

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.**

University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

78-3470

BURTON, Gary Andrew, 1945-
ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNITS: A
STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF SUPERINTENDENTS,
SECONDARY AND ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
IN SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Michigan State University,
Ph.D., 1977
Education, administration

University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1977

GARY ANDREW BURTON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNITS: A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES
OF SUPERINTENDENTS, SECONDARY AND ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
IN SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

By

Gary A. Burton

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

**Department of Administration
and Higher Education**

1977

ABSTRACT

ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNITS: A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF SUPERINTENDENTS, SECONDARY AND ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Gary A. Burton

The primary purpose of this research was to compare the attitudes of Michigan public school superintendents, secondary and elementary principals toward administrative bargaining units (ABU's). Three attitudinal variables were considered in the study: (1) general attitude toward administrative bargaining units; (2) belief concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units; and (3) attitude toward present situation. In addition to the three attitudinal dependent variables there were three independent variables: (1) type of administrative organization; (2) size of school district as determined by number of building principals employed; and (3) present employment position.

Methodology

The data for this study were obtained from 84 superintendents, 84 secondary principals, and 84 elementary principals. Half of the individuals in each of the three preceding categories were employed by school districts with ABU's; the remaining half were employed by school districts without ABU's. All 252 administrators were asked

to answer 74 identical questions which constituted the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire, an instrument developed especially for this research project. Two statistical techniques were used to analyze the data: multiple-group cluster analysis and analysis of variance. Four sets of hypotheses were formulated in order to test whether significant relationships existed between school administrators and their attitudes toward administrative bargaining units. An alpha level of .005 was set for testing each of the 17 individual hypotheses in order to insure an experiment-wise alpha level of .05.

Major Findings

The findings of this study are significant both in what was determined through statistical analysis of the data and what was not determined.

First, it was supported that administrators in school districts that have ABU's have attitudes that are more positive toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Second, it was supported that administrators in school districts that have ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Third, superintendents appear to have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than building principals. Superintendents appear to have more positive attitudes since the data

results were, in fact, significant in the opposite direction than hypothesized.

Fourth, superintendents appear to have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than building principals. Superintendents appear to have stronger beliefs since the data results were significant in the opposite direction than hypothesized.

Fifth, superintendents in school districts with ABU's appear to have attitudes that are more positive toward their present situation than superintendents in school districts without ABU's. Superintendents in school districts with ABU's appear to have more positive attitudes since the data results were, in fact, significant in the opposite direction than hypothesized.

Sixth, building principals in school districts with ABU's have attitudes which are more positive toward their present situation than building principals in school districts without ABU's.

In addition to the above findings which resulted from hypotheses testing, the following significant results were obtained from additional tests of the data collected.

1. Administrators in both small and large-sized school districts with ABU's appear to have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in medium-sized school districts with ABU's.
2. Elementary principals in school districts with ABU's appear to have more positive attitudes concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than elementary principals in school districts without ABU's.

Finally, of significance to the researcher was the inability to produce at a significant level, data results which supported the theory that building principals, and elementary principals in particular, hold attitudes that are more positive towards administrative bargaining units than superintendents. The literature had strongly promoted this theory which was not supported within the present study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The casual reader may find this acknowledgment overly sentimental and possibly redundant. Yet, now that the dissertation is completed and approved, this acknowledgment is as necessary, in the opinion of the researcher, as the conclusions in Chapter Five.

While only one name appears on the cover of this dissertation, the support and encouragement of many talented people have made this research project possible. It is only proper that they be acknowledged and publicly thanked, though thanking them alone is in no way an adequate payment for their efforts.

First, my love and appreciation to my wife, Chris, without whose constant understanding, encouragement, patience, and partnership this study would not have been possible.

Dr. Richard Featherstone, as chairman and friend, has given of himself far more than can ever be repaid by this researcher. Dick, I only hope that reflected in my lifestyle will be a willingness to do for others as you have so willingly done for me.

Dr. Howard Hickey's encouragement and ability to understand the trials and tribulations, the peaks and valleys, of a graduate program are without equal. Howard, you have influenced my thinking and changed my life for the better.

Drs. Brembeck, Grotz and Gardner as committee members have given more than time in making this dissertation possible. All three gentlemen have raised questions and arguments during the life of this

project, which while sometimes painful, needed to be addressed. Because these points were raised and issues reexamined, this is a better dissertation.

Without the technical advice of Dr. Marcia Carlyn, the researcher fears that he would still be wandering the halls of the Computer Center. Dr. Carlyn's assistance in the statistical development of this study was invaluable.

Dr. Cas Heilman did not serve on the researcher's committee or directly assist in his research, but his daily encouragement and willingness to allow the graduate assistant certain liberties proved to be as important to the researcher as the advice and assistance from others.

Finally, the researcher would like to acknowledge his parents, Ethel and Harold Burton, who instilled in their three sons a desire for self-betterment and who are, themselves, perfect examples of this attitude.

To the above individuals and numerous others, thank you sincerely for influencing this research project and this researcher.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose	5
Definition of Terms	7
Assumptions	9
Limitations and Delimitations	10
Research Hypotheses	12
Overview	14
II. SELECTED REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
Introduction	17
Historical Background of Collective Bargaining	18
In the Private Sector	18
In the Public Sector	24
Legal Activities Leading to Administrative Unionization in Public Education	27
Changing Attitudes of Public School Administrators Toward Unionism	32
The Impact of Administrative Unions on Middle Management/Superintendent Relationships	41
Alternatives to Administrative Unionization	46
Summary	53
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	61
Introduction	61
Sample Selection	63
Instrumentation	67
The Pilot Study	67
Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire	69
Summary	74

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	76
Introduction	76
Presentation of the Data	78
Additional Findings	98
Summary	100
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	104
Summary of the Study	104
Discussion of the Findings and Recommendations for Future Research	109
Additional Recommendations	117
Conclusions	120
APPENDIX. ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNIT PREFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER	124

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Variable Matrix	62
3.2 ABUPQ Return Rate by Stratum	68
3.3 Results of Cluster Analysis with the ABUPQ	71
3.4 Means and Standard Deviations of ABUPQ	74
4.1 Cell Means of ABUPQ Cluster Scores	77
4.2 Results of Analysis of Variance for Testing Hypothesis 1	80
4.3 Results of Analysis of Variance for Testing Hypothesis 2	84
4.4 Results of Analysis of Variance for Testing Hypothesis 3	88
4.5 Results of Analysis of Variance for Testing Hypothesis 4	92
4.6 ABUPQ Demographic Data	99
4.7 Results of Analysis of Variance for Further Testing of Hypothesis 4F	101

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Since the passage of Michigan's Public Act 379 (PERA) in 1965 and the 1968 decision of the Michigan Labor Mediation Board granting the Hillsdale Community school supervisory personnel the right to collectively bargain with their school boards over hours, wages, and working conditions, numerous administrative unions and bargaining units have been established throughout the state. These unions and bargaining units represented primarily middle-level administrators such as building principals, assistant principals, and curriculum coordinators. Usually excluded from these bargaining units, either by law or interpretation, were executive management personnel such as the superintendent, the assistants for personnel and business, and depending upon the size of the school district, other immediate members of the central office staff. Reasons cited for the formation of such organizations ranged from a desire for a better administrative wage and fringe benefit package to a show of administrators' solidarity in response to the growing strength of teacher unions at the negotiation table and the erosion of administrative prerogatives.¹

By 1977, collective bargaining by a group of Michigan school administrators with an elected or appointed agent for unit representation in an individual district had been a legal possibility for

seven years and was a reality in at least seventy school systems.² These administrative bargaining units (ABU's) and unions ranged in size from Detroit's Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors (OSAS) with over 1200 members and an annual budget of \$150,000 to the twelve administrators voluntarily recognized by the Carrollton School District Board of Education as a legal bargaining unit for purposes of contract negotiations. The formation of such units had grown from one in 1969, to twenty-two in 1971, to thirty-four in 1973, to the seventy administrative bargaining units which were formally recognized at the time of this writing.

As such, two distinct types of administrative bargaining organizations had emerged from within public school systems throughout the state of Michigan. The first and most common was an independent administrative bargaining unit which was voluntarily recognized by the individual school board for the primary purpose of contract negotiation with the building principals and other second-line administrators. The second and more formal organization was an administrative union, which after holding an election supervised by the Michigan Employment Relations Commission was then certified by MERC as the official bargaining unit for all second-line or middle-level administrators within a particular district. Certification as a union most often occurred after a group of administrators had been unsuccessful in petitioning their school board for voluntarily recognized bargaining status.

Administrative bargaining units once voluntarily recognized were afforded by law the same guarantees of good faith bargaining as

certified administrative unions. Therefore the terms administrative bargaining unit and administrative union are interchangeable.

In a state such as Michigan with its traditional support of laborers and their unions, the apparent incongruity of a labor organization for management personnel was settled in the courts. The 1970 decisions rendered an interpretation of the Michigan Public Employment Relations Act (PA 379), which granted administrators in supervisory or second-line positions the right to collectively bargain and were followed by two significant attitudinal changes. First, spokesmen both favoring and opposing these decisions predicted rapid growth of administrative bargaining units unless administrators could be made to feel part of the total management team. In The National Elementary Principal, McNally warned in 1973 that unless superintendents and boards of education incorporated middle-level administrators into the decision-making process as well as became more attuned to the special needs of these administrators, there would be a rapid increase in the number of administrative bargaining units and unions where law permitted throughout the country.³

Less than three years later, Bridges and Cooper reported in an article entitled "Collective Bargaining for School Administrators,"

Administrator bargaining units have spread like a forest fire in a record breaking drought. Prior to 1970 few such units existed in this country; almost seven years later approximately 1,275 units are sitting on the opposite side of the bargaining table from boards of education.⁴

The second significant change was the open encouragement of administrators to organize unions. The most vocal and prominent advocates were the spokesmen of statewide administrative associations.

In a speech to a group of Michigan administrators, Duvall, Executive Director of the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations, stated,

If we must organize on a local basis and force boards to become professional in treatment of administrators then let's organize -- frustration may force union movement.⁵

In 1976, the Representative Assembly of the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals voted in support of the following new statement regarding the management team.

We believe that the elementary principals have an inherent right to have a voice in the determination of their professional destiny. Within the Management Team concept, the MAESP recommends the use of formal bargaining procedures to the degree necessary for elementary principals to achieve and maintain a significant role in matters vitally important to them, including determination of wages, hours, and working conditions.⁶

With open encouragement to organize, there existed every likelihood that the number of administrative bargaining units would increase. Since the vast majority of administrative contracts throughout the state were determined with no local administrative organization representation (either formal or voluntarily recognized), by 1977 principals and superintendents were being forced to examine carefully the consequences, both beneficial and detrimental, of administrative unionization.

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to determine attitudes of administrators in selected Michigan school districts toward administrative bargaining units. For the purpose of this study only, the term administrators is used to denote superintendents, secondary and elementary

principals, while the term building principals refers only to secondary and elementary principals. The following four research questions address this problem.

1. Do administrators in school systems with and without administrative bargaining units have significantly different attitudes toward administrative bargaining units?
2. Do administrators in school systems of varying sizes have significantly different attitudes toward administrative bargaining units?
3. Do superintendents, secondary principals, and elementary principals have significantly different attitudes toward administrative bargaining units?
4. Do superintendents, secondary principals, and elementary principals in school systems with and without administrative bargaining units have significantly different attitudes toward administrative bargaining units?

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine a set of variables with respect to their ability to determine the attitudes of Michigan superintendents and building principals toward administrative bargaining units composed of building principals and other administrators excluding the superintendent and his immediate assistants. To accomplish this, it was important to investigate, with a reliable survey instrument, the underlying conditions which when present within a school system tended to encourage administrators to either petition their school board for voluntary bargaining status with agent representation or to actively seek the legal protections of a certified union.

The study did not attempt to promote administrative unionization or to evaluate the process of collective bargaining by school

officials. Rather, it acknowledged the continuing growth of administrative bargaining units involving Michigan administrators as deserving of systematic research.

This study was deemed professionally important and timely since administrative unionization and its alternatives were receiving national review by increasing numbers of educators and non-educators. This interest (and in some cases, action) by a few hundred middle-level administrators, in forming traditional labor organizations had embarrassed, alarmed, angered, and/or encouraged thousands of their counterparts in schools across the state. It was hoped that an in-depth study of attitudes of administrators toward administrative bargaining units would do much to enlighten school administrators and dispel many misconceptions concerning labor organizations.

Finally, this study was considered significant in that it would promote a better understanding of the changing roles and responsibilities of building principals as middle-level administrators in the public schools.

It is possible that the findings of this study may have impact far beyond the limits of the study itself. At this writing, it has not been established that administrative unionization is either intrinsically harmful or helpful to public education as many educator/authors on both sides of the controversy have argued. Hopefully this study has brought about a more enlightened attitude concerning administrative bargaining units. Second, since collective bargaining, which establishes an adversary relationship between the bargaining parties, is a major component of unionization, this study

will have done much to identify productive attitudes for superintendents and building principals when a labor/management relationship results from the formation of an administrative bargaining unit.

School board members will find the results of this study of interest since it is this group which is legally responsible for issuing administrative contracts. Finally, principals, superintendents, and school board members will find the results of this study beneficial when considering alternatives to administrative unions.

Definition of Terms

The following terms have significance for educators concerned with collective negotiations and administrative bargaining units.

Administrative Bargaining Unit, Administrative Union: Two terms which have been used interchangeably in the literature. Basically, a group of building level administrators within a single school system which has either been certified by the Michigan Employment Relations Commission (MERC) or voluntarily recognized by its school board as the official bargaining unit representative for the purposes of contract negotiations.

Administrators: Individuals appointed to administer a school building or school system. For this study, superintendent, secondary and elementary principals are considered administrators.

Building Principal: Administrative head of a school building or complex to which students in any or all grades, kindergarten through twelve, are assigned. For this study, secondary and elementary principals are considered building principals.

Superintendent: The chief executive in the school district and professional leader of the teaching staff.

Secondary School Principal: Administrative head of a school building or complex to which students in any or all grades seven through twelve, exclusively, are assigned. Known also as high school principal.

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

Executive Management: As defined by the Michigan Labor Mediation Board 1969 Labor Opinion 187, "executive" personnel are those managerial employees who may engage in concerted activities of the type specified in the Public Employees Relations Act of 1965 (absent consent of the public employer's legislative body), and are the primary creators of policy which affects the total activities of an employer or of a major division or department thereof. In Michigan public schools, this consists of superintendents and assistant superintendents.

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

Attitude: A state of mind or feeling with regard to some matter; disposition.

Collective Bargaining, Collective Negotiations, Professional Negotiations: Three terms which have been used interchangeably in the literature. It is a process whereby employees, as a group, bargain in good faith with their employers on the conditions of their

employment relationship, for the purpose of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement.⁷ It is a continuous process of bilateral accommodation on the part of labor and management and is concerned not only with the economic status of the employees but also with the protection and extension of their rights and freedom.⁸

Administrative Contract, Written Agreement: A written document containing the matters agreed to, which is signed by the local administrative organization and the board of education at the conclusion of negotiations.

Small-Sized School District: A Michigan public school district (K-12) employing zero to eight building principals.

Medium-Sized School District: A Michigan public school district (K-12) employing nine to fourteen building principals.

Large-Sized School District: A Michigan public school district (K-12) employing fifteen or more building principals.

Assumptions

It has been suggested that the answers to the research questions were greater in scope than the obvious examination of possible organizational groupings by educational administrators below the executive level of the school superintendent and his cabinet. Specifically, this research has contributed to the overall improvement of the learning environment for children who attend Michigan public schools. In order to accept the previous statement, the following two assumptions were necessary as directly or indirectly linked to this research project.

1. Administrative attitudes influence administrative decisions, and the decisions made by administrators are capable of affecting all aspects of education. Therefore, if the attitudes of administrators are known and understood, there is greater likelihood of understanding their decisions and how they will influence education.

2. The effective and efficient management of a school complex is highly correlated to student welfare, teacher performance, and quality of instruction. That is to say, when schools are poorly organized or poorly managed by administrative staffs, students and teachers alike will suffer the consequences of that environment.

Many research studies have shown that the building leadership or the lack thereof, makes a difference as to a quality educational program or a poor one.⁹

In many studies across the nation, it has been pointed out that a competent principal is the single most important person in the school system. Without a strong principal who stood up as an advocate for the education of the students and a buffer against those who aggressively pursued policies that gratified their own desires regardless of the boys and girls, quality education would erode.

Therefore, the major assumption made in defense of this research was that whatever affects administrators and their roles and responsibilities, be it school integration, teacher evaluation, or administrative bargaining units, affects to some degree the quality of education that children receive within their schools.

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations

A recognized limitation of this study was admittedly the confidence which could be placed upon the attitudes or opinions of those

administrators responding to the questionnaire and the reliability of the questionnaire itself.

Since the topic of administrative bargaining units is political by nature, the administrative responses were suspect in that they may not have accurately recorded an individual's true feelings on the topic of administrative unionization. Likewise, there existed the possibility that the data collection instrument was inaccurate, misleading, biased, or simply poorly constructed. While every effort to control for these possible weaknesses was made, the findings and conclusions are obviously not above question.

The study included only those items deemed to be within the general range of attitudes of superintendents, secondary principals, and elementary principals concerning administrative bargaining units as identified by the researcher in the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire (ABUPQ). The list of attitudinal preferences was not necessarily inclusive.

A further limitation was that this study did not include administrators involved in the management of schools, other than the superintendent and secondary and elementary principals, for reasons of time, energy, and monies available to the researcher. Finally, the researcher attempted to be as objective and free from bias as possible, but acknowledges this condition as a limitation in pursuing the research.

Delimitations

The researcher consciously delimited this study to 124 selected school systems throughout Michigan, soliciting a total of

252 responses from 84 superintendents, secondary principals, and elementary principals respectively. All respondents were randomly selected.

Although this study did not attempt to explain cause and effect for the continuing growth of administrative bargaining units and unionization, it did attempt to verify previously documented reasons why administrators form administrative bargaining units and to identify and define conditions under which additional studies might be conducted.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were drawn from the research questions for this study. In each case attitudes of the superintendents and building principals were tested via the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire (ABUPQ). Based on review of current literature concerning this topic and preliminary research, the researcher selected the following directional hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1 -- Type of Organization

1A. Administrators in school districts with administrative bargaining units have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

1B. Administrators in school districts with administrative bargaining units have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

1C. Administrators in school districts with administrative bargaining units have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than administrators in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

Hypothesis 2 -- Size of School District

2A. Administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in small-sized school districts.

2B. Administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in small-sized school districts.

2C. Administrators in large-sized school districts have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in medium-sized school districts.

2D. Administrators in large-sized school districts have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in medium-sized school districts.

Hypothesis 3 -- Employment Position

3A. Building principals have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than superintendents.

3B. Building principals have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than superintendents.

3C. Elementary principals have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than secondary principals.

3D. Elementary principals have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than secondary principals.

Hypothesis 4 -- Type of Organization and Employment Position

4A. Superintendents in school districts with administrative bargaining units have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than superintendents in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

4B. Superintendents in school districts with administrative bargaining units have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than superintendents in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

4C. Superintendents in school districts without administrative bargaining units have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than superintendents in school districts with administrative bargaining units.

4D. Building principals in school districts with administrative bargaining units have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than building principals in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

4E. Building principals in school districts with administrative bargaining units have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than building principals in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

4F. Building principals in school districts with administrative bargaining units have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than building principals in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

The testing of these hypotheses provided empirical evidence for the answers to the research questions concerning administrative attitudes toward administrative bargaining units.

Overview

The organization of this study involves five major chapters. The first chapter serves as the basis for Identification of the Problem, and a rationale for the purpose of the study.

Chapter II contains a selected review of the literature. This review covers a number of areas of concern to the researcher which logically develop the base from which this study was conducted. Administrative bargaining units were relatively new to public sector unionism, yet their roots are traceable to the very origin of the American labor movement. The researcher traced historically significant events, first in the private sector, and more recently in the public sector, which permitted and even encouraged unionization by a group of workers who, until then, had considered themselves, and more significantly had been viewed by the general public, as a division of management. The review of related literature is

organized under five areas of concern to the researcher. Findings in these areas provided the basis for the research questions and hypotheses of this study.

The third chapter, Design of the Study, identifies the source from which the data were collected, the instrumentation used by the researcher, and finally a description of the procedure used in an analysis of the data obtained from the respondents.

Chapter IV, Analysis of the Data, describes the administration of the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire. The researcher then makes a complete and detailed presentation and analysis of the data with regard to each of the hypotheses. A summary of the analysis of data is included.

The fifth and final chapter is a presentation of the researcher's summary, conclusions, and recommendations for future research. Implications of the study are presented here. A complete bibliography and appendices are attached.

Footnotes--Chapter I

¹A Survey of Administrative Bargaining Units in Michigan Public Schools, Eugene N. Spencer, chairman, Research Committee of the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations (September, 1971), p. 11.

²This figure was obtained after a manual search of the files at the Offices of the Michigan Employment Relations Commission in Detroit, Michigan (February, 1977), and a tabulation of a survey conducted by the Michigan Association of School Boards, Lansing, Michigan (December, 1976).

³Harold J. McNally, "A Matter of Trust. The Administrative Team," The National Elementary Principal, 53, 1 (November-December, 1973), 21.

⁴Edwin Bridges and Bruce S. Cooper, "Collective Bargaining for School Administrators," Theory Into Practice, Volume XV, Number 4 (), 306.

⁵Robert E. Hall, "Why Administrators Are Turning to Collective Bargaining," (Report presented at MASE Conference, Grand Rapids, Michigan, November 2, 1976), p. 2.

⁶William Mays, Jr., "Whether or Not Administrators Should Organize," Kalamazoo Intermediate School District, Kalamazoo, Michigan (Mimeographed sheet, February 9, 1977), p. 1.

⁷Perry Keith Gregg, "A Case Study of the Public School Collective Negotiations Process Designed for the Use of Administrators-in-Training," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969), p. 6.

⁸Walter W. Scott, "A Study of Preparation Programs in School Administration as Affected by Collective Negotiations," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1966), p. 17.

⁹Hall, "Why Administrators Are Turning to Collective Bargaining," p. 3.

¹⁰Ibid., 4.

CHAPTER II

SELECTED REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Five general areas of the literature were related to the present study. The first dealt with the historical background of collective bargaining, as it originated in the private sector and later developed among public employees. The first area was reviewed in order to establish the foundation for the development and analysis of administrative bargaining units and unionization as they occurred in Michigan public schools.

The second area concerned the legal activities which affected administrative unionization in public education, primarily in the state of Michigan. It also attempted to clarify areas of concern which were related to administrative bargaining but were often misunderstood or misinterpreted by administrators, their school boards, and the public in general.

The third area of literary review was related to the changing perceptions of public school administrators toward unionization and the formation of their own unions or bargaining units. The third section was aimed at determining how administrative bargaining units, both theoretically and in practice, may have influenced the actions of building level principals and superintendents.

The fourth area involved a search of the literature to determine the impact of administrative unions on principal/superintendent relationships.

The fifth and final area covered in the present chapter was a limited review of current alternatives to administrative bargaining units. The fifth section of the review was aimed at determining the potential influence of unionization while identifying some alternatives to bargaining units. The management team concept, as the most widely practiced alternative, was examined in greatest depth.

Chapter II was concluded with a short summation.

Historical Background of Collective Bargaining

In the Private Sector

The American labor movement had greatly influenced the thinking and attitudes of public school administrators toward unionization and collective bargaining. Much of what occurred in the public sector during the sixties and seventies had its roots in the colorful and sometimes painful history of the American labor movement of the private sector. This acknowledgment was essential since the more recent federal and state public employment acts were established only after a century and a half of bargaining between employers and employees in private industry.

Collective bargaining and unionism, which are usually inseparable, evolved through at least four distinct phases and established the starting point from which public sector bargaining was generally acknowledged to have begun in 1962. The four periods of the American

labor movement had corresponding public attitudes toward unions which were generally recognized as:

1806-1842	Repression
1842-1935	Limited Toleration
1935-1947	Encouragement
1947-present	Control and Restraint ¹

Each of the four periods, excluding the most recent, began and/or ended with a significant legislative act of the United States Congress or a landmark decision of the courts in the area of private sector unionization. The corresponding acts or court decisions were:

- 1806 - The Conspiracy Trials
- 1842 - Hunt vs. Commonwealth
- 1935 - Wagner Act (National Labor Relations Act)
- 1947 - Taft-Hartley Act (Labor Management Relations Act)

The American labor movement is generally acknowledged to have begun in the aftermath of the American Revolution with the rapid growth of industry in certain major cities.

Although guilds of craftsmen can be traced back to a much earlier period, trade unions in the United States did not begin to develop until the end of the eighteenth century. Philadelphia shoemakers organized in 1792; Boston carpenters in 1793; New York printers in 1794.²

The formation of these first combinations (unions) did not occur without public resistance, and by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the existence and development of the early American labor unions were threatened by an "ill-defined" doctrine of criminal conspiracy. Loosely defined, the conspiracy doctrine "made unlawful, concerted action by workers in making demands upon merchant or

manufacturer."³ The conspiracy doctrine was effectively used by employers in the early nineteenth century to prevent and frustrate laborers in their attempts to organize.

Labor's early attempts to organize to improve working conditions were blunted by judicial reaction which was highly unfavorable to the laborer. The most celebrated case was *Commonwealth vs. Pullis*, which in 1806 found the Philadelphia cordwainers (shoemakers) guilty under the criminal conspiracy doctrine of price fixing and other criminal activity. In summary, these craftsmen were found guilty of organizing to benefit those shoemakers who were members of the Cordwainers Society and thereby doing injury to those individual craftsmen who did not belong to this Society.⁴

In 1894 Justice Harlan's majority opinion stated that acts which are privileged (legal) if done by individuals may be actionable (illegal) if done in combination.

An intent upon the part of a single person to injure the rights of others or of the public is not in itself a wrong of which the law will take cognizance, unless some injurious act be done in execution of the unlawful intent. But a combination of two or more persons with such an intent, and under circumstances that give them, when so combined, a power to do an injury they would not possess as individuals acting singly, has always been recognized as in itself wrongful and illegal.⁵

The "conspiracy" rationale prevailed throughout the nineteenth century, but beginning as early as 1842 a number of court rulings were rendered which brought about the decline of the criminal conspiracy doctrine. Chief Justice Shaw, a clearly outstanding judge in early American history, decided in the now famous *Commonwealth vs. Hunt* case that unions in and of themselves were not

illegal, but that illegality would depend upon the means employed by the union members.

The legality of such an association will therefore depend upon the means to be used for its accomplishment. If it is to be carried into effect by fair or honorable and lawful means, it is, to say the least, innocent; if by falsehood or force, it may be stamped with the character of conspiracy.⁶

The shift in legal thinking from decisions regarding the very right of labor unions to exist, to rulings concerning what lawful means may be used by labor organizations in the economic struggle over the price of labor and working conditions, was considered to be the first sign of public tolerance of unionization.⁷ A 1909 ruling in the National Fireproofing Company vs. Mason Builder's Association case held "laborers and builders may combine for mutual advantage, and, so long as the motive is not malicious, the object not unlawful, nor oppressive and the means neither deceitful nor fraudulent, the result is not a conspiracy, although it may necessarily work injury to other persons."⁸

During the period immediately following the Civil War, public attitudes toward unions became more permissive as America rapidly industrialized. The passage of the Clayton Act in 1914 reflected the increased political influence of organized labor as well as the widespread acknowledgment of the misuse of the criminal conspiracy doctrine in labor cases. The Clayton Act declared "that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce, that the antitrust laws were not to be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor organization."⁹

Within the next twenty-one years the Roosevelt administration attempted to develop a national labor policy favorable to trade unionism. As a result, the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), known also as the Wagner Act, was enacted during 1935. The NLRA declared it to be "the policy of the United States" to encourage the practice of collective bargaining and permitted the worker to self-organize. The Wagner Act provided affirmative legal protection against employers' attempts to frustrate the unionization of employees for the purpose of collective bargaining. The employee's right to self-organize was secured and collective bargaining was made compulsory.

In relatively simple, if elastic provisions the act in general barred employer discrimination on account of, or interference with, organizational activities and other concerted activities by employees. It also imposed on employers an enforceable duty to bargain with unions chosen by a majority of employees in an appropriate unit, and it provided for machinery to determine such units and to ascertain employee preferences.¹⁰

The most significant portion of the NLRA was embodied in Section 7 as:

Employees shall have the right to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.¹¹

Additionally, the Wagner Act proscribed five kinds of illegal employer conduct as unfair labor practices. With virtually all restraints by employers prohibited, unions and their memberships flourished. The period of history immediately following the passage of the NLRA was one of much union activity and frequent violence, as the balance of power shifted from the employer to the employee.

It is necessary to note that although the United States government endorsed private industry unionization in 1935, such was not the case for public sector employees. In its definition of the term "employee," the Wagner Act expressly excluded "the United States, wholly owned government corporations, states and municipal corporations."¹² Therefore, public employees had no organizational rights under the 1935 Act.

During late 1945 and early 1946, while the U. S. was shifting from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy, numerous strikes occurred in many vital industries. Congressional reaction, reflecting the fear that union power would cause serious post-war inflation, took the form of the Labor Management Relations Act (LMRA). Known more commonly as the Taft-Hartley Act, the LMRA amended the NLRA, protecting individuals from unions and balancing management's unfair labor practices with a set of union unfair labor practices.

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 employee to a more equitable division of power.¹³

Public opinion as reflected in federal acts and court decisions concerning unionization had not traveled full circle since the conspiracy trials of the early eighteen hundreds, but by 1974 had reached a position of control and restraint of unionism in the private sector.

The "control and restraint" position was reinforced in 1959 by the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act which amounted to government intervention in the internal affairs of private labor organizations. The Landrum-Griffin Act reflected the growing concern by union members and the general public that union officials were often guilty of criminal mismanagement of union organizations and their funds.

In the Public Sector

While public or governmental employee unionism could be traced to the 1830's, unionization in this sector was more commonly recognized as having developed in the early 1960's.¹⁴ Two executive orders issued by Presidents Kennedy and Nixon, officially guaranteed the right of federal employees to join employee organizations for the purpose of negotiating collective agreements with federal agencies. While it could be shown that public sector unionism had already gained a foothold in selected locations and professions,¹⁵ Kennedy's Executive Order 10988 of 1962 was generally acknowledged as the beginning of public employee unionism. Updating and expansion of 10988 occurred under President Nixon, when he issued Executive Order 11491 in 1969. Executive Order 11491 required exclusive representation and established the right to negotiate collective bargaining agreements with agency management, thereby removing the stigma of "collective begging" by public employees.¹⁶

The two executive orders legally affected only federal governmental employees, but before long most state and local

governments were following the example set by the federal government by enacting collective bargaining laws to regulate negotiation procedures for their public employees. In Michigan the Public Employment Relations Act (PERA) of 1965 amended the Hutchinson Act of 1947 which had prohibited public employees' unions.¹⁷ The former, known as the "Little Wagner Act" or as PA 379, permitted collective bargaining in the public sector with exclusive representation for wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

It is important to note here that federal legislation developed to govern the private sector served as a model for state legislation concerning public sector negotiations. According to Johnson, the modeling of federal legislation by most state governments for collective negotiation in public employment was represented in features such as:

1. The right of employees to negotiate collectively with their employers.
2. The employer's legal obligation to negotiate with the employees' representatives.
3. The establishment of unit determination for categories of employees.
4. The determination of the scope of bargaining.
5. Establishment of an agency to administer the legislation.¹⁸

At this writing there is great inconsistency in state level statutes allowing yet often limiting collective bargaining by public employees. By 1971, thirty-five states had some labor relations legislation or procedures for dealing with their public employees.¹⁹ As of 1976 every state except Mississippi allowed certain public

employees to organize. Statutory coverage and conditions ranged from bare minimum in some states to near duplication of the private sector models in others.²⁰

In 1977, Michigan ordinances covered all public employees under MCLA Sec. 423.201 et seq. (1947) and police and fire fighters under the authority of MCLA Sec. 231 et seq. (1969).²¹ While the Michigan laws reflected a liberal labor attitude, as could be expected in a heavily industrialized state, Michigan laws were somewhat atypical when compared to the laws of other states.

The nature of these laws is as diverse as the states themselves. Some states have placed complete prohibitions upon collective bargaining . . . other(s) have enacted comprehensive statutes which afford public employees rights similar to those guaranteed to the private sector by the National Labor Relations Act. Between these extremes are the states which have chosen to enact lesser forms of bargaining, such as meet and confer legislation, or which have chosen to enact separate laws for differeng groups of employees.²²

A limited review of current Michigan regulations was done, but it must be noted that laws and court decisions may be enacted monthly, and therefore existing laws are subject to change by federal and state constitutional provisions, court decisions, as well as administrative regulations and decisions.²³

In order to administer Public Act 379, the Michigan legislature empowered the Michigan Employment Relations Commission (MERC), known formerly as the Michigan Labor Relations Board (MLRB), to administer statutes, determine bargaining units, conduct elections for certification, provide mediation and fact-finding for impasses, and hear unfair labor practices. School administrators, who were employees of a political subdivision of the state, were in theory

granted the same rights to collectively bargain as other public employees under the provisions of PA 379. In practice, the bargaining rights for school administrators were not immediately acknowledged or accepted by boards of education. In 1969, four years after the passage of PA 379, a Michigan Court of Appeals decision was rendered in favor of administrative bargaining units. Unionization among school administrators was therefore relatively new even to public sector unionism, yet its beginnings were traceable to the very origin of the American labor movement.

In summary, the present section presented a history of significant legislation affecting unionization in first, the private sector and more recently, the public sector. Current statutes permit and even encourage unionization by administrators who until recently had considered themselves, and more significantly been viewed by the general public, as a division of management.

That principals are generally thought of as part of the administration was demonstrated by the "Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education," which was conducted in mid-1975. The results concerning the question, "Should principals be considered a part of management?" found eight of every ten persons in the sample agreeing that principals should be considered a part of management.²⁴

Why, then, have a significant number of administrators, particularly at the building level, decided to exercise their rights as laborers to bargain? Moreover, what legal actions were necessary to ensure that middle-level administrators would be recognized as an official bargaining unit?

Legal Activities Leading to Administrative
Unionization in Public Education

The right and privilege of Michigan public employees to organize was established with the passage of Public Act 379 in 1965. This Act amended the Hutchinson Act of 1947 which had established the guidelines, statutes, and machinery for collective bargaining in the private sector and public utilities. PA 379 extended to all public employees the right to organize for the purpose of collective negotiations. With passage, a mandate was given to public employers to recognize employee bargaining groups and to enter into collective negotiations at the request of a recognized unit.²⁵ Though not immediately recognized, PA 379 included the potential for middle-school administrators to organize.

PERA for the public sector was very similar to the Labor Relations and Mediation Act for the private sector with one notable difference. PERA specifically permitted coverage of individuals employed as supervisors. The right of supervisors to unionize was established when the Michigan Labor Mediation Board (MLMB) concluded that as a matter of statutory construction and not of public policy, supervisory personnel had the right to collectively bargain under PERA (Hillsdale Community School: 1968 Labor Opinions 859). In its decision, the Labor Mediation Board sanctioned the Hillsdale Principals and Supervisors Association Unit on the grounds that there existed a sufficient community of interest between the staff specialists and the principals to form a bargaining unit. In the 1969 Labor Opinion (187), the MLMB decided that a distinction existed between supervisory and executive personnel and that the primary

purpose of PERA would be defeated if "executive" employees (those employees who formulate, determine, and effect management policy) were accorded collective bargaining rights. Two 1970 cases which went before the Michigan Court of Appeals at the requests of boards of education attempted to prohibit supervisory personnel from collectively bargaining, but the Court upheld the Board's earlier decision.²⁶

With the legal precedents established, administrators were free to form bargaining units within their individual school districts. Policies and regulations which governed public employees and their formal organizations were then applicable to those groups of public school administrators who wished to organize formal bargaining units. The administrative bargaining units which were formed represented primarily "middle-level" administrators or, as they were commonly referred to in the literature, "middle management."

"Middle management" was a somewhat misleading label since it implied top or executive level managers as well as low or bottom level managers. Such was not the case in the hierarchy of school administration. While there were executive level administrators, such as superintendents and their cabinets, who were excluded from bargaining units by law or interpretation, all other administrators below the rank of assistant superintendent were commonly labeled middle-level or second-line managers. The corresponding counterpart in the private sector would have been industrial foremen and supervisors. The distinction in education between top and middle management with an absence of any lower management was still subject to examination

by the Michigan courts. Laws, as has been noted, are subject to review and change.

It should be noted, however, that the distinction between "executive" and "supervisory" personnel established in the City of Detroit Decision has not as yet been expressly considered by the Courts. In addition, notwithstanding the apparent simplicity of the legal rule ("Supervisory" personnel have rights under PERA; executive personnel do not), its application will not be without difficulty. As the Court in Hillsdale stated, ". . . the remedy lies within the legislature." The legislature by the enactment of PERA purportedly has determined what the policy of Michigan is regarding collective bargaining by public employees. There are, however, meritorious constructions of PERA on both sides with respect to the rights of "supervisory" and "executive" personnel. The burden properly rests with the legislature to clearly set forth the "public policy" regarding this conflict.²⁷

The above was true in September, 1971 and was still accurate at this writing.

In Michigan, two types of middle management bargaining units were possible. One was the certified bargaining unit which came under the jurisdiction of MERC and the regulations of PERA. Such bargaining units could be affiliated with a national labor organization. The second and more common bargaining unit was one which was voluntarily recognized by the individual school board. The independent units usually followed many of the guidelines of certified unions. Both certified and voluntarily recognized bargaining units were guaranteed complete protection under state and federal laws.

The normal, but by no means established, procedure for a group of administrators seeking representation status, was to petition their school board for voluntarily recognized bargaining status. If voluntary recognition was denied, the administrators then had the option of requesting a MERC supervised certification election. If

voluntarily recognized, there was no need for a certification election unless a change of attitude by either party warranted an election. Withdrawal of voluntary bargaining status and de-certification were both possible and had occurred among Michigan administrators. The number of such actions was not great. To date, the trend has been for voluntary status with maintenance of the arrangement with each successive administrative contract.

During the late sixties, the formation of administrative unions was not openly advocated by many, but a more recent review of literature found many nationally prominent educators warning that administrative bargaining units were not only legally possible but rapidly becoming reality in school districts both large and small.^{28,29,30}

Unions, once forbidden in public employment, are now found in many public school systems. School districts in hundreds of locations . . . now recognize associations of school middle managers. Unlikely as it sounds, school principals, vice principals, central office supervisors, and other mid-rank administrators bargain collectively with their boards of education for salaries, benefits, and employment and work conditions. . . . It appears that some school administrators have realized that without the protection of unity, a contract, and due process procedures, they are too vulnerable to the edicts of top management and the will of "community" groups now organized to share in the hiring, firing, and evaluation of school leaders.³¹

At the present writing approximately 70 bargaining units exist in Michigan, while nation-wide there are over 1,275 administrative unions.³² In Michigan the breakdown of administrative bargaining units by the number of building principals employed in a school district was: (1) zero to eight, 30; (2) nine to fourteen, 20; and (3) more than fifteen, 19. It was noteworthy that of the sixteen largest school districts in Michigan, including the Detroit Public

Schools, eight recognized administrative bargaining units and eight did not.³³

Changing Attitudes of Public School
Administrators Toward Unionism

In 1976 an Educators Negotiation Service (ENS) article indicated that the attitudes of administrators toward their own organizations had in many instances made a one hundred percent about-face. Middle-level administrators, the ENS study reported, wanted to negotiate to protect their interests. Administrators were seeking employment contracts with grievance procedures, salary schedules, group health insurance, and leave policies clearly spelled out.³⁴

By the mid-seventies the apparent incongruities of a labor organization for management personnel within the public schools was no longer a subject of common agreement by school administrators. With increasing frequency the topic was openly debated in numerous workshops, articles, and conferences across the country. That otherwise "loyal" administrators were then permitted to consider unionization was an issue that received considerable review by boards of education, their superintendents, and professional educators in general. There was by no means a consensus among the writers surveyed as to the future of administrative unionization, other than an indication that administrative labor relations in the seventies and eighties would, like those of other public employee groups, develop on at least two levels. First, new legislation and sophisticated procedures would be developed to protect the right of administrators to represent their interests. Second, experimentation and

implementation of alternatives to administrative labor organizations would continue to be introduced and promoted by superintendents and boards of education.

The changes in attitude could generally be attributed to at least four significant developments which, since the issuance of Executive Order 10988, had created and stimulated administrative interest in the formation of bargaining units.

The first development occurred during the early sixties when both the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education Association (NEA) underwent fundamental changes in their public attitudes toward collective negotiations. The period was one of great activity for both organizations; struggle and development were the rule, as the first generation of collectively bargained contracts for teachers were determined. Prior to the first period only a few isolated groups of teachers had been able to negotiate written agreements between boards of education and teacher organizations. Norwalk, Connecticut and Philadelphia teachers were apparently among the first to have written master agreements.³⁶ Liberman and Moskow, citing the 1960 New York Teacher Strike, noted 1960 as the beginning of collective bargaining by teachers.³⁷ Prior to the New York Teacher Strike, neither of the two national teacher organizations openly advocated collective bargaining by local teacher associations. Kennedy's Order 10988 changed this attitude drastically.

In 1965 with a struggle for membership taking place between the AFT and NEA, the Federation announced its position regarding collective bargaining.

We would place no limit on the scope of negotiations . . . the items which are subject to the bargaining process. Anything on which the two parties can agree should become a part of the agreement; anything on which they cannot agree will of course not appear. In fact anything having to do with the operation of the school is a matter for professional concern and should thus be subject to collective bargaining.³⁸

The NEA, prior to 1966, had taken a much less vocal position on teacher negotiations, stating that it was unprofessional for teachers to bargain for their salaries. The NEA position was reversed completely in 1968 with the following statement:

Negotiation agreements . . . "must" be established between teachers and school boards. These agreements "shall provide" for grievance procedures that include binding arbitration.³⁹

With the issuance of the new positions concerning teacher negotiation, both national teacher organizations were immediately involved in a number of teacher strikes. In his research, Munger made the apparently true statement that as of 1969 the passage of public employee legislation was a stimulus to teacher militancy rather than a response to previous conflict. He further indicated that as negotiation procedures matured between teachers and boards of education, the number of conflicts decreased.⁴⁰ The actions of both the NEA and AFT at the national level were reflected in the actions of Michigan teachers statewide.

The second significant development, causing an attitudinal change in Michigan administrators, occurred during the late sixties with the disassociation of both elementary and secondary principals from the Michigan Education Association (MEA), an affiliate of the NEA. The AFT had never encouraged principals' memberships at the local level and had specifically prohibited membership of

superintendents by national constitution. During the late sixties, the MEA tried to maintain an all-inclusive organization in which teachers and administrators could hold membership in a bargaining unit even though only the teachers were involved in negotiations.⁴¹

A number of policy statements were developed to ensure representation for administrators in teachers' organizations, but it became apparent that principals were being torn between loyalties to the administration and to the teachers. Moskow described the "in between" position in 1967 when he predicted, "as collective negotiations become more widespread, administrators will be pushed out of any decision-making position in the teacher organization unless they are completely dedicated to the welfare of the teachers."⁴²

Kershen issued a strong warning to New York State administrators that left little doubt as to his belief in where administrative allegiance must lie.

Principals are caught in a practical and ideological dilemma in feeling a professional allegiance to their staff while having to manage them, and while at the same time being dependent upon the superintendent and board for authority and rewards. But even believing it can be both fish and fowl; to ignore the obvious is to face oblivion! If what is left of your role is the position of contract administrator and disciplinarian, then a teacher-shop steward and a policeman could do it as well. Unless you--the principals and assistant principals and supervisors--decide once and for all that you are part of management and become viable members of the management team, you will perish--and deservedly so!⁴³

Michigan administrators made the decision of allegiance between 1966 and 1968 when they first disaffiliated themselves from the Michigan Education Association and then reorganized a number of statewide independent administrative associations. The two largest

were the Michigan Association of Elementary Principals (MAESP) and the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP).

While it was debatable as to whether teachers in the MEA forced the administrators from that organization or administrators found their inclusion in the MEA untenable, the significant occurrence "was middle-level administrators' withdrawal from the MEA and adoption of a new position concerning collective bargaining. The administrators' position was basically one of neutrality between labor and management.

The success of teacher negotiations during the late sixties and early seventies represented the third significant development which was attributed to changing administrators' attitudes toward bargaining for master contracts. Local teacher associations with assistance from both the NEA and AFT wasted little time in becoming adept at the negotiation procedure for determining master agreements. Individual school boards, on the other hand, were often unprepared to handle collective bargaining with any degree of sophistication. As early as 1960, Seitz warned that while teachers were organizing for collective bargaining, boards of education were refusing to consider the merits of bargaining with teachers.⁴⁴ Often, during the mid-sixties the individuals designated as negotiators for the school boards were unskilled in the dynamics of the collective bargaining process.⁴⁵

Unlike those labor relations men hired by private enterprise to do their collective bargaining, the hapless members of a school board are by no means free to sit at the bargaining table all hours of the day and night--neither can a board use public funds to match those available to private

corporations or, for that matter, to the teachers themselves, for publicity and demonstration purposes. And worst of all, rarely has experience equipped a board's members for the subtleties and "gamesmanship" of collective bargaining--it is a field, says Dr. Wesley Weldman of the University of Chicago, in which "the curse of amateurism is rampant."⁴⁶

Teachers' success at the bargaining table was not necessarily reflected simply in matters of wage increases, but more often in the area of school policy determination, such as class sizes, teaching loads, and teacher transfers. Principals, who were often deliberately neutral at the time, became alarmed since these decisions represented a clear erosion of their responsibilities as educational leaders and school managers. That administrators' prerogatives were not being usurped is somewhat hard to defend when considering master teacher agreement clauses such as the following:

The Association reserves the right to select up to fifty percent of the teachers to serve on any committee, agency, commission or other such body. At the building level the Association's fifty percent will be selected by the building representative.⁴⁷

Principals who spoke out against the "territorial invasion" by teachers were frequently told by both teacher union representatives and school board members alike that middle-level administrators had lost no real power, per se, other than the power to be arbitrary.

It was this, the encroachment by teachers into areas which had been traditionally within the realm of administrative prerogatives, which constituted the fourth development encouraging administrators' attitudes favorable to administrative bargaining units. The change in attitude was supported by a number of writers who warned that unless middle-level administrators were involved

actively in teacher negotiations on management's side of the table, their very jobs within the schoolhouse would be threatened.

Building level administrators who had briefly enjoyed neutrality between the school board and teachers' union could no longer afford to maintain a neutral position regarding teacher negotiations.

Provisions of recent bargaining agreements between boards of education and teachers' organizations indicate that increased decision-making powers are being granted to teachers. One of the consequences of this realignment has been a decrease of power for middle administrators.⁴⁸

The almost certain realignment of administrative authority due to teacher negotiation was reflected in the writing of many educators.

. . . 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.⁴⁹

Kershen, as an outspoken critic of administrators' neutrality claimed,

Whether you realize it or not, middle management is in danger of being phased out of its job as the process of collective bargaining in the public sector . . . changes the long-standing pattern of roles in education . . . Now the board and the teachers make the policies and pass them along to the administrators. As teacher negotiations progress and become more sophisticated, it becomes clear that all the educational decisions will be made at the bargaining table. And with that there may develop the teacher-shop steward or teacher-lawyer, whose function in every school would be to administer the contract that is to run the school.⁵⁰

Dempsey further analyzed the principals' dilemma in an article for the National Association of Secondary School Principals:

The role of school principals today is not only being tested but it is actually being threatened because there are obvious

gaps between the role the principal actually plays and the role that he should play. It is being threatened by those who say that the principal is no longer the educational leader of the school and that he can be replaced by a business manager. It is being threatened because, for the most part, the principal has been left out of the negotiations process. And it is being threatened because principals themselves have had to be more concerned about budgets, grievances, and due process than they have in defining the role and responsibility of the principal in light of collective bargaining legislation.⁵¹

Arguing for a less emotional reaction by principals in the Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, one author presented a number of reasons which had allowed school boards to seemingly "forget" their middle managers while under the pressure of negotiating a master teacher contract. The reasons included the constant press of time, the newness of the negotiating process, and the lack of formal structure in which to involve their administrators.⁵²

Recognizing that the four developments occurred within a ten-year period, that much of the literature reflected a "call to action" of administrators, and that the legal precedents for administrative bargaining had been established, it became apparent that administrative attitudes had undergone a change from a position of relative disinterest in unionization to one reflecting interest if not support for a unionization movement.

In his 1969 study of the attitudes of Michigan principals toward organizing for negotiations, Munger found that 89.8 percent of the more than 250 principals surveyed felt that principals should have the right to negotiate a master contract. Furthermore, Munger found that 61.2 percent felt that their local principals' group should negotiate a contract with their local board of education. At the time of his study, Munger stated that there were almost no data

on variables affecting the principal's attitude toward negotiations and that the information which did exist dealt only with teacher/board negotiations.⁵³

Research conducted by Grotz and Smith in 1970 attributed the formation of administrative bargaining units to at least four possible reasons. In summary they were: (1) the behavior of executive management, (2) lack of principal involvement in decision-making, (3) teacher successes in negotiations, and (4) the principals' lack of control of their own professional destinies.⁵⁴

In 1971 a research committee of the Michigan Congress of School Administrators Associations also studied middle-level administrators' changes in attitude. In summary, the research committee designated six problem areas which were precipitating the formation of administrative bargaining units throughout the state. They were in descending rank:

1. Teacher negotiations erode administrative role
2. Problem of communication with school board
3. Problem of definition of role and responsibility
4. Salary and fringe benefits
5. Problem of communication with superintendent
6. Display of power to the board of education⁵⁵

Based on his 1975 research, Randles suggested that the move to unionization was not that difficult for principals to make since they were usually former teachers who held attitudes which were primarily labor-oriented. Boards of education and superintendents, on the other hand, had attitudes that tended to be management-

oriented. Consequently, principals had little difficulty in adopting teacher/labor techniques such as unionization and were somewhat unenthusiastic about the superintendent's efforts to develop administrative unity as a partial solution to middle management's insecurities.⁵⁶ Randles suggested that superintendents, through underutilization of principals as managers, may have been encouraging the formation of administrative bargaining units. He concluded that, "if principals see that teachers have made important financial and power gains through bargaining, they may want to avail themselves of those same possibilities."⁵⁷ The same attitude was illustrated, in a question which was raised more and more frequently by promoters of administrative unions, "Do the superintendent and school board do as good a job for the principals as the teachers' union does for its members?"

The Impact of Administrative Unions on Middle Management/Superintendent Relationships

With the legitimacy of administrative bargaining units established by 1969, middle management's relatively recent pro-labor attitudes toward collective bargaining raised numerous questions regarding the impact of administrative unions on the working relationship between superintendents and their building administrators. Most questions stemmed from the apparent contradictory roles of principals, who were seen as management during teacher negotiations and then as labor during administrative negotiations. It was generally felt that principals were either one or the other. The result of the dual role, as suggested by Redfern, was often strained

relations between top and middle-level management. Superintendents and school board members had frequently expressed their displeasure with this "either/or" arrangement, arguing that management should not bargain against itself. An Educators Negotiators Service article recorded the sentiments of a school board member who, referring to a principal, said, "He has a legal and moral duty of allegiance to the Board and to the administration; in fact, he is a part of management."⁵⁸

The literature was noticeably vague and inconclusive in the area of middle-level management loyalties as conditions varied so greatly from district to district and state to state. The general consensus appeared to view the superintendent as the key individual in determining the extent to which the superintendent/principal relationship would change with administrative bargaining.

Unless superintendents and boards of education make remarkable changes in their relationships with middle management in the schools . . . we shall see a rapid increase in the number of administrative bargaining units (or unions, where law permits) throughout the country.⁵⁹

Executive management had been accused of excluding middle management from meaningful participation in teacher contract negotiations, the results of which had been twofold. First, a feeling of distrust had developed between the superintendent and his administrative staff. Second, the superintendent or the board's negotiator, lacking the input of the principals during teacher negotiations, had often bargained away the authority of the middle managers, causing a still greater schism between the administrative staff and the superintendent.

The literature recorded disagreement over the impact of teacher bargaining on administrative relationships, but it was clear that increasing numbers of principals felt that they had lost many of their rights while absent from the teachers' bargaining table.⁶⁰ Randles disputed the principal's loss of power, claiming that master teacher contracts gave the principal more legitimacy in enforcing contractual provisions than they had formerly enjoyed.⁶¹ Nicholson and Nasstrom cited research that showed "no indisputable proof exists that collective negotiations have uniformly lessened the leadership role of the principal . . . negotiations per se have not necessarily reduced authority, but instead have required a redefinition of the parameters of authority."⁶²

Nevertheless, the literature suggested that principals were often deliberately excluded from full participation in management functions. Their role in teacher negotiations was probably the best example of exclusion. Superintendents realized that the bargaining strategies shared with principals during teacher contract talks were often used against them when the administrators sat down to negotiate their own contracts. Likewise, principals had been excluded from teacher negotiations since skills learned through participation on the board's negotiation team during teacher bargaining sessions were easily transferred to administrator/board negotiations at a later date. Finally, superintendents and principals needed only to look at the relationship changes that had occurred between teachers and principals since collective bargaining began, to realize that changes in relationships between the superintendent and principals were extremely likely to occur with administrative bargaining.

The relationship between top and middle management was further weakened in the opinion of Salmon, the Executive Secretary of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), who stated that administrative bargaining, as a process similar to all collective bargaining, is adversary in essence. It pits one party against another in power struggles involving proposals, counter-proposals, and compromise. The relationship then isolates the superintendent from the principals and requires both parties to function as adversaries at the bargaining table.⁶³

Principals and other middle-level administrators, while lacking the strength of membership and the treasuries of larger teacher unions, in many instances had been encouraged to adapt the successful techniques of these unions in their own struggle to protect their jobs while negotiating larger salaries, detailed job descriptions, and better fringe benefits.

Cooper pointed out that administrative unions had limited powers to begin with; they couldn't strike and a walk-out would hardly close down the schools. He suggested that principals could maximize their power during negotiations by courting the more influential teacher associations and by publicly embarrassing the superintendent and board of education by disagreeing with them on policy issues.⁶⁴ A potential power struggle between top and middle management caused much concern among superintendents and resulted in dissension among principals who were forced to take sides within their school districts.

Dudley argued that the fear of administrative unionization may have been more damaging than actual unionization.

Less competent management personnel will view with alarm the developing autonomy and professional leadership of principals (just as less competent principals view with alarm the developing power of teachers), but higher administrators, who are superior in professional leadership, will welcome these developments as inherent in a maturing profession.⁶⁵

At the present writing the fear that middle-level administrators would adopt labor tactics resulting in the disruption of administrative services has proven unfounded. In 1973, McConnell, then a doctoral student at Michigan State University, studied the impact of collective bargaining by school administrators on selected management functions. In his study McConnell examined four management functions in fourteen Michigan school districts where the boards of education had formally recognized administrative bargaining units. The management functions were: (1) decision making and involvement, (2) accountability, (3) communications, and (4) structure. In his conclusion, McConnell stated:

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 principals' 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.⁶⁶

Accepting McConnell's research, that there were no significant perceived changes in management functions related to administrative unions by either superintendents or building principals, the "Report of the Ethics and Management Relations Committee of the Michigan

Association of School Boards," delivered in 1970, took on even greater importance.

It seems that the majority of principals, or other administrators, who have chosen to negotiate do so reluctantly. They seem to accept with regret the adversary condition. Some conclude that they have thereby further removed themselves from the administrative decision making process, a position some feel they had reached anyway.⁶⁷

The literature suggested that superintendents would be wise to first accept the possibility of an administrative union within their districts and then work to achieve full participation by all administrators in the overall management of schools. The literature strongly recommended that at the present time, participation was most likely to be achieved through a total commitment to the management team concept by school boards, superintendents, and principals.

Alternatives to Administrative Unionization

During the late sixties and early seventies, the literature indicated that a number of prominent educational writers felt that there existed viable alternatives to administrative bargaining units which could be promoted and supported by both superintendents and building principals alike. The proposed administrative arrangements were intended to maintain harmonious working relationships between executive and middle management while ensuring adequate representation and protection of second-line administrators during teacher negotiations and administrative contract talks. More importantly, the proposals represented the means of "establishing smooth lines of organization and communication, common agreements and definite patterns of mutuality among administrators and boards of education as

they unite to provide effective educational programs for the community.⁶⁸ To varying degrees the proposals were accepted and rejected by administrators in school districts across the country.

The originators and promoters of the "plans of action" had usually made known their attitudes toward administrative bargaining units or unions.

My purpose is not to advocate unionism among principals, but rather to suggest ways by which boards of education can prevent this unfortunate turn of events from taking place.⁶⁹

In other words, participation in the administrative team would negate the necessity for principals and other middle administrators to form their own bargaining units to represent their own special interests.⁷⁰

From my experience I am convinced that in matters of labor relations a supervisor-manager or principal cannot be a good member of a union and at the same time carry out his duties as a management representative and implement union contracts of his subordinates.⁷¹

The proposals usually called for some arrangement which would permit increased middle-level administrative involvement in the determination of school policy while attempting to down-play administrative unionization as necessary for building principals.

Williams, in a 1970 article on teachers' negotiations, cited ten disadvantages in using a union model for bargaining; the disadvantages were transferable to administrative organizations. They were:

1. Conflict of interest becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy and is exaggerated.
2. Union stridence; emotion replaces rationality.
3. Residue of hard feelings restricts a move to problem solving.

4. Unions evolve from public interest to conservative, narrow, self-interest.
5. Written contracts reduce flexibility.
6. An outside organization is brought into the decision-making process.
7. Conflict is institutionalized.
8. There is hesitancy of school boards to deal with parties not elected.
9. Compromise as a decision-making process is not always rational.
10. Negotiations are time consuming.⁷²

Most of the disadvantages formed, to a degree, the rationale from which other writers have argued against unionization and for some other form of management arrangement.

Epstein, in writing for the NASSP, advocated much increased action and aggressive leadership within national administrative organizations which would then ensure proper representation of administrators for the purposes of job security and salary arrangement.⁷³

Randles, addressing the dilemma that principals faced as they debated whether they should formally organize or not, wrote:

An equally obvious alternative is to avoid bargaining status for principals, substituting informal organizational influence instead. A principal's organization can have considerable impact on a board of education . . . simply by virtue of being well organized, well disciplined, intentionally persuasive, and persistent. . . . Rather than contributing to an adversary relationship, this course of action is more in keeping with the management team concept.⁷⁴

Dempsey, of the University of Connecticut, made seven recommendations concerning principals and negotiations, of which the most profound was a proposal to "develop with other administrative organizations a professional model of their own design for negotiation with

boards of education, a model that is different from the labor model with its severe restrictions on a profession such as ours."⁷⁵

Epstein supported Dempsey's recommendations in theory when he warned that principals who were considering the formation of a bargaining unit had to be conscious that such a move could be very negatively viewed by the general public and school boards in particular, the results being less than desirable working conditions for principals. Regardless of the principal's professional desire to provide educational leadership, a step toward unionization was often seen as promoting limited self-serving goals at the expense of the community and its schools.⁷⁶

What then were the alternatives for principals who saw their rights and responsibilities eroded, yet were aware of the negative stigma of a management union? The concept of the management team as an alternative to formal bargaining by second-line administrators had far and away received the most popular review and support by school administrators and writers of administrative theory.

Throughout the literature reviewed, the management team concept enjoyed a somewhat nebulous definition which most often inferred, "school board recognition through salary, status, authority, and responsibility, that administrators are part of the management team"⁷⁷ Salmon, of AASA, suggested that school boards and superintendents should use the team concept as a means of aligning principals with management.⁷⁸ In order to accomplish the alignment, superintendents and school boards had to be committed to sharing decision making responsibilities and authority with their middle

administrators. Supporting Salmon's concept, McNally emphasized the importance of defining the responsibilities of team members in school system policy interpretation and operational matters.⁷⁹

Also in support of the management team concept, Groty and Smith claimed that the foundation of an effective management team is trust and that "arbitrary decision making by top management without the involvement of the rest of the management team is no longer acceptable."⁸⁰ Heddinge concurred with Groty and Smith and further claimed that, in light of the struggle for policy-making power between teachers and school boards, executive management had to share power with principals in order to control the schools.⁸¹ Heddinge specifically wanted principals, under the management team concept, to be given:

1. Greater discretion in decision making and selection of alternatives in a climate of increased responsibility for financial control.
2. Greater discretion in determining how to achieve educational objectives in a climate of greater responsibility for education leadership.
3. Even greater responsibility for ensuring that educational programs and services under control do not become constrained by collective bargaining procedures.⁸²

Redfern maintained that to make teams effective, top level administrators had to be consciously aware of the "environment factor"--the physical quarters in which the team works. He prompted superintendents to strive to generate job excitement among principals, to make performance evaluation more effective, and to seriously consider the use of discipline with reluctant team members.⁸³

Redfern's was an interesting position to defend since a study conducted by the Research Committee of the Michigan Congress of

School Administrator Associations had found a year earlier that over fifty percent of the respondents, when questioned about the management team, cited the superintendent for failure to make the team concept work.⁸⁴ Among principals, the same attitude of dissatisfaction was expressed six years later in 1977, when the NASSP conducted a national survey regarding collective bargaining by principals. The results of the NASSP survey indicated that among those secondary principals responding, a full 50 percent favored collective bargaining for principals, while only 30 percent opposed and 20 percent were recorded as undecided.⁸⁵

The NASSP findings were disturbing since the general viewpoint reflected in the literature was that if the management team functioned properly, there would be no need for collective bargaining by administrators. Salmon, as spokesman for the largest administrative organization (AASA), publicly stated in 1972 that, "the administrative team and collective bargaining are unmistakably incompatible."⁸⁶ Until early 1977 this viewpoint of incompatibility had been generally accepted among school administrators throughout the country.

In Michigan a supportive attitude of the team concept was reflected by the spokesmen for both the MAESP and MASSP. During the latter part of 1976, the state's elementary principals' association announced a new position concerning the management team and administrative bargaining units. In summary, the MAESP position held that the management team need not cease to function if the principals within a school district decided to formally bargain. The MAESP

voted in October 1976 to support the following new statement on the management team:

. . . We further believe that the extensive application of the Management Team concept, as defined by MAESP, will result in increased effectiveness in educational administration and endorse the Management Team concept as a means of maintaining the elementary principals' voice in policy determination. Adequate protection for principals, including due process procedures, is necessary and should be viewed as strengthening the Team Management concept and not weakening it.⁸⁷

Whether other administrative associations within the state or throughout the country would follow the lead of the MAESP was still subject to much debate at this writing. That the management team was not, in practice, living up to the expectations of principals, as supported by much of the literature, was also debatable since further study in the area was needed.

What was significant at this time was that the action taken by MAESP would probably be interpreted as a signal to other administrators that while the management team may be a viable concept for providing managerial input, it was not necessarily incompatible with administrative bargaining. What ramifications the MAESP position would have throughout the state was not yet known, but boards of education and superintendents would have been unwise to act in haste and scrap the management team concept simply because the middle-level administrators wanted formal bargaining unit representation.

Redfern promoted what was probably the most optimistic attitude for superintendents and principals alike when he wrote:

There is no reason to believe that middle management cannot or will not perform their regular duties and responsibilities with full fidelity and faithfulness despite the strains that may be generated during the negotiation period. Professional loyalty and dedication need not become casualties of the negotiation process.⁸⁸

Summary

The present chapter has traced the relatively recent emergence of administrative bargaining units from the early American labor movements through four distinct periods of public opinion toward unions in the private sector. The periods are: (1) 1806-1842, Repression; (2) 1842-1935, Limited Toleration; (3) 1935-1947, Encouragement; and (4) 1947 to the present, Control and Restraint. Particular attention was focused upon the significant legislative acts of the United States Congress and court decisions with regard to private sector unionization. Also examined were two presidential orders (10988 and 11491), the first of which is generally acknowledged to have signalled the beginning of collective bargaining by public employees. Specific Michigan laws such as Public Act 379 and court decisions which have directly influenced or encouraged unionism among building principals within this state were investigated.

The writings of others in the field of educational administration and public sector negotiations were examined in order to establish that the attitudes of middle-level administrators were changing from positions of anti-unionism to those generally more supportive of public employee unionization. Beginning in the early 1960's, four developments had apparently had the most pronounced influence on the attitudes of principals toward unionization. The first involved the militant positions developed by both the AFT and the NEA concerning collective negotiations for teachers. The second was the disassociation of Michigan principals from the Michigan Education Association, an affiliate of the NEA. The successes of

teacher negotiations in the areas of wages, hours, and working conditions represented the third development. The fourth, and most significant, was teacher encroachment through negotiations into areas which had been traditionally considered the responsibility of middle management. Studies examining the problems were presented.

A section of the present chapter was devoted to the impact of administrative unions on middle management/superintendent relationships, indicating a widening schism between top and middle-level administrators. Research in the area, while inconclusive, suggested that administrative unions were formed reluctantly for purposes of job security.

Finally, the literature reviewed was examined for alternatives to administrative bargaining. At the present writing, the management team concept was most widely supported as a means of preventing unionization among middle management, though the most recent literature examined indicated a possible belief by middle-level administrators that both are compatible within the same district.

Footnotes--Chapter II

¹ Benjamin Wolkinson, "Summary of the American Labor Movement," (unpublished notes, class lectures, Michigan State University, LIR 858 Industrial Relations, Winter Term, 1976).

² Bernard Meltzer, Labor Law, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970, p. 2.

³ Howard Meyers and David Twomey, Labor Law and Legislation, South-Western Publishing Co., 1975, p. 11.

⁴ Russell Smith, LeRoy Merrifield, and Theodore St. Antoine, Labor Relations Law, Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1974, p. 7.

⁵ Ibid., p.

⁶ Ibid., p. 10.

⁷ Marjorie S. Turner, The Early American Labor Conspiracy Cases Their Place in Labor Law, San Diego: San Diego State College Press, 1967, Social Science Monograph Series, Vol. I, No. 3, p. 59.

⁸ Smith, Merrifield and St. Antoine, loc. cit.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Meltzer, op. cit., p. 28.

¹¹ Meyers and Twomey, op. cit., p. 98.

¹² Ibid., p. 482.

¹³ Lawrence F. McConnell, "A Study of the Influence of Collective Bargaining by School Administrators on the Management Functions of Selected Michigan School Districts," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973), p. 17.

¹⁴ Donald H. Wollett and Joseph R. Grodin, Collective Bargaining in Public Employment, Unit Four: Labor Relations and Social Problems, Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1975, p. 1.

¹⁵ T. M. Stinnett, Jack H. Kleiumann, and Martha L. Ware, Professional Negotiation in Public Education, New York, N.Y.: The Macmillan Company, 1966, p. 7.

¹⁶Wollet and Grodin, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁷Michigan Congress of School Administrators Associations, Research Committee, Eugene N. Spencer, Chairman, A Survey of Administrative Bargaining Units in Michigan Public Schools, September, 1971, p. 111.

¹⁸George M. Johnson, Education Law, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1969, p. 218.

¹⁹U. S. Department of Labor, Summary of Public Sector Labor Relations Policies, Washington, D.C.: Labor-Management Services Administration, 1976, p. 63.

²⁰Ibid., p. 64

²¹Doris Ross, '76 Update: Collective Bargaining in Education, A Legislator's Guide Report #78, CB Update, Education Commission of the States, January, 1976, p. 31.

²²U. S. Department of Labor, State Profiles: Current Status of Public Sector Labor Relations, Washington, D.C.: Labor-Management Services Administration, 1971, p. 3.

²³Johnson, op. cit., p. 5.

²⁴George H. Gallup, "Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1975, p. 49.

²⁵McConnell, op. cit., p. 26.

²⁶Michigan Congress of School Administrators Association, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

²⁷Ibid., p. 8.

²⁸William Mays, Jr., "Why Administrators May Feel the Need to Establish Formal Bargaining Units," Michigan School Board Journal, February, 1976.

²⁹Robert H. Hall, "Why Administrators are Turning to Collective Bargaining," Reprint of address given at Michigan Association of School Boards Conference, Grand Rapids, Michigan, November 2, 3, 4, 1976.

³⁰Benjamin Epstein, Principals, An Organized Force for Leadership, Washington, D.C.: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974.

³¹Bruce S. Cooper, "Middle Management Unionization in Education," Administrator's Notebook, XXIII, Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago, June, 1975, p. 1.

³²Edwin M. Bridges and Bruce S. Cooper, "Collective Bargaining for School Administrators," Theory Into Practice, Vol. XV, No. 4, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, p. 306.

³³Educators Negotiating Service, "Protection of Interests Stirs Bargaining by Administrators," Washington, D.C.: The Educational Service Bureau, Inc., August 1, 1976, p. 9.

³⁴Educators Negotiating Service, "ENS Special Report: Teacher Labor Relations in the 1970's," Washington, D.C.: The Educational Service Bureau, Inc., July, 1974, p. 13.

³⁵Stinnet, Kleiumann and Ware, loc. cit.

³⁶Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966, p. 35.

³⁷Charles Cogen, "Collective Bargaining: The Aft Way," speech given at National Institute on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhode Island, July, 1975.

³⁸American School Board Journal, "The Tough New Teacher," Vol. 156, No. 5, November, 1968, p. 11.

³⁹Benson Scott Munger, "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Michigan Principals Toward Organizing for Negotiations," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969, p. 24.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 44.

⁴¹Michael H. Moskow, "Teacher Organizations: An Analysis of the Issues," in Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, Elam, Lieberman and Moskow, eds., Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1967, p. 246.

⁴²Harry Kershen, "The Role of the Principal in Middle Management," The Principal, Official Publication of the New York State Association of Secondary School Administrators and the New York State Association of Elementary Principals, Vol. I, No. 2, May, 1971, p. 7.

⁴³Reynolds C. Seitz, "School Boards and Teacher Unions," American School Board Journal, CXLI, August, 1960, p. 13.

⁴⁴Negotiation Management, Educational Services Bureau, June, 1968, p. 7.

⁴⁵Robert Bendiner, The Politics of Schools, A Crisis in Self Government, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, 1969, p. 98.

⁴⁶Richard Dempsey, "Principals and Negotiations," NASSP Bulletin, National Association of Secondary School Principals, March, 1975, p. 61.

⁴⁷Charles Kline and William Thomas, "Middle Administrator/School Board Relationships in Collective Negotiations," Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, Vol. 3, No. 1, Winter, 1974, p. 50.

⁴⁸David Sargent, "The Man in Between," Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association Journal (reprinted, Michigan Elementary School Principal, XXXIII, September-October, 1968, p. 14.

⁴⁹Kershen, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

⁵⁰Dempsey, op. cit., pp. 62-63.

⁵¹Larry Mong, "Unionized Principals: Is Your District Next?", Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, Vol. 1, No. 4, November, 1972, p. 295.

⁵²Munger, op. cit., p. 97.

⁵³C. 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, p. 8.

⁵⁴Michigan Congress of School Administrators Associations, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵⁵Harry E. Randles, "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts," National Elementary Principal, November/December, 1975, p. 58.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 61.

⁵⁷Educators Negotiating Service, "Iowa Principal Negotiating Rightfully Ousted by Board," Washington, D.C.: The Educational Service Bureau, Inc., February, 1977, p. 112.

⁵⁸Harold J. McNally, "A Matter of Trust," National Elementary Principal, November/December, 1973, p. 23.

⁵⁹Dee Schofield, Collective Negotiations and the Principal, NAESP School Leadership Digest, Second Series, No. 9, 1976, p. 20.

⁶⁰Randles, loc. cit.

⁶¹Schofield, op. cit., p. 59.

⁶²Paul B. Salmon, "Are the Administrative Team and Collective Bargaining Compatible?", Compact, June, 1972, p. 3.

⁶³Cooper, loc. cit.

⁶⁴James Dudley, "The Elementary Principal--The Man in the Middle," reprinted from the Pace Setter, the magazine of the Maryland Department of Elementary School Principals, March, 1967, p. 38.

⁶⁵McConnell, op. cit., p. 78.

⁶⁶Groty and Smith, loc. cit.

⁶⁷Mong, op. cit. p. 296.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Educators Negotiating Service, "ENS Special Report: Collective Negotiations and the Principal," Washington, D.C.: The Educational Service Bureau, Inc., September, 1976, p. 7.

⁷⁰Hiroshi Yamashita, "Unionized Principals: Is Your District Next?", MASB Journal, February, 1973, p. 9.

⁷¹R. C. Williams, "Teacher Militancy: Implications for the Schools," Piele, Eidell, and Smith, eds., in Social and Technological Change, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. 1970, p. 139.

⁷²Epstein, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

⁷³Randles, op. cit., p. 61.

⁷⁴Dempsey, op. cit., p. 63.

⁷⁵Epstein, op. cit., p. 38.

⁷⁶Michigan Congress of School Administrators Association, op. cit., p. 13.

⁷⁷Schofield, op. cit., p. 22.

⁷⁸McNally, op. cit., p. 21.

⁷⁹Groty and Smith, loc. cit.

⁸⁰Fred M. Heddinger, "The School Board Looks at the Status of the Principal," reprint of speech given before Pennsylvania Association of Secondary School Principals Annual Meeting, 38th, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, October 14-16, 1973.

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²George Redfern, "School Management-Administrative Union or Management Team," paper presented at AASA Annual Convention, 104th, Atlantic City, N.J., February 12-16, 1972.

⁸³Michigan Congress of School Administrators Associations,
op. cit., p. 13.

⁸⁴ENS, 1977, p. 111.

⁸⁵Salmon, loc. cit.

⁸⁶William May, Jr., "Whether or Not Administrators Should
Organize," paper presented to Western Michigan University at
Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District, Kalamazoo, Michigan,
February 9, 1977.

⁸⁷Redfern, loc. cit.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this research was to compare the attitudes of Michigan superintendents and building principals toward administrative bargaining units. Three attitudinal variables were considered in the study: (1) general attitude toward administrative bargaining units, (2) belief concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and (3) attitude toward present situation. The variable matrix takes the form of a three-way fully crossed design having an equal number of observations (fourteen) in each cell. In addition to the three attitudinal dependent variables there were three independent variables: (1) type of administrative organization, (2) size of school district as determined by number of building principals employed, and (3) present employment position. The variable matrix is shown in Table 3.1.

Multistage cluster sampling was used to randomly select 14 superintendents, 14 secondary principals, and 14 elementary principals for each of the 18 cells within the variable matrix. Two statistical techniques were used to analyze the data: multiple-group cluster analysis and analysis of variance.

Table 3.1--Variable Matrix

Independent Variables			Dependent Variables		
Type of Organization	Size of School District	Present Employment Position	SUBJECTS		
NO ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNIT PRESENT WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	0-8 Building Principals (small)	Supt.	General Attitude Toward Administrative Bargaining Units	Belief Concerning Potential Influence of Administrative Bargaining Units	Attitude Toward Present Situation
		H.S. Prin.			
		Elem. Prin.			
	9-14 Building Principals (medium)	Supt.			
		H.S. Prin.			
		Elem. Prin.			
	15 or more Building Principals (large)	Supt.			
		H.S. Prin.			
		Elem. Prin.			
ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNIT PRESENT WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	0-8 Building Principals (small)	Supt.	General Attitude Toward Administrative Bargaining Units	Belief Concerning Potential Influence of Administrative Bargaining Units	Attitude Toward Present Situation
		H.S. Prin.			
		Elem. Prin.			
9-14 Building Principals (medium)	Supt.				
	H.S. Prin.				
	Elem. Prin.				
15 or more Building Principals (large)	Supt.				
	H.S. Prin.				
	Elem. Prin.				

Note: The matrix is a completely crossed design with 14 subjects per cell.

Sample Selection

The population under investigation included all administrators in K-12 public school districts in the state of Michigan as of September, 1976. Specifically excluded from the study were all intermediate school districts as well as districts which did not have at least one secondary school (7-12) and one elementary school (K-6). At the time this research problem was identified, there were a total of 530 K-12 public school districts in the state. For purposes of this study, the population was comprised of only elementary and secondary school principals, and the superintendents in the 530 Michigan school districts.

A complete listing of the population was obtained from the Michigan Department of Education. The list contained all state-required information tabulated for the required 1976-77 fourth Friday count. The data were checked against the superintendents and principals listed in the Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide 1976-77.¹ The guide was used because it contained a fairly accurate listing of the names and addresses of all Michigan superintendents and building principals. As far as could be determined, a listing of such information was unobtainable from any other source.

The multistage cluster sampling procedure consisted of four stages. The first stage divided the 530 school districts into two groups--those with administrative bargaining units and those without.

In order to determine this placement, a listing of Michigan districts with administrative bargaining units was constructed in the following manner. An extensive search of the records of the Michigan

Employment Relations Commission in Detroit, Michigan during February, 1977 resulted in identifying 27 certified administrative unions. Of these, 24 were determined as suitable for inclusion in the study. The Detroit Public Schools, because of atypical size in relation to other Michigan school districts, as well as the Wyandotte and Flint City School Districts, which were in the process of conducting certification elections, were consciously delimited from the population.

The 24 unionized districts were combined with 41 districts in which administrative bargaining units were voluntarily recognized by their boards of education. The names of 42 districts meeting these criteria were obtained from the Michigan Association of School Boards which conducted a survey to obtain this and other related information in December, 1976. The Ferndale Public Schools were deleted from this list since the researcher pilot-tested the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire with the Ferndale administrative staff during February, 1977.

In summary, 65 Michigan school districts were identified as districts in which the second-line administrator had unit representation for the purpose of collective negotiations. The remaining 461 school districts were then classified as having no formal administrative bargaining unit for building principals.

The second stage in constructing a sample was determined by the number of building principals employed by a school district. This variable was selected in order to divide districts into three subgroups, since preliminary review of the literature indicated that the larger the size of the school district, the more likely it was

that the building administrators employed would consider the formation of administrative bargaining units.

The district sizes were determined by rank-ordering the 65 school districts with administrative bargaining units from the greatest to the least number of building principals and dividing them into three groups. In order to use all 65 unionized districts, the three groups were constructed in such a manner that a minimum of 17 districts was contained within each group. This procedure resulted in group definitions of: (1) zero to 8 building principals, (2) 9 to 14 building principals, and (3) 15 or more building principals. School districts for the remaining three groups, those systems with no administrative organizations, were randomly selected from the 461 school systems which were classified as having neither certified nor voluntarily recognized administrative bargaining units. These 461 districts were rank-ordered first by number of building principals employed (0-8, 9-14, 15 or more); a minimum of 18 school districts was randomly selected from each of the three lists. The researcher found only 18 school systems with no administrative bargaining unit and 15 or more building principals; therefore, the entire 15 districts were selected for sampling. The remaining two groups provided adequate choice of districts for random selection.

In summary, 18 districts from each list were randomly selected along with alternates where possible. This procedure resulted in the selection of a total of 59 districts without administrative bargaining units for participation in this study. These districts were representative of the remaining 402 Michigan school

districts which, while not having been selected, had had an equal chance for inclusion within an assigned group.

At the third stage of the sampling a total of 124 districts, representing 23.6 percent of the 526 usable school districts within the state, had been identified. The fourth and final stage was the random selection of superintendents, secondary and elementary principals from each of the six groups of school districts.

Since there is only one superintendent per school district, all from each group were selected. This group totaled, not including alternates, 118 individuals. Secondary and elementary principals were randomly selected from each individual district and respective totals of 119 and 120 individuals were selected. In all, a list of 357 individuals were selected to receive an Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire.

All 357 administrators were contacted by mail. Each administrator received a packet containing a single copy of the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire, a cover letter explaining the nature and purpose of the study, a coded carbon sensitive answer sheet, and a stamped envelope addressed to the researcher. Individuals not wishing to participate were asked to return the questionnaire and answer sheet to allow selection of a suitable replacement if this was possible. Twenty-seven replacements were chosen at random from the school districts selected in the second stage of the sampling procedure. After a period of two weeks, the researcher contacted all non-respondents by telephone to determine if there was a willingness to participate in this study. If so, a

second Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire with answer sheet and return envelope was mailed. Eight administrators requested a second questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire and cover letter are included in Appendix A.

From the total sample of 357 administrators, 288 responses were returned, for a response rate of 80.67%. In order to obtain equal cell sizes for statistical analyses, 14 respondents from each of the 18 groups were randomly selected. Thus, the final sample consisted of 252 administrators, as shown in Table 3.2.

The findings were generalizable to superintendents, secondary, and elementary principals in all but four K-12 Michigan school districts.

Instrumentation

The Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire (ABUPQ) used in the study was one developed by the researcher in the absence of any known alternative. It consists of 74 items, 66 of which are 5-point Likert Scale items and 8 are demographic items. Each of the Likert Scale items was designed to solicit a directional response ("definitely yes" to "definitely no"). The questionnaire was constructed to compare the attitudes of Michigan superintendents and building principals toward administrative bargaining units.

The Pilot Study

The items which were developed from the review of relevant literature with regard to administrative unionization and collective bargaining were pilot-tested. A preliminary form of the ABUPQ was

Table 3.2--ABUPQ Return Rate by Stratum

Type of Organ- ization	Size of School District	Present Employment Position	Number Surveyed	Number Returned	Return Rate Percentage	Number Selected for Study
ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNIT PRESENT WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	Small	Supt.	26	17	65.38	14
		H. S. Prin.	27	22	81.48	14
		Elem. Prin.	26	20	76.92	14
	Medium	Supt.	18	15	83.33	14
		H. S. Prin.	18	14	77.78	14
		Elem. Prin.	18	15	83.33	14
	Large	Supt.	17	15	88.24	14
		H. S. Prin.	17	14	82.35	14
		Elem. Prin.	17	14	82.35	14
	Small	Supt.	20	18	90.00	14
		H. S. Prin.	20	16	80.00	14
		Elem. Prin.	22	17	77.27	14
NO ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNIT PRESENT WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	Medium	Supt.	19	15	78.95	14
		H. S. Prin.	19	17	89.47	14
		Elem. Prin.	19	16	84.21	14
	Large	Supt.	18	15	83.33	14
		H. S. Prin.	18	14	77.78	14
		Elem. Prin.	18	14	77.78	14
Totals			357	288	80.67	252

completed and reviewed by the administrative staff of the Ferndale Public Schools during February, 1977. The purpose of this pilot test was to gather the individual reactions of the participating administrators to the subject matter of the questionnaire. Of the 11 administrators who reviewed the questionnaire, 2 were classified as executive level managers, 3 as secondary building principals, and 6 as elementary principals. Each item was scored and reviewed with the assistance of a consultant from the MSU Office of Research Consultation. All items which received 4 or more "no opinion" scores on the 5-point Likert scale were reexamined for clarity and specificity. A total of 13 items were rewritten and 4 additional items added, based upon the suggestions of the Ferndale administrators and the MSU consultant.

Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire

The final version of the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire consisted of 74 items, 66 of which were Likert scale items, and incorporated the revisions suggested by the pilot study. The revised questionnaire is presented in Appendix A and is assumed to have reasonable content validity.

After the data were collected, a first approximation to defining the cluster structure of the variables was obtained using principal components factor analysis followed by varimax rotations. The multiple-group method was then employed to evaluate the resulting cluster of variables. The end result was a set of three clusters,

each one dealing with a different aspect of attitudes toward administrative bargaining units. The three clusters are listed below.

1. General attitude toward administrative bargaining units.
2. Belief concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units.
3. Attitude toward present situation.

Descriptions of the items comprising each of the three clusters are listed in Table 3.3. The questionnaire items which did not appear to form clusters were disregarded. The ABUPQ clusters appear to be satisfactorily reliable, with Coefficient Alphas ranging from .77 to .93, as shown in Table 3.3. In its present form, the ABUPQ appears to be an adequate instrument for measuring an administrator's attitude toward administrative bargaining units.

After the clusters were determined, each administrator's scores on the individual items comprising each cluster were totaled. Questionnaire answers were thus transformed into three composite cluster scores. The three composite scores varied in range, depending on the number of items comprising each cluster, and provided data for testing the four hypotheses. Mean scores and standard deviations for each ABUPQ cluster are shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.3--Results of Cluster Analysis with the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire.
N = 252

Coeff. Alpha	Cluster Loading	Item Number	Questionnaire Items
.89		<u>Cluster 1: General Attitude Toward ABU's</u>	
.62		16.	My opinion of administrative bargaining units is positive.
.49		*71.	Administrative bargaining units are usually detrimental to student welfare.
.47		*18.	Administrative bargaining units are counter-productive for administrators.
.44		*21.	Administrative bargaining units tend to hurt administrator/school board relationships.
.43		44.	Administrative bargaining units best represent the collective needs of administrators.
.40		*26.	Administrative bargaining units antagonize the general public.
.35		*23.	Administrative bargaining units tend to antagonize teacher/administrator relationships.
.35		*61.	Administrative bargaining units tend to produce administrator militancy.
.31		*60.	Administrative bargaining units make teacher contract negotiations more difficult.
.29		*59.	Administrative bargaining units are an expression of lack of loyalty to the superintendent.
.27		34.	Administrative bargaining units improve the quality of education.
.27		*35.	Administrative bargaining units generally promise more than they can deliver.
.26		*19.	Administrators generally work fewer hours per week for the same salary when represented by a bargaining unit.
.19		*33.	Administrative bargaining units tend to produce complicated definitions of administrative roles and responsibilities.
.15		*39.	Administrative bargaining units can lead to administrative strikes.

*Item was weighted negatively for cluster analysis.

Table 3.3--Continued

Coeff. Alpha	Cluster Loading	Item Number	Questionnaire Items
.89		<u>Cluster 2: Belief Concerning the Potential Influence of Administrative Bargaining Units</u>	
	.56	48.	Administrative bargaining units encourage school boards to listen to the opinions of the administrators.
	.56	66.	Administrative bargaining units tend to improve communication with the school board.
	.54	15.	Administrative bargaining units guard against the erosion of the role and responsibilities of administrators.
	.54	47.	Administrative bargaining units are in the best interest of administrators.
	.52	14.	Administrative bargaining units usually improve administrative working conditions.
	.49	62.	The school board generally has more respect for administrators who are represented by a bargaining unit.
	.48	13.	Administrative bargaining units promote communication between the school board and building level administrators.
	.47	73.	Superintendents generally have more respect for administrators who are represented by a bargaining unit.
	.46	53.	Administrative bargaining units help ensure that administrators are considered as an integral part of management.
	.45	22.	Administrative bargaining units usually produce a more cohesive group of administrators.
	.44	24.	Administrative bargaining units promote communication between the school board and building level administrators.
	.42	50.	The role of administrators is more accurately defined through administrative bargaining units.
	.36	29.	Administrative bargaining units are generally a positive display of power.
	.36	70.	Building principals have a greater role in determining what will be included in administrators' contracts when they are members of a bargaining unit.
	.36	54.	Administrative bargaining units eliminate inequities in administrative salaries.
	.33	12.	Administrative bargaining units protect individual administrators from school board/superintendent harassment.
	.32	37.	Administrative bargaining units mean higher salaries and better fringe benefits for building principals.
	.26	32.	Administrative salaries are generally higher when the administrators are represented by a bargaining unit.

Table 3.3--Continued

Coeff. Alpha	Cluster Loading	Item Number	Questionnaire Items
.77		<u>Cluster 3: Attitude Toward Present Situation</u>	
	.65	10.	I am satisfied with the manner in which the principals' present contracts were determined.
	.65	*40.	I would change to a significant degree, the manner in which administrative contracts are determined in my district.

*Item was weighted negatively for cluster analysis.

TABLE 3.4--Means and standard deviations of ABUPQ Cluster Scores
N = 252

ABUPQ Cluster	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cluster 1: General Attitude Toward ABU's	25.996	8.506
Cluster 2: Belief Concerning Potential Influence of ABU's	32.151	12.190
Cluster 3: Attitude Toward Present Situation	3.381	2.567

Summary

The major problem of the present study was to compare the attitudes of selected Michigan administrators toward administrative bargaining units. The sample, selection procedure, the development of the questionnaire, and statistical analysis used in the study were described in the present chapter. A detailed description of the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire was presented, including results from the pilot testing and final content analysis.

Footnotes--Chapter III

¹Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide, Michigan Education Directory, Lansing, Michigan 1976-1977.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The present study was designed to examine and compare the attitudes of Michigan superintendents, secondary and elementary principals toward administrative bargaining units. The sample was composed of 252 administrators: 84 superintendents, 84 secondary principals, and 84 elementary principals.

The attitudes of the administrators were measured by the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire (ABUPQ), a self-report instrument which yields three continuous attitudinal scores and which also classifies respondents with respect to the three categories. The following attitudinal preferences were measured: (1) general attitude toward administrative bargaining units, (2) belief concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and (3) attitude toward present situation. The three classification categories were: (1) type of administrative organization, (2) size of school district as determined by the number of building principals employed, and (3) present employment position. Cell means of the ABUPQ cluster scores are presented in Table 4.1.

Four sets of hypotheses were formulated in order to test whether significant relationships exist between school administrators and their attitudes toward administrative bargaining units. All

Table 4.1--Cell Means of ABUPQ Cluster Scores

Independent Variables			Dependent Variables			
Type of Organization	Size of School District	Present Employment Position	SUBJECTS			
ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNIT PRESENT WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	0-8 Building Principals (small)	Supt.	14	37.571	44.286	2.714
		H.S. Prin.	14	32.500	36.571	4.000
		Elem. Prin.	14	29.857	32.571	4.357
		Supt.	14	35.286	43.000	1.857
	9-14 Building Principals (medium)	H.S. Prin.	14	30.429	33.786	4.357
		Elem. Prin.	14	24.357	24.714	5.500
		Supt.	14	32.643	43.857	2.286
		H.S. Prin.	14	29.357	35.500	2.071
	15 or more Building Principals (large)	Elem. Prin.	14	28.357	32.786	4.429
		Supt.	14	26.214	37.357	3.071
		H.S. Prin.	14	18.643	23.071	2.929
		Elem. Prin.	14	17.500	27.143	3.929
NO ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNIT PRESENT WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICT	9-14 Building Principals (medium)	Supt.	14	28.571	35.214	3.786
		H.S. Prin.	14	15.786	20.286	2.000
		Elem. Prin.	14	15.643	17.714	2.571
		Supt.	14	29.786	35.500	4.500
	15 or more Building Principals (large)	H.S. Prin.	14	19.214	26.286	4.000
		Elem. Prin.	14	16.214	29.071	2.500

hypotheses were tested with three-way analysis of variance, with the three independent variables being: (1) type of administrative organization, (2) size of school district as determined by the number of building principals employed, and (3) present employment position. An alpha level of .005 was set for testing each of the 17 individual hypotheses in order to insure an experiment-wise alpha level of .05.

Presentation of the Data

The study produced a number of significant findings. The hypotheses and the results of the hypotheses tests are presented below.

Hypothesis 1 -- Type of Organization

Hypothesis 1A: Administrators in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 1A was based on findings presented in Chapter II. Most researchers of administrative bargaining units have suggested that building principals once organized for collective bargaining purposes have a significantly more positive attitude toward ABU's than building principals who are not organized for collective bargaining. Researchers have also suggested that superintendents of school districts with ABU's may have a significantly more positive attitude toward ABU's than superintendents of school districts without ABU's. This theory is based, in part, upon research which indicates that superintendents in school districts with ABU's have often found that administrative bargaining units are less threatening to the efficient management of schools than they had originally believed.

Hypothesis 1A was tested by comparing the attitudes of administrators in school districts with ABU's toward administrative bargaining units with the attitudes of administrators in school districts without ABU's. A high score on Cluster 1 indicated a positive attitude toward ABU's, while a low Cluster 1 score was regarded as a negative attitude toward ABU's. Cluster 1 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 1A.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.2 and indicate that administrators' attitudes in school districts with administrative bargaining units are significantly more positive than administrators' attitudes in school districts without ABU's. Hypothesis 1A was therefore supported.

Hypothesis 1B: Administrators in school districts with ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 1B, like 1A, was based on findings presented in Chapter II. Researchers have suggested that administrators in school districts with administrative bargaining units, regardless of their present employment positions, have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 1B was tested by comparing the beliefs of administrators in school districts with ABU's concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units with the beliefs of administrators in school districts without ABU's. A high Cluster 2 score indicated a positive belief concerning the potential influence

Table 4.2--Results of Analysis of Variance for Testing Hypothesis 1
N = 252

Hypothesis	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	MS	F	Probability
1A. Administrators in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 (Cluster 1)	1	6696.036	92.556	.0001*
1B. Administrators in school districts with ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 (Cluster 2)	1	4425.143	29.778	.0001*
1C. Administrators in school districts with administrative bargaining units have more positive attitudes toward their present situations than administrators in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 (Cluster 3)	1	4.064	.617	.433

*Significant at the .005 level.

of ABU's, while a low Cluster 2 score was interpreted as a less positive belief. Cluster 2 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 1B.

Results of analysis of variance for Hypothesis 1B are shown in Table 4.2 and indicate that administrative scores for administrators in school districts with ABU's are higher than the administrators in school districts without ABU's. Hypothesis 1B was therefore supported.

Hypothesis 1C: Administrators in school districts with administrative bargaining units have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 1C was based on research in Chapter II, which indicated that elementary and secondary principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situations than elementary and secondary principals in school districts without ABU's. Researchers have also suggested, however, that superintendents in school districts with ABU's have less positive attitudes toward their present situations than superintendents in school districts without ABU's. Because Hypothesis 1C was based on a sample consisting of one-third superintendents and two-thirds building principals, it was hypothesized that the majority of these administrators in school districts with ABU's would have more positive attitudes toward their present situations than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 1C was tested by comparing the attitudes of administrators in school districts with ABU's toward their present

situation with the attitudes of administrators in school districts without ABU's. A high Cluster 3 score indicated a positive attitude toward present situation while a low Cluster 3 score was regarded as a less positive or negative attitude. Cluster 3 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 1C.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.2 and indicate no significant difference in the Cluster 3 scores of the two groups of administrators toward their present situations. Hypothesis 1C was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 2 -- Size of School District

Hypothesis 2A: Administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in small-sized school districts.

Findings in the literature reviewed in Chapter II supported the theory that the size of the school district is significantly correlated with the attitudes of administrators toward ABU's. Research indicated that the larger the school district, the more positive the attitudes of administrators toward ABU's. Hypothesis 2A was designed to test whether administrators in school districts employing nine or more building principals have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than administrators in smaller school districts.

Hypothesis 2A was tested by comparing the attitudes of administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts towards ABU's with the attitudes of administrators in small-sized school districts. A high Cluster 1 score was regarded as a positive attitude

toward ABU's, while a low Cluster 1 score indicated a negative attitude. Cluster 1 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 2A.

Results are shown in Table 4.3 and indicate no significant difference in the attitudes of the two groups of administrators toward ABU's. Hypothesis 2A was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 2B: Administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in small-sized school districts.

Hypothesis 2B was developed using the same rationale upon which Hypothesis 2A was constructed; that is, the administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in school districts with eight or fewer building principals. Hypothesis 2B was developed to test this premise.

Hypothesis 2B was tested by comparing the beliefs of administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts concerning the potential influence of ABU's with the beliefs of administrators in small-sized school districts. A high Cluster 2 score was regarded as a positive belief concerning the potential influence of ABU's while a low Cluster 2 score indicated a negative belief. Cluster 2 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 2B.

Analysis of variance results are shown in Table 4.3 and indicate that there is no significant difference in the beliefs of administrators from medium- and large-sized school districts concerning the potential influence of ABU's when compared with the beliefs

Table 4.3--Results of Analysis of Variance for Testing Hypothesis 2
N = 252

Hypothesis	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	MS	F	Probability
2A. Administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than administrators in small-sized school districts	$\frac{B2 + B3}{2} > B1$ (Cluster 1)	1	139.335	1.926	.167
2B. Administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in small-sized school districts.	$\frac{B2 + B3}{2} > B1$ (Cluster 2)	1	229.365	1.543	.215
2C. Administrators in large-sized school districts have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than administrators in medium-sized school districts	$B3 > B2$ (Cluster 1)	1	35.292	.4878	.486
2D. Administrators in large-sized school districts have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in medium-sized school districts.	$B3 > B2$ (Cluster 2)	1	933.429	6.281	.013

of administrators from small-sized school districts. Hypothesis 2B was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 2C: Administrators in large-sized school districts have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than administrators in medium-sized school districts.

Hypothesis 2C was developed to examine the relationship between size of school district and attitudes of administrators concerning administrative bargaining units. The literature indicated that middle-level administrators in large-sized school districts organized ABU's before middle-level administrators in smaller-sized school districts. Hypothesis 2C was designed to test whether administrators in school districts employing more than 15 building principals have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than administrators in school districts employing from 9 to 14 building principals.

Hypothesis 2C was tested by comparing the attitudes of administrators in large-sized school districts toward ABU's with the attitudes of administrators in medium-sized school districts. A high score on Cluster 1 indicated a positive attitude toward ABU's, while a low score was regarded as a negative attitude toward ABU's. Cluster 1 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 2C.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.3 and indicate that there is no significant difference in the attitudes of administrators from large- and medium-sized school districts towards ABU's. Hypothesis 2C was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 2D: Administrators in large-sized school districts have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in medium-sized school districts.

Hypothesis 2D was developed to examine the relationship between size of school district and beliefs of administrators concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units. The literature suggested that administrators in large-sized school districts have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in smaller-sized school districts. Hypothesis 2D was designed to test whether administrators in school districts employing more than 15 building principals have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in school districts employing from 9 to 14 building principals.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.3 and indicate that there is no significant difference in the beliefs of administrators from large- and medium-sized school districts concerning the potential influence of ABU's. Hypothesis 2D was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 3 -- Employment Position

Hypothesis 3A: Building principals have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than superintendents.

Hypothesis 3A was based on a general attitude widely supported in the literature that superintendents, representing executive management, have less positive attitudes toward ABU's than building principals, who represent middle-level management. Furthermore, building principals were considered to be more supportive of ABU's than superintendents.

Hypothesis 3A was tested by comparing the attitudes of the 168 building principals toward ABU's with the attitudes of the 84 superintendents. A high Cluster 1 score indicated a positive attitude toward ABU's, while a low Cluster 1 score was regarded as a negative attitude. Cluster 1 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 3A.

Analysis of variance results for Hypothesis 3A are presented in Table 4.4 and indicate that the superintendents' attitudes toward administrative bargaining units were surprisingly more positive than the attitudes of the building principals. Hypothesis 3A was therefore not supported. The results were, in fact, significant in the opposite direction than hypothesized.

Hypothesis 3B: Building principals have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than superintendents.

Hypothesis 3B was developed using the same rationale upon which Hypothesis 3A was constructed; that is, superintendents representing executive management have less positive beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than building principals who represent middle-level management. Furthermore, building principals have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than superintendents. Hypothesis 3B was developed to test this premise.

Hypothesis 3B was tested by comparing the beliefs of the 168 building principals concerning administrative bargaining units with the beliefs of the 84 superintendents. A high Cluster 2 score indicated a positive belief concerning the potential influence of

Table 4.4--Results of Analysis of Variance for Testing Hypothesis 3
N = 252

Hypothesis	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	MS	F	Probability
3A. Building principals have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than superintendents	$\frac{C2 + C3}{2} > C1$ (Cluster 1)	1	4068.698	56.240	.0001*
3B. Building principals have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than superintendents.	$\frac{C2 + C3}{2} > C1$ (Cluster 2)	1	7506.002	50.510	.0001*
3C. Elementary principals have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than secondary principals.	$C3 > C2$ (Cluster 1)	1	228.667	3.161	.077
3D. Elementary principals have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than secondary principals.	$C3 > C2$ (Cluster 2)	1	154.292	1.038	.309

*Although mean differences between groups were significant at the .005 level, results were not in the expected direction.

ABU's, while a low Cluster 2 score was regarded as a negative belief. Cluster 2 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 3B.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.4 and indicate that the superintendents' beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units were surprisingly more positive than the beliefs of the building principals. Hypothesis 3B was therefore not supported. The results were, in fact, significant in the opposite direction than hypothesized.

Hypothesis 3C: Elementary principals have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than secondary principals.

Hypothesis 3C was developed from findings presented in Chapter II, that elementary principals were likely to express attitudes more favorable to ABU's than secondary principals. McConnell's research in 1973 found elementary principals more interested in ABU's than secondary principals for numerous reasons, including perceived benefits in decision-making, role definition, and salary increases.¹

Hypothesis 3C was tested by comparing the attitudes of the 84 elementary principals toward administrative bargaining units with the attitudes of the 84 secondary principals. A high Cluster 1 score was regarded as a positive attitude while a low Cluster 1 score indicated a negative attitude. Cluster 1 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 3C.

Analysis of variance results are shown in Table 4.4 and indicate no significant differences in the scores of elementary and secondary principals regarding attitudes towards ABU's. Hypothesis 3C was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 3D: Elementary principals have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than secondary principals.

Hypothesis 3D, like Hypothesis 3C, was based on the research of others. McConnell's 1973 study suggested that elementary principals expressed stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than did secondary principals.²

Hypothesis 3D was tested by comparing the beliefs of the 84 elementary principals concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units with the beliefs of the 84 secondary principals. A high score on Cluster 2 indicated a positive belief concerning the potential influence of ABU's, while a low Cluster 2 score was regarded as a negative belief. Cluster 2 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 3D.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.4 and indicate that elementary principals' beliefs are not significantly different than secondary principals' beliefs regarding the potential influence of ABU's. Hypothesis 3D was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 4 -- Type of Organization and Employment Position

Hypothesis 4A: Superintendents in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes concerning administrative bargaining units than superintendents in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4A was based primarily on findings presented in Chapter II. Research by Munger in 1969³ and McConnell in 1973⁴ suggested that there are differences in the perceptions of superintendents regarding the influence of collective bargaining by school administrators on selected management functions. Both researchers acknowledged that superintendents more often expressed strong

opinions against the formation of ABU's. The researchers further suggested that superintendents in school districts with ABU's have more positive beliefs about this arrangement than superintendents in districts without ABU's. This theory was based upon writings which indicated that superintendents in school districts with ABU's have often found that administrative bargaining units are less threatening to the efficient management of schools than they had originally believed. Therefore it was hypothesized that superintendents in districts with ABU's would express attitudes more positive of ABU's since their middle-level administrators are organized compared with superintendents in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4A was tested by comparing the attitudes of the 42 superintendents in school districts with ABU's toward administrative bargaining units with the attitudes of the 42 superintendents in school districts without ABU's. A high score on Cluster 1 indicated a positive attitude toward ABU's, while a low Cluster 1 score was regarded as a negative attitude toward ABU's. Cluster 1 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 4A.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.5 and indicate that there is no significant difference in the attitudes of the two groups of superintendents toward ABU's. Hypothesis 4A was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 4B: Superintendents in school districts with ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than superintendents in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4B was developed using the same argument and findings cited for Hypothesis 4A; that is, superintendents in school

Table 4.5--Results of Analysis of Variance for Testing Hypothesis 4
N = 252

Hypothesis	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	MS	F	Probability
4A. Superintendents in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than superintendents in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 for C1 (Cluster 1)	1	350.000	4.838	.029
4B. Superintendents in school districts with ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than superintendents in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 for C1 (Cluster 2)	1	15.018	.101	.751
4C. Superintendents in school districts without ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than superintendents in school districts with ABU's.	A2 > A1 for C1 (Cluster 3)	1	96.907	14.712	.0002*

*Although mean differences between groups were significant at the .005 level, results were not in the expected direction.

Table 4.5--Continued

Hypothesis	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	MS	F	Probability
4D. Building principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than building principals in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 for C2 and C3 (Cluster 1)	2	192.191	2.657	.072
4E. Building principals in school districts with ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than building principals in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 for C2 and C3 (Cluster 2)	2	242.512	1.632	.198
4F. Building principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than building principals in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 for C2 and C3 (Cluster 3)	2	56.814	8.626	.0003*

*Significant at the .005 level.

districts with ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than superintendents in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4B was tested by comparing the beliefs of the 42 superintendents in school districts with ABU's concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units with the beliefs of the 42 superintendents in school districts without ABU's. A high Cluster 2 score was regarded as a strong belief while a low Cluster 2 score was regarded as a less strong belief concerning the potential influence of ABU's. Cluster 2 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 4B.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.5 and suggest that there is no significant difference in the beliefs of the two groups of superintendents concerning the potential influence of ABU's. Hypothesis 4B was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 4C: Superintendents in school districts without ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than superintendents in school districts with ABU's.

Hypothesis 4C, like Hypotheses 4A and 4B, was based primarily on previous research and findings presented in Chapter II. It is theorized that superintendents in school districts with ABU's are more positive toward their present administrative arrangements than superintendents in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4C was based upon findings in the literature which strongly suggested that superintendents would prefer not to have their middle-level administrators organize for purposes of collective bargaining. The hypothesis is reversed when compared to

the others, in that superintendents in school districts without ABU's are expected to have more positive attitudes toward their present situations than superintendents in school districts with ABU's.

Hypothesis 4C was tested by comparing the attitudes of the 42 superintendents in school districts with ABU's toward their present situations with the attitudes of the 42 superintendents in school districts without ABU's. A high Cluster 3 score was regarded as a positive attitude toward present situation while a low Cluster 3 score was regarded as a negative attitude. Cluster 3 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 4C.

Analysis of variance results for Hypothesis 4C are presented in Table 4.5 and indicate that the attitudes of superintendents in school districts with ABU's towards their present situations were surprisingly more positive than the attitudes of the superintendents in school districts without ABU's. Hypothesis 4C was therefore not supported. The results were, in fact, significant in the opposite direction than hypothesized.

Hypothesis 4D: Building principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes towards administrative bargaining units than building principals in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4D was formulated based on findings presented in Chapter II. Most researchers of administrative bargaining units have theorized that building principals once organized for collective bargaining hold attitudes more positive toward ABU's than building principals who are not members of an ABU. It is assumed that building principals once organized support their ABU's, while unorganized

building principals are somewhat fearful of possible negative ramifications from organizing for purposes of collective bargaining.

Hypothesis 4D was tested by comparing the attitudes of the 84 building principals in school districts with ABU's toward administrative bargaining units with the attitudes of the 84 building principals in school districts without ABU's. A high score on Cluster 1 was regarded as a positive attitude toward ABU's, while a low Cluster 1 score was an indication of negative attitude toward ABU's. Cluster 1 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 4D.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.5 and indicate that building principals' attitudes in school districts with ABU's are not significantly different than building principals' attitudes in school districts without ABU's. Hypothesis 4D was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 4E: Building principals in school districts with ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than building principals in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4E was developed in the same manner as Hypothesis 4D, and was based upon findings suggested in Chapter II. Hypothesis 4E tested the theory developed in earlier research that building principals in school districts with ABU's have different beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than building principals in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4E was tested by comparing the beliefs of building principals in school districts with ABU's concerning the potential

influence of ABU's with the beliefs of the building principals in school districts without ABU's. A high Cluster 2 score was regarded as a strong belief, while a low Cluster 2 score was regarded as less positive belief. Cluster 2 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 4E.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.5 and indicate no significant difference in the beliefs of the two groups of building principals. Hypothesis 4E was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 4F: Building principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than building principals in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4F was based on findings suggested in Chapter II. Much of the literature indicated that building principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than building principals in school districts without ABU's. The basis for this theory was suggested by the increasing number of ABU's that have been organized throughout Michigan in the last five years. Hypothesis 4F attempted to test this theory.

Hypothesis 4F was tested by comparing the attitudes of building principals in school districts with ABU's toward their present situation with the attitudes of building principals in school districts without ABU's. A high score on Cluster 3 was regarded as a positive attitude while a low Cluster 3 score was regarded as a negative attitude. Cluster 3 was regarded as the dependent variable in testing Hypothesis 4F.

Results of analysis of variance are shown in Table 4.5 and indicate that the attitudes of building principals in school

districts with ABU's are more positive concerning their present situation than building principals in school districts without ABU's. Hypothesis 4F was therefore supported.

Additional Findings

In addition to testing the four groups of hypotheses, exploratory analyses were conducted with the data. The exploratory analyses yielded some interesting results.

The first eight items of the ABUPQ were demographic and are presented in Table 4.6. No predictions were formulated regarding this information, though items #3 and #8 were used to verify the coded answer sheets returned by the individual administrators.

Regarding Hypothesis 2, statistical tests revealed no significant differences in the attitudes toward ABU's of administrators in small districts compared with administrators in medium- or large-sized school districts. Also, there were no significant differences in the attitudes of administrators in medium-sized districts compared with administrators in large districts. However, further examination of the data revealed that administrators in small- and large-sized school districts appeared to have surprisingly stronger beliefs in the potential influence of ABU's than do administrators in medium-sized school districts. The following mean scores were obtained for Cluster 2: 33.50 for administrators in small-sized districts, 29.12 for administrators in medium-sized districts, and 33.83 for administrators in large-sized districts.

Regarding Hypothesis 4F, statistical tests revealed that building principals in school districts with ABU's had more positive

Table 4.6--ABUPQ Demographic Data
N = 252

Item Number	Item Statement					
1. Sex						
Male	Female					
93.7%	6.3%					
2. Age						
21-29	30-38	39-47	48-55	Over 56	Omit	
0.0%	17.9%	38.1%	36.9%	6.5%	.4%	
3. Current Job Title						
Elem. Prin.	H. S. Prin.	Superintendent				
33.3%	33.3%	33.3%				
4. Years Employed in Present Position						
0-3	4-6	7-10	11-15	Over 15	Omit	
23.0%	25.4%	24.2%	15.1%	11.9%	.4%	
5. Years Employed as Full-time School Administrator						
0-3	4-6	7-10	11-15	Over 15		
5.2%	9.5%	22.2%	25.4%	37.7%		
6. Length of Present Personal Contract						
Less than 1	One	Two	Three	More than 3	Omit	
7.5%	28.6%	28.6%	24.2%	9.5%	1.6%	
7. Level of Educational Training						
Bachelors	Bachelors plus 15 credits	Masters	Masters plus 30 cr.	Ph.D.		
0.0%	0.8%	26.2%	50.4%	22.6%		
8. Type of Administrative Organization within School District						
Formal ABU	No ABU					
50.0%	50.0%					

attitudes toward their present situation than building principals in school districts without ABU's. This result was consistent with the current literature concerning collective bargaining by and for middle-level administrators. In order to examine whether this finding was also true for elementary principals as well as secondary principals, separate analyses were conducted for elementary principals and secondary principals using analysis of variance. Results (see Table 4.7) indicated that elementary principals in school districts with ABU's appeared to have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than elementary principals in school districts without ABU's. However, there was no significant difference between the attitudes of secondary principals in school districts with ABU's and the attitudes of secondary principals in school districts without ABU's. Elementary principals in districts with ABU's apparently felt so positive about their present situation that their scores, when combined with the less positive secondary principals' scores, produced significant results for Hypothesis 4F.

Summary

In order to examine the attitudes of Michigan superintendents and secondary and elementary principals toward administrative bargaining units, three attitudinal cluster scores derived from responses to the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire of 252 administrators were examined and compared using three classification categories. The three classification categories were: (1) type of administrative organization, (2) size of school district as determined by the number of building principals employed,

Table 4.7--Results of Analysis of Variance for Further Testing of Hypothesis 4F
N - 252

Hypothesis	Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	MS	F	Probability
Secondary principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situations than secondary principals in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 for C2 (Cluster 3)	1	1.907	.290	.591
Elementary principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situations than elementary principals in school districts without ABU's.	A1 > A2 for C3 (Cluster 3)	1	111.7202	16.962	.0001*

*Significant at the .005 level.

and (3) present employment position. The three attitudinal clusters were: (1) general attitude toward administrative bargaining units, (2) beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and (3) attitude toward present situation.

Four sets of hypotheses, or a total of 17 directional hypotheses were tested, and the results were reported in the present chapter. An alpha level of .005 was set for testing each of the 17 hypotheses in order to insure an experiment-wise alpha level of .05. As a result of these tests, three hypotheses were supported (1A, 1B, and 4F), and fourteen hypotheses were not supported (1C, 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, and 4E). However, for three of the nonsupported hypotheses (3A, 3B, and 4C), results were significant in the opposite direction than hypothesized. The results of hypotheses 3A, 3B, and 4C were most interesting since they are not believed to be consistent with current literature regarding administrative bargaining units. A full discussion of the findings is included in the following chapter.

Footnotes--Chapter IV

¹McConnell, Lawrence F., "A Study of the Influence of Collective Bargaining by School Administrators on the Management Functions of Selected Michigan School Districts," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.

²Ibid.

³Munger, Benson Scott, "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Michigan Principals Toward Organizing for Negotiations," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

⁴McConnell, op. cit.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The major problem of the present study was to determine attitudes of superintendents and building principals (secondary and elementary) in selected Michigan school districts toward administrative bargaining units (ABU's).

Summary of the Study

Attitudes of Michigan administrators toward administrative bargaining units were measured by the Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire (ABUPQ), an instrument constructed for the study. The sample consisted of 252 administrators: 84 superintendents, 84 secondary principals, and 84 elementary principals, all employed in Michigan public school districts (K-12).

The Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire is a self-report instrument designed by the researcher and based upon opinions expressed in a review of the literature concerning administrative bargaining units in Michigan prior to February 1977. The ABUPQ consists of 74 items of which 35 items were used to measure the following attitudinal preferences: (1) general attitude toward ABU's, (2) beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's, and (3) attitude toward present situation. Each administrator's questionnaire responses were transformed into three composite cluster

scores. The ABUPQ clusters appeared to be satisfactorily reliable, with Coefficient Alphas ranging from .77 to .93.

Administrators were classified according to three categories: (1) type of administrative organization, (2) size of school district as determined by number of building principals employed, and (3) present employment position. Four sets of hypotheses, or 17 individual directional hypotheses, were formulated in order to test whether significant relationships existed between the three classification categories for each administrator and the attitudinal preferences of each administrator as measured by the three cluster scores. The hypotheses were tested with three-way analysis of variance. In all cases, the cluster scores were regarded as the dependent variables and were used to determine directionality of administrative attitudes. A high cluster score was regarded as a positive attitude, while a low cluster score was regarded as a negative attitude. An alpha level of .005 was set for testing each of the 17 directional hypotheses in order to insure an experiment-wise alpha level of .05. The following results were obtained:

Hypothesis 1 -- Type of Organization

Hypothesis 1A: Administrators in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 1B: Administrators in school districts with ABU's have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 1C: There are no significant differences between the attitudes of administrators in school districts with ABUs toward their present situation and the attitudes of administrators in school districts without ABUs.

Hypothesis 2 -- Size of School District

Hypothesis 2A: There are no significant differences between the attitudes of administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts toward administrative bargaining units, and the attitudes of administrators in small-sized school districts.

Hypothesis 2B: There are no significant differences between the beliefs of administrators in medium- and large-sized school districts concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and the beliefs of administrators in small-sized school districts.

Hypothesis 2C: There are no significant differences between the attitudes of administrators in large-sized school districts toward administrative bargaining units and the attitudes of administrators in medium-sized school districts.

Hypothesis 2D: There are no significant differences between the beliefs of administrators in large-sized school districts concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and the beliefs of administrators in medium-sized school districts.

Hypothesis 3 -- Present Employment Position

Hypothesis 3A: Superintendents appear to have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than building principals.

Hypothesis 3B: Superintendents appear to have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than building principals.

Hypothesis 3C: There are no significant differences between the attitudes of elementary principals toward administrative bargaining units, and the attitudes of secondary principals.

Hypothesis 3D: There are no significant differences between the beliefs of elementary principals concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and the beliefs of secondary principals.

Hypothesis 4 -- Type of Organization and Employment Position

Hypothesis 4A: There are no significant differences between the attitudes of superintendents in school districts with ABU's toward administrative bargaining units and the attitudes of superintendents in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4B: There are no significant differences between the beliefs of superintendents in school districts with ABU's concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and the beliefs of superintendents in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4C: Superintendents in school districts with ABU's appear to have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than superintendents in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4D: There are no significant differences between the attitudes of building principals in school districts with ABU's toward administrative bargaining units, and the attitudes of building principals in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4E: There are no significant differences between the attitudes of building principals in school districts with ABU's concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and the beliefs of building principals in school districts without ABU's.

Hypothesis 4F: Building principals in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward their present situations than building principals in school districts without ABU's.

In addition to testing the 17 hypotheses, exploratory analyses were conducted with the data, resulting in two interesting findings.

Regarding Hypothesis 2, statistical tests revealed no significant differences in the attitudes toward ABU's of administrators in small districts compared with administrators in medium- or large-sized school districts. Also, there were no significant differences in the attitudes of administrators in medium-sized districts compared with the attitudes of administrators in large districts. However, further examination of the data revealed that administrators in small- and large-sized school districts appear to have surprisingly stronger beliefs in the potential influence of ABU's than do administrators in medium-sized school districts.

Regarding Hypothesis 4F, statistical tests revealed that building principals in school districts with ABU's had more positive attitudes toward their present situations than building principals in school districts without ABU's. This result was consistent with the current literature concerning collective bargaining by and for

middle-level administrators. In order to examine whether this finding was also true for elementary principals as well as secondary principals, separate analyses were conducted for elementary principals and secondary principals using analysis of variance. Results were tabulated and indicated that elementary principals in school districts with ABU's appear to have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than elementary principals in school districts without ABU's. However, there was no significant difference in the attitudes of secondary principals in school districts with ABU's and the attitudes of secondary principals in school districts without ABU's. Elementary principals in districts with ABU's apparently felt so positive about their present situation that their scores, when combined with the less positive secondary principals' scores, produced significant results for Hypothesis 4F.

Discussion of the Findings and Recommendations for Future Research

The study produced a number of significant results. A discussion of the findings and recommendations for future research are presented below.

Hypothesis 1 -- Type of Organization

The first set of hypotheses (1A, 1B, and 1C) postulated that administrators in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units, have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and have more positive attitudes toward their present situation, than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

The statistical tests of the study revealed that administrators in school districts with ABU's do have more positive attitudes toward ABU's and stronger beliefs concerning their potential influence. However, there appeared to be no significant differences in the attitudes of these two groups of administrators toward their present situations.

The results of Hypotheses 1A and 1B were consistent with the current literature. Once a group of middle-level administrators elect to organize for purposes of collective bargaining, their general attitudes toward ABU's and their beliefs in the potential influence of ABU's are more positive than the attitudes of administrators who, for whatever reasons, have not organized for the purpose of collective bargaining. The literature reviewed illustrated numerous reasons why groups of middle-level administrators in growing numbers are seeking the protection of ABU's.

Relationships between superintendents and building principals based upon a fear or lack of understanding of ABU's may well be more detrimental to the effective management of schools than actual unionization by middle-level administrators. Thus, the results of Hypotheses 1A and 1B were not unexpected. However, the results of Hypothesis 1C were surprising. It had been expected, because of the constantly increasing number of ABU's in Michigan public schools, that administrators in school districts without ABU's would be less positive about their present situation. That this expected finding was not supported by the data is interesting and worthy of additional study.

Perhaps one reason that administrators in school districts without ABU's appear to be as satisfied with their present situation as administrators in school districts with ABU's is that administrative hours, wages, and working conditions are somewhat standardized by regions throughout the state regardless of the type of administrative organization within an individual school district.

This possible explanation of the data results is supported by at least one superintendent in a school district with an administrative bargaining unit who included the following comment with the ABUPQ answer sheet.

Administrators and supervisors in this district have been legally organized for years but have not negotiated for the past four years. We are operating a management team program. The formal bargaining unit remains in name only.

Another possible reason suggested in the literature is that ABU's are organized only after a crisis or series of events occur which are detrimental to middle-level administrative morale such as the release of an administrator without due process or just cause. Historical studies are needed to examine the relationships which have existed between superintendents and middle-level administrators before and after the formation of an administrative bargaining unit.

An interesting comment received from a high school principal in a large-sized school district without an administrative bargaining unit tends to support the above statements regarding administrative morale and crisis events. According to the secondary principal it is the superintendent within this particular district who is promoting an administrative bargaining unit as protection for middle-level administrators. The high school principal's comment was:

We are now in the process of organizing a local bargaining unit after operating on the team concept for several years with two superintendents. Our present superintendent thought the time was right (to organize) because board members who had attended conventions were favorable to the idea. Because of two high school principals being discharged recently, no tenure for administrators, and attitudes of the teacher union, it appears advisable for us to organize.

Hypothesis 2 -- Size of School District

The second set of hypotheses (2A, 2B, 2C, and 2D) postulated that size of school district as determined by the number of building principals employed would cause significant differences in administrative attitudes toward ABU's, and beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units. The literature here supported the theory that the larger the school district the more likely it was that administrators at the building level would favor administrative bargaining units. Reasons cited were many but primarily indicated that increased size of school districts brought communication problems for middle-level administrators and the school board and superintendent. Furthermore, the literature supported additional reasons for administrative interest in ABU's, which were, the lack of meaningful involvement by middle-level administrators in large school districts in teacher negotiations and the lack of meaningful involvement in the determination of school policies.

None of the four hypotheses were supported but further analyses revealed that administrators in both small- and large-sized school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes concerning the potential influence of ABU's than administrators in medium-sized school districts with ABU's.

The non-support of the four hypotheses is surprising as is the distinction between medium-sized school districts and small- and large-sized school districts with ABU's. It would appear that size of district, contrary to the current literature, is not a valid predictor of administrative interest in ABU's. Two possible explanations, worthy of consideration in future studies, are: (1) the personalities of the individual administrators employed in a school district at the time an administrative bargaining unit is organized and (2) the specific conditions or events which have led to the formation of administrative bargaining units within individual school districts.

Hypothesis 3 -- Present Employment Position

The third set of hypotheses (3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D) postulated that superintendents, secondary and elementary principals have significantly different attitudes toward ABU's, and beliefs concerning the potential influences of administrative bargaining units. Elementary principals were theorized as having the most positive attitudes toward ABU's, with superintendents feeling least positive toward administrative bargaining units.

Hypotheses 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D were not supported. The rejection of these hypotheses is especially surprising since related research indicated that elementary principals would display the most interest in ABU's, followed next by secondary principals and finally by superintendents. Using this information, it was assumed that elementary principals would compile the highest ABUPQ cluster scores

in the present study. Superintendents were expected to compile the lowest cluster scores for the three groups of administrators.

While the complete opposite did not occur, superintendents in school districts with ABUs and superintendents in school districts without ABUs expressed more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than did all of the building principals, regardless of the type of administrative organization within their school district.

Elementary and secondary principals unexpectedly expressed basically the same attitudes as indicated in the test results for Hypotheses 3C and 3D.

These results are interesting and would indicate a serious contradiction of much of the current literature, especially those articles which are authored by spokesmen of state and national administrative associations. Future research should examine the possibility that there are significant differences between superintendents and building principals concerning perceptions of ABUs, using a different set of dependent variables. One possible explanation for the present study results is that superintendents, unlike most building principals, must work directly with teacher contract negotiations and therefore better understand and accept the adversary conditions of collective bargaining by school employees. Perhaps the attitudes reflected in the literature produced by principals' associations are more a warning of things to come than a reflection of present conditions. The results of these hypotheses do not indicate increased interest on the part of middle-level administrators

in organizing ABU's as is strongly suggested by many writers in the area of administrative bargaining units.

The results of testing Hypothesis 3 are reflected in the comment of one elementary principal who in returning the ABUPQ answer sheet wrote, "Up to this date in time, I, personally, have had an extremely pleasant career without an administrative bargaining unit."

Hypothesis 4 -- Type of Organization and Employment Position

The fourth set of hypotheses (4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 4E, and 4F) postulated that superintendents and building principals, independent of each other, in school districts with ABU's have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units, have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units, and have more positive attitudes toward their present situation, than superintendents and building principals in school districts without ABU's.

Individuals writing about ABU's had indicated that administrators who have experienced the process of a certification election for an administrative bargaining unit or have experienced the procedure involved in seeking voluntary recognition status of middle-level administrations within a school district could be expected to express attitudes considerably more positive regarding ABU's than superintendents and building principals in school districts without administrative bargaining units.

Hypotheses 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, and 4E were not supported while 4F was supported. However, the testing of Hypothesis 4C indicated significant results in the opposite direction. Therefore the testing

of the six hypotheses appear only to support that superintendents and building principals in school districts with ABUs have more positive attitudes towards their present situation than administrators in school districts without ABUs.

What is of interest in the test results of Hypotheses 4A, 4B, 4D, and 4E is that no difference in the attitudes of administrators in school districts with ABUs was found from the attitudes of administrators in school districts without ABUs, regarding either attitudes toward ABUs or beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABUs.

The current literature appears to be as contradictory for Hypotheses 4A, 4B, 4D, and 4E as it was for Hypotheses 3C and 3D. The research data for the present study support that administrators once organized for collective bargaining have more positive attitudes towards ABUs than administrators in districts without ABUs. However, this does not necessarily mean that there is a prevailing pro-administrative bargaining unit attitude among middle-level administrators which is influencing or causing building principals in school districts without ABUs to consider organizing for the purpose of collective bargaining.

The comments of one secondary principal in a small-sized school district without an ABU lends support to the above statement:

If there is true team management with a superintendent dedicated to looking out for the best interests of his administrators, there is no need for a bargaining unit. In fact, a unit could be counter-productive if it stirs up public resentment in small communities.

As was previously suggested there is a need for a historical studies designed to examine and determine the actual events or existing conditions which have led to the organizing of approximately seventy administrative bargaining units in Michigan since 1969.

Additional Recommendations

This study was concerned primarily with determining the attitudes of superintendents, secondary and elementary principals in selected Michigan school districts toward administrative bargaining units. It was necessarily limited in scope. Many other professional educators and laymen are affected by ABU's and a similar investigation of their attitudes should prove profitable. These would include teachers, school board members, other administrators, and parents.

In addition to the recommendations mentioned throughout this chapter, a number of suggestions are offered to future researchers of administrative bargaining units.

1. The formation of administrative bargaining units for middle-level administrators is occurring nationwide. Therefore, similar research based on the results of the present study should be conducted in several other states in which ABU's have been organized.

2. Future investigation of the impact of ABU's on selected management functions such as, role and responsibilities of building principals, problems of communication with the school board and superintendent, and administrative salary and fringe benefits, could be expanded upon beyond the abstract concept of beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units to the

measurement of absolute changes resulting from the organization of ABU's.

3. Research should be undertaken to determine the degree of compatibility between ABU's and the management team concept. The results of this study suggest that perhaps a management team approach and ABU's are not incompatible. The results of Hypothesis 4C indicate that superintendents in school districts with ABU's are more positive in their attitudes toward their present situation than superintendents in school districts without ABU's. Accepting these results, which are contrary to the current literature, there is reason to believe that research to determine the compatibility of ABU's and the management team concept would be most beneficial to school administrators at all levels.

4. A study should be conducted to examine the degree of representativeness of Michigan building principals by the state's administrative associations. It would be interesting to learn whether the administrative associations reflect the needs and attitudes of their members or whether the associations are actually attempting to pre-determine the needs and attitudes of member administrators. This distinction requires clarification since the results of the present study indicate that the opinions expressed concerning ABU's in much of the literature published by state administrative associations, particularly for secondary and elementary principals, is not reflective of the attitudes of the building principals surveyed for this study. The inconsistency of representativeness raises numerous questions concerning the influence of these

associations on the growth of administrative bargaining units in Michigan.

5. A longitudinal study over a period of at least three master teachers' contracts should be conducted to examine administrative relationships between executive managers (superintendents) and middle-level managers (building principals) in light of collective bargaining by teachers. This would enable administrators to realize the actual influences of collective bargaining by teachers on administrative interest in administrative bargaining units.

6. A study of school districts with administrative bargaining units should be undertaken to identify those conditions or events which have precipitated the formation of an administrative bargaining unit in those individual districts. Examination of actual conditions prior to organization should prove most profitable for school administrators at all levels, if relationships between prior conditions and the formation of an ABU are significant. This is necessary since no significant differences were found between the attitudes of administrators in school districts with ABU's toward their present situation and the attitudes of administrators in school districts without ABU's. Therefore, it is suspected, outside the scope of this study, that crisis conditions or events occur within a school district which cause building principals to undergo sudden attitudinal changes from personal and group positions of satisfaction with their present situation to positions of dissatisfaction.

7. It has been suggested that the reason superintendents appear to have more positive attitudes toward ABU's than building

principals, and appear to have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of ABU's than building principals in school districts with ABU's practice of hiring superintendents with previous experiences and positive attitudes in dealing with administrative bargaining units. That is to say, a school district with an ABU will select and hire, as its chief executive, an individual who displays an ability to work with building principals and other middle-level administrators who are organized for the purposes of collective bargaining. This premise is outside the scope of the present study, but future research should examine the possibility that the superintendent's attitude toward ABU's is highly related to the interest building principals may have in administrative bargaining units. Furthermore, it would be interesting to know to what extent superintendents with positive attitudes toward ABU's will encourage building principals to organize for collective bargaining. The data results suggest that there is a possibility that superintendents would prefer to have their middle-level administrators organized for purposes of administrative efficiency and staff morale.

Conclusions

The findings of this study are significant both in what was determined through statistical analysis of the data and what was not determined.

First, it can be supported that administrators in school districts that have ABU's have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABU's.

Second, it was supported that administrators in school districts that have ABUs have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in school districts without ABUs.

Third, superintendents appear to have more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than building principals.

Fourth, superintendents appear to have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than building principals.

Fifth, superintendents in school districts with ABUs appear to have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than superintendents in school districts without ABUs.

Sixth, building principals in school districts with ABUs have more positive attitudes toward their present situation than building principals in school districts without ABUs.

In addition to the above findings which resulted from hypotheses testing, the following significant results were obtained from additional tests of the data collected.

1. Administrators in both small- and large-sized school districts with ABUs appear to have stronger beliefs concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than administrators in medium-sized school districts with ABUs.

2. Elementary principals in school districts with ABUs appear to have more positive attitudes concerning the potential influence of administrative bargaining units than elementary principals in school districts without ABUs.

Finally, of significance to the researcher was the inability to produce significant data results which supported that building principals, and elementary principals in particular, hold more positive attitudes toward administrative bargaining units than superintendents. The literature had strongly promoted this theory which was not supported within the present study.

APPENDIX

**ADMINISTRATIVE BARGAINING UNIT
PREFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE
AND COVER LETTER**

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

March 31, 1977

Dear Administrator:

For the purposes of completing a doctoral dissertation concerning administrative bargaining units in Michigan public schools, we would appreciate your taking the time necessary to assist in the research of this topic. We are interested in your attitudes toward administrative bargaining units for building level administrators. You have been selected at random to participate in this study, along with over 280 other Michigan school administrators.

Participation involves only the completion of the enclosed questionnaire and return of the answer sheet to Michigan State University. The information gathered is strictly confidential and at no time will your name or the school system's name appear in print. The results of this questionnaire will be incorporated into a doctoral dissertation and will be made available through Michigan State University.

Accompanying this letter is a seven-page questionnaire, an answer sheet, and a stamped return envelope. We would appreciate your taking approximately twenty minutes to complete and return the answer sheet within the next two days. You may keep the actual questionnaire. Again, the purpose of this research is to gather information on this topic and is in no way designed to favor or encourage any particular type of administrative contract negotiations.

If you should for any reason wish not to participate, please return the entire packet of materials and another participant will be selected. Questions or concerns should be directed to Mr. Burton at either the address or phone number listed below. Your participation is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,


Gary A. Burton
Richard L. Featherstone
Professor
Administration and Higher Education

334 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Tel: (517) 355-1833

Administrative Bargaining Unit Preference Questionnaire

First, read each statement or question carefully. Then mark with a carbon pencil (#2) how strongly you feel (1 to 5) about each of the following items, using the answer sheet. Please do not answer on this questionnaire.

Here is an example of how you might respond.

Do you think you will earn an M. A. degree within the next five years?

(1)
Definitely
yes

(2)
Probably

(3)
I have no
opinion

(4)
Probably
not

(5)
Definitely
not

Your answers will be Strictly Confidential, so please be completely honest and candid. A student number has been assigned to your answer sheet by the researcher in order to determine a response percentage of the 280 administrators asked at random to participate in this study. Anonymity is guaranteed by the researcher.

Upon completion, do not fold the answer sheet, but return it immediately via the enclosed mailer to the researcher within the next two days.

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR HELP. If there is anything you would like to say about administrative bargaining units, please do so, by including your comments on a separate sheet of paper and enclosing it with the answer sheet.

Questions one through eight are requests for demographic information. Please mark the appropriate number on your answer sheet.

1. What is your sex?

(1)	(2)
male	female
2. How old are you?

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
21-29	30-38	39-47	48-55	Over 56
3. Your current job title is:

(1)	(2)	(3)
Elem. Principal	H.S. Principal	Superintendent
4. How many years have you been employed in your present position?

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
0-3	4-6	7-10	11-15	Over 15
5. How many years have you been employed as a full time school administrator?

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
0-3	4-6	7-10	11-15	Over 15
6. How many years of employment are stated in your present personal contract?

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Less than one	One	Two	Three	More than three
7. What is the level of your educational training?

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Bachelors	Bachelors plus 15 credits	Masters	Masters plus 30 credits	Ph.D.
8. Which of the following two arrangements best describes the manner in which present building principals' contracts for your school district were determined?
 - (1) Formal administrative bargaining unit (an administrative union which was legally certified by the Michigan Employment Relations Commission or an administrative bargaining unit which was voluntarily recognized by the school board.
 - (2) No organized administrative bargaining unit was recognized by the school board for the purpose of contract negotiation for building principals as a group.

IMPORTANT: All of the following questions about administrative bargaining units are referring to formal bargaining units either certified by MERC or voluntarily recognized by the school board.

Marking Instructions				
(1) Definitely yes	(2) Probably	(3) I have no opinion	(4) Probably not	(5) Definitely not

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 9. Administrative bargaining units tend to improve communication with the superintendent..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. Are you satisfied with the manner in which the principals' present contracts were determined?..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. Administrative bargaining units encourage greater teacher association activities..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. Administrative bargaining units protect individual administrators from school board/superintendent harassment..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. Administrative bargaining units promote communication between the school board and building level administrators..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. Administrative bargaining units usually improve administrative working conditions..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15. Administrative bargaining units guard against the erosion of the role and responsibilities of administrators..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16. My opinion of administrative bargaining units is positive..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 17. There are alternatives to administrative bargaining units in small school districts..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 18. Administrative bargaining units are counter-productive for administrators..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 19. Administrators generally work fewer hours per week for the same salary when represented by a bargaining unit..... | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Marking Instructions				
(1) Definitely yes	(2) Probably	(3) I have no opinion	(4) Probably not	(5) Definitely not
20. Do you believe that the employment needs of building principals are properly understood by the school board?.....	1	2	3	4 5
21. Administrative bargaining units tend to hurt administrator/school board relationships.....	1	2	3	4 5
22. Administrative bargaining units usually produce a more cohesive group of administrators.....	1	2	3	4 5
23. Administrative bargaining units tend to antagonize teacher/administrator relationships.....	1	2	3	4 5
24. Administrative bargaining units promote communication between the school board and building level administrators.....	1	2	3	4 5
25. Elementary principals have much to gain from bargaining units....	1	2	3	4 5
26. Administrative bargaining units antagonize the general public....	1	2	3	4 5
27. Superintendents would prefer to have their administrators represented by a bargaining unit.....	1	2	3	4 5
28. Administrative bargaining units protect the administrative role during teacher contract negotiations.....	1	2	3	4 5
29. Administrative bargaining units are generally a positive display of power.....	1	2	3	4 5
30. Do you believe that the employment needs of building principals are properly understood by the superintendent?.....	1	2	3	4 5

- | Marking Instructions | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1)
Definitely
yes | (2)
Probably | (3)
I have no
opinion | (4)
Probably
not | (5)
Definitely
not |
| 20. Do you believe that the employment needs of building principals are properly understood by the school board?..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 21. Administrative bargaining units tend to hurt administrator/school board relationships..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 22. Administrative bargaining units usually produce a more cohesive group of administrators..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 23. Administrative bargaining units tend to antagonize teacher/administrator relationships..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 24. Administrative bargaining units promote communication between the school board and building level administrators..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 25. Elementary principals have much to gain from bargaining units.... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 26. Administrative bargaining units antagonize the general public.... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 27. Superintendents would prefer to have their administrators represented by a bargaining unit..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 28. Administrative bargaining units protect the administrative role during teacher contract negotiations..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 29. Administrative bargaining units are generally a positive display of power..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| 30. Do you believe that the employment needs of building principals are properly understood by the superintendent?..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |

Marking Instructions				
(1) Definitely yes	(2) Probably	(3) I have no opinion	(4) Probably not	(5) Definitely not

31. Administrative bargaining units increase the time required for the school board to determine administrative employment contracts.....1 2 3 4 5
32. Administrative salaries are generally higher when the administrators are represented by a bargaining unit.....1 2 3 4 5
33. Administrative bargaining units tend to produce complicated definitions of administrative roles and responsibilities.....1 2 3 4 5
34. Administrative bargaining units improve the quality of education.....1 2 3 4 5
35. Administrative bargaining units generally promise more than they can deliver.....1 2 3 4 5
36. Administrative bargaining units allow active involvement by administrators in determining school policies.....1 2 3 4 5
37. Administrative bargaining units mean higher salaries and better fringe benefits for building principals.....1 2 3 4 5
38. When administrators are members of a bargaining unit, administrative grievances are handled promptly and fairly by the school board.....1 2 3 4 5
39. Administrative bargaining units can lead to administrative strikes.....1 2 3 4 5
40. Would you change to any significant degree, the manner in which administrative contracts are determined in your district?.....1 2 3 4 5

Marking Instructions				
(1) Definitely yes	(2) Probably	(3) I have no opinion	(4) Probably not	(5) Definitely not

41. The local teacher's association probably has more respect for administrators who are represented by a bargaining unit.....1 2 3 4 5
42. Superintendents usually seek alternatives to administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5
43. Of all eligible administrators, high school principals usually benefit most from administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5
44. Administrative bargaining units best represent the collective needs of administrators.....1 2 3 4 5
45. Team management is opposed to administrative bargaining units....1 2 3 4 5
46. Administrative bargaining units would protect the administrator from unjust teacher association complaints.....1 2 3 4 5
47. Administrative bargaining units are in the best interest of administrators.....1 2 3 4 5
48. Administrative bargaining units encourage school boards to listen to the opinions of the administrators.....1 2 3 4 5
49. Administrators tend to have greater job security when members of a bargaining unit.....1 2 3 4 5
50. The role of administrators is more accurately defined through administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5
51. The general public would probably tolerate a strike by school administrators.....1 2 3 4 5
52. Superintendents have difficulty in working with administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5

Marking Instructions				
(1) Definitely yes	(2) Probably	(3) I have no opinion	(4) Probably not	(5) Definitely not

53. Administrative bargaining units help ensure that administrators are considered as an integral part of management.....1 2 3 4 5
54. Administrative bargaining units eliminate inequities in administrative salaries.....1 2 3 4 5
55. Administrative bargaining units allow administrators to freely criticize school board policy.....1 2 3 4 5
56. Teachers tend to support administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5
57. Most superintendents try to prevent administrators from organizing a bargaining unit.....1 2 3 4 5
58. Elementary principals should be the prime promoters of administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5
59. Administrative bargaining units are an expression of lack of loyalty to the superintendent.....1 2 3 4 5
60. Administrative bargaining units make teacher contract negotiations more difficult.....1 2 3 4 5
61. Administrative bargaining units tend to produce administrator militancy.....1 2 3 4 5
62. The school board generally has more respect for administrators who are represented by a bargaining unit.....1 2 3 4 5
63. Administrative bargaining units make the principals accountable for the instructional programs in their buildings.....1 2 3 4 5

Marking Instructions				
(1) Definitely yes	(2) Probably	(3) I have no opinion	(4) Probably not	(5) Definitely not

64. Of all eligible administrators, elementary principals usually benefit the most from administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5
65. There are alternatives to administrative bargaining units in large school districts.....1 2 3 4 5
66. Administrative bargaining units tend to improve communication with the school board.....1 2 3 4 5
67. Administrators generally have greater respect for themselves when members of a bargaining unit.....1 2 3 4 5
68. Administrative bargaining units allow administrators to freely criticize the superintendent.....1 2 3 4 5
69. There are alternatives to administrative bargaining units in medium sized school districts.....1 2 3 4 5
70. Building principals have a greater role in determining what will be included in administrators' contracts when they are members of a bargaining unit.....1 2 3 4 5
71. Administrative bargaining units are usually detrimental to student welfare.....1 2 3 4 5
72. High school principals should be the prime promoters of administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5
73. Superintendents generally have more respect for administrators who are represented by a bargaining unit.....1 2 3 4 5
74. Team management is a viable alternative to administrative bargaining units.....1 2 3 4 5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Allen, Roy B. and Schmid, John. Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. College of Education, University of Arkansas, 1966.
- Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.
- Beard, Mary. A Short History of the American Labor Movement. New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1968.
- Davey, Harold W. Contemporary Collective Bargaining (3rd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Department of Elementary School Principals. Professional Negotiation and the Principalship. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1969.
- Epstein, Benjamin. Principals, An Organized Force for Leadership. Washington, D.C.: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974.
- _____. The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations Between Teachers and School Boards. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965.
- Grodin, Joseph R. and Wollett, Donald H. Labor Relations and Social Collective Bargaining in Public Employment. Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1975.
- Johnson, George. Education Law. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1969.
- Lieberman, Myron and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations for Teachers. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.
- Meltzer, Bernard. Labor Law. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co., 1970.
- Meyers, Howard and Twomey, David. Labor Law and Legislation (5th Ed.). South-Western Publishing Co., 1975.

Moskow, Michael H. "Teacher Organizations: An Analysis of the Issues." In Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, Elam, Lieberman and Moskow, Eds. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.

. The Crisis in Public Employee Relations in the Decade of the Seventies. Public Employee Relations Center, Harbridge House, Inc., 1970.

Rayback, Joseph G. A History of American Labor. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1959.

Roberts, Harold. Roberts Dictionary of Industrial Relations (Revised Edition). Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1971, 1966.

Ross, Doris. 76 Update: Collective Bargaining in Education, A Legislator's Guide Report #78. Education Commission of the States, CB Update, January, 1976.

Shannon, Thomas A. Administrator's Bill of Rights. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1975.

Smith, Russell; Merrifield, LeRoy; and St. Antoine, Theodore. Labor Relations Law (5th Ed.). Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1974.

Stinnett, T. M.; Kleiuman, Jack H.; and Ware, Martha L. Professional Negotiation in Public Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.

Taft, Phillip. Organized Labor in American History. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.

Turner, Marjorie S. The Early American Labor Conspiracy Cases Their Place in Labor Law. Social Science Monograph Series, Vol. 1, No. 3. San Diego State College Press, 1967.

U. S. Department of Labor. State Profiles: Current Status of Public Sector Labor Relations. Washington, D.C.: Labor-Management Services Administration, 1971.

. Summary of Public Sector Labor Relations Policies. Washington, D.C.: Labor-Management Services Administration, 1976.

Warwick, Donald P. and Linnger, Charles A. The Sample Survey: Theory and Practice. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

- William, R. C. "Teacher Militancy: Implications for the Schools." In Social and Technological Change, Piele, Eidell, and Smith, Eds. Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1970.
- Wolfbein, Seymour (Ed.). Emerging Sectors of Collective Bargaining. Morristown, NJ: A.D.H. Mark Publication of General Learning Press, 1971.

Journals and Periodicals

- Bridges, Edwin M. and Cooper, Bruce S. "Collective Bargaining for School Administrators." Theory Into Practice, Vol. XV, No. 4. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Butch, Thomas L. "School Labor Law." Michigan Public Employment Relations Manual, Chapter 22, Michigan Public Employer Labor Relations Association, Inc. (1976, Revised).
- Cooper, Bruce S. "Middle Management Unionization in Education." Administrator's Notebook, Vol. XXIII, No. 6. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago. (June, 1975).
- Dempsey, Richard. "Principals and Negotiations." NASSP Bulletin, National Association of Secondary School Principals (March, 1975), pp. 60-63.
- Dudley, James. "The Elementary Principal--The Man in the Middle." Reprinted from the Pace Setter, the magazine of the Maryland Department of Elementary School Principals (March, 1967).
- Educators Negotiating Service. "ENS Special Report: Teacher Labor Relations in the 1970's." Washington, D.C.: The Educational Service Bureau, Inc. (July, 1974).
- _____. "ENS Special Report: Collective Negotiations and the Principal" (September 1, 1976).
- _____. "ENS Special Report: Decisions Affecting Public Employment Relations." Washington, D.C. (October 1, 1976).
- _____. "Iowa Principal Negotiating Rightfully Ousted by Board." Washington, D.C.: The Educational Service Bureau, Inc. (February, 1972).
- _____. "Protection of Interests Stirs Bargaining by Administrators." Washington, D.C.: The Educational Service Bureau, Inc. (August 1, 1976).
- Gallup, George H. "Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education." Phi Delta Kappan (December, 1975).

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, Vol. XVII, No. 7 (September, 1970).

Heddinger, Fred. "Federal Collective Negotiations Law Could Emascuate Representative Government." Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1976).

Journal(s) of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, Vol. 1 (1) through Vol. 5 (3). Baywood Publishing Co., Inc. (1972-1976).

Keller, Ed. "Collective Bargaining, A State Issue." National Elementary Principal (September-October, 1976), pp. 68-69.

Kershen, Harry. "The Role of the Principal in Middle Management." The Principal, official publication of the New York State Association of Secondary School Administrators and the New York State Association of Elementary Principals, Vol. I, No. 2 (May, 1971).

Mays, William, Jr. "Why Administrators May Feel the Need to Establish Formal Bargaining Units." Michigan School Board Journal (February, 1976).

McNally, Harold J. "A Matter of Trust." National Elementary Principal (November/December, 1973).

Mong, Larry. "Unionized Principals: Is Your District Next?" Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, Vol. 1, No. 4 (November, 1972).

Nicholson, Everett W. and Nasstrom, Roy R. "The Impact of Collective Negotiations on Principals." NASSP Bulletin, 58, 384 (October, 1974), pp. 100-107.

"Principals Organize Their Own Bargaining Units." Education USA. Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association (February 1, 1971).

Randles, Harry E. "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts." National Elementary Principal (November/December, 1975).

Salmon, Paul B. "Are the Administrative Team and Collective Bargaining Compatible?" Compact (June, 1972).

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

Seitz, Reynolds C. "School Boards and Teacher Unions." American School Board Journal, CXLI (August, 1960).

Schofield, Dee. "Collective Negotiations and the Principal." NAESP School Leadership Digest, Second Series, No. 9 (1976).

Schmidt, Charles T., Jr. "The Question of the Recognition of Principals and Other Supervisory Units in Public Education Collective Bargaining." Labor Law Journal (May, 1968).

Smith, David. "Professional Negotiations and the Principal." National Elementary Principal (January, 1973).

_____. "Professional Negotiations and the Principal." National Elementary Principal (November, 1972).

_____. "Should Administrators Negotiate?" National Elementary Principal (February, 1973).

_____. "So You've Decided to Negotiate." National Elementary Principal (April, 1973).

"The Tough New Teacher." American School Board Journal, Vol. 156, No. 5 (November, 1968).

Yamashita, Hiroshi. "Unionized Principals: Is Your District Next?" MASB Journal (February, 1973).

Other Sources

Board of Education. Master Agreement Between Lansing Association of School Administrators and Lansing School District Board of Education 1975-1978.

Cogen, Charles. "Collective Bargaining: The AFT Way." Speech given at National Institute on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhode Island, July, 1975.

Flannery, Edward Thomas. "Administrative Bargaining Groups: Their Perceived Effects Upon the Decision Making Role of the Elementary Principal." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1974.

Gregg, Perry Keith. "A Case Study of the Public School Collective Negotiations Process Designed for the Use of Administrators in Training." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

- Hall, Robert E. "Why Administrators are Turning to Collective Bargaining." Reprint of address given at Michigan Association of School Boards Conference, Grand Rapids, Michigan, November 2, 3, 4, 1976.
- Heddinger, Fred. "The School Board Looks at the Status of the Principal." Reprint of speech given before Pennsylvania Association of Secondary School Principals Annual Meeting, 38th, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, October 14-16, 1973.
- May, William, Jr. "Whether or Not Administrators Should Organize." Paper presented to Western Michigan University at Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District, Kalamazoo, Michigan, February 9, 1977.
- McConnell, Lawrence F. "A Study of the Influence of Collective Bargaining by School Administrators on the Management Functions of Selected Michigan School Districts." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.
- Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide, Michigan Education Directory, Lansing, Michigan, 1976-1977.
- Munger, Benson Scott. "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Michigan Principals Toward Organizing for Negotiations." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.
- Murry, Adams. "A Study of the Perception 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.
- Redfern, George. "School Management-Administrative Union or Management Team." Paper presented at AASA Annual Convention, 104th, Atlantic City, N.J., February 12-16, 1972.
- Richards, George Henry. "Collective Negotiations Implications for the Curriculum Decision Making Process." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.
- Scott, Walter W. "A Study of Preparation Programs in School Administration as Affected by Collective Negotiations." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1966.
- Shannon, Thomas. "Management Rights in Negotiations." Excerpted from presentation at the Fifth Annual AEN Convention in San Francisco, California, April 4, 1974.

Spencer, Eugene N., Chairman. "A Survey of Administrative Bargaining Units in Michigan Public Schools." Research Committee of the Michigan Congress of School Administrator Associations, September, 1971.

"The Hillsdale Case." Bargaining Units and Supervisory Personnel.

Wolkinson, Benjamin. "Summary of the American Labor Movement." Unpublished notes, class lectures, Michigan State University, LIR 858 Industrial Relations, Winter Term, 1976.