

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-29,744

McCONNELL, Lawrence F., 1932-
A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ON
THE MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS OF SELECTED
MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1973
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
ON THE MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS OF
SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL
DISTRICTS

By

Lawrence F. McConnell

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1973

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ON THE MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS OF SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Lawrence F. McConnell

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the similarities and differences in the perceptions of school superintendents, secondary principals and elementary principals concerning the influence of administrative collective bargaining on the management functions of Michigan school districts in which collective bargaining is being practiced. The management functions considered in this study are divided into four main sections: (1) Decision-making and Involvement; (2) Accountability; (3) Communications, and (4) Structure.

Methodology

The data for this study were obtained from principals and superintendents, in fourteen Michigan public school districts, who had personal experience with administrative bargaining agreements. All respondents were asked to answer fifty-one identical questions.

The superintendents were asked to answer each question twice, once as it applied to elementary principals and again as it related to secondary principals. Responses from each school district were treated separately in order to assure independence of the data. The F test was employed to analyze the variability of school mean scores.

Major Findings

This study reveals that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary principals, secondary principals and superintendents concerning the effects of negotiations on the principal's decision-making authority and involvement in administrative decision, his accountability for the instructional program and general management of his assigned building or his communication to and from the superintendent. Further, the data support the theory that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of the principals and superintendents concerning any change in structure of the administrative organization resulting from management bargaining.

Responses related specifically to changes in the principal's system-wide responsibilities, building authority, budget control, salary and benefits and involvement in preparation for and the process of teacher negotiations showed no pattern of divergence

between perceptions of elementary principals and secondary principals, nor secondary principals and superintendents. The only category which showed any difference in the perception of change, resulting from management bargaining, between the elementary principals and superintendents was the area of principals' salary and benefits. The elementary principals saw the results of bargaining as being significantly more beneficial to elementary principals than did the superintendents. This difference, however, is only a matter of degree, as further analysis of the data reveals that both categories viewed the effects as being positive.

All administrator categories perceived significant changes in the management functions of school districts as a result of administrative bargaining and these changes are in a positive direction, indicating increases or improvements in the situation or condition considered in this study. The superintendents and principals concurred that significant increases had taken place in the degree to which principals are held accountable for the management of their schools and staffs. Elementary and secondary principals agreed that there were significant changes in the principal's decision-making authority and involvement in administrative decisions as well as structural changes in the administrative organization.

Superintendents' responses differed when answering in relation to elementary principals or secondary principals. Superintendents perceived administrative bargaining as resulting in an increase of involvement of elementary principals in decision-making, while they did not perceive this as resulting in any significant increase in the secondary principal's involvement. The superintendents perceived the effects of negotiations by administrators as producing no structural change as the superintendent relates to the secondary principal, but as having a positive structural change as the superintendent and elementary principal understand each other's role and position in the organizational structure. Finally, all categories of respondents agreed that administrative bargaining produced no significant change in communication between and among the board of education, superintendent and principal. Elementary and secondary principals perceived an increase in involvement in decision-making for themselves, yet the superintendent did not view bargaining as affecting secondary principals this way. Consequently, in the perceptions of the superintendents included in this study, elementary principals realized more benefits, in terms of decision-making involvement than did secondary principals.

Only secondary principals see a significant increase in their system-wide responsibilities.

Superintendents did not perceive any significant change for either secondary or elementary principals in this category. Elementary principals saw no change in their role related to system-wide responsibilities. All categories of respondents perceived significant increases in the principal's authority to administer his building, his involvement in budget development and budget administration, and his salary and benefits in relation to teachers' salaries and benefits. This latter category showed the greatest degree of change, with the significance levels ranging from .001 to .01.

In summary, principals and superintendents included in this study generally concurred that administrative collective bargaining did influence the management practices of the school district and that these changes were for the better. Superintendents and principals, alike, saw increases in the principal's involvement in administrative decisions, as well as the degree to which he is held accountable for his area of administrative responsibility. Surprisingly, the section dealing with changes in communications among and between the superintendent, principal and board of education was the only area for which no significant change was perceived by any category of respondent.

A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
ON THE MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS OF
SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL
DISTRICTS

By

Lawrence F. McConnell

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many persons have helped to make this dissertation possible. Dr. Howard Hickey, my committee chairman and friend, has provided wise counsel and valuable encouragement throughout my studies. The writer is also indebted to Dr. Clyde Campbell who served as a constant source of motivation during my doctoral program. Acknowledgments are also due to the Mott Foundation for providing the financial assistance necessary for the writer to complete this project and to Mr. James Maas, whose assistance in the statistical development of this study was invaluable.

Finally, my appreciation to my wife, Suzie, and our six children, without whose constant understanding, encouragement and patience this study would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Purpose.	9
Scope and Limitations	10
Definition of Terms.	10
Hypotheses.	11
Summary and Overview	12
II. SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Historical and Legal Background.	14
Negotiations Setting in the State of Michigan	20
The Principal and Teacher Negotiations	26
The Principal-Management Team vs. Administrative Negotiations	35
Summary	43
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.	45
Introduction	45
Source of the Data	45
Instrumentation	48
Analysis	51
Summary	52
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	54
Instrument Administration.	54
Statistical Procedure	54
Presentation and Analysis of Data	55
Summary	75
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	76
Summary	76
Conclusions	78
Implications of the Study.	86
Recommendations for Future Research	87

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	89
APPENDICES	
Appendix	
A. List of Management Functions From Which Questionnaire Statements Were Developed .	94
B. Cover Letter and Principals' Questionnaire .	101
C. Superintendent Questionnaire	110

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	F-test Results for the Differences in the Mean Scores of Elementary Principals and Superintendents in Each of the Four Sections and the Total Questionnaire . . .	56
2.	F-test Results for the Differences in the Mean Scores of Elementary Principals and Secondary Principals on Each of the Four Subsections and the Total Questionnaire . .	57
3.	F-test Results for the Differences in the Mean Scores of Secondary Principals and Superintendents on Each of the Four Subsections and the Total Questionnaire . . .	58
4.	F-test Results for Elementary Principals and Secondary Principals' Responses on Subscales of Section I Concerning Decision Making and Involvement.	59
5.	F-test Results of Elementary Principals' and Superintendents' Responses on Subscales of Section I Concerning Decision Making and Involvement	60
6.	F-test Results of Secondary Principals' and Superintendents' Responses on Subscale of Section I Concerning Decision Making and Involvement	61
7.	F-test Results for the Difference from Three of the Mean Scores of Elementary Principals on Each of the Four Sections and the Total Questionnaire.	62
8.	F-test Results for the Difference from Three of the Mean Scores of Secondary Principals on Each of the Four Sections and the Total Questionnaire.	63

Table	Page
9. F-test Results for the Difference from Three of the Mean Scores of Superintendents' Responses as They Perceive Elementary Principals on Each of the Four Sections and the Total Questionnaire	63
10. F-test Results for the Difference from Three of the Mean Scores of Superintendents' Responses as They Perceive Secondary Principals on Each of the Four Subsections and the Total Questionnaire	64
11. F-test Results for the Differences from Three of the Mean Scores of Elementary Principals on Subscales of Section I, Decision-Making and Involvement	65
12. F-test Results for the Difference from Three of the Mean Scores of Secondary Principals on Subscales of Section I, Decision-Making and Involvement	65
13. F-test Results for the Differences from Three of the Mean Scores of Superintendents' Responses as the Questionnaire Relates to Elementary Principals on Subscales of Section I, Decision-Making and Involvement	66
14. F-test Results for the Differences from Three of the Mean Scores of Superintendents' Responses as the Questionnaire Relates to Secondary Principals on Subscales of Section I, Decision-Making and Involvement	66
15. Frequency Distribution of Responses Concerning General Effects of Administrative Bargaining on School Districts	68
16. Frequency Distribution of Responses Concerning the Practice of Management Team Principles	69
17. Statements for Which Greater than 70 Per Cent of Each Category of Respondents Indicated No Change	70
18. Statements for Which Greater than 50 Per Cent of Each Category of Respondents Indicated Change	71

Table	Page
19. F-test Results of Dichotomized Data Relating Mean Score of Responses to Statement 29 (Accountability) to Mean Score of Responses to Statements 5, 7, 10, 11, 14 and 20 (Decision-Making and Involvement) .	72
20. F-test Results of Dichotomized Data Relating Mean Scores of Responses to Statement 31 (Accountability) to Mean Scores of Responses to Statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 18 (Decision-Making and Involvement) . . .	73
21. F-test Results of Dichotomized Data Relating Mean Scores of Responses to Statement 50 (Structure) to Mean Scores of Responses to Statements 6 and 8 (Decision-Making and Involvement) and Statement 42 (Communication).	74
22. F-test Results of Dichotomized Data Relating Mean Scores of Responses for Statement 48 (Structure) to Mean Score Responses for Statements 38, 39 and 43 (Communications).	75

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In 1965 the Michigan State Legislature passed Public Act 379, which established the right of public employees to collectively bargain with their employers. One significant consequence of this legislation has been a redefinition of the relationships among boards of education, superintendents, administrative staff personnel and the instructional staffs within the public school sector. The advent of teacher collective bargaining with boards of education disrupted the traditional role of school administrators as being official spokesmen for the interest of teachers. By collective bargaining, teachers found a method of representing themselves and their interest directly to the board of education.

The first thrust of teacher negotiations was directed at salary and working condition improvements. Once significant gains had been established in those domains, such hallowed management functions as teacher assignments and transfers, pupil supervision and evaluation became legitimate and frequent topics of

negotiation between the teachers' representatives and the representatives of the board of education.

Spokesmen for teacher unions in Michigan have been very open in defining their ultimate goal as that of control over the educational system. This objective was the topic of a presentation by Richard Neal, Executive Secretary, National Association of Educational Negotiators. Neal predicted that teacher unions would strive for control of public education by gaining concessions from local boards in such areas as administrative rules and regulations, through clauses defining maintenance of standards and past practices, academic freedom, teacher certification, transfer, evaluation, promotions, dismissals and recruitment practices.¹

It became readily apparent that teachers' demands and subsequent concessions made by the board at the negotiating table would encroach upon areas previously considered exclusively management prerogatives. Lester Anderson views the impact of teacher negotiations on administrators as follows:

As a result of the end-run made by teachers, confusion was created within the administrative staff with respect to their authority and the role required for their positions. Board members and administrators

¹Speech by Richard Neal, Annual Fall Conference of Michigan Negotiations Association, Pontiac, Michigan, October 1 and 2, 1970.

had not generally anticipated their changing roles under collective bargaining, and it was too late to do it while bargaining was in session.²

Teacher negotiations place the principal in a position of isolation. He was prohibited by law from serving with the teachers in formulating their demands for bargaining and in many instances he was not consulted concerning the formulation of board of education bargaining positions, policies and guidelines. He, thus, frequently found himself responsible for the administration of a negotiated agreement over which he had no influence. The net result, in many cases, was that concessions were made at the negotiating table which influenced the function of the principal, either by restricting his authority to administer his building and/or changing his scope of responsibility. The resultant reaction of the principals was to seek methods to become more involved in the process of policy formulation and decision making in policies which affect their professional roles.

At the 1970 National Association of Elementary School Principals Convention, Joseph Formica, Executive Secretary of the Connecticut Elementary School Principals Association, stated, "School boards continually negotiate

²Lester W. Anderson, "Management Team Concept," Michigan School Board Journal, XVII (March, 1969), 7-9, 23.

teacher demands without consulting their middle management personnel, the principals, and they usually wind up giving away the kitchen sink."³

The undertone of this convention was that the elementary school principal was not accepted as a full administrator by either the local board or central administrators. Suggestions for solving this dilemma ranged from demanding representation on the board of education negotiating teams, which develop written agreements with teacher organization, to the establishment of separate bargaining units representing the interest of middle management exclusively.

As a result of his research in the field of participatory management, Murray Adams concludes:

In the educational hierarchy, the office of the principal was the first to be threatened by teacher contracts. The adversary relationship between teachers and administrators which collective bargaining has fostered, bewilder and frustrate principals. They perceive themselves as being suspect by their staff and as being outside the coterie of the central office and the bargaining team for the board. The literature in this area from 1966 to the present emphasizes the principal as the "forgotten man" or the "man in the middle." This change in the collective attitude of teachers created a growing concern among principals that the right of teachers to negotiate wages, hours and working conditions was eroding their authority and was forcing them to operate with a handicap.⁴

³Eric Rhodes, ed., Educators Negotiating Service, XVI (August 1, 1970), 3.

⁴Murray Adams, "A House Divided," Michigan School Board Journal, XVIII (July, 1971), 21-22, 25.

To relieve the "man in the middle" syndrome, two movements developed within school districts in the state of Michigan. One was the organization of school administrators into collective bargaining units. The legality of such an organization was established by means of the Hillsdale case in 1968. In this case, the Michigan Employment Relations Commission ruled that school supervisors and administrators below the position of superintendent have the right to organize and form bargaining units. This decision was appealed to the Michigan Appellant Court which upheld the decision of the Commission.⁵

The first Michigan school administrators organization was officially recognized in January of 1969 in the Lakeshore School District. At the time of this writing, there are thirty-four Michigan school districts in which administrative bargaining units have been officially recognized by their boards of education.⁶

The concurrent movement, fostering voluntary involvement of all administrators in decisions affecting

⁵Decision and Order in the Matter of Hillsdale Community Schools (employer) and Hillsdale Community School Principals and Supervisory Association (petitioner) and the Michigan Education Association (special intervenor) (December, 1968).

⁶Edward Keller, Executive Secretary of Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals, personal interview (October 5, 1972).

them, was termed the Management Team Concept. Adams defines this concept as follows:

Involvement of subordinates in the decision-making process in matters which affect them, a formal organizational structure which provides an avenue for subordinates to participate in the resolution of problems confronting management, free and open communication among subordinates and with their superiors, and accountability of subordinates by giving them control over the factors which contribute to the operation of their programs.⁷

In February, 1971, the Michigan Association of School Administrators publication, Reflections, carried a front page announcement of statewide meetings sponsored jointly by the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB), Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA), Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP), Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP) and Michigan Congress of School Administrators (MCSA). The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the pros and cons of team management versus administrative negotiations. This publication stated the problem as follows:

Each school board faces an important question relative to the management function of the district. That question, simply stated, is "do we want to operate as a management team which includes all administrators in the local decision-making process

⁷ Murray Adams, "A Study of the Perceptions of Elementary Principals, Secondary Principals and Superintendents with Respect to the Practice of the Management Team Concept" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971), p. 15.

to include policy and procedures and salaries, or are these decisions to be negotiated with the administrative staff across the bargaining table?"⁸

In an effort to ascertain why the Management Team Concept was accepted as a suitable method of involvement for some administrators, while negotiations were pursued by other administrators; and further to determine if negotiations by administrators and participation in the Management Team Concept were in conflict, the Ethics and Management Relations Committee of MASB held intensive meetings for the purpose of trying to identify attributes of successful school management organizations and to identify circumstances surrounding the increasing utilization of formal negotiations by educational administrators. Practicing educational administrators, university specialists and private sector management personnel served as resource people to the committee.

The committee found that the four most common reasons cited for administrators considering it necessary to organize to bargain collectively were:

1. The unilateral behavior of the top administrative leadership.
2. Lack of meaningful involvement in decision making.
3. The relative success teachers have experienced in improving their salaries and working conditions.

⁸Michigan Association of School Administrators, Reflections, February, 1971.

4. The lack of a significant voice in matters of their own professional destiny.⁹

Three of these four reasons relate to lack of involvement, yet the committee reported that some administrators concluded that their organization into negotiating units removed them still further from the administrative decision-making process.

In the research conducted by Murray Adams relative to the perceptions of the superintendent, secondary principal and elementary principal concerning the perception of each about the degree of involvement of the principal in management functions, he found that the endorsement to the concept of a management team by many superintendents has been more of a verbal commitment than actual practice. The extent to which principals perceive their involvement is significantly less than the superintendents' perception of the principals' involvement.¹⁰ Adams' study dealt with those districts reportedly practicing the Management Team Concept.

Considering the two studies, Adams concluded that the Management Team Concept does not necessarily satisfy the principals' perceived need of involvement, and the

⁹C. Keith Grotz and David C. Smith, "Approaches to a Management Team--A Report of the Ethics and Management Relations Committee of MASB," Michigan School Board Journal, XVII, No. 7 (September, 1970), 8, 9.

¹⁰Adams, "Study of Perceptions," op. cit., p. 21.

MASB survey indicated that the foremost reason for administrators organizing into collective bargaining units was to affect their involvement in decisions which influence their role, responsibilities and authority. There is therefore a need to examine the influence collective bargaining by administrators has had on the involvement of principals in management decisions and the impact such organization has had upon communications, structure and principal accountability within the total management staff. Further, there is a need to examine the compatability of administrative collective bargaining and the practice of the Management Team Concept.

Purpose

This study is designed to measure the similarities and differences in the perception of school superintendents, secondary principals and elementary principals concerning the influence of administrative bargaining on the involvement of secondary and elementary principals in the management function of selected Michigan public school districts in which administrative bargaining is being practiced. The management functions considered are divided into four major areas: (1) Decision-making and Involvement; (2) Accountability; (3) Communications and (4) Structure.

Scope and Limitations

The study includes only those items deemed to be part of the management function of school administrators as identified by Murray Adams in a survey of representatives of the following organizations: MASSP, MAESP, MCSA, MSBA, MASA. The list of management functions is not necessarily inclusive.¹¹

All school districts which qualified according to the criteria established are included in the study. The validity of the findings rest upon the accuracy of those included to recall levels of involvement in management functions prior to the advent of bargaining and their assessment of the influence of bargaining as distinguished from other unaccounted for influences.

This study does not include administrators involved in the management of school districts, other than the superintendent and principals.

Definition of Terms

Management Team Concept.--Involvement of subordinates in the decision-making process in matters which affect them, a formal organizational structure which provides an avenue for subordinates to participate in the resolution of problems confronting management, free and open communication among subordinates and with their

¹¹Adams, "Study of Perceptions," op. cit., p. 130.

superiors and accountability of subordinates by giving them control over the factors which contribute to the operation of their programs.

Middle Management.--Administrative or supervisory personnel excluding the superintendent and the assistant superintendents.

Perception.--An intuitive cognition or judgment.

Secondary School Principal.--Administrative head of a school building or complex to which students in any or all grades 5 through 12, exclusively, are assigned.

Elementary School Principal.--Administrative head of a school building or complex to which student in any or all of grades kindergarten through 6, exclusively, are assigned.

Hypotheses

This study will test four primary hypotheses:

Hypothesis A:

There is no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary school principals as compared to the perceptions of the superintendent of schools with respect to the influence of administrative collective bargaining on management functions.

Hypothesis B:

There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the elementary school principals as compared to the perceptions of the secondary school principals with respect to the influence of administrative collective bargaining on management functions.

Hypothesis C:

There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the secondary school principals as compared to the perceptions of the superintendent of schools with respect to the influence of administrative collective bargaining on management functions.

Hypothesis D:

The process of administrative collective bargaining has had no significant effect upon management functions as perceived by superintendents and school principals.

Summary and Overview

The influence of the formation of administrative bargaining units on the management of school districts is a matter of concern, not only to boards of education, but also to middle management personnel included in such units. The need for such organization is said to develop as a result of lack of involvement of administrators in decisions which influence them and their roles within the organization.

The writer will attempt to ascertain whether the process of administrative bargaining has affected the involvement of and communication with administrators within bargaining units.

The review of the literature will investigate the historical and legal developments of collective bargaining in the field of public education. The review will further investigate the effects of teacher negotiations on the role, responsibilities and authority of the principal. And finally the writer will explore the literature concerning two possible options open to principals--management team participation or administrative bargaining.

The remaining chapters will describe the design of the study and present and analyze the data. This will be followed by the concluding chapter in which a summary of the findings, recommendations and conclusions will be made.

CHAPTER II

SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This is a selected review of the literature related to collective bargaining in the field of education. The first section presents a brief historical and legal background of the development of collective bargaining, first in the private sector and then in the public sector. The second section focuses on the emergence of bargaining in the state of Michigan, with particular focus on the formation of administrative bargaining units. The following sections summarize the current research and literature on the effects of teacher bargaining on the role of the principal and the factors which foster the management team approach to administration of school districts as opposed to the formation of administrative collective bargaining.

Historical and Legal Background

By the year 1932, most courts had accepted the view that employees in the private sector could combine for purposes of negotiating. The employer, however, had the right to fire an employee for joining a union.

Further, the courts tended to rule that union tactics such as boycotts, strikes or even picketing were illegal.¹

In that year, passage of the Norris-LaGuadia Act reflected a laissez-faire philosophy on the part of the federal government concerning employment relations in the private sector. The main effect of this act was to deprive the federal courts of jurisdiction in most labor disputes.²

In the following year (1933) the Congress passed the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) in an effort to cope with the great depression. Section 7 (a) of the Act included a forthright endorsement of collective bargaining, but it contained no effective penalties for noncompliance. The National Labor Board, established to settle disputes, had little effect because it had no authority to penalize employers for unfair labor practices.³

The period of 1932 through 1935 was one marked by intense industrial conflict and instability in

¹Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moscow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966), p. 65.

²Ibid., p. 66.

³Herbert R. Northrup and Gordon F. Bloom, Government and Labor (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1963), pp. 46-47.

labor-management relations. It was in this setting that the National Labor Relations Act, more commonly known as the Wagner Act, was passed by Congress in 1935. The Wagner Act is considered to be one of the most significant labor laws ever enacted in the United States.

According to Lieberman and Moscow,⁴ in effect Congress' passage of this act said that, because of the great disparity of power between the individual employee and his employer, government could no longer remain neutral between them. Congress considered it necessary to limit employers' rights to oppose the employee's organization into bargaining units. The Wagner Act strongly encouraged collective bargaining and constituted a fundamental turning point in public policy concerning labor relations. In legal theory, many of the rights accorded employees under the Wagner Act were not new; however, this Act provided enforcement of the employee rights by appropriate administrative measures and legal sanctions. Another area of controversy settled was that of right to representation. Election of employee representation replaced the strike as a device for gaining recognition by the employee.⁵

⁴Lieberman and Moscow, op. cit., p. 69.

⁵Ibid., pp. 68-70.

By 1947 the public attitude and that of Congress toward unions had changed considerably. There had developed a widespread concern that the balance of power had swung too far in the unions' favor. As a result of this public concern, Congress passed the Taft Hartley Act in June, 1947, which, along with other provisions limiting union influence, guaranteed employees the right to refrain from union participation. The Taft-Hartley Act was designed to protect the individual employee and union member from certain union practices and to shift the balance of power between union and employer to a more equitable division of power.

The legislation cited has applied to individuals and organizations associated with interstate commerce. Since school boards are subdivisions of state government, school employees are employees of a political subdivision of the state. Consequently, school employees are excluded from the coverage of this Federal legislation. However, the development of collective bargaining in the private sector has had a significant influence on bargaining in the public sector.

The idea that public employees should have the same rights to bargain for their wages, hours and working conditions has just recently become an accepted fact. Probably the greatest stimulant to the formation of

public employee bargaining resulted from Executive Order 10988, issued by President Kennedy on January 17, 1962.

This order was a result of the report of a special task force appointed to study and make recommendations with regard to employee-management relationships in the federal service.

According to William B. Voslou, this order was the first government-wide official policy on collective employee representation. It spelled out clearly the right of employees to organize, to have their organization accorded official recognition and, under specific conditions, to negotiate agreements with agency management on working conditions.⁶

Isolated examples of public employee bargaining agreements existed prior to the 1960's. As early as 1937 the city of Philadelphia had entered into a bilateral agreement with a labor organization representing its employees.⁷ Other governmental units could be cited which had developed bargaining procedures with employee groups before the 1960's. However, in 1960 not one state had authorized collective negotiations in public education by statute. Because of Executive Order 10988

⁶William B. Voslou, Collective Bargaining in the U.S. Federal Service (Chicago, Ill.: Public Personnel Assn., 1966), p. 2.

⁷Lieberman and Moscow, op. cit., p. 84.

and the subsequent press by public employee groups to be recognized for bargaining purposes, collective bargaining began to arrive de facto, if not de jure, and state legislatures began the process of legalizing public negotiations by passage of acts defining the relationship of employee organizations to school boards.⁸

By 1966 legislative authority permitting or requiring collective negotiations had been introduced in one-third of the states, including most of the heavily populated ones.⁹ In some instances separate statutes regulated boards of education--school employee negotiations exclusively, as in the states of Connecticut and Rhode Island. In other cases such as Michigan and Wisconsin, school employees are covered by broad legislation regulating all state and local public employment.¹⁰ Thus, a body of laws governing public employee bargaining began to build up which paralleled the early developments leading to the Wagner Act of 1935 and the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, which were the foundation for the recognition of unions in the private sector.

⁸Edward B. Shils and Taylor C. Whittier, Teachers, Administration and Collective Bargaining (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968), p. 93.

⁹Lieberman and Moscow, op. cit., p. 387.

¹⁰Arvid Anderson, "State Regulation of Employment Regulations in Education," in Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, ed. by Stanley Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael Moscow (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968), Ch. 1 and 11, pp. 103-12.

Negotiations Setting in the
State of Michigan

In the state of Michigan, the Hutchinson Act of 1947 set the guidelines, statutes and machinery for collective bargaining in the private sector and public utilities. Public Act 379, passed in 1965, amended the Hutchinson Act and extended the rights of public employees to organize for the purpose of collective negotiations. This act placed a mandate upon public employers to recognize employee bargaining units and to enter into collective negotiations at the request of a duly organized unit.

The result of Act 379 in Michigan was an immediate response by public employees, particularly in public schools, to organize. According to a Michigan State Labor Mediation Board Report, approximately 99 per cent of the public education employers voted to organize collective bargaining units subsequent to passage of PA379. This number was reportedly double the vote for the private employment sector of our working population.¹¹

The question of unit determination and community of interest quickly became an issue in Michigan, as it did in other states following the enactment of public

¹¹ Robert Pisasski, member of Michigan State Labor Mediation Board, in a speech given to the Oakland County School Board Association, at Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, March, 1966.

employee bargaining legislation. The most difficult question, according to Lieberman¹² was the question of inclusion (or exclusion) of various levels of administrative personnel. This was in no way an unexpected hurdle, as unit determinations outside education are also characterized by much controversy.

Actual unit determinations concerning administrators vary. Three major sources of unit determination exist. They are State laws, State Employment and Labor Relations Boards and school boards.¹³

In Oregon and Washington, administrative personnel are included by law and there is no alternative except individual representation (in Oregon), while in Connecticut the unit includes everyone below the rank of superintendent, but a majority of the personnel voting in either the teacher-special service category, or the administrative-supervisory category, can require administrative personnel to be excluded from the basic teacher unit.

In Massachusetts, Michigan and Wisconsin, unit determinations are made by the state labor relations boards. The Wisconsin Employment Relations Board (WERB) has included teaching principals in a negotiating unit

¹²Lieberman and Moscow, op. cit., p. 154.

¹³Ibid., pp. 158-61.

of classroom teachers if the principal was involved in teaching 50 per cent of his time. Principals, assistant principals and other administrative and advisory personnel were excluded from bargaining units of classroom teachers.

School board determinations vary widely. In some instances, superintendents have been included in the bargaining unit, when the determination was made by the school board. However, such rulings have since been superseded by law. Where outside sources, such as labor relations experts and attorneys, have been used by school boards, determinations have usually excluded administrative personnel in teachers' bargaining units.

In Michigan, the Public Employment Relations Act (PERA) does not specifically exclude individuals employed as executives or supervisors from its coverage. However, particular sections of PERA incorporate, by reference, provisions of the Labor Relations and Mediation Act (LRMA). The LRMA does specifically exclude individuals employed as executives or supervisors from its coverage. Section 2(e) of LRMA defines employee for purposes of this act to include: "--any employee--but shall not include any individual employed as an executive or supervisor."¹⁴

¹⁴ Research Committee of the Michigan Congress of School Administrators, A Survey of Administrative Bargaining Units in Michigan Public Schools, September, 1971, p. 1.

The question of the legality of school administrators in Michigan organizing to bargain centered around the relationship of the LRMA as it relates to the PERA. Those who opposed administrative bargaining maintained that, when the two acts are read in conjunction, administrative bargaining is clearly prohibited.

The conflict emerges from the relationship of section 13 PERA and Section 9(e) of LRMA. Section 13 (PERA) provides in part:

The board shall decide in each case, in order to insure public employees the full benefit of their right to self-organization, to collective bargaining and otherwise to effectuate the policies of this act, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining as provided in Section 9 of Act 176 of the Public Acts of 1939.¹⁵

Section 9(e) of LRMA in part provides:

The board, after consultation with the parties, shall determine such a bargaining unit as will best secure to the employees their right of collective bargaining. The unit shall be either the employees of one employer employed in one plant or business enterprise within this state not holding executive or supervisory positions, or a craft unit, or a plant unit, or a subdivision of the foregoing units . . . ¹⁶

It is the express incorporation of Section 9(e) of LRMA into PERA which caused the conflict.

The Saginaw County Road Commission, 1967 Labor Opinion 196, first dealt with the issue of the right of supervisory personnel in the public sector to bargain. The Michigan Labor Mediation Board held that a bargaining

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁶ Ibid.

unit of foremen employed by the Saginaw County Road Commission was an appropriate collective bargaining unit entitled to all benefits provided by the PERA.

The issue of the right of school administrators to bargain collectively was tested when the Hillsdale Community Schools Principals and Supervisory Association (PSA) petitioned the Board for a recognition election for a unit composed of the following:

High school, junior high and elementary principals, curriculum coordinator, reading coordinator, ESSA coordinator, cooperative education coordinator, head librarian and physical education director; excluding teachers, superintendent, assistant superintendent, business manager and all non-certified employees.¹⁷

The Hillsdale Board of Education opposed the petition on the grounds that executive and supervisory personnel have no rights to collectively bargain under PERA; the proposed unit was inappropriate because the principals supervised the staff specialists in the proposed unit; and since the PSA was affiliated with the Michigan Education Association (MEA), it would be an inappropriate unit because the parent organization (MEA) represents the teachers. The Labor Mediation Board upheld the earlier Saginaw County Road Commission decision, granting exclusive representation to PSA. The Board held that there existed a sufficient community of interest between staff specialists and the principals to constitute a bargaining unit.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 4.

This case was appealed to the Michigan Court of Appeals. The Appeals Court affirmed the Board's earlier decision allowing public supervisory employees to bargain collectively.

In a similar case before the MLRB, the Board held that executive employees were not included under the provisions of PERA. In its decision in City of Detroit and Governmental Accounts and Analysis Association,¹⁸ the Board held that including executives in collective bargaining units would defeat the primary purpose of PERA. The Board held that executive employees are so intrinsically connected with the determination of policy that their engagement in concerted activities could damage, not enhance, the statutory purpose. The Board, in this decision, cited a line of demarcation between "managerial employees and employees who, although they may be supervisory, are not primarily creators of policy which affects the total activities of an employer or of a major division or department thereof.

As of this writing, legislation requiring or permitting public employee negotiations has not yet been enacted in all states. However, the pressure for such laws is growing as a result of the gains in salary and improved working conditions made by teachers in states where bargaining exists. The right of

¹⁸MLRB decision 187, 1969.

administrators, below the level of assistant superintendent, to bargain collectively has also been established in those states permitting or requiring public employee bargaining. There are variations in the method of administrative representation, but the most common approval appears to be the formation of separate units representing middle management administrators exclusively.

The Principal and Teacher Negotiations

Many of the collective bargaining demands of teachers can be satisfied only through gaining a share of the power now held by principals and other administrators. According to Benjamin Epstein¹⁹ most negotiations in the first stage of development and most agreements which emerged from initial bargaining were concerned primarily or exclusively with salary problems and related compensation for teachers. They dealt with salaries, increments, medical and hospital insurance, rate of payment for extra assignments and other monetary considerations. But the second and third generation of teacher negotiations and agreements were no longer so simple or narrow in scope. Agreements are now long and elaborate documents covering a wide range of items such as school funding procedures, staff recruitment, selection and

¹⁹ Benjamin Epstein, "What Is Negotiable," Professional Negotiations Pamphlet No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 16th Street, N.W., 1969), pp. 3, 4.

placement, curriculum, supervision, evaluation and sometimes even such intangible items as academic freedom.

Such agreements have the obvious effect of diminishing administrative prerogative and determination--narrowing the range of the decision-making powers of administrators.

The thrust of teacher bargaining groups has been made clear by both the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The 1968 summer issue of IDEA,²⁰ published by the Kettering Foundation carried parallel interviews with NEA spokesmen Allen West and AFT President Charles Cogen. West presented the NEA position as follows: "We take a position that everything that affects the quality of education is negotiable." He went on to state that teachers would no longer be satisfied with participation in policy and curriculum development through administration selected teachers. Teachers would determine their own spokesmen as a result of bargaining. Cogen voiced a similar position for the AFT. He stated: "There is no limit to how far we'll go. We claim our jurisdiction is as extensive as the total area of education."

²⁰IDEA, Publication of the Kettering Foundation, (Dayton, Ohio), Summer, 1968.

In a speech before the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals held in Detroit, December, 1966, Benjamin Epstein said:

The entire relationship between principal and staff which has existed for many years is being changed. Principals have begun to be in conflict with superintendents and school boards, who they feel are too easily permitting too much of their (the principals') needed authority to be taken away from them during negotiations in which simultaneously their (the principals') responsibilities are being increased.²¹

Epstein held that principals feel this conflict chiefly because they are excluded from the bargaining process even though the principals' functions and activities were constantly a topic of negotiations between the board and teachers. He stated as follows:

When representatives of teacher organizations sit at the bargaining table with the superintendent and members of the board of education, a considerable portion of items they deal with, impinge upon, and seriously affect the responsibilities, powers, decision making functions, and possibly almost every prerogative that principals have in relationship to the staffs they are required to supervise.²²

Shils and Whittier support Epstein's views on the influence of teacher bargaining on the principal's role, authority and responsibility. They conclude the following:

²¹Benjamin Epstein, "A Principal Does Some Soul-Searching in the New Era of Collective Negotiations," A speech given at the MASSP Convention, Detroit, Michigan, December 1, 1966, p. 5.

²²Ibid., p. 6.

Obviously, the principals' prerogatives have been under fire and gradually whittled down by teacher negotiations. Too many districts have ignored principals and have not permitted them to participate or even to be consulted during the process of negotiations. Often principals are the last to learn about what happened at the bargaining table. The teachers are better informed and drop into the principal's office and tell him about their new rights. Without adequate representation of the principals on the negotiating team, items are negotiated which might make it impossible for the principal to do his job.²³

Terrance Hatch,²⁴ Professor of Educational Administration at Utah State, supports the views of Epstein, stating that the principal operates from a base which is not legally legislated and one which is somewhat powerless. He maintains that the principal has been stripped of much of his leadership role by central administration and is removed from the decision-making center of the school operation as a result of negotiations concessions made to teachers by boards of education.

In the same publication, Luntz sees the principal's role in the communications network of the school system weakened by negotiations. His views are as follows:

The "leadership" role in the light of reality of the distribution of power among the teachers, school boards and superintendents, and the prescribed role

²³Shils and Whittier, op. cit., p. 534.

²⁴Terrance E. Hatch, "The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations," Bulletin of the NASSP, LV, No. 359 (December, 1971), 26-39.

of the principal in the school bureaucracy, is an unrealistic one. Many teachers realize that, although their building principal functions in the formal organization as the communications link in the line between themselves and the central administration, they can more readily achieve their goals via the informal communications channels maintained among teacher organization leaders, chief administrators and board members. This is especially true in school districts where, in their rush to mollify teacher militancy, superintendents maintain an "opendoor" and board members an "open telephone line." In situations where blatant dysfunction of the formal organization exists, teachers perceive the principal as being in a position to provide only tentative decisions pending approval of higher-ups, at best. When such relationships exist, teachers soon find it more fruitful to by-pass the principal completely--or engage in a mock and/or courteous interaction.²⁵

Taking the opposite view point, Lieberman and Moscow disagree that it is a goal of the teacher unions to assume management of school districts. They summarize their opinion as follows:

Many administrators and school boards have a fear that teachers want to "take over the system," and that collective negotiations are the opening wedge in this effort. Although there may be individual teachers or organization leaders who have this objective, this fear is usually not warranted.

To the extent that a teacher organization becomes involved in day-to-day administration, it is losing its reason for existence. The organization has a protective function. That is, it is supposed to ensure that certain administrative actions are performed equitably and efficiently. The organization cannot serve this protective function by assuming these administrative responsibilities itself. If it does, who is then available to ensure that the organization performs these actions in the desired manner? It is naive to contend that the teachers need an organization to protect them from the administration, but not from

²⁵Robert Luntz, "Grievances and Their Resolutions," Bulletin of the NASSP, LV, No. 359 (December, 1971).

the organization when it exercises administrative functions. Actually, teachers may need protection from both the administration and the organization, a possibility which deserves more attention than it has received thus far.

In private employment unions typically do not manage and do not want to manage. Where they do, the cause is weak and inefficient management more often than it is power-hungry unions. One may question the relevance of private employment to public education, but for whatever value it has, experience in the private sector clearly indicates that employee organizations do not "take over" under collective negotiations. Given the additional obstacles involved, they are even less likely to do so in public education.²⁶

The conflict caused principals by teacher negotiations is brought into focus by Allen and Schmidt.²⁷ They itemized seven areas of conflict directly related to teacher bargaining.

1. The principal has usually had the prerogative of making teacher assignments to special or honors classes; now this is negotiable.
2. The principal has usually been responsible for making assignments to nonteaching duties; this is also negotiable.
3. Grievance procedures can be used to reflect on a principal's ability to administer a school; too many grievances, poor administrative ability.

²⁶Lieberman and Moscow, op. cit., pp. 240-41.

²⁷Roy Allen and John Schmidt, "Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration," UCEA and the College of Education of the University of Arkansas, 1966, p. 54.

4. If a principal loses a grievance, how can he save face with his staff, with the superintendent or with his board of education?
5. When the negotiations concern physical facilities and instructional materials in the school, who does the principal represent, teachers or board?
6. When the teacher agreement gives teachers the right to transfer, what is the position of the principal who sees requested transfers adversely affecting the school program?
7. What is the principal's position when he sees financial resources of the school being used to attract new teachers, at the expense of adequately compensating experienced teachers?

Areas of conflict caused by teacher negotiations range from the principal's need to protect his rights on the one hand, to continued representation of teacher interest as they influence the instructional program on the other.

According to Lieberman and Moscow,²⁸ collective negotiations by teachers does weaken the authority of line administrative personnel. It leads either to a more important role for certain staff or the exercise of line function by staff personnel. Prior to

²⁸Lieberman and Moscow, op. cit., p. 366.

negotiations, there were only administrative limits on the principal's discretion. Afterwards, there are limits set by the agreement. In addition, appeals of the principal's decisions are no longer made only to another line administrator, but may go to a staff person.

The dynamics of the bargaining process tend to lead to system-wide rules according to Lieberman and Moscow,²⁹ thus further limiting the line administrator's discretion. If one principal's faculty meetings are longer than others, word gets around. Consequently, there is a press toward system-wide rules with a consequent decrease of the principal's authority. Before, during and after negotiations, there is a strong tendency for a staff person to be the focus of efforts to bring consistency out of decentralized line personnel.

In a survey of building principals, Cunningham³⁰ reported that principals perceived teacher negotiations as a search for power which would usurp the prerogatives of the building principal. He further stated that the spectre of two negotiating parties, neither one of which represents the principal, reaching accord by swapping

²⁹Ibid., p. 368.

³⁰Luvern L. Cunningham, "Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," in Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, ed. by Elam, Lieberman and Moscow (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1967), pp. 299-313.

such things as work rules that have been the principal's prerogatives until now is a source of increased frustration, if not panic, for the building administrator. Interviews with principals from districts now negotiating contracts revealed as much disillusionment and distrust with the superintendent's role as with the teachers organization.

Because the result of teacher negotiations has such a direct bearing upon the authority and responsibilities of the building principal, the degree of the principal's involvement in the establishment of administrative and board bargaining positions and the actual bargaining process has been the subject of many articles and much discussion.

Companion articles in the January, 1967, issue of the Michigan Elementary Principal³¹ were titled, "The Principal--Negotiator or Observer?" and "Principals On the Negotiating Team."³² The first article, authored by a board of education member, and the second, by a principal, agreed on the necessity of the principal's involvement in the preparation and process of negotiations on

³¹Jay Van Sweden, "The Principal--Negotiator or Observer?" The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXXI (January, 1967), 10.

³²Allen TenEyck, "Principals on the Negotiating Team," The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXXI (January, 1967), 11.

behalf of the board of education. This position was supported by David Sargent, former chairman of Wellesley, Massachusetts, School Committee in an article he wrote for the Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association Journal. Sargent declared:

Thus for the sake of educational excellence, the principal must jump into the collective bargaining melee. But perhaps of more importance to himself, if he does not, if he insists on neutrality, he may find his job whittled away as the teachers association on one hand and the school committee on the other take pieces of his responsibility to themselves. Such a process could in time leave the principal the chief clerk of the building, responsible for non-education routine and record keeping only.³³

The Principal-Management Team vs.
Administrative Negotiations

While there are factors which are particular to the reasons for specific groups of employees organizing into collective bargaining units, there are common conditions and circumstances present in most cases when employees select bargaining organizations to represent their salary, fringe benefits and working conditions interests. According to E. Wright Bakke, Professor of Economics at Yale University, the most important of these predispositions which precede bargaining are:

³³David Sargent, "The Man In Between," Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association Journal (reprinted), Michigan Elementary School Principal, XXXXIII (September-October, 1968), 14.

- 1) Social Products: Where the goods or services produced are social products in the sense that no one employee's contribution produces the whole. It is difficult to disentangle for personnel evaluations the value of any employee's contribution to the total process.
- 2) Impersonality of Relations: When an organization is large enough so that there are several strata of supervision between the employee and the decision-making employer, the problem is to find and get to the employer. The implication is that many persons cannot do this individually but it can be done by collectively focusing their search and dealings in an organizational representative.
- 3) Employers As An Organized Group: When the "employer" is in reality another group of organized employees (or agents) called "management," the implication is that an organized group is needed to deal with them. In the case of a school system, the school superintendent and the school board constitute an organized group of employees of the public.
- 4) Group Concerns and Personal Complaints: When an effort is made to present effectively the human and professional interests shared by the whole group some person has to speak up. Lacking the support of the united front of an organized group, this person is likely to be labeled a troublemaker, an agitator, disloyal and other terms scarcely designed to increase the person's job security.³⁴

It became apparent in Michigan, after the first formal agreements were reached between boards of education and teacher unions, that the conditions and circumstances leading to administrative bargaining units were developing. The literature left little doubt that two primary courses of action were open to middle management employees to resolve the conflicts in their roles, rights and responsibilities caused by teacher negotiations. The Detroit Free Press carried an article in December,

³⁴Rhodes, Educators Negotiating Service (November 15, 1970), 2.

1966, entitled, "School Principals Find New Law Puts Them in Limbo."³⁵ The writer expressed his opinion that the principals in Michigan did not know where they belonged or whom they should represent and support. In a follow-up article titled, "School Officials Want Out of Limbo,"³⁶ the writer predicted that Michigan principals would find their way out of the confusion by forming collective bargaining units of their own.

In Michigan, the basic question became--how could administrative personnel, particularly those classified as middle management, bring their professional interests and talents to bear on negotiations between school boards and teacher unions and further how could the professional well-being of middle management personnel be best maintained and advanced? In the state of Michigan, two "protective reactions" developed. The first was the concept of the Management Team in which administrative functions and policies are based on shared decision making and participatory group management. The second reaction which emerged as a result of teacher bargaining was the formation of administrative bargaining units.

³⁵Detroit Free Press, December 1, 1966, p. 2B.

³⁶Detroit Free Press, February 5, 1967, p. 15A.

In May, 1967, an article titled "Single Management Concept" appeared in the Michigan Elementary Principal.³⁷

In this article Taggart and Reynolds discuss the new role of the elementary principal resulting from teacher bargaining. They state: " . . . because of the new and somewhat unexplored relationship, it is imperative that the survival of the total administrative establishment be based upon mutual understanding, open communication and cooperation from all members of the management team."

Despite the outcry for meaningful management team formations, in some districts middle management personnel quickly chose to form formal bargaining units. Richard Higgenbotham viewed this move as an effort in the part of principals to gain protection and security. Writing for the Michigan School Board Journal, he stated:

Principals in the "in-between" position will look first to their own protection and later, if at all, to the good of the district. Principals in this kind of situation join and form unions for their protection and security. The Board of Education and the Superintendent must take the principal out of the "in-between" position by adopting a team management basis for operation of the district.

The Board must provide training and guidance for the principal who may feel he is in "no-man's land," a place where he doesn't have teachers' confidence and respect and top level management support. The

³⁷Donald Taggart and Francis Reynolds, "Single Management Concept," Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXX, No. 5 (May, 1967), 8-15.

Board must help him realize that he is management, a part of the team, and is not just a go-between for teachers and the board.³⁸

C. Keith Groty and David C. Smith investigated the reasons administrators cite for engaging in collective negotiations. The four most common are:

- 1) The unilateral behavior of the top administrative leadership.
- 2) The lack of meaningful involvement in decision making.
- 3) The relative success teachers have experienced in improving their salaries and working condition without need of paternalistic behavior.
- 4) The lack of a significant voice in matters of their own professional destiny.³⁹

A survey of 175 administrators in 21 of the 22 Michigan school districts where administrators collectively bargained was reported in a 1971 publication of the Michigan Congress of School Administrators Association.⁴⁰ The Research Committee which conducted the survey asked each respondent to list in rank order 6 identified problem areas in terms of their importance in precipitating the formation of an administrative bargain unit in his school district. The priority list

³⁸ Richard Higgenbotham, "The Principal As Manager," Michigan School Board Journal, XVIII, No. 2 (April, 1971), 29.

³⁹ C. Keith Groty and David C. Smith, "A Report of the Ethics and Management Relations Committee of MASB," Michigan School Board Journal, XVII, No. 7 (September, 1970), 8.

⁴⁰ Research Committee of the Michigan Congress of School Administrators, op. cit., p. 11.

is given below, with number one being considered most important by the respondents and the others listed in descending rank order:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Item</u>
1	Teacher negotiations erode administrative role
2	Problems of communication with school board
3	Problems of definition of role and responsibility
4	Salary and Fringe benefits
5	Problems of communication with superintendent
6	Display of power to the board of education

A panel of experts from the field of labor-management relations discussed the ramifications of administrative bargaining for school districts, questioning the idea that such bargaining would result in solution of the problems which administrators perceived as those causing them to organize.⁴¹ The panel members expressed concern that the division between the board of education and superintendent on one side and the middle management members on the other could create an adversary relationship which could eventually lead to destruction of the purposes for which administrators organize, such as, better communications, more voice in decision making and improved salaries.

⁴¹Panel discussion, Michigan Congress of School Administrators Conference, Eastern Michigan University, March 11, 1971, Panel members: Charles M. Rehmers, Harry Casselman, Leon Cornfield, James Tobin and William R. Ralls, Moderator.

Several articles in the Phi Delta Kappan discussed the concern superintendents and other school administrators perceived as a result of teacher bargaining upon the relationship of boards of education, superintendents and other school administrators. In 1967, Joseph Cronin⁴² called for a reappraisal of the web of relationships school boards and superintendents have with principals because of the recent spread of teacher negotiations.

Louis Panuch and Edgar Kelley suggest that administrative bargaining units selected by some groups of administrators to gain a partnership in decision making with boards of education have the potential for leading to constructive changes, or for simply perpetuating the status quo. In this article of October, 1970, they state the following:

A rapidly emerging and still unclear area of professional concern is the direction of professional organizations. Some groups, in response to teacher militancy, have called for the principal to become part of a "management team" approach to school administration. In New York City and in Detroit, strong organizations of principals--separate from teachers or top administrators--are in existence. These groups can be leaders in increased professional concern and pressures for constructive change, as many teacher groups have been. They could also become self-centered agencies for protection of the

⁴²Joseph Cronin, "School Boards and Principals, Before and After Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1967, pp. 123-24.

rights of principals, when such rights represent a clinging to traditional concepts--such as rigid promotional patterns--which no longer serve the needs of a changing society and its educational institutions.⁴³

Because the formation of administrative bargaining units in education is still limited and recent, research on the actual effects of this method of middle management bargaining verses management team involvement is preliminary and incomplete. The literature concerning the advantages and disadvantages of each method is primarily speculative at this time. However, many authors suggest that better communications, more middle management involvement in decisions and more productive utilization of the administrative staff will result from implementation of the management team concept.

One further impact of administrative bargaining upon the relationships of boards of education, top management and middle management staff members in school districts is predicted by Lieberman. He foresees the following shifts emerging:

Of all the significant consequences of collective negotiations, perhaps the one which has received the least attention thus far is the gain in the power of administrators and the corresponding decline in the power of school boards. This shift has gone unnoticed because so much attention has been devoted to the increased power of teacher organizations vis-a-vis boards and administrators. There is no doubt that such a shift has occurred. It is not

⁴³ Louis Panuch and Edgar A. Kelley, "The High School Principal: Pro Active or Reactive Role?" Phi Delta Kappan, LII, No. 2 (October, 1970), 92.

generally recognized, however, that equally important shifts of power and authority have been taking place within as well as between the employer and employee sides. Negotiators for school boards must have the authority to negotiate. If they must first secure the approval of their boards for each individual concession, negotiations are practically impossible. Furthermore, the dynamics of negotiations require that negotiators be in a position to make a deal at the appropriate time--and this literally may be any time of the day or night, when it may be virtually impossible to have a board meeting. Thus boards of education have increasingly found it necessary to delegate more authority to their negotiating teams; the latter have been making more and more of the crucial decisions governing school personnel relationships.⁴⁴

While Lieberman presents no documentation for this prediction, further experience in the negotiations area by school boards, administrators and teachers should provide suitable data from which such a shift of authority and decision-making prerogatives may be scientifically analyzed.

Summary

This chapter has presented an historical and legal setting for the emergence of collective bargaining by school administrative units in education. Particular attention was focused upon this development in the state of Michigan, where the research for this dissertation was conducted. The influence of teacher negotiations was investigated as it applied to the change in the

⁴⁴Myron Lieberman, "The Future of Collective Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII, No. 4 (December, 1971), 215.

relationship of the building principal to teachers, superintendents and school boards. Finally, the current literature concerning the advantages and disadvantages of administrative bargaining was presented as compared to involvement of administrators within the concept of management teams. This section itemized conditions which precipitate the formation of bargaining units as perceived by those included in such units and by experts in the field of management relations.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the similarities and differences in the perceptions of school superintendents, secondary principals and elementary principals concerning the influence of administrative collective bargaining on the management functions of Michigan school districts in which collective bargaining is being practiced. The management functions considered in this study are divided into four main sections:

- (1) Decision-making and Involvement, (2) Accountability,
- (3) Communications and (4) Structure.

Source of the Data

At the time this research problem was identified (September, 1972) there were a total of 608 public school districts in the state of Michigan. In 34 of those districts, boards of education had formally recognized administrative collective bargaining units, organized for the purpose of representing middle

management personnel in negotiations with their respective boards of education concerning wages, benefits and working conditions for administrators.

It was determined that only those school districts in which the superintendent was present as an administrator prior to the adoption of formal administrative bargaining would be included in the study. Additionally, only those current principals who had served as administrators within the school system prior to recognition of the administrative bargaining unit are included, as the study deals with perceived changes, requiring the respondents to compare conditions and situations before and after management bargaining began. Another limiting criteria for inclusion in the study is the requirement that at least one agreement between the board of education and the administrative bargaining unit has been consummated. This was done to eliminate the inclusion of respondents who had not served under the conditions of a negotiated agreement.

Using the above criteria, the superintendents of the remaining fifteen school districts were personally contacted by the writer, who requested permission to conduct the study in their respective school districts. Fourteen of the fifteen superintendents agreed to participate. The remaining superintendent agreed to participate with qualifications which were unacceptable to the writer, so his school district was disqualified.

The 14 school districts included in the study range in enrollment from 3,800 students to 39,000 students, according to the 1971-72 Michigan Education Association Directory statistics. Three of the school systems are in the 20,000 to 40,000 student enrollment category, 4 in the 7,500 to 10,000 student enrollment category and 7 in the 3,500 to 7,500 student enrollment category. One district is classified as a Metropolitan Core City district, as defined by the Michigan Department of Education for classification of school districts for reporting local results of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program.¹ Using the same classification standard, 10 districts are described as urban fringe, 1 as city and the remaining 2 as town.

Questionnaires were delivered by the writer to all school districts included in the study, addressed to all administrators qualified for participation in the study. The total potential of respondents was 14 superintendents and 184 principals.

A 100 per cent response was received from superintendents and a 69 per cent response from principals. By school district size classifications the total percentage of responses was as follows:

¹Local District Results Michigan Educational Assessment Program, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan, 1971.

<u>School District Size</u>	<u>Percentage Response</u>
40,000 - 20,000 students	57%
10,000 - 7,500 students	84%
7,500 - 7,499 students	80%

The questionnaires were disseminated via inter-school mailing systems and responses were returned in provided self-addressed stamped envelopes via U.S. mail.

Instrumentation

In his study on the Management Team Concept, Adams² developed a list of fifty-three statements related to the management functions of school districts (see Appendix A). These statements were divided into four major areas: (1) Decision Making and Involvement, (2) Structure, (3) Communications and (4) Accountability. This list was submitted by Adams to the Executive Board of the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, the Executive Board of the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals, the Executive Board of the Michigan Association of Professors of Educational Administration, the Executive Board of the Michigan Association of School Administrators and the Representative Council of the Michigan Congress of School

²Murray Adams, "A Study of the Perceptions of Elementary Principals, Secondary Principals and Superintendents with Respect to the Practice of the Management Team Concept" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971), p. 130.

Administrators for their individual reactions. Respondents were requested to answer "agree" or "disagree" to each statement. Seventy-five per cent agreement was established as a minimum level for acceptance. All items exceeded this pre-determined level of agreement.

This writer utilized Adam's validated list of statements from which to develop a series of fifty-one statements designed to measure the degree of change, if any, in the areas of decision making and involvement, accountability, communications and structure of school districts included in the study which resulted since the beginning of administrative bargaining.

The instrument, as modified and developed by the writer (see Appendix B), was informally field tested for clarity and specificity by selected practicing administrators and college professors, after which minor modifications were made to eliminate ambiguity. Each of the fifty-one statements in the questionnaire requires one of five response ranging from "greatly increased" to "greatly decreased." Principals were requested to respond once for each statement. Superintendents were requested to respond twice for each statement, once as it related to elementary principals and once as it related to secondary principals. The dual response by superintendents was employed because previous studies have revealed that the perceived level of involvement

in decision making and the degree of communication is higher between secondary principals and superintendents than it is between elementary principals and superintendents. The questionnaire was developed to solicit directional responses, with statements of low numeric value being in a positive direction, representing a perceived increase or improvement in the situation or condition being considered, and the higher numeric value representing a perceived decrease or deterioration of the situation or condition under consideration.

Additional information obtained from respondents include age, sex, years served as an administrator in current position, total years in school administration and participation on board of education negotiating teams. All respondents were also asked to evaluate the general effects of administrative bargaining on the school district and each was asked, if in his opinion, his district is practicing the principles of the Management Team Concept.

In the cover letter accompanying the questionnaire (see Appendix B), all respondents were guaranteed anonymity, but questionnaires were coded to permit identification of the school districts to which they apply.

Analysis

The data were key punched and subscales were formed. A reliability test of the total questionnaire and four major sections produced the following results.

<u>Section</u>	<u>Reliability Coefficient</u>
Total Questionnaire	.95
Section I (Involvement and Decision-making)	.90
Section II (Accountability)	.74
Section III (Communications)	.86
Section IV (Structure)	.85

The mean scores and frequency distributions of each questionnaire item were obtained in order to identify those statements in which the greatest or least perceived change had occurred. To assure independence of the data, responses from each school district are treated separately from every other school district. Paired mean analysis of the responses of all elementary principals, all secondary principals and the superintendent of each school district are considered in reporting mean differences and F scores. The data were analyzed for each of the four main sections, subscales of the main sections and the total questionnaire.

The subscales were formed by considering questionnaire statements specifically related to system-wide responsibilities of principals, their authority to operate assigned buildings, budget control, salary and

benefits and involvement in teacher negotiations. F scores were computed for each of these subscales.

Responses to statements of accountability are analyzed as they relate to corresponding responses to statements of decision-making and involvement. This is done by dichotomizing the data into two categories, responses indicating change in a positive direction and responses indicating no change or change in a negative direction. Results are reported in F scores.

Similarly, responses to statements of structure are considered in relationship to responses of corresponding statements in the other three main sections of the questionnaire.

Responses to questions relating to the general effect of administrative bargaining and the degree to which the Management Team Concept principles are practiced in the district are presented by frequency distribution.

Summary

The instrument used in this study is designed to measure the changes in management functions of school districts as a result of administrative bargaining as perceived by superintendents, secondary principals and elementary principals. In this chapter the writer described the development of the questionnaire, the

method of selecting the study population, the administration of the questionnaire and the methods of interpreting the data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Instrument Administration

The questionnaire used to collect the data for this study was administered during the month of October, 1972. One hundred eighty-four elementary and secondary principals and 14 superintendents were asked to participate in the study, which represented 100 per cent of those eligible according to the criteria established. All superintendents and 127 principals completed and returned the instrument, which represented a 70 per cent return. Three of the elementary principals' returns were spoiled, so the data from the 14 superintendents, 37 secondary principals and 87 elementary principals were placed on computer cards and processed through the Michigan State University CDC 3600 and 6500 computers.

Statistical Procedure

In this chapter, the statistical hypotheses will be analyzed in light of the data collected. The paired mean F Test will be utilized as the primary method of significance testing. An arbitrary significance level

of .05 was chosen for purposes of this study. Sub-scales of the major four categories were formed prior to analysis of the data to test the correlation of responses to related statements. These data are analyzed using F Test scores and frequency distributions.

That data related directly to the main hypotheses of this study are presented first. Subscale analysis and additional statistical information compiled from the collected data are presented following the main hypotheses test.

For the purposes of this study, management functions of school districts are divided into four main areas: (a) Decision-Making and Involvement, (b) Accountability, (c) Communications and (d) Structure. Mean scores of each category of respondents, the difference in their mean scores, F score and level of significance are presented for each area as well as for the total questionnaire as a test of each hypothesis.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Hypothesis A:

There is no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary school principals as compared to the perceptions of the superintendent of schools with respect to the influence of administrative collective bargaining on management functions.

Hypothesis B:

There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the elementary school principals as compared to the perceptions of the secondary school principals with respect to the influence of administrative collective bargaining on management functions.

Hypothesis C:

There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the secondary school principals as compared to the perceptions of the superintendent of schools with respect to the influence of administrative collective bargaining on management functions.

The data presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3 fail to reject Hypotheses A, B and C. Based on the population of this study and the management areas tested, there is no significant difference in the perceptions of the elementary principals, secondary principals and superintendents concerning the effects of administrative bargaining on the management functions of school districts considered in this study.

TABLE 1.--F-test results for the differences in the mean scores of elementary principals and superintendents in each of the four sections and the total questionnaire

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score Elementary Principal	Mean Score Superintendent	Difference Between Means	F Score	Level of Significance
Decision-Making and Involvement	2.83	2.74	.11	.98	N/S
Accountability	2.79	2.67	.12	.77	N/S
Communications	2.80	2.77	.03	.82	N/S
Structure	2.85	2.57	.28	3.29	N/S
Total Questionnaire	2.80	2.73	.08	1.01	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/13

TABLE 2.--F-test results for the differences in the mean scores of elementary principals and secondary principals on each of the four subsections and the total questionnaire

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score Elementary Principal	Mean Score Secondary Principal	Differences Between Means	F Score	Level of Significance
Decision-Making and Involvement	2.85	2.77	.08	1.17	N/S
Accountability	2.76	2.73	.03	.30	N/S
Communications	2.84	2.77	.07	.47	N/S
Structure	2.86	2.79	.07	.74	N/S
Total Questionnaire	2.82	2.76	.06	.94	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/12

TABLE 3.--F-test results for the differences in the mean scores of secondary principals and superintendents on each of the four subsections and the total questionnaire

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Scores Secondary Principals	Mean Scores Superintendents	Difference Between Means	F Score	Level of Significance
Decision-Making and Involvement	2.77	2.80	.03	.15	N/S
Accountability	2.73	2.73	--	--	N/S
Communications	2.77	2.87	.10	.68	N/S
Structure	2.79	2.63	.16	.98	N/S
Total Question- naire	2.76	2.78	.02	.09	N/S

Degree of Freedom = 1/12

These data are further analyzed by the formation of subscales of Subsection I which deal with Decision-making and Involvement. Responses dealing with the principals' system-wide responsibilities (numbers 1, 9, 13), his specific building authority (numbers 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 20), budget control (numbers 9, 10, 11), salary and benefits (numbers 23, 24, 25, 26), and negotiations involvement (numbers 18, 19, 21, 22) are analyzed for significant differences in responses by principals and superintendents.

Data from Tables 4, 5 and 6 show that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary principals, secondary principals and superintendents concerning the changes that have taken place in the management functions of those school districts surveyed, in the areas of principals' system-wide responsibilities, building authority, budget control or involvement in board of education negotiating positions. A difference in perception of such changes is observed between the elementary principals and superintendents concerning the effects of administrative bargaining on salary and benefits for principals. This is significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 4.--F-test results for elementary principals and secondary principals' responses on subscales of section I concerning decision making and involvement

Subscale of Subsection I	Mean Score Elementary Principal	Mean Score Secondary Principal	Difference Between Means	F Score	Level of Significance
System-wide Responsibilities	2.83	2.64	.19	2.02	N/S
Building Authority	2.67	2.75	.08	.74	N/S
Budget Control	2.62	2.66	.04	.15	N/S
Salary and Benefits	2.74	2.56	.18	3.39	N/S
Negotiations Involvement	3.05	3.06	.01	.02	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/12

TABLE 5.--F-test results of elementary principals' and superintendents' responses on subscales of section I concerning decision making and involvement

Subscale of Section I	Mean Score Elementary Principal	Mean Score Superintendent	Difference Between Means	F Score	Level of Significance
System-wide					
Responsibilities	2.83	2.88	.05	.21	N/S
Building					
Authority	2.66	2.72	.06	.66	N/S
Budget Control	2.64	2.57	.07	.23	N/S
Salary and					
Benefits	2.68	2.39	.29	8.70	.05
Negotiations					
Involvement	3.10	2.87	.23	1.40	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/13

Hypothesis D:

The process of administrative collective bargaining has had no significant effect upon management functions as perceived by superintendents and principals.

To test this hypothesis, school mean scores for elementary principals, secondary principals and both responses of superintendents were computed and analyzed for significance as they differed from the absolute "remained the same" responses (a numeric score of 3). School means are utilized to eliminate the unbalanced influence of larger school district responses as

compared to the few responses received from smaller school districts. The design of the questionnaire permits analysis of the direction of the change, if any, perceived by the respondents. Mean scores significantly less than 3 show positive change and mean scores significantly greater than 3 show negative change as perceived by the respondents.

TABLE 6.--F-test results of secondary principals' and superintendents' responses on subscale of section I concerning decision making and involvement

Subscale of Section I	Mean Score Secondary Principal	Mean Score Superintendent	Difference Between Means	F Score	Level of Significance
System-wide					
Responsibilities	2.64	2.87	.23	3.03	N/S
Building					
Authority	2.75	2.74	.01	.01	N/S
Budget Control	2.66	2.61	.05	.90	N/S
Salary and					
Benefits	2.56	2.46	.10	.80	N/S
Negotiations					
Involvement	3.06	2.96	.10	.41	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/12

The data presented in Table 7 reveal that elementary principals included in this study do perceive a significant change in the total management function

considered in this study as a result of administrative bargaining. This change is in a positive direction, with the principals perceiving positive changes. Null Hypothesis D, as it relates to elementary principals, is rejected.

TABLE 7.--F-test results for the difference from three of the mean scores of elementary principals on each of the four sections and the total questionnaire

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score	F Score	Level of Significance
Decision Making and Involvement	2.74	6.29	.05
Accountability	2.68	10.62	.01
Communications	2.80	1.69	N/S
Structure	2.57	8.51	.05
Total Questionnaire	2.72	6.83	.05

Degrees of Freedom = 1/13

The data presented in Table 8 reveal that Secondary principals included in this study do perceive a significant change in the total management functions considered in this study as a result of administrative bargaining. This change is in a positive direction, with principals perceiving positive change. Null Hypothesis D, as it relates to secondary principals, is rejected.

The data presented in Table 9 reveal that superintendents perceive a change in the total management function of elementary school principals as a result

TABLE 8.--F-test results for the difference from three of the mean scores of secondary principals on each of the four sections and the total questionnaire

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score	F Score	Level of Significance
Decision Making and Involvement	2.77	9.99	.01
Accountability	2.73	20.93	.001
Communications	2.77	3.29	N/S
Structure	2.79	5.59	.05
Total Questionnaire	2.76	11.45	.01

Degrees of Freedom = 1/12

TABLE 9.--F-test results for the difference from three of the mean scores of superintendents' responses as they perceive elementary principals on each of the four sections and the total questionnaire

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score	F Score	Level of Significance
Decision-Making and Involvement	2.74	5.00	.05
Accountability	2.68	11.45	.01
Communications	2.77	3.38	N/S
Structure	2.57	12.48	.01
Total Questionnaire	2.72	7.19	.05

Degrees of Freedom = 1/13

of administrative bargaining. Again, this change is in a positive direction. Null Hypothesis D, as it relates to superintendents and elementary principals, is rejected.

The data presented in Table 10 reveal that superintendents perceive a change in the total management functions of secondary school principals as a result of administrative bargaining. This change is in a positive direction. Null Hypothesis D, as it relates to superintendents and secondary principals, is rejected.

TABLE 10.--F-test results for the difference from three of the mean scores of superintendents' responses as they perceive secondary principals on each of the four subsections and the total questionnaire

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score	F Score	Level of Significance
Decision-Making and Involvement	2.83	4.31	N/S
Accountability	2.76	28.33	.001
Communications	2.80	4.08	N/S
Structure	2.85	2.24	N/S
Total Questionnaire	2.80	7.72	.05

Degrees of Freedom = 1/13

Subscales identical to those presented in Tables 4, 5 and 6 are analyzed in relation to Hypothesis D in Tables 11, 12, 13 and 14. These subscales are a division of Section I, Decision-Making and Involvement. Mean scores for elementary principals, secondary principals and superintendents are computed and analyzed for significance as they differ from the absolute "remained the same" response of 3.

TABLE 11.--F-test results for the differences from three of the mean scores of elementary principals on subscales of section I, decision-making and involvement

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score	F Score	Level of Significance
System-wide Responsibilities	2.83	2.18	N/S
Building Authority	2.70	12.18	.01
Budget Control	2.59	7.47	.05
Salary and Benefits	2.39	22.63	.001
Negotiations Involvement	2.87	.60	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/13

TABLE 12.--F-test results for the difference from three of the mean scores of secondary principals on subscales of section I, decision-making and involvement

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score	F Score	Level of Significance
System-wide Responsibilities	2.65	12.32	.01
Building Authority	2.75	14.59	.01
Budget Control	2.66	11.82	.01
Salary and Benefits	2.56	13.05	.01
Negotiations Involvement	3.06	.23	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/12

TABLE 13.--F-test results for the differences from three of the mean scores of superintendents' responses as the questionnaire relates to elementary principals on sub-scales of section I, decision-making and involvement

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score	F Score	Level of Significance
System-wide Responsibilities	2.88	.71	N/S
Building Authority	2.72	7.02	.05
Budget Control	2.57	7.83	.05
Salary and Benefits	2.39	22.63	.001
Negotiations Involvement	2.87	.60	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/13

TABLE 14.--F-test results for the differences from three of the mean scores of superintendents' responses as the questionnaire relates to secondary principals on sub-scales of section I, decision-making and involvement

Section of Questionnaire	Mean Score	F Score	Level of Significance
System-wide Responsibilities	2.83	2.29	N/S
Building Authority	2.66	15.95	.01
Budget Control	2.64	6.73	.05
Salary and Benefits	2.69	10.07	.01
Negotiations Involvement	3.10	.57	N/S

Degrees of Freedom = 1/13

Only secondary principals perceived a significant change in their system-wide responsibilities, and all three categories agreed that no significant difference has taken place in the involvement of principals in management and board of education policies and procedures concerning teacher negotiations. Elementary principals, secondary principals and superintendents all perceived positive changes in the principals' involvement and decision-making roles related to building authority, budget control and salary and benefits. Significance levels ranged from .05 to .001 with improvements in salary and benefits consistently the highest significance level.

All respondents were asked the following question: In your opinion, generally what affect has administrative collective bargaining had on your district?

There were three possible responses: detrimental, no significant effect and wholesome. Table 15 summarizes the responses.

Over 50 per cent of the secondary and elementary principals perceived management bargaining as having a wholesome effect upon the school district. The largest percentage of the superintendents view the effect of bargaining as insignificant.

TABLE 15.--Frequency distribution of responses concerning general effects of administrative bargaining on school districts

	Detrimental		No Significant Effect		Wholesome	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Elementary Principal	5	5.7	32	36.8	50	57.5
Secondary Principal	4	10.8	14	37.8	19	51.4
Superintendent	4	28.6	7	50.0	3	21.4
Composite	13	9.4	54	39.8	72	51.8

One additional question asked of all respondents was: In your opinion, is your district practicing the principles of the Management Team Concept? Table 16 summarizes responses to this question.

Interestingly, 100 per cent of the superintendents considered the principles of the management team concept to be practiced in their school districts. Fifty-nine and three-tenths per cent of the elementary principals and 40.5 per cent of the secondary principals disagreed.

The frequency of various responses to each question was studied to determine which areas were perceived by respondents to be least affected by management bargaining and which were most affected. Those questions in which each category of respondents indicated no change

in 70 per cent of the cases were identified. Both responses of each superintendent were averaged to give one response.

TABLE 16.--Frequency distribution of responses concerning the practice of management team principles

	No		Don't Know		Yes	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Elementary						
Principal	51	59.3	8	9.3	27	31.4
Secondary						
Principal	15	40.5	3	8.1	19	51.4
Superin-						
tendent	0	0	0	0	14	100.
Composite	66	48.2	11	8.0	60	43.8

Those questions for which greater than 50 per cent of each category of respondent indicated either an increase or decrease are identified and reported. Table 17 and Table 18 show the summary of these findings.

The design of this study provides for an analysis of the relationship between selected statements on Accountability (Section II) and related statements on Decision-Making and Involvement (Section I). Because of the limited spread of responses on questions on Accountability (majority of responses were either 1, 2 or 3), the data are dichotomized into two responses. Responses 1 and 2 are considered 1 and responses 3, 4 and 5 are considered to be 2. Tables 19 and 20 are summaries of the F-Test analysis of these data, designed to determine if

TABLE 17.--Statements for which greater than 70 per cent of each category of respondents indicated no change

Statement Number	Number of Respondents Indicating no Change			Total Number	Percentage
	Elementary	Secondary	Superintendents		
16 ^a	N = 76	N = 31	N = 12.5	119.5	87.3
34 ^b	N = 64	N = 33	N = 13	110	79.8
36 ^c	N = 66	N = 26	N = 10.5	102.5	75.0
6 ^d	N = 61	N = 30	N = 10	101	73.3

^a16 = Freedom to attend board meetings.

^b34 = Accountability for evaluating nonprofessional employees.

^c36 = Opportunity to learn by doing.

^d6 = Consideration for one holding a minority opinion.

respondents who indicated a positive perception of change on statements of accountability (Section II) also responded positively to related statements on Decision-making and Involvement (Section I) and if those who indicated no change or negative change on Section II also indicated a similar response on Section I.

Table 19 reveals a high correlation between positive responses by secondary and elementary principals on statement 29 which asked the degree to which the superintendent holds the principal accountable for the over-all educational climate of his building and to statements 5, 7, 10, 11, 14 and 20. These statements deal

TABLE 18.--Statements for which greater than 50 per cent of each category of respondents indicated change

State- ment Number	Number and Mean Score of Respondents Indicating Change												Total		
	Elementary Principals				Secondary Principals				Superintendents						
	Positive	Negative	Mean	%	Positive	Negative	Mean	%	Positive	Negative	Mean	%	Positive	Negative	%
23 ^a	N = 51 (60%)	N = 7 (8.3%)	2.36	68.3	N = 24 (64.9%)	N = 2 (5.4%)	2.30	70.3	N = 10 (71.4%)	N = 0	2.14	71.4	N = 85 (12.5)	N = 9 (6.6%)	69.1
6 ^b	N = 32 (37.2%)	N = 19 (22.1%)	2.84	59.3	N = 14 (37.8%)	N = 6 (16.3%)	2.78	54.1	N = 6 (42.9%)	N = 2 (14.2%)	2.71	57.1	N = 52 (39.0%)	N = 27 (19.7%)	57.7

^a 23 = Principals' influence on their salaries and benefits.

^b 8 = Principals' involvement in decisions affecting them.

TABLE 19.--F-test results of dichotomized data relating mean score of responses to statement 29 (accountability) to mean score of responses to statements 5, 7, 10, 11, 14 and 20 (decision-making and involvement)

	Frequency of Responses		F Score	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
	1	2			
Elementary Principals	35	52	21.21	1/85	.0005
Secondary Principals	17	20	4.38	1/35	.05
Superintendent El. Princ. Response	6	8	.524	1/13	N/S
Superintendent S. Princ. Response	6	8	2.97	1/13	N/S

with the principals' authority to establish regulations for the operation of their buildings, their influence in hiring teachers, involvement in development and administration of their building budgets, inservice programs for teachers and the principals' involvement in determining the instructional program for their buildings.

Superintendents' responses did not show a relationship between the two variables.

Table 20 data reveal no significant relationship between respondents' answers to statement 31, which concerns the degree to which principals are held responsible for implementing board and administration policies and the responses to statements 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8. These statements deal with the principals' involvement in

TABLE 20.--F-test results of dichotomized data relating mean scores of responses to statement 31 (accountability) to mean scores of responses to statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 18 (decision-making and involvement)

	Frequency of Responses		F Score	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
	1	2			
Elementary Principals	30	57	.257	1/85	N/S
Secondary Principals	13	23	.036	1/34	N/S
Superintendents' Response-El.	7	7	.005	1/13	N/S
Superintendents' Response-Sec.	7	7	.077	1/13	N/S

system-wide policy development, his understanding of the decisions made by the board and superintendent and his freedom to evaluate the effectiveness of such policy.

Table 21 data reveal a significant relationship between responses of elementary principals, secondary principals and superintendents to question 50 (structure) and their responses to statements 6, 8 and 42. These statements deal with the reception of the superintendent to suggestions and expressed opinions of principals.

A further analysis relates the dichotomized data of Section IV (Structure) to related statements in the remaining sections of the questionnaire. Again, all 1 & 2 responses are grouped in response 1 and 3, 4 and 5 responses are considered to be 2.

TABLE 21.--F-test results of dichotomized data relating mean scores of responses to statement 50 (structure) to mean scores of responses to statements 6 and 8 (decision-making and involvement) and statement 42 (communication).

	Frequency of Responses		F Score	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
	1	2			
Elementary Principals	27	57	28.91	1/83	.0005
Secondary Principals	9	27	34.76	1/35	.0005
Superintendents					
Elementary Response	7	7	17.81	1/13	.001
Superintendents					
Secondary Response	7	7	15.02	1/13	.005

Table 22 data reveal a significant relationship between responses of elementary principals, secondary principals and superintendents to question 48 (structure) and their responses to statements 38, 39 and 43. These statements deal with the understanding the principal and superintendent have for each other's role and problems.

TABLE 22.--F-test results of dichotomized data relating mean scores of responses for statement 48 (structure) to mean score responses for statements 38, 39 and 43 (communications)

	Frequency of Response		F Score	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
	1	2			
Elementary Principals	23	61	14.70	1/83	.0005
Secondary Principals	12	24	6.39	1/35	.05
Superintendents Elementary Response	4	10	6.76	1/13	.05
Superintendents Secondary Response	5	9	15.37	1/13	.01

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to present the statistical data gathered in this study. The data fail to support the rejection of Hypotheses A, B and C. The data do support the rejection of Hypothesis D, in that significant differences in the management functions of school districts, as a result of administrative bargaining, are perceived by superintendents, elementary principals and secondary principals.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The spread of collective bargaining in public education has been a recent phenomenon in the United States. In Michigan, Public Act 379 which was passed by the state legislature in 1965 clearly established the right of teachers and other nonadministrative school employees to bargain for wages, benefits and working conditions with boards of education.

Concessions gained by teachers, from boards of education, through the bargaining process encroached upon and, in some cases, usurped management prerogatives previously considered to be the exclusive rights of building principals and other middle management employees. In addition, the economic gains achieved by teachers in the first rounds of negotiations appeared to many administrators to have narrowed the gap between the salaries of classroom teachers and administrators. The concerns of public school middle management for their potential loss of authority, status and relative economic

advantage manifested itself in two ways. One was the movement to adopt the Management Team Concept as the formally recognized method of administration of school districts. Proponents of this concept maintained that its practice would provide middle management with an acceptable method of sharing in board and administrative policy and procedure development--thus reducing the loss of control of management functions by principals and others. Further, the recognition of principals, directors and other middle management administrators as true members of the management of the school district was expected to restore lost status and assure an adequate compensation spread between teacher and administrator.

The other movement, and the one this study is most concerned with, is the formation of administrative bargaining units, usually composed of all administrators below the level of Assistant Superintendent. The practice of administrators organizing to bargain with boards of education for wages, benefits and working conditions was immediately challenged by a school board in Michigan. The Michigan Employment Relations Commission ruled that middle management administrators do have the right to bargain collectively and this ruling was upheld by the Michigan Appellate Court.

The purpose of this study was to determine if those intimately involved in the administration of public

schools and administrative bargaining, namely the superintendents and principals, perceive the effects of management bargaining differently or similarly. Secondly, this study set out to determine if the practice of management bargaining had any effect on the management functions of school districts, and if so, if the effects were positive or negative in the perceptions of those involved.

Conclusions

The data collected for this study reveal that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary principals, secondary principals and superintendents concerning the effects of negotiations on the principal's decision-making authority and involvement in administrative decision, his accountability for the instructional program and general management of his assigned building or his communication to and from the superintendent. Further, the data support the theory that there are no significant differences in the perceptions of the principals and superintendents concerning any change in structure of the administrative organization resulting from management bargaining.

Further refinement of the decision-making and involvement section of the questionnaire into those responses related specifically to changes in the principal's system-wide responsibilities, building

authority, budget control, salary and benefits and involvement in preparation for and the process of teacher negotiations showed no pattern of divergence between perceptions of elementary principals and secondary principals, nor secondary principals and superintendents. The only category which showed any difference in the perception of change, resulting from management bargaining, between the elementary principals and superintendents was the area of principals' salary and benefits. The elementary principals saw the results of bargaining as being significantly more beneficial to elementary principals than did the superintendents. This difference, however, is only a matter of degree, as later analysis of the data reveals that both groups of administrators viewed the effects as being positive.

The responses of superintendents, elementary principals and secondary principals were analyzed to determine if they perceived changes in management functions of school districts as a result of administrative bargaining. This was done by considering each category of respondent separately and considering their responses to each of the four main sections of the questionnaire as well as their composite response to the total questionnaire.

All four categories of respondents perceived significant changes in the management functions of

school districts as a result of administrative bargaining and these changes are in a positive direction, indicating increases or improvement in the situation or condition in question (Total Questionnaire). On the subscales, interestingly, all categories of respondents concurred that significant increases had taken place in the degree to which principals are held accountable for the management of their schools and staffs. Elementary and secondary principals agreed that there were significant changes in the principal's decision-making authority and involvement in administrative decisions as well as structural changes in the administrative organization.

Superintendents' responses differed when answering in relation to elementary principals or secondary principals. Superintendents perceived administrative bargaining as resulting in an increase of involvement of elementary principals in decision making while they did not perceive this as resulting in any significant increase in the secondary principal's involvement. The superintendents perceived the effects of negotiations by administrators as producing no structural change as the superintendent relates to the secondary principal, but as having a positive structural change as the superintendent and elementary principal understand each other's role and position in the organizational structure. Finally, all categories of respondents agreed that

administrative bargaining produced no significant change in communication between and among the board of education, superintendent and principal.

Previous studies, and the viewpoint of many experts in the field of educational administration, suggest that secondary principals carry more influence with the superintendent and affect the direction of decisions more than do elementary principals. The relatively fewer secondary administrators within a school system, the public visibility of the curricular and extracurricular programs of the secondary school and the higher economic and hierarchical status ascribed to the secondary principal's role are suggested reasons for this condition.

The findings of this study support the idea that administrative bargaining increases the principal's involvement in decision-making. Both the elementary principals and superintendents agreed that this was the net effect for elementary principals. Interestingly, while the secondary principals perceived an increase in involvement in decision-making for themselves, the superintendent did not view bargaining as affecting secondary principals this way. Consequently, in the perceptions of the superintendents included in this study, elementary principals realized more benefits, in terms of decision-making involvement than did

secondary principals, who predictably were more involved than elementary principals prior to bargaining. Administrative bargaining appears to be a leveler in this regard.

The findings relating to structural changes resulting from administrative bargaining support the above. Again both secondary and elementary principals perceive structural changes, in a positive direction. The superintendents do not consider bargaining to have improved the lot of the secondary principal in this regard, but do see bargaining as having caused improvements of the elementary principal's position within the organization.

Further refinement of Section I (Decision-Making and Involvement) into subsections dealing with system-wide responsibilities, building authority, budget control, salary and benefits and negotiations involvement provide some interesting analyses.

Only secondary principals see a significant increase in their system-wide responsibilities. Superintendents did not perceive any significant change for either secondary or elementary principals in this category. Elementary principals saw no change in their role related to system-wide responsibilities. All categories of respondents perceived significant increases in the principal's authority to administer his building,

his involvement in budget development and budget administration and his salary and benefits in relation to teachers' salaries and benefits. This latter category showed the greatest degree of change, with the significance levels ranging from .001 to .01. All categories of respondents concurred that no change in the involvement of principals in the development board of education negotiating positions or practices had taken place.

When asked about the general effects of administrative bargaining on their respective school districts, more than one-half of the elementary and secondary principals responded that it was wholesome. Superintendents did not share this view, with 78.6 per cent responding that bargaining had either a detrimental or no significant effect on the district.

A much more diverse response was received by the following question which asked whether or not the principles of the Management Team Concept were being practiced in the district. All of the superintendents answered affirmatively. However, more than one-half of the secondary principals shared this view, but only 31.4 per cent of the elementary principals. Approximately 60 per cent of the latter group answered this question negatively.

The data were analyzed to determine which statements solicited responses indicating the greatest change

and the least change by all categories of respondents. The practice of administrative negotiations is perceived by principals and superintendents as having little, if any, influence on the freedom of principals to attend board of education meetings, the degree of accountability of principals for evaluation of nonprofessional personnel assigned to their buildings, their freedom to learn by doing and the amount of respect and consideration other administrators have for a principal who holds an opinion different from the majority.

The greatest change, as a result of administrative bargaining, perceived by all categories of respondents related to the influence of principals on their salary and fringe benefits and their involvement in decisions which affect them. In terms of salary and benefits, all respondent categories perceived this change to be in a highly positive direction while the responses to change in involvement in decisions affecting principals were less skewed to the positive direction. Thirty-eight per cent of the respondents viewed these changes as increasing the principal's involvement, while 19.7 per cent viewed the changes as decreases in involvement.

The final statistical treatment of the data collected for this study deals with the relationship of responses for each category of respondent to statements of Accountability and Structure to corresponding statements

of Involvement and Communication. By dichotomizing the data into positive responses, on one hand, and neutral and negative responses on the other, the writer attempted to determine if those respondents who perceived increases in the accountability of principals also perceived increases in their involvement in decision and communications within the school system.

Elementary and secondary principals who perceive significant increases in their accountability for the overall responsibilities for assigned buildings do also perceive corresponding increases in their involvement in decisions that effect their building and program supervision. There was no significant correlation between the responses of superintendents on items of accountability and those matched items of decision-making and communication.

Similarly, a high correlation of positive responses to the understanding of the position of the principal in the administrative hierarchy to positive responses to related items of communication and accountability was found. All categories of respondents who perceived increases in their understanding of the position of the principal in the administrative organization also perceived an increase in mutual understanding of the role and expectation of the principal between superintendent and principal.

Implications of the Study

The findings of this study should serve to relieve some of the anxieties of those students of administrative organization and superintendents who have been predicting dire consequences as the result of middle management bargaining in public school districts. They should further help to dispel the opinion that principals and superintendents hold dramatically different viewpoints concerning the effects of administrative bargaining. Principals and superintendents included in this study generally concurred that administrative collective bargaining did influence the management practices of the school district and that these changes were for the better. Superintendents and principals, alike, saw increases in the principal's involvement in administrative decisions, as well as the degree to which he is held accountable for his area of administrative responsibility. Surprisingly, the section dealing with changes in communications among and between the superintendent, principal and board of education was the only section of the questionnaire for which no significant change was perceived by any category of respondent.

As may have been expected, the greatest influence of management bargaining was felt by all to be its influence on the salary and fringe benefits of

principals. All categories of administrators considered bargaining to have significantly increased the compensation received by principals.

One last interesting observation should be made. The involvement of principals in their own bargaining units does not significantly affect their individual input, either positively or negatively, into the board of education policies or positions for negotiations with other unions within the school district. Some authorities have suggested that the union activities of principals would reduce or eliminate their involvement in the bargaining strategy of the board of education. Such does not appear to be the case.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study was concerned primarily with the similarities and differences in the perceptions of school principals and superintendents about the changes resulting from administrative bargaining. It was necessarily limited in scope. Many others are affected by management bargaining and a similar investigation of their perceptions should prove profitable. These would include teachers, school board members, other line administrators and staff administrators.

A further investigation of the impact of management bargaining on administrators could extend beyond the abstract concept of perceptions to the measurement of

absolute changes. This might be accomplished by measuring changes in percentages of the total budget over which the principal exercises discretion, specific changes in his responsibility for hiring, promotion, demotion and discharge of employees assigned to his building and actual changes in the relationship of his salary and benefits to that of other classifications of school district employees.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- American Association of School Administrators. Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of School Administrators, 1963.
- Elam, Stanley; Lieberman, Myron; and Moscow, Michael. Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Epstein, Benjamin. The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations Between Teachers and School Boards. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965.
- Lieberman, Myron. The Future of Public Education. Chicago: Phoenix Books, University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- _____, and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.
- Moskow, Michael. Teachers and Unions. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1966.
- Northrup, Herbert R., and Bloom, Gordon F. Government and Labor. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1963.
- Schmidt, Charles T., Jr.; Parker, Hyman; and Repas, Bob. A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education. Social Science Research Bureau. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1967.
- Shils, Edward B., and Whittier, Taylor C. Teachers, Administrators, and Collective Bargaining. New York: Thomas Crowell Co., 1968.

Stinnett, T. M.; Kleinmann, Jack H.; and Ware, Martha L. Professional Negotiation in Public Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1966.

Voslou, William B. Collective Bargaining in the U.S. Federal Service. Chicago, Ill.: Public Personnel Association, 1966.

Journals and Periodicals

Adams, Murray. "A House Divided." Michigan School Board Journal, XVIII (July, 1971).

Anderson, Lester W. "Management Team Concept." Michigan School Board Journal, XVII (March, 1969).

Cronin, Joseph H. "School Boards and Principals Before and After Negotiations." Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1967).

Dudley, James. "The Elementary Principal--The Man in the Middle." Pace Setter (March, 1967).

Educators Negotiating Service. XVI (August 1, 1970).

_____. XVII (November 15, 1970).

Epstein, Benjamin. "What Is Negotiable." Professional Negotiations Pamphlet No. 1. National Association of Secondary School Principals, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Groty, Keith C., and Smith, David C. "Approaches to a Management Team--A Report of the Ethics and Management Relations Committee of the MASB." Michigan School Board Journal, XVII, No. 7 (September, 1970).

Hatch, Terrance E. "The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations." Bulletin of the NASSP, LV (December, 1971).

Higgenbotham, Richard. "The Principal as Manager." Michigan School Board Journal, XVIII (April, 1971).

Kettering Foundation. IDEA. Kettering Foundation Publication, Dayton, Ohio, Summer, 1968.

Lieberman, Myron. "The Future of Collective Negotiations." Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (December, 1971).

- Luntz, Robert. "Grievences and Their Resolution." Bulletin of the NASSP, LV (December, 1971).
- Michigan Association of School Administrators. Reflections, February, 1971.
- Pinis, Fritz. "No Place to Hide." The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXXI, No. 1 (September, 1966).
- _____. "No Time to Lose." The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXXII, No. 5 (May, 1968).
- Panuch, Lonis, and Kelley, Edgar A. "The High School Principal: Pro Active or Reactive Role?" Phi Delta Kappan, LII (October, 1970).
- Reynolds, Francis, and Taggart, Donald. "Single Management Concept." Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXX (May, 1967).
- Schmidt, Charles T., Jr. "The Question of the Recognition of Principal and Other Supervisory Units in Public Education Collective Bargaining." Labor Law Journal (May, 1968).
- Ten Eyck, Allan. "Principals on the Negotiating Team." The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXXI (January, 1967).
- Van Sweden, Jay. "The Principal-Negotiator or Observer?" The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXXI, No. 3 (January, 1967).
- White, Joe. "A Decision in the Making." The Michigan Elementary Principal, XXXI, No. 5 (May, 1967).

Other Sources

- Adams, Murray. "A Study of the Perceptions of Elementary Principals, Secondary Principals and Superintendents with Respect to the Practice of the Management Team Concept." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971.
- Detroit Free Press. December 1, 1966.
- _____. February 5, 1967.

- Epstein, Benjamin. "A Principal Does Some Soul-Searching in the New Era of Collective Negotiations." A speech given to the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals at their annual convention held in Detroit, Michigan, December 1 and 2, 1966.
- Garver, George Gaylin. "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Public School Principals in Oakland County, Michigan, Concerning Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Keller, Edward. Personal Interview with the Executive Director, Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals, East Lansing, Michigan, October 5, 1972.
- Michigan, General School Laws, Section 423.215.
- Michigan Congress of School Administrators. Panel discussion at Eastern Michigan University, March 11, 1971 (panel members: Leon Cornfield, Harry Casselman, William Ralls, Charles Rihmus and James Tobin).
- Michigan Department of Education. Local District Results of Michigan Assessment Program. Lansing, Michigan, 1971.
- Michigan Labor Mediation Board. "Decision and Order in the Matter of Hillsdale Community Schools (Employer) and Hillsdale Community Schools Principals and Supervisory Association (Petitioner) and Michigan Education Association (Special Intervenor)," December, 1968.
- Michigan Labor Relation Board Decision 187, 1969.
- Neal, Richard. Speech to the Michigan Negotiations Association in Pontiac, Michigan, October 1, 1970.
- Pisarski, Robert. Speech given at Oakland County School Board Association meeting, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, March, 1966.

Research Committee of the Michigan Congress of School
Administrators. A Survey of Administrative
Bargaining Units in Michigan Public Schools.
East Lansing, Michigan, 1971.

U.S. Government. Labor Management Relations Act of 1947.
Section 8 (D).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

**LIST OF MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS FROM WHICH
QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS WERE DEVELOPED**

APPENDIX A

LIST OF MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS FROM WHICH QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS WERE DEVELOPED

Following are statements which may or may not describe the characteristics of the Management Team Concept. The purpose of this instrument is to seek your opinion as to whether or not you agree or disagree with each statement. Therefore, it is important that you record your true feeling concerning the statement.

INTER-ACTION INFLUENCE DECISION-MAKING AND INVOLVEMENT

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
1. Decision-making should involve <u>all</u> administrators who will be affected by the decision.	_____	_____
2. System-wide administrative policies concerning the operation of elementary and secondary buildings should be determined only after joint discussions with the superintendent and the principals.	_____	_____
3. Final decision-making, as it affects the district, should be the prerogative of the superintendent.	_____	_____
4. Principals should not be consulted in the formulation of policy which is to be recommended to the board.	_____	_____
5. It is not necessary that principals understand why decisions were made. It is only necessary for them to implement the decisions.	_____	_____
6. It is not necessary that principals always agree with the decisions of the board, superintendent or the administrative cabinet.	_____	_____
7. Principals should not evaluate the effectiveness of decisions previously made by the board, superintendent or the administrative cabinet.	_____	_____

DECISION-MAKING AND INVOLVEMENT--continued

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
8. Principals should have the authority to establish rules and procedures for the operation of their building providing they are consistent with board and administrative policy.	_____	_____
9. Decision-making should encourage a give-and-take proposition directed toward establishing an environment in which differences of opinion are respected.	_____	_____
10. Since superintendents are ultimately responsible for what happens in a district, they should not permit principals to establish rules and procedures for the operation of their buildings.	_____	_____
11. Principals should be consulted as to the number of teachers needed for their instructional program.	_____	_____
12. Principals should be held responsible for the overall educational climate of their buildings.	_____	_____
13. Since budget formulation is the responsibility of the superintendent, he alone should determine the allocation of monies.	_____	_____
14. Principals and their staffs should be free to determine how money allocated to their building is spent within previous budgetary approval.	_____	_____
15. No one should be employed in a building without the principal's approval.	_____	_____
16. Principals should not be involved in interviewing and recommending nonprofessionals seeking employment in their building.	_____	_____

DECISION-MAKING AND INVOLVEMENT--continued

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
17. In-service education programs should be developed by central office staff and not left to principals in individual buildings.	_____	_____
18. Principals should interview and recommend all professionals seeking employment in their buildings.	_____	_____
19. The board should provide in-service opportunities for the purpose of developing better working relations between principals and their superintendent.	_____	_____
20. Principals should not be encouraged to attend school board meetings.	_____	_____
21. Principals should be represented by membership on the board team that negotiates contracts with teachers.	_____	_____
22. Principals should be involved along with central staff personnel in determining the instructional program in their building.	_____	_____
23. As a result of collective negotiations, principals should no longer be held responsible for the instructional program in their buildings.	_____	_____
24. Collective negotiations should be between the board and teachers. Principals should not be asked to participate in the proceedings.	_____	_____
25. Principals not on the board negotiating team should be informed regularly of the status of negotiations.	_____	_____
26. Principals should review the final contract with members of the negotiating team so as to know the intent and ramification of each article.	_____	_____

DECISION-MAKING AND INVOLVEMENT--continuedAgree Disagree

27. Principals should be assured by the superintendent and board of the opportunity to be involved in the determination of their salary and working conditions.

28. Principals should be considered as an integral part of management.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS CONCERNING DECISION-MAKING WHICH YOU THINK SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE CRITERIA FOR A MANAGEMENT TEAM:

STRUCTURE

29. There should be a formally structured administrative organization in which principals have representation in formulating system-wide policies.

30. The contents of the agenda for the administrative council should be determined only by the superintendent.

31. Discussion in the administrative council should be free and open without fear of reprisal.

32. The administrative council should be a place where principals and the superintendent can bring their concerns and expect to find solutions.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS CONCERNING STRUCTURE WHICH YOU THINK SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE CRITERIA FOR A MANAGEMENT TEAM:

COMMUNICATION

Agree Disagree

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|-------|
| 33. | There always should be dialogue between the superintendent, or his representative, and principals on matters of mutual concern before final decisions are made. | _____ | _____ |
| 34. | Principals should not be involved in discussions of the educational goals of the district. They should be determined by the board and the superintendent. | _____ | _____ |
| 35. | The superintendent should hold regularly scheduled meetings to inform principals of the "state of the district." | _____ | _____ |
| 36. | The superintendent is responsible for the total district; therefore, he can't consider suggestions of individual principals. | _____ | _____ |
| 37. | The superintendent should understand the problems of the principals but it is not necessary for principals to understand the problems of the superintendent. | _____ | _____ |
| 38. | The superintendent and principals should feel free to discuss important things about their job with each other. | _____ | _____ |
| 39. | The flow of information should be principal to superintendent, superintendent to principal and principal to principal. | _____ | _____ |

COMMUNICATION--continuedAgree Disagree

40. Principals should know the superintendent's perception of the office of the principal.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS CONCERNING COMMUNICATION WHICH YOU THINK SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE CRITERIA FOR A MANAGEMENT TEAM:

ACCOUNTABILITY

41. Principals should be held responsible to the superintendent for the management of their building.

42. Principals should be accountable for the instructional programs in their buildings.

43. Principals should be held accountable for implementing board and administrative policy as directed.

44. Because he is a professional employee, the principal's effectiveness should not be evaluated.

45. The instructional program as it is operating in a building should be evaluated periodically.

46. Teachers are professional people, therefore, they should not be accountable to their principal.

47. Nonprofessional personnel (custodians and cooks) should not be accountable to the principal but to a supervisor who understands their problems.

ACCOUNTABILITY--continued

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
48. When a complaint regarding a building reaches the superintendent, he should resolve it without involving the principal.	_____	_____
49. When a professional is disturbed at the building level, he should feel free to by-pass his principal and go directly to the superintendent.	_____	_____
50. Problems of nonprofessional personnel should first be referred to the principal for solution before central office becomes involved.	_____	_____
51. Principals must "live" with their teachers; therefore, they should not be required to evaluate teachers.	_____	_____
52. Principals should evaluate periodically the effectiveness of non-professionals on their staff.	_____	_____
53. Each position in the administrative hierarchy should have a job description.	_____	_____

ADDITIONAL FACTORS CONCERNING ACCOUNTABILITY WHICH YOU THINK SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE CRITERIA FOR A MANAGEMENT TEAM:

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER AND PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

Dear Principal:

There are currently thirty-four school districts in Michigan in which administrators are organized for collective bargaining. My doctoral dissertation will deal with the changes this has brought about in the management functions of school districts involved.

Your superintendent has agreed to complete a questionnaire similar to the one enclosed. Would you please take a few minutes to respond also, and then return the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope. A summary of the results of this study will be sent to all participating school districts.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,


Larry McConnell

This questionnaire has to do with the management functions of school districts. Its purpose is to access changes that have taken place in Michigan school districts where administrators collectively bargain. No individual or school district will be identified in the study. Secondary principals (including middle school principals) are asked to consider each question as it applies to secondary principals only. Elementary principals are asked to consider each question as it applies to elementary principals only.

Please place the number of the answer which you feel best describes the changes, if any, that have taken place in your district since your administrative organization was officially recognized as the bargaining unit for administrators.

Current Title

- ☐ Elementary Principal
☐ Middle School Principal
☐ Junior High School Principal
☐ Senior High School Principal

Sex

- ☐ Female
☐ Male

Age

Total Number of Years in
School Administration

Number of Years in Current
Position

Are you a Member of a
Negotiating Team for the
Board of Education

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

In your opinion, generally what affect has administrative
collective bargaining had on your district.

- ☐ Detrimental ☐ No Significant Effect ☐ Wholesome

In your opinion, is your district practicing the principles of
the Management Team Concept.

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

INVOLVEMENT AND DECISION-MAKING

1. The amount of discussion held by the superintendent and principals about system-wide policies concerning the operation of schools has _____
 a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

2. The opportunity for input by principals' in the formulation of policy which is to be recommended to the board has _____
 a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

3. The principals' understanding of the reasons for decisions made by the Board and superintendent has _____
 a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

4. The principals' freedom to evaluate the effectiveness of decisions previously made by the board, superintendent or administration cabinet has _____
 a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

5. The degree to which principals have authority to establish rules and procedures for the operation of their buildings, consistent with board and administrative policy, has _____
 a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

6. The amount of respect and consideration for a principal who has an opinion different from the majority of administrators has _____
 a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

7. The influence of the principals concerning the number and preparation of teachers assigned to their buildings has _____
 a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

8. In general, the involvement of principals in decisions which affect them has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
9. The principals' involvement in the development of the district wide budget has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
10. The principals' involvement in the development of their building budgets has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
11. The principals' responsibility for the administration of their building budgets has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
12. The principals' involvement in the employment of non-professional employees for their building has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
13. The principals' involvement in the development of inservice education programs for the system has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
14. The principals' involvement in determining inservice education programs for their buildings has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
15. The amount of inservice opportunities (eg. conference attendance, seminars, etc) which the board provides for principals has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

16. The freedom of principals to attend board meetings has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
17. The amount of give and take between principals and other administrators, directed toward arriving at an administrative decision has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
18. The amount of input by principals concerning Board of Education positions for negotiations with other employee groups has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
19. The actual representation of principals on Board of Education negotiation teams has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
20. The degree of involvement of principals in determining the instructional program for their buildings has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
21. The amount of information available to all principals concerning the status of negotiations with other employee groups has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
22. The degree to which principals are helped to understand the intent and ramification of all agreements negotiated with employee groups has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
23. Principals' influence concerning their salaries and fringe benefits has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

24. The relationship of principals salaries and fringe benefits to that of other administrators has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
25. The relationship of principals salaries and fringe benefits to that of teachers has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
26. The relationship of principals' salaries and fringe benefits to that of school district non-professional employees has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
27. The working conditions of principals in this school district have _____
- a. Greatly improved b. Improved c. Remained the same d. Deteriorated e. Greatly Deteriorated
28. The degree to which principals are a part of the management team in this school district has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

ACCOUNTABILITY

29. The degree to which the superintendent holds the principals accountable for the overall educational climate of buildings has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
30. The degree to which the superintendent holds principals responsible for the management of their buildings has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
31. The degree to which the superintendent holds principals responsible for implementing board and administrative policy, as directed, has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

32. The frequency with which the superintendent evaluates the effectiveness of the principals has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
33. The degree to which the principals are held accountable for evaluation of teachers assigned to their buildings has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
34. The degree to which the principals are held accountable for evaluation of non-professional personnel assigned to their buildings has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
35. The degree to which the superintendent involves the principals regarding complaints about their building has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
36. The degree to which the principals have the opportunity to learn by doing, including the freedom to make mistakes, and to learn from them, has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
37. The opportunity for principals to communicate ideas and suggestions to the superintendent or his representative has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
38. The degree to which principals know the superintendent's perception of the role of the principal has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

39. The degree to which the superintendent knows the principals perception of the role of the superintendent has _____

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

COMMUNICATIONS

40. The chance for dialog between the superintendent, or his representative, and principals on matters of mutual concern which takes place before a final decision is made has _____

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

41. The quality and regularity of the meetings called by the superintendent to keep principals informed of the "state of the district" has _____

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

42. The reception of suggestions to the superintendent by principals has _____

a. Greatly improved b. Improved c. Remained the same d. Deteriorated e. Greatly deteriorated

43. The understanding the superintendent has of the problems faced by the principals has _____

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

44. The understanding the principals have of the problems faced by the superintendent has _____

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

45. The freedom principals have to discuss important things about their jobs with the superintendent has _____

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

46. The accuracy and amount of information available to the principals from the board, superintendent and administrative cabinet has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
47. The accuracy and amount of information from the principals to the superintendent and board has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

STRUCTURE

48. The degree to which principals understand their role and position in the administrative hierarchy has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
49. The degree to which formal line of communication and reporting are adhered to in this district has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
50. The degree to which administrative staff meetings provide the opportunity for principals to share ideas and concerns with other administrators has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
51. The degree to which principals can determine contents of the agenda for administrative staff meetings has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remained the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

APPENDIX C

SUPERINTENDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C

The attached questionnaire was designed to measure your assessment of changes, if any, that have taken place as a result of administrative bargaining in your school district. Please record separate answers as the questions apply to secondary principals (including middle school principals) and as they apply to elementary principals.

No individual or school district will be identified in this study. A summary of the results will be made available to each participating school district as soon as the data has been analyzed.

Before answering the questionnaire, would you please provide the information requested below:

Number of Years Served
in Current Position

Number of Years Served
as Administrator in
Current District

In your opinion, generally what affect has
administrative collective bargaining had on
your district.

Detrimental No Significant Effect

Wholesome

In your opinion, is your district practicing
the principles of the Management Team Concept.

Yes No Don't Know

INVOLVEMENT AND DECISION-MAKING

					<u>Elementary Principals</u>	<u>Secondary Principals</u>
1.	The amount of discussion held by the superintendent and principals about system-wide policies concerning the operation of schools has				_____	_____
	a. Greatly increased	b. Increased	c. Remain the same	d. Decreased	e. Greatly decreased	
2.	The opportunity for input by principals' in the formulation of policy which is to be recommended to the board has				_____	_____
	a. Greatly increased	b. Increased	c. Remain the same	d. Decreased	e. Greatly decreased	
3.	The principals' understanding of the reasons for decisions made by the Board and superintendent has				_____	_____
	a. Greatly increased	b. Increased	c. Remain the same	d. Decreased	e. Greatly decreased	
4.	The principals' freedom to evaluate the effectiveness of decisions previously made by the Board, superintendent or administration cabinet has				_____	_____
	a. Greatly increased	b. Increased	c. Remain the same	d. Decreased	e. Greatly Decreased	
5.	The degree to which principals have authority to establish rules and procedures for the operation of their buildings, consistent with board and administrative policy, has				_____	_____
	a. Greatly increased	b. Increased	c. Remain the same	d. Decreased	e. Greatly decreased	
6.	The amount of respect and consideration for one who has an opinion different from the majority has				_____	_____
	a. Greatly increased	b. Increased	c. Remain the same	d. Decreased	e. Greatly decreased	

<u>Elementary</u> <u>Principals</u>	<u>Secondary</u> <u>Principals</u>
--	---------------------------------------

7. The influence of the principals concerning the number and preparation of teachers assigned to their buildings has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

8. In general, the involvement of principals in decisions which affect them has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

9. The principals' involvement in the development of the district wide budget has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

10. The principals' involvement in the development of their building budgets has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

11. The principals' responsibility for the administration of their building budgets has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

12. The principals' involvement in the employment of non-professional employees for their building has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

13. The principals' involvement in the development of inservice education programs for the system has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

14. The principals' involvement in determining inservice education programs for their buildings has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

15. The amount of inservice opportunities (eg. conference attendance, seminars, etc.) which the board provides for principals has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

16. The freedom of principals to attend board meetings has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

17. The amount of give and take between principals and other administrators, directed toward arriving at an administrative decision has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

18. The amount of input by principals concerning Board of Education positions for negotiations with other employee groups has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

19. The actual representation of principals on Board of Education negotiation teams has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

20. The degree of involvement of principals in determining the instructional program for their buildings has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

21. The amount of information available to all principals concerning the status of negotiations with other employee groups has

- | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| a. Greatly increased | b. Increased | c. Remain the same | d. Decreased | e. Greatly decreased |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|

22. The degree to which principals are helped to understand the intent and ramification of all agreements negotiated with employee groups has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
23. Principals' influence concerning their salaries and fringe benefits has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
24. The relationship of principals salaries and fringe benefits to that of other administrators has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
25. The relationship of principals salaries and fringe benefits to that of teachers has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
26. The relationship of principals' salaries and fringe benefits to that of school district non-professional employees has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
27. The working conditions of principals in this school district have _____
- a. Greatly improved b. Improved c. Remain the same d. Deteriorated e. Greatly deteriorated
28. The degree to which principals are a part of the management team in this school district has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

115
ACCOUNTABILITY

Elementary
Principals Secondary
Principals

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|-------|
| 29. | The degree to which the superintendent holds the principals accountable for the overall educational climate of buildings has | _____ | _____ |
| | a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased | | |
| | | | |
| 30. | The degree to which the superintendent holds principals responsible for the management of their buildings has | _____ | _____ |
| | a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased | | |
| | | | |
| 31. | The degree to which the superintendent holds principals responsible for implementing board and administrative policy, as directed, has | _____ | _____ |
| | a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased | | |
| | | | |
| 32. | The frequency with which the superintendent evaluates the effectiveness of the principals has | _____ | _____ |
| | a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased | | |
| | | | |
| 33. | The degree to which the principals are held accountable for evaluation of teachers assigned to their buildings has | _____ | _____ |
| | a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased | | |
| | | | |
| 34. | The degree to which the principals are held accountable for evaluation of non-professional personnel assigned to their buildings has | _____ | _____ |
| | a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased | | |
| | | | |
| 35. | The degree to which the superintendent involves the principals regarding complaints about their building has | _____ | _____ |
| | a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased | | |

36. The degree to which the principals have the opportunity to learn by doing, including the freedom to make mistakes, and to learn from them, has

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

37. The opportunity for principals to communicate ideas and suggestions to the superintendent or his representative has

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

38. The degree to which principals know the superintendent's perception of the role of the principal has

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

39. The degree to which the superintendent knows the principals perception of the role of the superintendent has

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

COMMUNICATIONS

40. The chance for dialog between the superintendent, or his representative, and principals on matters of mutual concern which takes place before a final decision is made has

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

41. The quality and regularity of the meetings called by the superintendent to keep principals informed of the "state of the district" has

a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

42. The reception of suggestions to the superintendent by principals has

a. Greatly improved b. Improved c. Remain the same d. Deteriorated e. Greatly deteriorated

43. The understanding the superintendent has of the problems faced by the principals has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
44. The understanding the principals have of the problems faced by the superintendent has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
45. The freedom principals have to discuss important things about their jobs with the superintendent has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
46. The accuracy and amount of information available to the principals from the board, superintendent and administrative cabinet has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
47. The accuracy and amount of information from the principals to the superintendent and board has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

STRUCTURE

48. The degree to which principals understand their role and position in the administrative hierarchy has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased
49. The degree to which formal line of communication and reporting are adhered to in this district has _____
- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

50. The degree to which administrative staff meetings provide the opportunity for principals to share ideas and concerns with other administrators has _____

- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased

51. The degree to which principals can determine contents of the agenda for administrative staff meetings has _____

- a. Greatly increased b. Increased c. Remain the same d. Decreased e. Greatly decreased