing in identifying any relationship that might exist between these variables.

Campbell et al. (1965) stated that school districts are influenced by the type of local government that exists in the district.
Drachler (1977) stated that large city governments reduced the focus of attention on school needs. He went on to say, "The transformation of the city during the past thirty years has radically altered the politics of urban education" (p. 217). Masotti and Lineberry (1976) cited a greater mix of people creating livelier politics in metropolitan areas. Gross (1958) found that superintendents from large cities were exposed to different pressures. For these reasons examining the political participation of superintendents based on the location of the school district, relative to metropolitan areas, seems appropriate.

Gross (1958) also found that the number of students enrolled in a school district was a factor related to the views superintendents held toward job pressures. Carlson (1972) found a superintendent's view on prestige was related to the district's enrollment, while Salley (1979-1980) found a superintendent's view of job priorities was related to the district's enrollment. Since enrollment size was related to various characteristics of superintendents, it would seem justified to examine if a relationship exists between district size and the superintendent's political participation.

Griffiths (1966) found that the previous jobs a superintendent held prior to his/her appointment as a superintendent differed when superintendents were compared based on the size of the enrollment of the district that they worked in. Ferguson (1969) cited a study which found some occupations more adaptive to political involvement than others. Salley (1979-1980) found some evidence that superintendents' job priorities were associated with their position.
immediately prior to becoming a superintendent. Since a superintendent's prior job was related to other characteristics of the superintendent and a characteristic of the school district, it would seem justified to examine if a relationship exists between political participation and the superintendent's prior job.

Salley (1979-1980) also stated that the relationship between a superintendent's job priorities and his/her highest academic degree warranted further scrutiny. Since political participation is a part of a superintendent's job, it would seem justified to compare superintendents' types of academic degrees with the priority (measured by political participation) to the superintendents' place on political involvement. Verba and Nie (1972) found a relationship between the amount of formal education and the degree of political participation which would further strengthen the case for this area being investigated.

Questions to Be Examined

What this study attempted to do was determine if superintendents with differing characteristics differ in the types and degrees of political participation they use with the state legislature. Specifically, the following questions were examined:

1. Is there a relationship between a superintendent's educational background and the extent of state political participation that the superintendent uses?

2. Is there a relationship between the size (measured by student enrollment) of the school district that employs the
3. Is there a relationship between the geographical location relative to metropolitan areas of the school district and the extent of state political participation that the superintendent uses?

4. Is there a relationship between the previous job held by the superintendent and the extent of state political participation that the superintendent uses?

5. Does the method that superintendents feel is most effective in influencing state legislators differ based on the selected characteristics that this study examines?

Limits of the Study

One concern of the researcher dealt with comparing the degrees of political participation. The inability to differentiate, in specific terms, the extent that a particular type of political participation is used limits the investigation.

Another limitation of the study was the inability of the investigator to check the responses given by the superintendents regarding the extent of their political participation. The potential for a superintendent to indicate that he/she had a more extensive political participation effort than he/she had actually undertaken existed.

Summary

The problem statement followed by the significance of the study were discussed in this chapter. The background of the problem
emphasized that the importance of political participation has increased over the past 2 decades. Justification was cited for the superintendents' characteristics that were studied. The questions that this study attempted to answer involve public school superintendents' political participation with the state legislature. Specific characteristics of the superintendents were used to develop subpopulation categories.

Chapter II contains a review of the related literature, while Chapter III will detail the research design. Chapter IV will provide an analysis of the research results. A summary with conclusions based on the analysis of the results will appear in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this review is to summarize the literature as it relates to educational politics and the public school superintendents' involvement. This review of the related literature has been divided into four categories.

The first section of the review builds an understanding of how the views toward educational leaders' involvement in political action has changed. The next section presents a review of the literature on the measures of political participation that are in existence. This is followed by a review of methods regarding political participation that are available to educators. The final section reviews literature on how the selected independent variables of this study might differ.

Changing Attitudes Towards Politics

One might think that educational systems would have been the subject of a great number of studies by political scientists because school districts are legal subdivisions of the state governments. However, studies of education by political scientists prior to the early 1960s were rare. Bailey et al. (1962) surveyed the scene and substantiated the neglect that education received from political
scientists. Their study was limited to the northern part of the United States and they admitted that the states of the Northeast represented an atypical group of industrial and commercial wealth, but felt the study may have at least some relevance to other parts of the nation. This study lacked the methodological rigors of the type utilized by the behavioral sciences. Even though Bailey et al. felt that the findings were somewhat inadequate and in some ways misleading, they believed that group analysis and other even more traditional constructs of political science were not irrelevant to an understanding of the political process. Heavy reliance upon unstructured and open-ended interviews with nearly 500 people from state legislatures, schools, and executive and administrative offices led to their findings.

Bailey et al. (1962) expressed an irony in the fact that school systems and school problems were rarely studied as political phenomena even though more public money had been spent for education than for any other single function of state and local government. No public school in America existed without state legislative sanction.

Campbell et al. (1965) found that after the 1950s the national government's commitment to education was strengthened in terms of funding and control. This interrelationship increased the likelihood that education would be viewed as being engaged in politics. In addition to the national government the authors explored four other levels of government extending down to the local unit. The roles of individuals were emphasized with special attention given to the superintendent's office. Chapter 3 dealt specifically with the
relationship between local schools and state governments. Of par-
ticular interest to this investigator was a section that dealt with
decision making at the state level. A brief description of the
individuals and groups that possessed the power was also presented in
the chapter, while chapter 8 dealt with characteristics of 859 super-
intendents in the state of Illinois.

During the 20 years from 1930 to 1950 a number of social science
studies on community power structures were undertaken. These studies
led to other related investigations of school board-community rela-
tions in education. Goldhammer (1955) focused upon the relations
between school board members and community power structures and
concluded that school political issues were closely tied to the
issues of the community. Gross (1958) surveyed Massachusetts super-
intendents, board members, and community interest groups. Gross's
study utilized lengthy confidential interviews with about half of the
school superintendents in Massachusetts and their school board mem-
ers. The book dealt with problems that have a direct bearing on the
schools.

Fifty percent of 217 superintendents were categorized by Gross
(1958) on the basis of four geographical areas. Three stratification
criteria were used in drawing subsamples from each of the geographi-
cal areas: superintendents in charge of one district or more than
one district, the population of the community or communities, and the
extent of local financial support. As a result of the procedures 105
superintendent interviews were conducted. At the time Gross seemed
to downplay that state's influence on local public education when he
wrote, "It is probably correct to assert that no other groups exert more influence on public education than school board members and superintendents" (p. x).

Although studies such as Goldhammer's (1955) and Gross's (1958) did not specifically address politics in education, studies such as these did provide a logical stepping stone to further the study of politics in education during that time period. Soon after, political scientists took the lead in defining boundaries for the study of educational politics. Many studies that followed involved community power, decision making, and educational politics. School boards and superintendents' relations with local constituents was a recurring theme. Although not as numerous as the local studies, several investigations of educational politics at the state level were carried out.  

Masters et al. (1964) recorded case histories from Missouri, Illinois, and Michigan to determine how and by whom power was exercised when state policy decisions were made on school matters. They found that emphasis on avoidance of conflict and consensus lead to enormous disadvantages whenever divisions and conflicts occurred in the political system. However, this 2-year study of state governments and how those governments influenced education found Michigan's legislature to be high-pressure and periodically explosive. The Senate tended to be overly represented with rural Republicans, while the House tended to be more evenly divided between the two major parties and between rural and suburban-metropolitan areas. The state's politics were unique in that there was a lack of consensus
toward what was best for education among the groups that were a part of the educational system. The authors hypothesized:

Based largely on the mythology that education and politics should be kept apart, a major goal of educational interests is to have governmental decisions affecting public schools made in a routine manner; that is they desire a process in which all decisions are highly predictable as to their outcome, even if this means the sacrifice of certain policy alternatives or acceptance of less desirable results. (p. 272)

A hypothesis such as the one just cited might lead one to believe that political participation in the Michigan Legislature would be especially important for educational leaders.

Although there were a great number of studies regarding educational politics in the 1960s, few attempts to integrate all the studies into an organized and cohesive area of study were ever carried out. Campbell et al. (1965), although their work was not exclusively devoted to politics in education, showed how the study of educational politics could be interrelated with other fields. Iannaccone (1967) compiled most of the significant research on educational politics at that time. His work focused on the concepts of change in all three governmental levels.

Iannaccone (1967) saw education as a major social institution subject to all the forces present in our society. Of particular interest to this investigator was Iannaccone's compilation of findings regarding the way in which education has been shaped by political forces. The study sought to examine politics and education in theoretical as opposed to descriptive terms. Iannaccone used the general social systems theory to develop a model for examining
political acts in education. He also examined general patterns which effectively categorized the political activities of educationalists at the state level.

Wirt (1970) categorized research literature in a system-analytic framework and developed basic questions on conceptual and methodological research in the politics of education. Later Wirt and Kirst (1972) centered an analysis on local and state education. This work was a comprehensive attempt to organize and unify the many avenues of research in educational politics. Wirt and Kirst (1982) reexamined the issues of educational politics and found that dramatic changes had occurred since 1970. Their reexamination was rekindled as a result of the new issues, new pressure groups, and changing public politics that have marked the current politics in education. Their book attempted to discuss the main currents in educational politics and tried to provide a framework for understanding politics of local, state, and national as they related to education. Of particular interest to this investigator was the authors' discussion of the expanding role of state government in influencing policy direction. The authors provided an overview of the origins, nature, and impact of political forces surrounding and influencing schools.

Verba and Nie (1972) conducted a large-scale empirical study. They considered two general political processes: that by which citizens come to participate in political life and that by which their participation affects the responsiveness of governmental leaders. They examined these two general processes in relation to various forms of political participation, levels of social status, types
of political attitudes, amount of voluntary association memberships, citizen policy preferences, and leadership policy preferences. According to Verba and Nie these variables form the building blocks of a model of the courses and consequences of political participation. What was particularly pertinent for this investigator was the identification and description of participation variables, categorization of participation into four modes, demographic questions related to political participation, and types of political participation. This investigator's design categorizing the types of political participation used by superintendents was a mutation of the categories designed and validated by Verba and Nie.

Besides their 1972 work, Verba and Nie (1977) undertook the first comprehensive review of how Americans voted during the 1956 to 1973 time period. The study showed the characteristics of voters had substantially changed. Party identification was found to have steadily weakened after the 1950s and citizen interest in issues had increased. The authors avoided forecasting, although their presentation of data from political complacency to the politics of engagement were worthy of thoughtful attention.

Although the study did not specifically address educational issues, it did provide a sound empirical base of data to examine political issues. Data were based on 15 separate national surveys conducted between 1939 and 1974. Collectively, these surveys contained information on the political attitudes, beliefs, and behavior of over 30,000 respondents. Since this study replaced earlier studies of the 1950s and 1960s with more up-to-date data, it enabled
this investigator to base decisions on this study's formulation on more recent empirical data.

A 1977 topic of one of the National Society for the Study of Education yearbooks was the politics of education. The contributors to this yearbook included both practitioners and scholars, educators, and political scientists. The yearbook has five general sections: overview, concepts and methodologies, major influence systems, policy-making processes, and future directions of educational politics. Chapter 6 written by Wirt (1977) dealt with the states' roles in education and described the research model used to compare different states. Chapter 7 written by Drachler (1977) centered on the influences upon education at the local level. Drachler pointed out political and educational implications of demographic transformations that have occurred in large cities. His study was primarily based on a view of the Detroit metropolitan area.

The consensus of the authors of this yearbook was that the study of politics in education had never been of greater importance than it was in 1977. This consensus on the importance of politics in education was further support for need of a study in this area. In addition to the general consensus of the importance of educational politics, the chapter that dealt with the states' roles in education and the chapter which addressed the local influences on education in the Detroit area were both issues that specifically related to the investigator's study.
Measures of Political Participation

Although none of the instruments mentioned specifically measure the characteristics that this investigator attempted to measure, the instruments did have some items that addressed the characteristics under study by this investigator. By examining a variety of instruments two things were accomplished. First, the investigator determined that a new instrument would have to be constructed, since no instrument specifically attempted to measure the characteristics and the population that the investigator was attempting to measure. Second, the items that other researchers felt were of importance were compiled. After the compilation of the items, those items that were pertinent to the study conducted by this investigator were incorporated into an instrument developed specifically for this study.

Robinson, Athanasion, and Head (1969) compiled tests and measurements of political attitudes and behavior. Their aim was to include a complete list of relevant empirical instruments, the instruments' actual items and scoring instructions for them, and a comprehensive assessment. The authors also gave limited evaluations of the measurements that they compiled. Chapter 11 was of particular interest since the scales listed in this chapter covered the area of political participation. The first four scales discussed cover general political characteristics: similar item content, high internal consistency of items, and scales which were tested on representative cross-sectional samples.
Matthews and Prothro (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, pp. 427-430) developed the Political Participation Scale. This instrument attempts to measure the extent of political participation on a cumulative scale of participation behavior. Respondents were dichotomized into those who had engaged in any of these activities and those who had not. The scale steps are coded responses to about 15 questions. The main sample was composed of a representative cross section of citizens of voting age living in private households in the 11 states of the former Confederacy. There were 618 Negroes and 694 Caucasians sampled. An additional sample of 264 Southern Negro college students was also drawn. Although the scale had a high coefficient of reproducibility (.98 Caucasians and .95 Negroes), no tests for the validity of this behavior-based measure were reported. This scale centered on topics of political discussions with others, voting, campaign participation, and office holding and political memberships.

Woodward and Roper (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, pp. 431-432) developed the Political Activity Index. This index attempts to classify individuals in terms of the amount of political activity in which they engage, specifically referring to political activity in channels of possible influence on legislators and government officials. This instrument is composed of seven items concerned with voting, being a member of a potential pressure group, communicating with legislators, participating in political party activity, and habitually talking politics. Possible range of scores is 0-12, with points given for reported frequency of activity in addition to a
simple positive response. The items were first tested in a pilot study with a national sample of 500 respondents and then administered to a representative national cross section of 8,000 respondents. The authors reported "partial, but not perfect" inter-item correlation. No tests for validity were reported.

A. Campbell, Gurin, and Miller (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, p. 433) developed the Index of Political Participation. This superficial scale attempts to measure the level of political activity in the national electorate. The five item scale was administered to a national cross section of 1,614 Americans interviewed after the 1952 election. No reliability or validity data were reported.

W. Robinson (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, pp. 434-435) developed the Political Participation instrument. This instrument attempted to determine the dimensions of psychological involvement in a political campaign. Twelve behavioral items were used to classify 600 members of an Erie County, Ohio, sample into one of the following roles: spectator, citizen, or partisan. The data were gathered during the 1940 electoral campaign. No test-retest reliability was reported and no formal validity test was used.

Information on the validity and reliability of the four instruments just mentioned was generally lacking. It would seem the cost and time of collecting the appropriate data was a major reason for not collecting such information. In addition to the cost, the belief of some social scientists that validity testing of behavioral measures is not a must may have led to this missing information.
The following scales focused on a more specific form of political participation. These authors attempted to generate data related to the opinion of leadership, especially during the periods prior to elections.

Katz and Lazarsfeld (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, pp. 436-437) developed the Public Affairs Opinion Leadership. The items that composed this instrument reflected the extent that persons felt they influenced the opinions of others about public affairs. The scale consists of only two questions. The sample consisted of a cross section of 800 women over 16 years of age in Decatur, Illinois. The interviews took place in 1945. The test-retest reliability was .15. Information on validity was not formally conducted.

Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, p. 438) developed the short Opinion Leadership index which reflected the degree of interest and articulateness about public issues. The scale consists of two items that were administered to a cross section of 3,000 adults in Erie County, Ohio. No data on reliability or directly related to validity were reported.

Rogers (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, pp. 439-440) developed the Opinion Leadership Scale to identify opinion leaders. This scale consisted of six items designed for use with farmers. No test-retest reliability figures were given.

Two scales that fall into the category of "attitudes toward the political process" seem worthy of investigation. A. Campbell, Gurin, and Miller (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, pp. 459-460) developed the Political Efficacy scale. This scale measured an individual's
subjective competence in politics. Internal consistency of the 5-item scale was adequate. Validity for the scale was based on its high correlation with political participation questions.

A. Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes (cited in Robinson et al., 1969, pp. 456-458) also developed the Political Involvement instrument which was composed of three items and two other scales, the Political Efficacy and the Sense of Citizen Duty. No test-retest reliability was presented. However, behavioral evidence for the validity of this measure may be seen in comparisons of voting turnout.

Milbrath (1968) developed the Inputs to the Political System measure. It was based on the premise that “beliefs are important determinants of the political behavior of ordinary citizens.” The author examined 21 inputs to the political system by administering the measure to about 960 residents of Buffalo, New York. No data bearing directly on validity were reported.

Verba and Nie (1972) compiled the most comprehensive scales of political participation. The area they investigated dealt with individual participation. They broke the investigation into four parts: voting, campaign participation, communal activity, and particularized contact. In addition to these areas of investigation, Verba and Nie also studied political orientation and policy attitudes of individuals. Verba and Nie used The Index of Psychological Involvement in Politics, The Information Index, The Index of Political Efficacy, Strength of Partisanship, Propensity to Take Sides, Index of Issue Extremity, and Civic Mindedness to examine political orientation.
They used items regarding welfare, race and civil rights, and partisan identification. The authors spend more time discussing the validity of their measures than any of the other authors of similar measures. Verba and Nie used the smallest space analysis (SSA) and also stated that further validity of the structure would appear much more dependent on improving our measurements of various kinds of activity than on alternative methods of spatial analysis.

The data of the Verba and Nie (1972) studies were based on a national population survey consisting of 2,549 interviews conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in some 200 separate locales in March 1967. The total noninstitutionalized population of the United States, 21 years or older, was used for this study.

Although the measures discussed attempted to study different attitudes or behaviors at different times in the past, they do have some items that are similar in nature. A compilation of the items found on the various instruments and scales that relate to this study can be found in Appendix A.

Types of Political Participation for Educators

Many of these articles were based on the author(s') experiences or personal studies. The articles that were examined were not based on empirical studies and because of this the reader will not find a description of the population or information regarding the studies themselves. What is presented are the views of professionals from various backgrounds regarding politics in education. Some of the articles addressed specific items, while others were more global in
nature. What all these articles had in common was information regarding the influence of state legislators. This information supported the need for educators to become more involved in politics and also suggested items that should be considered when designing an instrument to measure political participation.

In recent years the number of articles in periodicals regarding politics in education has grown rapidly. Educators McGuire (1982-1983) and Schuster (1982) wrote of the influence of politics in education in general terms. Journalists Taylor (1979) and Kaplan (1982) wrote of the increased need for educators to become good at lobbying. These authors felt that tougher economic conditions have forced educators to fight for educational legislation and funds.

Wise (1978) and Carberry (1982) discussed regulations and registration of lobbyists. Lobbying has been a topic which many feel needs to be discussed. Gove and Carpenter (1977), Cones (1979), Angel (1980), Kennedy (1981), Elliott (1981), Levy (1982), Whaples and Waugaman (1982), and Medcalf (1983) all wrote articles pertaining to effective lobbying techniques. In addition, McKillop (1976), K. A. Shaw and Brown (1981), Berry (1981), and Mertes (1983) wrote not only regarding effective lobbying, but also to other strategies involved with influencing governmental decisions. Blount (1976) and Holcomb (1981) wrote specifically about presenting information to legislators at hearings or when legislators are in committee. Both mentioned things to do and not to do.

Issues regarding state legislative action, state control of education, educational politics, and state politics have all been

The development of grass-roots lobbying was discussed by Heath (1979), Berry (1981), and Timmons (1982). Berry also discussed the development of coalitions to influence legislators to support the desires of the coalition. In addition to Berry (1981), Black (1983) also discussed building coalitions with other interest groups.

A compilation of the ideas, suggestions, methods, and techniques that the authors, previously mentioned, felt were important in influencing state legislators can be found in Appendix A.

Construction of Political Participation Instrument

Although there have been many articles written regarding what types of political participation educational leaders should use, no instrument specifically designed to measure the types and extent of school superintendents' political participation has been developed. Therefore, the researcher was forced to develop an instrument in order to conduct this study. The items designed to investigate political participation were selected and developed based on items that were a part of other measurement instruments, and the information derived from journal articles (see Appendix A). By utilizing
these authorities, a stage in the validation of the instrument was accomplished.

**Selected Characteristics of Superintendents and School Districts**

In addition to investigating the relationship between the selected characteristics and the superintendents' political participation with the state legislature, this study also investigated the types of political participation superintendents identify as most effective. It was anticipated that the investigation regarding the most effective types of political participation would enable the investigator to increase the study's contributions to the educational practices of educational leaders.

**Metropolitan Versus Nonmetropolitan School Districts**

Gross (1958) used lengthy and confidential interviews with approximately 50% of the school superintendents in Massachusetts and their school board members. A total of 105 superintendents and 508 school board members took part in this study. Among the many findings of Gross's study was that superintendents in cities were exposed to different pressures than superintendents in districts in outlying areas.

Drachler (1977) examined large cities in the United States with his chief focus upon Detroit, Michigan. Drachler felt interviews and questionnaires, although useful, were insufficient to provide insights to the total political picture. Drachler personally visited
Detroit and found a demographic transformation that reduced the emphasis on education and placed it in city governmental problems. Drachler felt that school leaders in large cities needed to be more politically involved than those leaders in rural areas.

Ferguson (1969) cited results similar to Drachler's (1977). Ferguson surveyed 454 legislators in California, New Jersey, Ohio, and Tennessee and found that rural legislators were much more likely than other legislators to support educational issues.

Campbell et al. (1965) and Verba and Nie (1972) found that the characteristics of the local government and different geographic locations created different influences. These influences affected the type and extent of political participation. Masotti and Lineberry (1976) felt political participation was influenced by the community type, community government, and community location. Masotti and Lineberry expressed a concern with the efficacy and accuracy of how social and political scientists conceptualized and analyzed urban phenomena. Chapter 7 of their book examines some structural and political conditions of local government and politics of local services. The authors found that a greater mix of people in metropolitan areas created a greater mix of political interests.

Based on these studies, the investigator believed the comparison of political population of superintendents employed in metropolitan areas with superintendents employed outside metropolitan areas was warranted. This review of literature resulted in the following hypotheses:
Hypothesis 1: Superintendents employed by metropolitan school district boards will have a greater degree of political participation with the state legislature than superintendents employed by non-metropolitan school district boards.

Hypothesis 2: Superintendents employed by metropolitan school boards will indicate a different type of political participation as most effective with the state legislature when compared with superintendents employed by nonmetropolitan school boards.

Definitions related to Hypotheses 1 and 2: Metropolitan school districts will be defined as those districts which are a part or abut Michigan cities with populations of 50,000 or more. Political participation was measured with the instrument developed for this study. The superintendents' political participation scores were measured with Items 1-30 on the instrument. The type of political participation that superintendents believed was most effective was identified with the superintendents' responses to Item 31 on the same instrument.

School District Size

Gross (1958) cited a direct relationship between school district student enrollment and superintendents' job pressures. Carlson (1972) surveyed school superintendents to gather information in primarily two areas: superintendents' career aspirations and superintendents' performances. Carlson found a relationship existed between the prestige a superintendent has for one's position and the student enrollment of the district.
Of the studies that the researcher has cited, Salley's (1979-1980) survey involving 194 school superintendents across the United States was most applicable for justifying the examination of district size and political participation. Salley found that variables related to the size of the school district accounted for the greatest number of differentiations among superintendents' job priorities. Among the 17 job priorities that Salley studied was "dealing with political influence."

Based on these studies the investigator justified the comparison of superintendents utilizing school district size as the independent variable. This portion of the review of literature resulted in the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 3:** There is a direct relationship between the number of building principals employed in the school district and the superintendent's political participation with the state legislature.

**Hypothesis 4:** The type of political participation with the state legislature that superintendents identify as most effective is dependent on the school district size in which the superintendent is employed.

**Clarification related to Hypotheses 3 and 4:** School districts will be divided into four classifications based on the number of building principals employed by the district.

**Superintendents' Previous Jobs**

Griffiths (1966) offered a descriptive study on school superintendents. Griffiths found that 70.6% of the superintendents from the
largest cities held the position of assistant superintendent prior to their appointment as superintendent. In districts with populations less than 100,000 people the superintendents' positions immediately prior to their appointment as superintendent was most often that of principal. In Ferguson's 1960 four-state study of state legislators presented in *State Politics* (Crew, 1969, pp. 479-500). Ferguson found that the type of educational position held prior to one's election was related to the legislators' political views toward education. Although this study does not include school superintendents, it does indicate that one's employment background was related to political views of education. In Salley's (1979-1980) study mentioned previously, Salley felt that the relationship of the position held immediately prior to becoming superintendent and the superintendents' job priorities warranted further study.

With these three studies in mind, the researcher felt an investigation to determine if a relationship exists between political participation and one's previous job position was justified. This portion of the review resulted in the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 5:** The type of position held by a superintendent immediately prior to his/her current position is related to the degree of political participation with the state legislature.

**Hypothesis 6:** The types of political participation identified by superintendents as being more effective with the state legislature differs with the positions that the superintendents held immediately prior to their current position.
Definition related to Hypotheses 5 and 6: Central office administration positions will be defined as those that are not directly responsible for individual buildings, but are directly responsible for programs and/or influencing buildings across the district.

Degree of Formal Education

Salley (1979-1980) found inconclusive evidence regarding the relationship between the highest academic degree attained and a superintendent's job priorities and, therefore, suggested the need for further investigation. Verba and Nie (1972) found that the more education an individual had, the more the individual participated in political activities. However, Verba and Nie's highest category of education was "some college." Verba and Nie did not investigate the extent of political participation of individuals with different types of college graduate degrees.

Since Salley (1979-1980) felt further study in this area was warranted and Verba and Nie (1972) stopped short of categories that would differentiate superintendents by the degree of formal education, further investigation in this area seems justified. This area of the review resulted in the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 7: There is a direct relationship between a superintendent's degree of formal education and the extent of political participation in which the superintendent is involved.

Hypothesis 8: The type of political participation with the state legislature that superintendents identify as most effective is dependent on the superintendents' educational classifications.
Clarification related to Hypotheses 7 and 8: Three educational classifications were examined: master's degree, specialist degree, and doctoral degree.

Summary

While a wide variety of literature has been reported, there is general agreement that educational leaders need to become more involved in politics. The literature presented gives a brief background regarding the development of educational politics. In addition, instruments that have been used to measure individuals' political participation were briefly discussed. With the examination of other instruments and the input from authors of pertinent journal articles and books, the researcher developed an instrument for this investigation which contained items appropriate to measure political participation.

Finally, a review of the characteristics which were used as the independent variables were discussed. Along with these identified independent variables, hypotheses and definitions were presented.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Because an economical design with a wide scope was sought by the investigator, a survey research design was selected for this study. The design and methodology attempted to meet Kerlinger's (1973) criteria for research design. Kerlinger's main criterion of research was, "Does the design answer the research questions?" (p. 322). In addition to Kerlinger's main criterion, adequate control of independent variables, the generalizability of the study, and response rate of the sample were all major concerns of the researcher.

This chapter will outline the methodology used to conduct the study. The development of the instrument, the population and sample, and the procedures adopted for data collection and analysis will be discussed.

Instrumentation

The instrument in this study was developed by the investigator. The major purpose of the survey was to obtain superintendents' views of the extent and types of their political participation with the state legislature. Although there have been several instruments designed to measure political participation, the researcher did not use any of these instruments since none of them were totally
appropriate for measuring a school superintendents' state political participation.

The items were selected from the literature of authors who had been or are legislators, educators, and journalists. In addition, some items from previously developed instruments were used in the development of the instrument created for this study. Two tables were developed to assist in the selection of items for this instrument (see Appendix A).

After the instrument was initially developed, feedback regarding the instrument was gathered from several educational administrators in Kent County, Michigan, and from the executive director and lobbyist of the Michigan Association of School Administrators. After receiving feedback from these professionals, the necessary modifications of the instrument were made.

The modified instrument was then used in a pilot test. Borg and Gall (1979) suggested a sample size of 20 randomly selected subjects from the population that will be surveyed. After receiving the feedback from the superintendents' responses on the pilot test, modifications were again made. The instrument was then deemed ready for the primary study regarding political participation.

Instrument Content

The survey contained questions that enabled the investigator to measure the four independent variables and the two dependent variables.
Measure of Independent Variables

The independent variables were district size, degree of superintendent's formal education, location of the school district in relation to metropolitan cities, and previous position held by the superintendent.

Measure of Dependent Variables

Other parts of the survey instrument measured political participation with the state legislature and what superintendents considered the most effective method of influence. It was felt by this investigator that the response rate would drop if superintendents perceived this as a test of their knowledge. Therefore, an effort was made to keep the statements and questions nonthreatening and neutral. Fonvielle (1982) pointed out the value of asking neutrally worded questions which have no clear "right answers."

Content Validity

Kerlinger (1973) felt content validity was judgmental. M. E. Shaw and Wright (1967) mentioned that in practice, the evaluation of content validity was usually a subjective judgmental procedure. There were two judgments that must be made before one can say that an instrument as a whole has content validity. One must determine whether and to what degree the content of each item pertains to the concept and the degree to which the set of items represent all aspects of the concept. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1972) suggested
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developing content validity by using input from a number of experts.

The researcher developed the measurement instrument based on the prior statements. Numerous journal articles, books, and other instruments that a variety of authors developed were used to gain experts' input. The initial development was followed by a formal pilot test to gain further input. As a result of the feedback from the pilot test, the investigator found the need to word more clearly the instructions to the respondents so that they would not make multiple responses to Item 31.

Response Scale

A 4-point Likert scale was utilized in measuring the dependent variable. Responses were divided into the following categories: (a) things you never do at all, (b) things you seldom do, (c) things you do fairly often, and (d) things you do regularly.

A 4-point Likert scale with the types of possible responses just mentioned was used by Milbrath (1968) in his Inputs to the Political System instrument. Milbrath used a 1-to-4-point value scale. In addition, Yankelovich, Skelly, and White (cited in Lipset & Wattenberg, 1981) felt respondents were more likely to be indecisive when they were given to chance. A 4-point scale provided a clearer direction for interpretation of the data than a 5-point scale because a middle response allowed for more uncertainty.
Population and Sample

The population to be investigated was identified as superintendents in public schools in the state of Michigan. The members of the population were identified by using the 1984 Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide (1983).

Based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a random sample of 226 out of the 531 Michigan public school superintendents employed in K-12 systems were surveyed for this study. A probability of .05 for committing Type I error was used. The superintendents were given identification numbers for the purpose of random selection. Then, using a table of random numbers, three digit numbers were drawn until 226 superintendents had been selected.

Data Collection

A mail questionnaire was used to collect data. Kerlinger (1973) stated, "it has serious drawbacks . . . defects include lack of response and inability to check responses" (p. 414). However, it was with these two drawbacks in mind that the choice to mail the questionnaire was still made.

Dillman (1978) made recommendations regarding the design of the questionnaire. Attractiveness, ease of response, brief and clear instructions, and questions organized in a logical manner were recommended by Dillman and sought in the design. By designing a questionnaire based on these recommendations, the investigator hoped to increase the response rate.
Procedures

Materials were mailed to 226 superintendents. The materials included a cover letter, the questionnaire, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The cover letter was written on Western Michigan University, College of Education, letterhead stationery and was signed by the investigator and the doctoral committee chairperson. Each letter quoted an endorsement from the executive director of the Michigan Association of School Administrators. Fonvielle (1982) stated the need to gain support for surveys to increase participation. It was felt this endorsement would increase the participation.

The basic design of the survey format, survey questions, cover letters, postcards, and the procedures for all the mailings were taken from Dillman's (1978) book, Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method, chapters 4 and 5.

The surveys were numbered to correspond to the numbers initially assigned to the superintendents for the purpose of random sampling. The numbering of the instruments was for follow-up purposes. Because of the concern for confidentiality, only the investigator recorded the numbers on the returned questionnaires. Once the numbers were recorded those identification numbers were separated from the questionnaires and destroyed. Procedures to protect the respondents' confidentiality were submitted to the doctoral committee chairperson for approval.
Follow-Up Mailings

The second mailing consisted of a postcard. The follow-up postcard was sent to 100 nonrespondents 9 days after the first mailing. Dillman (1978) suggested the follow-up mailing assume the tone that the researcher was sure the subject wished to fill out the questionnaire, but perhaps had overlooked it. This mailing went on to again point out the importance of the study and value of the subject's contribution.

A third mailing was made 12 days after the mailing of the postcard. In this mailing a follow-up letter along with another copy of the questionnaire and another stamped, self-addressed envelope was sent to the subjects. The tone of the third mailing was stronger and reinforced the message that the respondent's views were important to the success of the study. Twenty-two days after the third mailing a fourth mailing was made using certified mail. In this last mailing a cover letter, another copy of the questionnaire, and another stamped, self-addressed envelope was sent. The greater overall intensity of this contact did not come from the wording of the cover letter, which was in fact somewhat softer than the preceding one. Rather, its insistent nature stemmed from the fact that the letter was sent by certified mail.

Data Analysis

All information on each questionnaire was transferred to optional scanning sheets for input in the Western Michigan University
computer. In the case of missing data, due to unanswered questions on the returned questionnaires, the political participation score was calculated as zero. An average political participation score was determined by dividing the total score on this section of the questionnaire by the number of questions that were answered. The "STATPACK" statistical program was used with the Western Michigan University computer to analyze the data.

Extent of Formal Education

Recovered data were classified into three distinct categories: (a) superintendents with doctorates, (b) superintendents whose highest degree was a specialist, and (c) superintendents whose highest degree was a master's.

Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979) suggested a one-way analysis of variance to measure mean differences for more than two levels of the independent variable. Therefore, the one-way analysis of variance was used. The level of significance was set at .05.

The post hoc multiple comparison test used was suggested by Petroelje (1978). His recommendation of the protected least significance difference was made for homogeneous populations such as the one under examination in this study. Petroelje stated, "The optional choices for controlling Type I error with unequal sample sizes are PLSD, K, and PW procedures" (p. 43). Although Milbrath (1968) and Verba and Nie (1972) found individuals with some college are more politically active than those without college, these studies did not
compare college graduates with advanced degrees. Therefore, a two-tailed test was used. The level of significance was set at .05.

School District Size

Information regarding this independent variable was obtained from the last page of the questionnaire. The public school districts were divided into four groups based on the number of building principals employed in the district. The categories were (a) 0 to 2 principals, (b) 3 to 4 principals, (c) 5 to 6 principals, and (d) 7 or more principals.

The one-way analysis of variance was used to determine the likenesses and differences of the mean scores on the political participation instruments between the four groups. The level of significance was set at .05. The discussion of the post hoc multiple comparisons test in the section on "Degree of Formal Education" also applies to this section.

School Districts Geographic Location in Relation to Metropolitan Areas

Information regarding the location of the school district in which the subjects worked was dichotomized into distinct categories: (a) school districts that are a part or abut city limits of a city with a population of 50,000 or more and (b) school districts that are not a part or do not abut city limits of a city with a population of 50,000 or more.
Based on the **Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide** (1981), there are 26 cities with populations of 50,000 or more in Michigan (see Appendix B).

Populations of 50,000 or more were identified as the key consideration in the classification of standard metropolitan statistical areas by the Office of Statistical Standards (1967). Based on this consideration the investigator used 50,000 as the cutoff point for the two categories.

A one-way analysis of variance for two independent samples was used to determine the likeness or difference of the mean scores on the political participation instrument between groups. Although previous studies indicated that school districts in or near large cities were exposed to different pressures, the studies did not compare the political activities of school employees in and outside metropolitan areas. Therefore, a two-tailed test was used. The level of significance was set at .05.

**Superintendents' Previous Job**

Information regarding the subjects' previous job prior to their present position was divided into three categories: (a) superintendent in another school district, (b) central office administration position other than that of superintendent, and (c) principal. Griffiths's (1966) study of superintendents was the basis for the three categories.

The one-way analysis of variance was used to determine likenesses or differences of the mean scores on the political
participation instrument between the three groups. The level of significance was set at .05. The discussion of the post hoc multiple comparison test in the section on "Degree of Formal Education" also applies to this section.

Superintendents' Most Effective Type of Political Participation

The investigator categorized the responses to Question 31 on the survey instrument into four groups. This categorization was based on Verba and Nie's (1972, p. 384) study which used the smallest-space analysis of the structure of participation behavior to classify political participation into four categories. The categories developed were: voting, campaign participation, communal participation, and particular contacting. A list of specific activities Verba and Nie placed into the various categories may be found in Appendix C.

Based on the literature review (see Appendix A), the investigator modified Verba and Nie's (1972) categories to fit this study. The modified chart of categories may be found in Appendix D.

Based on Appendix D, the superintendents' most effective method of political participation, as indicated on the questionnaire, was placed into the four categories. Then, the chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was used to measure the differences in the proportions of superintendents in the various categories of the independent variables. If the null hypotheses were true, one would expect to find identical or nearly identical proportions of categorized types of political activity among the various categories of the independent variables.
The extent of a superintendent's formal education, the metropolitan/nonmetropolitan classification of the superintendent's employing district, the size of the superintendent's employing district, and the position that the superintendent held immediately prior to his or her current superintendency were the four independent variables that were examined in relation to the dependent variable. The level of confidence was set at .05.

The superintendents' most effective method of political participation, as indicated on the questionnaire, was placed into one of the four categories. Then, the chi-square ($\chi^2$) test of independence was used to measure the differences between the various categories of superintendents. If the null hypotheses were true, one would expect to find identical or nearly identical proportions of categorized types of political activity among the various categories of the independent variables. The level of significance was set at .05.

Summary

In this chapter the design of the study was examined in detail. The development of the instrument for collecting the data for this study, the population and sample, the procedures, data analysis, data collection, and the operational hypotheses were discussed.

The statistical tests that were used:

1. Degree of formal education—one-way ANOVA.
2. Geographic location relative to metropolitan areas—one-way ANOVA.
3. School district size—one-way ANOVA.
4. Superintendents' previous position—one-way ANOVA.

5. Superintendents' most effective political participation—chi square.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents data pertaining to the research questions, description of characteristics of the sample, and results of the hypotheses testing. The chapter is divided into two primary sections. The first section describes the characteristics of the sample, while the second section presents the data analysis for each of the independent variables studied. These independent variables were examined in an attempt to determine their relationship to superintendents' political involvement with the state legislature.

The description of respondents is intended to aid the reader to better understand the characteristics of the sample. This information is presented under four categories: highest educational degree attained, position immediately prior to the individual's current superintendency, the size of school district in which the respondent is employed, and whether the school district is a part of a metropolitan or nonmetropolitan area.

Analysis of the Sample

On April 11, 1984, questionnaires were sent by first-class mail to 226 randomly selected public school superintendents listed in the 1984 Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide (1983). The
initial letter along with three follow-up correspondences produced responses from 216 of the 226 superintendents. Of the 216 respondents, 214 completed all or a portion of the questionnaire. The researcher did not find any trend in the characteristics of the school districts where the nonresponding superintendents were employed. The 214 questionnaires that were returned totally or partially completed represented 94.7% of the 226 superintendents contacted.

Description of Respondents

The information in this section has been designed to provide a perspective for the results. Descriptive data regarding the respondents are presented under five headings: highest educational degree attained, position immediately prior to the individual's current superintendency, the size of school district where the superintendent is employed, metropolitan and nonmetropolitan school districts, and the type of political participation superintendents felt was most effective.

Highest Educational Degree Attained

Hypotheses in this area of the study were designed to test information which had been divided into three categories: master's, specialist, and doctorate. Two hundred and eleven superintendents responded to this item on the questionnaire (see Table 1).

Many of the superintendents who indicated that they had attained a master's degree also indicated they had completed course work beyond their master's. Of the three superintendents who fell into
the "other" category, one had a bachelor's degree, while the other two superintendents indicated that they had completed "all but the dissertation."

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Spec.</th>
<th>Doct.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of superintendents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position Held Prior to Superintendency

Hypotheses in this area of the study were designed to test information which had been divided into three categories: superintendent in another district, central office position other than superintendent, and building principal. Two hundred and ten superintendents responded to this item on the questionnaire (see Table 2).

Of the 11 superintendents who were classified in the "other" category, 5 were teachers, 2 had worked at the college level, 1 had worked as a management consultant, and 1 had worked for the Department of Education. Two other respondents stated that they worked in the district where they were currently superintendent, but the
researcher could not determine their previous position from their responses.

Table 2
Position Held Prior to Superintendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Central Ofc.</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of superintendents</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Size of School District

Hypotheses in this area of the study were designed to test information which had been divided into four categories: districts with zero to two principals, districts with three to four principals, districts with five to six principals, and districts with seven or more principals. Information from all 214 respondents was obtained for this item (see Table 3).

Metropolitan/Nonmetropolitan School Districts

Hypotheses in this study were designed to test information which had been divided into two categories: metropolitan and nonmetropolitan (see Table 4).
Table 3
Size of School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school district</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of building principals</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of superintendents</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of superintendents</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Superintendents Employed in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of district</th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Nonmetropolitan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of superintendents</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At first the percentage of nonmetropolitan school districts that were selected for this study might seem high. However, there are only 24 cities in Michigan with populations greater than 50,000, and 17 of those cities are located in the southeastern corner of the lower peninsula. Initially, 62 respondents indicated that their school district should be classified as metropolitan and only one respondent indicated that he/she was not sure if his district should be classified as a district adjacent to or a part of a city which had a population of 50,000 or more. The data in Table 4 were obtained when the researcher classified the one district in which the superintendent was "not sure" and reclassified 14 other districts. The 14 districts that the researcher reclassified were districts that were adjacent to Bay City, Traverse City, Port Huron, Battle Creek, Jackson, Kentwood, and Muskegon. None of these cities just mentioned have populations of 50,000 or more. The researcher was doubtful and reexamined the response on the questionnaire for this item when it was noted that only one respondent indicated that he was not sure of his district's classification.

Type of Political Participation Considered Most Effective

Hypotheses in this area of the study were designed to test information from respondents who were classified into one of four categories: voting, campaign participation, communal participation, and particularized contacting (see Table 5).

Based on the respondents' feedback to Item 31 on the questionnaire, the superintendents were classified into one of the four
Table 5

Type of Political Participation Considered Most Effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Multiple response unable to categorize</th>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Campaign participation</th>
<th>Communal participation</th>
<th>Particularized contacting</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of superintendents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
categories that described the type of political participation that they felt was most effective. Of the 214 respondents, 5 did not respond to this item and 6, despite instructions not to, made multiple selections. Of the 6 superintendents who made multiple selections, 5 made multiple selections that fell into one category. The lone respondent who the researcher was unable to categorize had selected responses which were not a part of just one of the four categories. Therefore, the 5 nonrespondents and the 1 respondent who made selections in more than one category produced the 6 missing responses.

Data Analysis Procedures

Inferential techniques were used to test all of the hypotheses of the study. The statistical techniques used included one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), the protected least significance difference (PLSD) post hoc method of multiple comparisons, and the nonparametric chi-square test. All data were tested using a probability of .05 for committing Type I error.

Metropolitan/Nonmetropolitan Districts and Political Participation

H₁: Superintendents employed by metropolitan school boards (as defined by the investigator) will have a higher group mean score on the political participation instrument (Questions 1-30) used in this study than superintendents employed by nonmetropolitan school boards.

An analysis of variance revealed that the superintendents employed by metropolitan school boards have a greater degree of
political participation with the state legislature than superintendents employed by nonmetropolitan school district boards. As Table 6 indicates, the null hypothesis was rejected since the one-way analysis of variance produced a \( p \) value less than .05.

Table 6

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Metropolitan/Nonmetropolitan Variable With Regard to the Superintendents' Political Participation Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of district</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmetropolitan</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*\( p < .05 \).

Since only two groups existed for this comparison, only one comparison between the groups was possible. Therefore, a post hoc test was not needed.

**Metropolitan/Nonmetropolitan Districts and the Most Effective Type of Political Participation**

To test Research Hypothesis H2, the null hypothesis was tested against a nondirectional alternative hypothesis. The researcher
sought to compare the superintendents employed by metropolitan school boards and nonmetropolitan school boards with regard to the type of political participation the superintendents felt was most effective. The appropriate data analysis procedure used to test the null hypothesis of no difference between independent samples was the chi-square test. An alpha level of .05 was used.

***H₂:*** The proportions of superintendents employed by metropolitan school boards who are classified into one of the four categories created by the investigator (based on superintendents' responses to Question 31 on the political participation instrument) will differ from the proportions in the corresponding cells of superintendents employed by nonmetropolitan school boards.

Originally four types of political participation were used to categorize the superintendents' responses. However, since three out of the eight cells had less than five responses, the researcher collapsed two of the political categories, "campaign" and "particulized participation," into one category. This combination was based on the similarity of these two categories and the lack of similarity with other combinations of the categories. After the data were collapsed, two of the six cells still had less than five responses. Because of the small number of subject responses in two of the cells, any conclusions drawn based on these data must be viewed with a great deal of reservation. Siegel (1956) addressed this question of when it is appropriate to collapse categories and under what conditions the collapsing of categories should be done.
When $df = 1$, that is, when $K = 2$, each expected frequency should be at least 5. When $df > 1$, that is, when $K > 2$, the test for the one-sample case should not be used when more than 20 per cent of the expected frequencies are smaller than 5 or when any expected frequency is smaller than 1. Expected frequencies sometimes can be increased by combining adjacent categories. This is desirable only if combinations can meaningfully be made. (p. 46)

The results for this chi-square test are presented in Table 7. Since the probability obtained was greater than the stated alpha level, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Based on these data the researcher believed that no conclusions could be drawn regarding the effect that the metropolitan/nonmetropolitan variable had on the type of political participation superintendents believed was most effective.

**Size of School District and Political Participation**

$H_3$: The mean group scores on the political participation instrument (Questions 1-30) used in this study will differ among groups of superintendents whose school district employs two or less, three or four, five or six, and seven or more principals.

An analysis of variance revealed that the number of building principals employed in the school district was related to the superintendent's degree of political participation with the state legislature. As Table 8 indicates, the null hypothesis was rejected since the one-way analysis of variance produced a $p$ value less than .05.

The PLSD post hoc testing procedure was used to uncover which difference or differences between pairs of defined groups exceeded
Table 7
Chi-Square Test Results for the Collapsed Categories of Political Participation Versus Metropolitan/Nonmetropolitan Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of political participation</th>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Campaign and particularized</th>
<th>Communal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmetropolitan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 1.73 with 2 degrees of freedom. p = .42. a = .05.
the critical value for this one-way analysis of variance as implied by the Research Hypothesis H3.

Table 8

One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Size of School Districts With Regard to the Superintendents' Political Participation Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of district</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

In Figure 1 the six comparisons of political participation were categorized according to the type of school district where the superintendents were employed. It should be noted that the results produced from the comparison of the superintendents who were working in Type II districts and the group of superintendents who were working in Type III districts was the only comparison that contradicted the
research hypothesis. All other comparisons regarding district type supported the research hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Type I (0-2)</th>
<th>Type II (3-4)</th>
<th>Type III (5-6)</th>
<th>Type IV (7 or more)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The t values of PLSD post hoc group comparisons are directly above the line segments.

*Ends of line segments where significant difference in the means of the groups exists. Significant at $\alpha = .05$.

Figure 1. Descriptive data and mean scores for Hypothesis $H_3$, comparison of the various size of districts and the mean scores of the superintendents' political participation.

The data indicated that as the number of principals increased in a school district, the mean score of the superintendents' political participation increased. Although there was a difference in the mean
scores between Type II and Type III districts, this difference was not large enough to have an alpha of less than .05.

Size of School District and the Most Effective Type of Political Participation

To test Research Hypothesis H₄, the null hypothesis was tested against a nondirectional alternative hypothesis. The researcher sought to compare the type of district where the superintendents are employed with regard to the type of political participation the superintendents felt was most effective.

H₄: Superintendents employed in school districts that also employ two or less building principals will have different proportions of their responses in corresponding cells of the four categories of political participation created by the investigator (based on the superintendents' responses to Question 31 on the political participation instrument) than superintendents employed in school districts which also employ three or more building principals.

The appropriate data analysis procedure used to test the null hypothesis of no difference between two independent samples was a chi-square test. An alpha level of .05 was used. Since 6 of the 16 cells had less than five subjects in the various categories, the researcher collapsed the types of districts from four levels into two levels. After examining the types of educational structures in Michigan school districts, the researcher decided to divide the two groups between two and three building principals. Districts with two or less building principals usually had one or two buildings in their
district, and their structure was elementary and secondary with one central office position. Districts with three or more principals usually had three or more buildings, and their structure was elementary, middle or junior high school, and high school with a higher probability of having more than one central office position.

The results for this chi-square test are presented in Table 9. Since the probability obtained was less than the stated alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Based on this data, the researcher concluded that the type of political participation deemed most effective by public school superintendents was dependent on the type of district in which the superintendents are employed. The political participation categories which showed the greater differences in proportions were "voting" (12.5%) and "particularized participation" (14.8%).

Previous Position and Political Participation

H₃: The mean group scores on the political participation instrument (Questions 1-30) used in this study will differ among groups of superintendents whose positions immediately prior to their current position was that of principal, central office position other than superintendent, and superintendent in another district.

An analysis of variance revealed that the type of position held by a superintendent immediately prior to his/her current position was related to the degree of political participation the superintendent had with the state legislature. As Table 10 indicates, the null hypothesis was rejected since the one-way analysis of variance
Table 9
Chi-Square Test Results for the Categories of Political Participation Versus the Collapsed Categories of District Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of political participation</th>
<th>0-2 principals</th>
<th>3 or more principals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularized participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 11.29 with 3 degrees of freedom. \( p = .01 \), \( \alpha = .05 \).
produced a $p$ value of less than .05. The PLSD post hoc testing procedure was used to uncover which difference or differences between pairs of defined groups exceeded the critical value for this one-way analysis of variance as implied by the Research Hypothesis $H_5$.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent in another district</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office position</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

In Figure 2 the three comparisons of political participation were categorized according to the previous position held by the superintendents. It should be noted that the results produced from the comparison of the group of superintendents who were previously in a central office position and the group of superintendents who were previously principals was the only comparison that supported the
research hypothesis. The group of superintendents with the lowest mean political participation score were in a principal's position prior to their superintendency. The group of superintendents who held a superintendency in another district prior to their current position had the second highest group score. The highest group score was that of superintendents who were in another central office position other than a superintendency prior to their current position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Superintendent in another district</th>
<th>Central office</th>
<th>Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.924</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>3.627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The *t* values of PLSD post hoc group comparisons are directly above the line segments.

*End of line segment indicates significant pair of means.
Significant at *α* = .05.

Figure 2. Descriptive data and mean scores for Hypothesis H₅, comparison of the previous employment positions held by superintendents and the mean scores of the superintendents' political participation.
Previous Employment Position and the Most Effective Type of Political Participation

To test Research Hypothesis $H_6$, the null hypothesis was tested against a nondirectional alternative hypothesis. The researcher sought to compare superintendents' previous employment position with regard to the type of political participation the superintendents felt was most effective.

$H_6$: Superintendents whose previous positions were in central offices will have different proportions of their responses in corresponding cells of the four categories of political participation created by the investigator (based on the superintendents' responses to Question 31) than superintendents whose previous position was that of a principal.

The appropriate data analysis procedure used to test the null hypothesis of no difference between independent samples was a chi-square test. An alpha level of .05 was used. Since 4 of the 12 cells had less than five responses, the researcher collapsed the types of previous employment from three levels into two levels. After the data were collapsed, two of the eight cells still contained less than five responses. Because of the small number of responses in two of the cells, any conclusions drawn based on this data must be looked on with a certain degree of reservation.

The results for this chi-square test are presented in Table 11. Since the probability obtained was greater than the stated alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Based on these data, the researcher believed that no conclusion could be drawn
Table 11

Chi-Square Test Results for the Categories of Political Participation Versus the Collapsed Categories of the Superintendents' Previous Employment Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of previous employment</th>
<th>Type of political participation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Campaign participation</td>
<td>Communal participation</td>
<td>Particularized participation</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/central office</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 4.69 with 3 degrees of freedom. $p = .20$. $\alpha = .05$. 
regarding the effect of the superintendents' previous employment position on the type of political participation superintendents believed was most effective.

**Superintendents' Degree Status and Political Participation**

H7: The mean group scores on the political participation instrument (Questions 1-30) used in this study will differ among groups of superintendents who have attained different levels of graduate degrees (master's, specialist, doctoral).

An analysis of variance revealed that the degree of formal education is related to the degree of political involvement. As Table 12 indicates, the null hypothesis was rejected since the one-way analysis of variance produced a p value less than .05.

The PLSD post hoc testing procedure was used to reveal which difference or differences between pairs of defined groups exceeded the critical value for this one-way analysis of variance as implied by the Research Hypothesis H7.

In Figure 3 the three comparisons of political participation were categorized according to the highest educational degree attained by the superintendents. It should be noted that the results produced from the comparison of the groups of superintendents with master's degrees and superintendents with specialist degrees contradicted the research hypothesis. All other group comparisons did not contradict the research hypothesis.

The research hypothesis inferred that there would be a difference between the mean scores of the superintendents' political
Table 12
One-Way Analysis of Variance of the Superintendents' Degree Status With Regard to the Superintendents' Political Participation Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree attained</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |          |            |          |
|                  | 3.719    | 1.333      | 2.143    |

*Ends of line segment indicate significant pair of means.
Significant at α = .05.

Figure 3. Descriptive data and mean scores for Hypothesis H7, comparison of the various educational degree groups and the mean scores of the superintendents' political participation.
participation when the superintendents were classified into groups based on their highest educational degree attained. As the degree of formal education became more advanced, the political participation score of the superintendents increased. The comparison between the master's and specialist groups was the only comparison which contradicted the research hypothesis.

**Highest Educational Degree Attained and the Most Effective Type of Political Participation**

To test the Research Hypothesis $H_g$, the null hypothesis was tested against a nondirectional alternative hypothesis. The researcher sought to compare superintendents with various graduate degree levels with regard to the type of political participation the superintendents felt was most effective.

$H_g$: Superintendents grouped by the degree of formal graduate education (master's, specialist, doctoral) will have different proportions of superintendents in the corresponding cells of the four categories created by the investigator (based on the superintendents' responses to Question 31 on the political participation instrument).

The appropriate data analysis procedure used to test the null hypothesis of no difference between independent samples was a chi-square test. An alpha level of .05 was used. Since 4 out of the 12 cells had less than five responses, the researcher collapsed two of the educational degree categories into one category. After the data was collapsed, only one category remained with less than five subjects.
The results for this chi-square test are presented in Table 13. Since the probability obtained was less than the stated alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Based on this data, the researcher concluded that the type of political participation deemed most effective by public school superintendents was dependent on the type of educational degree attained by the superintendents. The political participation categories which showed the greater differences in proportions were "voting" (5.6%) and "campaign participation" (13.3%).

Summary

This chapter began by presenting information that described characteristics of the participating respondents and the school districts they represent. The number of respondents and nonrespondents were discussed. The remainder of this chapter focused upon a discussion of the data results obtained for each of the eight research hypotheses investigated by this researcher.

Chapter V focuses upon the conclusions which were drawn from the data obtained and then analyzed for this study. Recommendations are also presented for further study in researching political participation.
Table 13

Chi-Square Test Results for the Categories of Political Participation Versus the Collapsed Categories of the Superintendents' Educational Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of political participation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Campaign participation</th>
<th>Communal participation</th>
<th>Particularized participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
<td>No. of supts.</td>
<td>% of row totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/doctorate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>187.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Chi square = 8.21 with 3 degrees of freedom. \( p = .04 \). \( \alpha = .05 \).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three major sections. The first section discusses the research findings of the study and relates them to past research in this area. An explanation of how the investigator's findings have narrowed the focus of previous research and the implications for educators are also presented. The second section makes recommendations for further research regarding political participation of public school superintendents. The third section gives a brief summary of the study.

Conclusions

In Chapter I it was indicated that this study would be an attempt to find answers to five questions pertaining to six variables. The first area of inquiry focused on answering the question of what relationship exists between public school superintendents' education and the extent of their state political participation. The second area focused on answering what relationship exists between public school superintendents' school district where they are employed and the extent of their state political participation. The third area focused on answering what relationship exists between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan school district superintendents and
the superintendents' political participation. The fourth area focused on answering what relationship exists between public school superintendents' previous position of employment and the superintendents' political participation. In addition to examining superintendents' political participation in each of the four previously mentioned areas, the type of political participation superintendents felt was most effective was also examined in regard to those same four variables.

The first research hypothesis focused on the different amounts of political participation used by metropolitan and nonmetropolitan superintendents. Of interest to the investigator was whether metropolitan superintendents would indicate a different degree of political participation than would nonmetropolitan superintendents. Since the resulting probability level obtained was less than the alpha level set for this study, the data analysis indicated a difference between the two groups.

The results did not contradict any of the previous studies mentioned in Chapter XI, although the results did seem to clarify some of these previous studies. Ferguson (1969) reported rural legislators were more likely to support educational issues. If Ferguson's report was accurate, this could be one explanation why this investigator found metropolitan superintendents to have a higher degree of political participation than nonmetropolitan superintendents. Rural superintendents may not have to spend as much time involved in political activities, if they already have the support of their district's legislator or legislators. Since the investigator
could not conclude a difference existed between the two groups regarding the type of political participation considered most effective, the investigator could not support nonmetropolitan superintendents' use of different types of participation as an explanation.

Campbell et al. (1965) found school district operations were influenced by the type of local government, while Drachler (1977) was more specific when he reported large city government reduced the focus of attention on school needs. If the superintendents felt they needed to become more politically involved in order to redirect the focus of attention on schools, both studies could help explain why this investigator found metropolitan superintendents to have a higher degree of political participation than did nonmetropolitan superintendents. Masotti and Lineberry (1976) reported that a greater mix of people created "livelier politics" in metropolitan areas. If the reader interprets "livelier" as a greater number of political interest groups involved in the "political arena," this interpretation might then explain why metropolitan superintendents indicated a higher degree of political participation than nonmetropolitan superintendents.

Since this study was designed to discover if a difference between groups existed and not the cause of the difference in political participation, the prior research cited might provide insight into possible explanations for this difference. While focusing the findings on superintendents and their political participation, the findings of this investigator did not contradict the cited research findings. Campbell et al. (1965) and Masotti and Lineberry (1976)
indicated that politics in metropolitan areas influenced school district operations, but neither study indicated the magnitude of the influence or how schools were involved in politics. The results of this study did indicate that metropolitan superintendents had a higher degree of political participation than nonmetropolitan superintendents. The higher level of participation of the metropolitan superintendents might be due to a more competitive budgetary situation with many different groups vying for funds.

Another area of this study focused on what relationship the size of the school district in which the superintendent was employed had with superintendents' political participation. Of interest to the investigator was whether smaller school districts' superintendents indicated a different degree of political participation than superintendents employed by larger school districts. Since the resulting probability level obtained was less than the alpha level for the related hypothesis, the data analysis supported a difference in the degree of political participation between the groups studied.

A number of studies examined enrollments of school districts, which is one way to classify districts, and their relationship to various characteristics of school superintendents. However, of the studies mentioned in Chapter II, none addressed the issue of superintendents' political participation. Salley (1979-1980) found a superintendent's job priorities were related to the enrollment of the school district where the superintendent was employed. The investigator mentions this study since one of the job priorities Salley examined was political activity.
This investigator found that differences in superintendents' political participation existed between five of the six statistical comparisons that dealt with the size of the school district. The investigator categorized districts into four types based on the number of principals employed in the district. As the size of the district increased, the degree of the superintendents' political participation increased (see Table 9). The comparison of Type II and Type III districts was the only one which did not produce a difference at an alpha level of .05. The investigator did not design this study to determine causes for the differences between the groups. However, there are some possible explanations.

As districts increased in size the budget for the districts also may have increased, and the magnitude of the importance of the decisions made in the state legislature regarding education could be directly related to the amount of state funds that districts may have received. Therefore, school officials in larger districts may have felt participation was especially warranted. Another possible explanation might be that many larger districts are located in metropolitan areas, and therefore, the types of areas where the school districts are located may influence these results. Still another possible explanation is that larger districts, with larger budgets, may be better able to allot more funds to undertake political participation.

With regard to the type of political participation that superintendents from various types of school districts viewed as most effective, differences were identified between districts with less than
three principals and districts with three or more principals. When compared to superintendents in larger districts, superintendents employed in smaller districts indicated a more pronounced use of "voting." Superintendents employed by larger districts indicated a more pronounced use of "particularized participation," when compared to superintendents in smaller districts.

In addition to supporting Salley's (1979-1980) 1980 research this investigator narrowed the focus of Salley's research related to general job priorities and district size. The investigator found a superintendent's political participation, one of Salley's job priorities, was directly related to the size of the school district.

Another area of this study focused on what relationship the previous positions of the superintendents had with the superintendents' degree of political participation. The results did not contradict any of the previous studies mentioned in Chapter II. The results did, however, focus on superintendents' political participation whereas previous studies were of a more general nature. Ferguson (1969) found some occupations more adaptive to political involvement than others. The investigator examined three classifications of superintendents' previous jobs: central office position other than superintendent, superintendent in another district, and building principal. These three classifications produced three different comparisons between groups. The only comparison which fell below the .05 alpha level set by the researcher was the comparison involving a central office position other than that of superintendent and a building principal. Superintendents whose previous positions were
central office positions other than that of a superintendency had the highest mean group political participation score. The design of this study was developed to determine if differences in political participation existed between groups of superintendents who held different positions of employment prior to their current position. Once again, this study was not designed to determine the cause or causes of any differences. Whether the differences can be attributed to Ferguson's suggestion that some occupations were more adaptive to political participation, that more central office positions might be found in metropolitan areas, or that more central office positions might be found in larger school districts is an area which warrants further study.

Salley (1979-1980) reported superintendents' job priorities were associated with their previous position. His findings, while more global, were not in opposition with the results of this study and offer another direction to examine in attempting to determine a cause or causes for the differences.

With regard to the type of political participation that superintendents felt was most effective, the investigator found a difference that did not fall below the .05 alpha level. Even after the three employment classifications were collapsed into two, the investigator had 25% of the cells with less than five responses. Because of the limited number of responses in some cells, this portion of the study should be viewed with reservation.

Another area of this study focused on what relationship the superintendents' highest educational degrees had with the
superintendents' degrees of political participation. The results of
this study dealt more specifically with educators involved in poli-
tics than the findings of the studies mentioned in Chapter II.
Salley (1979–1980) suggested job priorities of superintendents and
the highest academic degree attained by superintendents deserved
further investigation. Verba and Nie (1972) found that as an indi-
vidual's formal education increased, the individual's political par-
ticipation also increased. However, Verba and Nie's highest educa-
tional category was "some college education." As a result, they did
not examine the political participation of individuals who were
categorized into different levels of graduate education.

This investigator extended the educational categories to include
the graduate degrees of master's, specialist, and doctorate. These
three classifications created three comparisons between groups. The
comparison between superintendents with master's degrees and superin-
tendents with specialist degrees was the only comparison of the three
that did not fall below the .05 alpha level. The comparison of
superintendents with master's degrees with superintendents who have
earned doctoral degrees and the comparison of superintendents with
specialist degrees with superintendents who have earned doctoral
degrees produced statistical differences at the .05 alpha level.
Since superintendents with doctoral degrees indicated a higher degree
of political participation, the findings do not contradict Verba and
Nie's (1972) study, and the findings also extend the educational
categories studied. Superintendents with a specialist degree indi-
cated a higher degree of political participation than superintendents
with a master's degree, but the difference was not significant at an alpha level of .05. Superintendents with doctoral degrees had the highest mean political participation score. A possible explanation offered by this investigator might be that more superintendents in metropolitan and in larger school districts have doctorates than superintendents in smaller districts or superintendents in nonmetropolitan districts. However, the determination of the factor or factors contributing to the direct relationship between political participation and an individual's amount of education was not undertaken in this study. However, the cause or causes of this relationship could be the topic of a future study.

The investigator also examined the educational classifications of superintendents with regard to what the superintendents felt was the most effective type of political participation. Because of the lack of responses in certain cells, the classifications regarding the educational degree attained by the superintendents were collapsed from three to two categories. Due to this collapse of classifications, superintendents with a specialist or a doctorate degree were placed together in one category. The comparison of superintendents with specialist and doctorate degrees with superintendents who have attained master's degrees produced a significant difference at an alpha level of .05. When compared to superintendents with specialists and doctorates, superintendents with master's degrees more frequently indicated "voting" as the most effective type of political participation utilized. Superintendents with specialist and doctorate degrees indicated a more pronounced use of "campaign
participation" as the most effective type of political participation, when they were compared to superintendents with master's degrees.

Finally, 19 response categories were presented on the survey for superintendents to indicate what they felt was the single most effective type of political participation. It was interesting to note that the category which received the highest number of responses, "development of long-term relationship with state legislative members," had almost five times the responses as the second most selected response. Seventy-six superintendents selected this method as the most effective. The second highest category, "supply information to members of the state legislature," was selected by 17 superintendents. The third highest category, "hire a lobbyist," was selected by 16 superintendents. Just these top three categories, which all deal with communicating with state legislative members, collectively total 50.9% of the responses. Thus, in the minds of a majority of the superintendents surveyed this type of contact was felt to be the most effective (see Appendix J).

Suggestions for Further Study

Because of the limited research in the area of public school superintendents' political participation with the state legislature, further investigation seems warranted.

1. How do public school superintendents gain their knowledge of effective means of influencing state legislators?

2. Since there were a variety of methods reported by superintendents to be most effective, are there, indeed, some methods of
political participation which are more effective than others?

3. Does the most effective method of political participation vary with the size of the district, location of the district, or characteristics of the superintendent?

4. Does the amount of political participation vary with the size of the district, location of the district, or characteristics of the superintendent?

5. Do superintendents perceive their political participation effective in influencing state-level educational policy making?

6. Is there a difference between the actual political participation of school superintendents and an "ideal" method of participation?

7. Is a superintendent's lack of sufficient involvement in the state political arena due to lack of commitment, naiveness of the political process, other job duties given higher priority, or lack of knowledge in using effective techniques for working with legislators?

8. Would hiring a person to work exclusively in state politics gain school districts enough benefits from the state legislature to warrant the costs?

Implications

Because of the funds needed to keep Michigan's public education operating, and because the amount and application of state funds are determined by the Michigan Legislature, the Michigan Legislature has more to do with determining the direction of public education in the state than any other group. What state legislators do is related to
what educators can do. In a paper read at the American Association of School Administrators in 1968, Rozzell (cited in DePree, 1971) said:

[Legislators] control the purse strings of the principal sources of financial support. They frame the limits of local school board actions. They can facilitate or stymie educational change. They can initiate new educational programs and alter or abolish existing programs. They establish priorities in the use of public resources. All permanent progress in the field of education depends fundamentally on their decisions. (p. 180)

It seems that concerns regarding education have steadily increased in the last 16 years. DePree (1971) examined Michigan public school superintendents' understanding and participation in legislative policy making. He felt legislative actions regarding education would continue to increase.

Because of a growing public concern with public education, the legislators are seemingly assuming an increasingly visible role in educational policy-making. And, as the interconnection of education with all aspects of the state's life continues to increase, the significance of legislative actions and attitudes in educational matters will likewise increase. (p. 181)

This investigator's findings indicated that public school superintendents are aware that public education has been placed under more scrutiny. However, the amount of influence superintendents felt they could have on the legislature varies a great deal. Since the legislature has a great impact on public education, attempts to exert influence on the legislature seem to be worth the effort involved regardless of the magnitude of the actual effects. Any superintendent desiring to influence the legislative process must have at least a basic understanding of the factors that control the passage of
legislation. There are those who feel that it is sufficient to vote. There are those who go one step further and contact legislators occasionally. Contacts with legislators can, however, be ineffective if those individuals who are attempting to influence legislators are not aware of effective approaches to influence those legislators. Thomas Schweigert, former lieutenant governor of Michigan, spoke to this issue in 1969 (cited in DePree, 1971) when he stated, "Since many people have either no knowledge, or misguided knowledge, of how to approach a legislator, ..." (p. 182).

To be an effective influencer of state legislators, superintendents must be informed and their actions must be carefully calculated. Knowledge of legislative processes and procedures is essential. Professional educators must understand and utilize effective methods of political participation to further the advancement of educational issues. Failure to become involved in the "political arena" may not only limit legislators' knowledge of educators' needs, but may lead to legislators acting on incomplete or inaccurate information.

Summary

This investigation was conducted to determine if particular characteristics of superintendents and public school districts were related to the type and magnitude of public school superintendents' political participation. Initially, a brief discussion of the increase of politics in public education and the increased need for political participation was presented. This discussion was followed by a presentation of the limited number of studies, there were few
useful instruments available for this investigator to use to measure the items this investigator had identified as appropriate to the issues under study. Because of the lack of an appropriate measurement instrument for the study of superintendents' political participation, it was necessary for the investigator to develop a new instrument to examine the specific areas of this study. Therefore, a rationale for selection of the items of the measurement instrument was needed. A review of the literature aided the construction of the survey instrument.

A comprehensive description of the survey procedures used by this investigator to collect the data for this study was explained in Chapter III. This description was followed by the presentation and analysis of the data collected.

Finally, this chapter presented conclusions based on the data analysis in Chapter IV. In addition to the conclusions that were drawn, recommendations for future studies and implications for educational leaders' future involvement in the politics of the state legislature were presented.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Compilation of Items From Survey Instruments, Published Articles, and Related Material
## Survey Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Instruments</th>
<th>Instruments' Author(s) and Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Participation Scale</td>
<td>Matthews &amp; Prothro, 1966/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Activity Index</td>
<td>Woodward &amp; Roper, 1950/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Political Participation</td>
<td>A. Campbell, Gurin, &amp; Miller, 1954/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>Robinson, 192/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Leadership</td>
<td>Lazarsfeld, Berelson, &amp; Gaudet, 1964/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Leadership Scale</td>
<td>Rogers, 1962/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>A. Campbell, Gurin, &amp; Miller, 1954/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Involvement</td>
<td>A. Campbell, Converse, Miller, &amp; Stokes, 1960/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Citizen Duty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs to the Political System</td>
<td>Milbrath, 1968/1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Psychological Involvement in Politics</td>
<td>Verba &amp; Nie, 1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questions

- Talk with others about a political problem
- Try to persuade people to vote in a particular way
- Been asked for political advice
- Voted in last election or last (n) elections
- Contributed one's time to candidate's political campaign
- Contributed one's money to candidate's political campaign
- Attended political meeting or demonstration
- Followed campaign in media and kept informed
- Party preference
- Someone wears a campaign button
- Tried to get elected to a political group
- Belonged to a political group
- Convinced someone to vote in a particular way
- Written to government official regarding political issue
- Yelled or swore at government official
- Spoke with government official to persuade them
- Spoke with government official to add to or subtract from preference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political participation</th>
<th>Author(s) and Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know which party controls legislature</td>
<td>Angel, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know the ins and outs of individuals you work with</td>
<td>Elliott, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be straightforward with your talk with legislators</td>
<td>Holcomb, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get people in district to contact legislators</td>
<td>Cones, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop citizens interest groups</td>
<td>Blount, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop long-term relationships with legislators</td>
<td>Whipples &amp; Maugaman, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with aides or legislators</td>
<td>Martinez, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have follow-up visits or calls with legislators</td>
<td>McCall, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build coalitions with other interest groups</td>
<td>Shaw &amp; Brown, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply information backed up with research</td>
<td>Gove &amp; Carpenter, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invite legislator(s) to your district for school event</td>
<td>Timmons, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build coalitions with other interest groups</td>
<td>Yoder &amp; West, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have lobbyists for your interests</td>
<td>Gormley, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply information backed up with research</td>
<td>Levy, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send letter or telegram to legislator</td>
<td>Black, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply information backed up with research</td>
<td>Berry, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>Rourke, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>Langston, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>Magrath, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>Heath, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>Taylor, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>Kaplan, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>Jolley, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>McKillop, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone legislator to indicate one's concerns</td>
<td>KISD, 1983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Michigan Cities With Populations Greater Than 50,000
Michigan Cities With Populations Greater Than 50,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>1,197,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>181,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>161,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>159,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>130,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sterling Heights</td>
<td>108,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Livonia</td>
<td>104,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>100,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>90,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Westland</td>
<td>84,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>79,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>77,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>77,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td>76,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>St. Clair Shores</td>
<td>76,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Southfield</td>
<td>75,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td>70,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Clinton Township</td>
<td>68,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dearborn Heights</td>
<td>67,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>67,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Redford</td>
<td>63,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>59,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Farmington Hills</td>
<td>57,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>54,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

Verba and Nie's (1972) Categorization of Specific Political Activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Frequency of local vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign participation</td>
<td>1. Persuade others how to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Party work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Attend meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Membership in political club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Contribute money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal participation</td>
<td>1. Active membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Work with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Formed group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Local social contacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Outside social contacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularized Contacting</td>
<td>1. Local particularized contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Outside particularized contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

The Investigator's Categorization of Specific Political Activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>1. Voted in past state elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Voted in past local elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign participation</td>
<td>1. Persuade others how to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Party work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Attend political meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Membership in political club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Contribute money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Contribute time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Campaign stickers or buttons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal participation</td>
<td>1. Active membership in group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Work with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Formed groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Local social contacts with members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Inside social contacts with representative or state governmental official.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularized contacting</td>
<td>1. Local contacts with particular members of community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Outside contacts with particular representatives or state governmental officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Hired lobbyists to contact representatives or state governmental officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Formed coalition with another interest group outside the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Develop &quot;grassroot&quot; lobbying groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Train community members in lobbying techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Invite state governmental officials to school district events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Long-term relationships with legislators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Supply research to legislators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Testify at legislative hearings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Telephone and write letters to legislators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Survey Instrument
This survey is done to better understand the extent and type of political involvement Michigan public school superintendents have with the state legislature. Please answer all of the questions. If you wish to comment on any questions or qualify your answers, please feel free to use the space in the margins. Your comments will be read and taken into account. This survey is supported by the Educational Leadership Department of Western Michigan University.

Thank you for your help.

Return this questionnaire to:
Gary W. Allen
6927 Adaside Dr. S.E.
Ada, Michigan 49301
In order to get the views of more superintendents would you please complete this questionnaire at this time — it takes only about 9 minutes. Then, mail it today in the postage-paid envelope to the address on the front of this questionnaire.

(All answers are confidential. Your name is not required.)

Q-1 Do you discuss political issues regarding education with any members of the state electorate? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-2 Do any members of the state electorate ask you for political advice regarding educational issues? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-3 Do you try to persuade any members of the state electorate to vote in a particular way on educational issues? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-4 Have you convinced any member of the state electorate to vote for or against a particular issue regarding education? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-5 Do you or a district designee write or telephone members of the state legislature to discuss educational issues? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Please go on to the next page
Q-6 Do you or a district designee make follow-up contacts regarding educational issues that were discussed in a letter, in a telephone conversation, or in person? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-7 Do you or a district designee supply information or research data to members of the state legislature regarding educational issues that could affect your district? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-8 Do you or a district designee personally testify at legislative hearing or sub-committee sessions on issues pertinent to education? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-9 Do you or a district designee invite state legislative members to school events or activities held in your school district? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-10 Do you or a district designee speak personally with state legislative members regarding educational issues while the legislators are in your school district? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-11 Do you or a district designee meet personally with members of the state legislature while away from the school district to discuss educational issues? (Circle number)

1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
Q-12 Do you develop a relationship with a member(s) of the state legislature that continues even when the legislator(s) is/are not dealing with issues that will directly affect your school district? (Circle number)
1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-13 Do you or a district designee hold meetings to inform community members about possible effects of issues being discussed in the state legislature? (Circle number)
1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-14 Do you or a district designee encourage community members to become involved in "grassroots" lobbying in order to contact members of the state legislature regarding an issue that could affect your school district? (Circle number)
1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-15 Do you or a district designee develop citizen interest group(s) to contact state legislative members with the intent of expressing the group's feelings regarding issues that could affect your school district? (Circle number)
1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-16 Do you or a district designee hold training sessions or workshop to educate community members in "grassroots" lobbying techniques? (Circle number)
1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY

Q-17 Do you follow political campaigns by use of the various media? (Circle number)
1 NEVER
2 SELDOM
3 FAIRLY OFTEN
4 REGULARLY
Q-18 Do you contribute personal funds to a pro-educational state governmental candidate's political campaign and/or political action committees? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  Seldom  
3  Fairly Often  
4  Regularly  

Q-19 Do you contribute your own time to a pro-educational state governmental candidate's political campaign? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  Seldom  
3  Fairly Often  
4  Regularly  

Q-20 Do you become actively involved in political groups or organizations that support education? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  Seldom  
3  Fairly Often  
4  Regularly  

Q-21 Do you attend state political meetings or dinners that focus on educational issues? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  Seldom  
3  Fairly Often  
4  Regularly  

Q-22 Have you held an elected state or local governmental position? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  Seldom  
3  Fairly Often  
4  Regularly  

Q-23 Does your district become part of state political coalitions with other school districts to further education? (Exclude membership in state associations such as MASA, etc.) (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  Seldom  
3  Fairly Often  
4  Regularly  

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
Q-24 Does your School Board join interest groups not directly associated with education in an attempt to influence members of the state legislature? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  SELDOM  
3  FAIRLY OFTEN  
4  REGULARLY

Q-25 Does your district hire a state lobbyist(s) in conjunction with other school districts? (Exclude lobbyists hired by state associations such as MASA, etc.) (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  SELDOM  
3  FAIRLY OFTEN  
4  REGULARLY

Q-26 Does your district employ its own lobbyist solely to deal with your district's concerns? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  SELDOM  
3  FAIRLY OFTEN  
4  REGULARLY

Q-27 Do you vote in national elections? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  SELDOM  
3  FAIRLY OFTEN  
4  REGULARLY

Q-28 Do you vote in state elections? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  SELDOM  
3  FAIRLY OFTEN  
4  REGULARLY

Q-29 Do you vote in local elections? (Circle number)

1  NEVER  
2  SELDOM  
3  FAIRLY OFTEN  
4  REGULARLY

Q-30 How important do you feel it is to vote? (Circle number)

1  OF NO IMPORTANCE  
2  OF LITTLE IMPORTANCE  
3  SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT  
4  VERY IMPORTANT

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
Q-31 What is the most effective method of influencing state legislators that you or your district designate utilize? (Circle Number)

(ITAL IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU SELECT ONLY ONE METHOD)

1. Attempt to persuade other community members to vote a particular way
2. Involvement in party work
3. Attend political meetings
4. Contribute time to a candidate's campaign or a campaign issue
5. Contribute money to a candidate's campaign or a campaign issue
6. Be an active member in local organization(s)
7. Develop "grassroots" lobbying groups
8. Train community members in lobbying techniques
9. Social contact with members of the community
10. Social contacts within the district with state government officials
11. Social contacts while away from the school district with state governmental official(s)
12. Invite state governmental official(s) to school district events
13. Development of long term relationship with state legislative members
14. Supply information or research data to members of the state legislature
15. Testify at legislative hearings
16. Form coalitions with other interest groups outside the community
17. Hire a lobbyist
18. Vote in elections
19. Other (Please specify)  

Q-32 Has your district identified any state political goals it wishes to achieve? (Circle number)

1. No (If no, please go to the next page, question #33)
2. Yes

A. If you answered "Yes" to question #32, what political method(s) did your district utilize in attempting to achieve this goal?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
II. If your district identified a political goal(s), was your district successful in achieving the goal(s)? (Circle number)

1 NO  
2 YES

Q-33 What is the highest educational degree that you have attained? (Circle number)

1 MASTERS  
2 SPECIALIST  
3 DOCTORATE  
4 OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY ________________________________

Q-34 What position did you hold immediately prior to your current position as superintendent? (Circle number)

1 SUPERINTENDENT IN ANOTHER DISTRICT  
2 CENTRAL OFFICE POSITION OTHER THAN THAT OF SUPERINTENDENT  
3 PRINCIPAL  
4 OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY ________________________________

Q-35 How many assistant principals are employed by your district?________

Q-36 How many principals are employed by your district?________

Q-37 How many assistant superintendents are employed by your district?________

Q-38 Is your school district a part of or adjacent to a city with a population of 50,000 or more?

1 YES  
2 NO  
3 NOT SURE

Is there anything else you would like to express regarding the kinds of political involvement you have used. If so, please use this space for that purpose.

Your contribution to this effort is very greatly appreciated. If you would like a summary of results, please print your name and address on the back of the return envelope (NOT on this questionnaire). I will see that you get it.
Appendix F

Letter of Solicitation to Participate in the Study
April 11, 1984

In recent years the role of the state legislature in educational policy making has become increasingly visible and significant. The rising cost of education and pressure to shift the responsibility of financing quality education are just two items the legislature and school officials have to consider. The need for school superintendents to take an active role in influencing the state legislature is more important today than ever before.

You are one of a small number of superintendents being asked to give their opinion on political involvement with the state legislature. Your name was drawn in a random sample of the entire state. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of the superintendents in Michigan, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

This study has the endorsement of Don Elliott, Executive Director of the Michigan Association of School Administrators. Mr. Elliott stated,

I have endorsed this study, believing it will assist M.A.S.A.'s continuing efforts to become more influential in the educational policy-making process in the Michigan Legislature.

The results of this research will be made available to M.A.S.A. and all interested superintendents. You may receive a summary of results by writing your name and address on the back of the return envelope.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.
Gary Allen, Ed.S.
Project Director
Appendix G

Reminder Postcard
April 20, 1984

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about your political involvement with the state legislature was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a random sample of public school superintendents in Michigan.

If you have already completed and returned it to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of Michigan superintendents, it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of Michigan superintendents.

Sincerely,

Gary Allen
Project Director
Appendix H

Follow-Up Letter
May 2, 1984

About three weeks ago we wrote to you seeking feedback regarding your political involvement with the state legislature. As of today we have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

Our research unit has undertaken this study because of the belief that a better understanding of political involvement by educational leaders may help further Michigan public education.

We are writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. Your name was drawn through a scientific sampling process in which every public school superintendent has an equal chance of being selected. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the opinions of all Michigan superintendents it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

In the event your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.                          Gary Allen, Ed.S.
                                                Project Director
Appendix I

Follow-Up Certified Letter
May 24, 1984

We are writing to you about our study of superintendents' political involvement with the state legislature. We have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

The large number of questionnaires returned is very encouraging. But, whether we will be able to describe accurately how superintendents work with the state legislature depends upon you and the others who have not yet responded. This is because our past experiences suggest that those of you who have not yet sent in your questionnaire may hold quite different views regarding political involvement than those who have.

The results of this study are of particular importance to many superintendents, other educators, and lawmakers now considering the direction of education in Michigan. The usefulness of our results depends on how accurately we are able to describe how superintendents deal with the state legislature.

It is for this reason that we are sending this by certified mail to insure delivery. In case our other correspondence did not reach you, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. May we urge you to complete and return it as quickly as possible.

We'll be happy to send you a copy of the results if you want one. Simply put your name and address on the back of the return envelope. We expect to have them ready to send early next fall.

Your contribution to the success of this study will be appreciated greatly.

Most sincerely,

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.                         Gary Allen, Ed.S.
Project Director

COPY
Appendix J

Superintendents' Responses Regarding the Most Effective Type of Political Participation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of participation deemed most effective</th>
<th>Number of superintendents</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response or multiple responses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attempt to persuade other community members to vote a particular way</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Involvement in party work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attend political meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contribute time to a candidate's campaign or a campaign issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contribute money to a candidate's campaign or a campaign issue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Be an active member in local organization(s)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop &quot;grassroots&quot; lobbying groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Train community members in lobbying techniques</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Social contact with members of the community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social contacts within the district with state governmental officials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social contacts while away from the school district with state governmental official(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Invite state governmental official(s) to school district events</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Development of long term relationship with state legislative members</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of participation deemed most effective</td>
<td>Number of superintendents</td>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Supply information or research data to members of the state legislature</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Testify at legislative hearings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Form coalitions with other interest groups outside the community</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Hire a lobbyist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Vote in elections</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total does not equal 100% due to rounding.
Appendix K

Location by County of School Districts Represented by Responding Superintendents
Location by county of the school districts represented in this study. The total of all counties exceeds 214 (the number of respondents) because 26 school districts were a part of two or more counties.
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