

1982

Comparative judgments of secondary school principals about collective bargaining as a function of prior non-management experience

Paul William Massman
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1982 Paul William Massman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Massman, Paul William, "Comparative judgments of secondary school principals about collective bargaining as a function of prior non-management experience" (1982). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2832. <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2832>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Comparative judgments of secondary school principals about collective bargaining as a function of prior non-management experience

Abstract

Collective bargaining has been in Iowa for only a short time. 1 Personal involvement and curiosity about the topic provided the intrinsic motivation for this study, The author organized and led a teachers' association in the first bargaining year and served as a grievance officer for that association for three years. Based on this involvement, the researcher was interested in ascertaining how administrator opinions have been affected by previous experiences with the bargaining process. What changes in opinions have new Iowa school administrators had when they changed sides of the bargaining table?

COMPARATIVE JUDGMENTS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ABOUT COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING AS A FUNCTION OF PRIOR NON-MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE

A Research Paper

Presented to

the Department of School Administration
and Personnel Services
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Education

by

Paul William Massman

May 1982

This Research Paper by: Paul William Massman

Entitled: Comparative Judgments of Secondary School Principals About
Collective Bargaining As a Function of Prior Non-management
Experience

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the
Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

James E. Albrecht

April 1, 1982
Date Approved

Director of Research Paper

Donald L. Hanson

April 1, 1982
Date Approved

Second Reader of Research Paper

James E. Albrecht

April 1, 1982
Date Received

Graduate Faculty Adviser

Robert J. Krajewski

April 21, 1982
Date Received

Head, Department of School
Administration and Personnel
Services

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Importance of the Study.....	2
Assumptions.....	3
Limitations of the Study.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	7
Design of the Study.....	8
Treatment of the Data.....	9
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	13
3. SUMMARY OF THE DATA.....	20
4. ANALYSIS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DATA.....	25
5. SUMMARY.....	29
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	32
APPENDIXES	
A. COVER LETTER AND SURVEY.....	38
B. SUMMARY DATA.....	44

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Collective bargaining has been in Iowa for only a short time.¹ Personal involvement and curiosity about the topic provided the intrinsic motivation for this study. The author organized and led a teachers' association in the first bargaining year and served as a grievance officer for that association for three years. Based on this involvement, the researcher was interested in ascertaining how administrator opinions have been affected by previous experiences with the bargaining process. What changes in opinions have new Iowa school administrators had when they changed sides of the bargaining table?

Statement of the Problem

Is there a difference in the opinions about collective bargaining held by Iowa public secondary school principals on the basis of the presence or absence of prior non-management collective bargaining experience? Do prior life experiences exert control over opinions about bargaining, or are the opinions only a reflection of administrative experience?

This problem was reduced to a null hypothesis.

¹L.L. Kruckenberg, "How Iowa School Principals View Professional Negotiations," (Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1977), 1.

Hypothesis

There will be no difference between the opinions held about collective bargaining by current Iowa public secondary school principals with prior non-management collective bargaining experience and public secondary school principals without such experience.

Importance of the Study

Researching the area of principal opinions on collective bargaining had merit on three levels: 1. personal satisfaction of curiosity; 2. examination of the opinions from the relatively new perspective of antecedent union experiences; and 3. resolution of a conflict of opinions about principals and collective bargaining.

It was important to know if previous experiences similar to the researcher's were going to be an asset or a liability for upwardly mobile administrators. Are generally favorable attitudes and experiences relating to collective bargaining going to bear interest by adding to a growing opinion account, or are they a bad check to be covered up as quickly as possible? Reviewing earlier research on the topic provided little investment advice. Previous experiences with bargaining have been subjected to very little scrutiny. To establish a point of view, as will become apparent in the Review of the Literature, research addressed to this problem needed to be carried out.

This enterprise provided an indication of whether an adaptation or evolution in school administration had taken place. If differences in opinion showed up at the secondary level, then in time those differences would have been apparent at the superintendency level. As secondary principals develop ambitions or follow through on pre-existing

ones, they might have possibly changed the nature of superintendency opinions about bargaining. There could have been significant changes in store for collective bargaining as the generations of administrators wax and wane.

Epistemologically, this research tried to eliminate a considerable difference of opinion about the impact and perceptions of collective bargaining. One view was that unions cause problems for everybody.² The other extreme maintained that bargaining had pushed schools toward democratic leadership and made decision making more effective.³ It was hoped that a tailor-made research study would be able to tag one of these views as more valid than the other.

Assumptions

One assumption that was made about bargaining was that principals saw some impact from the process on their school situations. As will be evident in the Review of the Literature, the predominance of evidence supported this assumption. However, there was some evidence that contradicted this assumption and that evidence had to be considered.

A study by Sobel of the effects of the New Jersey law passed in 1968 found no such impact. Sobel claimed that "... a picture of the high school principalship in New Jersey as having changed little since

²B.F. Brown, "American Education: The Problems Ahead," NASSP Bulletin, LIX (May, 1975), 26.

³C.A. Butkiewicz, "A Study of the Effects of Professional Negotiations On the Role of Selected Secondary School Principals In Maryland," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIV (November, 1973), 2194-95A.

the introduction of state-wide negotiations..." was painted.⁴ One recent and highly related research paper by Missman found little trace of consensus on the nature or existence of impacts from collective bargaining in Iowa.⁵ In a similar vein, an extremely limited research enterprise initiated by Franklin suggested that principals did not perceive an effect on the functioning of their schools due to the effects of bargaining.⁶ Results such as these seemed to call into question any impact by bargaining. Critical examination of these studies led to more profitable questions about the research than about the impact of bargaining.

Sobel's New Jersey work stood up to critical examination best. His sample seemed adequate; his statistical analysis was appropriate; his rate of return was acceptable; but his analysis seemed extreme. He found a statistically significant difference in perception of a principal's level of involvement in selected administrative tasks, but concluded that little change had occurred.⁷ The logic of that analysis was hard to grasp. The Missman and Franklin products shared a common problem: adequacy of sample. The two combined only surveyed sixty-six

⁴I.L. Sobel, "The Principalship--Enlarged Or Diminished When Examined Within the Context of Collective Negotiations?" Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVIII (May, 1978), 6458A.

⁵C.H. Missman, "Effects of Collective Negotiations On the Role of the Secondary Principal In Selected Iowa School Districts," (Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1980), 73-76.

⁶E.H. Franklin, "The Relationship Between Principals' Leader Behavior And Their Perception of Changes Under Contractual Agreement," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVI (April, 1976), 6393A.

⁷Sobel, p. 6458A.

principals, and Missman's group was geographically concentrated.⁸ In addition to the sample problems, simple frequency analysis supposedly showed no consensus on impact, and correlation analysis "suggested" no perception of effect.⁹ The levels of analysis used seemed to be inadequate.

All things considered, the assumption of impact seemed justified, or at least unsuccessfully challenged.

A second assumption of this venture was that a random sampling process based on a population of all Iowa secondary school principals generated a truly representative picture of all those principals. Lacking the credentials to argue the issue, and lacking a source of validating information for the variables concerned, it is a matter of personal faith that random sampling eliminated systematic bias and provided the needed sample, given the large sample size.

The third assumption related to the nature of opinions. Are they crystallized phenomena that can be evaluated and broken into measurable levels or gradations? Once again, researcher qualifications do not justify a discussion of the issue. Common practice treats opinion scaling as interval data, fixed in time, but the validity of this practice must be kept in mind. If this treatment is not valid, the hypothesis of this study as stated is untestable.

⁸Missman, pp. 14, 5-6; Franklin, p. 6393A.

⁹Missman, p. 76; Franklin, p. 6393A.

Limitations of the Study

In addition to the previously discussed assumptions that might invalidate this work, there were other possible pitfalls.

Use of a mail questionnaire imposed some limitations. An inadequate response rate would have crippled the project. The method counted on honest self-reporting and self-perception, and these might not have occurred. The instrument developed might not have been sensitive to the real variations or lack of variations in opinions held by principals. Developmental defects in the survey were possible, and must not be discounted.

By concentrating on Iowa secondary principals, the applicability of this research to other areas and circumstances cannot be assumed. While this was of little concern in relation to satisfying curiosity, it does seriously hamper the fulfillment of the goal of settling the question of the nature of the impacts of bargaining.

The possibility of researcher bias must be considered. Having the bargaining background noted earlier, there existed a personal interest in the outcome of this work. If the objective safeguards of the research process have been circumvented, then the study lacks validity.

Defining a secondary school principal created a limitation on this research. There was an overlap between elementary and secondary school classifications at the seventh and eighth grade levels. Using seventh grade as the key division point meant that some of the surveyed principals were predominantly elementary-oriented but responsible for a K-8 building, or a middle school arrangement (5-8, or some such hybrid). Also, the size of some districts caused them to have only one or two

administrators, with a K-12 principal or a superintendent who also functioned as a building principal. These arrangements resulted in a lack of control over the secondary principalship as a variable. Data interpretation must be considered in the light of this limitation.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were developed:

Collective bargaining: a two-way exchange between an employee organization and management resulting in a mutually ratified, negotiated agreement between the two parties concerning wages, hours, rules and working conditions of the organization-represented employees.

Iowa public secondary school principal: any person listed as the principal or administrator of a school containing any or all of grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12; as listed in the Iowa Educational Directory 1981-82 School Year.¹⁰

Non-management collective bargaining experience: holding a job where the salary or wages, hours, rules and working conditions are specified by a collectively bargained contract, or being closely related to someone holding such a job.

Management collective bargaining experience: holding any position that was excluded from coverage of its salary or wages, hours, rules and working conditions by a collectively bargained contract because of the terms of the contract or by law.

¹⁰Iowa Educational Directory 1981-82 School Year, (Des Moines: State of Iowa Department of Public Instruction, 1981), 6-81.

Design of the Study

To carry out this causal comparative study, two types of information needed to be gathered: levels of prior non-management experience under a bargained contract and opinions held about collective bargaining. Practical considerations dictated the use of a survey questionnaire to gather the needed information.

Based on a rather limited analysis, some good survey work in the general area has been done. Pecarrere's work in 1978 suggested the use of a seven interval Likert-like scaling technique.¹¹ Nighswander's 1977 study of NCA administrators provided a very detailed listing of possible areas of impact by bargaining on schools and administrative functions.¹² From these two initial points, a survey was constructed consisting of descriptive items to elicit the personal history data needed, and a large number of items to elicit opinions about bargaining or the impact of bargaining.

The initially constructed survey and cover letter were pilot-tested with a group of graduate students in the College of Education at the University of Northern Iowa. Those two items were then revised on the basis of the pilot group's comments and criticisms. The revised versions were then submitted to a small group of active principals

¹¹J.F. Pecarrere, "The Impact Upon Principals' Job Performance of a Union Agreement Between Teachers and the School Board In a Large Urban Public School System," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (October, 1978), 1973A.

¹²J.K. Nighswander, The Perceived Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining On Schools and Colleges--A Survey of North Central Association Administrators. Final Report, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 136 416, 1977, 26-29.

known to the researcher, and further revised. These final versions were mailed on February 1, 1982, to the selected sample of 150 principals. A copy of the final versions of the cover letter and survey can be found in Appendix A, pp. 38-43.

A postcard "thank you" was sent out after the initial large return became apparent four days after mailing the surveys. A second mailing of the survey was not necessary based on returns of almost 90% of the surveys by the February 17 deadline. Provisions had been made for such a follow-up, but it was not judged necessary.

The population of this study consisted of 754 individuals or positions listed in the Iowa Educational Directory 1981-82 School Year as being administrators of a school containing a seventh grade class or higher grade classification.¹³ Some confusion results from a lack of data for some of the positions. Where this has occurred, the entry "Prin Admin" was treated as a separate individual. The appearance of an individual name in more than one position was treated as one entry. From this population, a random sample of 150 individuals was drawn by use of a random number table.

Treatment of the Data

Tally sheets were made for each of the relevant groups that appeared in the Descriptive Data. From the raw scores, means, standard deviations, and variances were computed for each survey item for each group. Since the total sample was so large, the .05 level of confidence was based on a normal curve value of 1.96. Standard error of the

¹³Iowa Educational Directory 1981-82 School Year, pp. 6-81.

difference was computed:

$$S_{\text{diff}} = \sqrt{\frac{V_1}{N_1} + \frac{V_2}{N_2}}$$

In this formula, V_1 was equal to the variance of the scores on an item for a group; N_1 was equal to the number of scores on an item for the same group; V_2 was equal to the variance of the scores on an item by the group without non-management experience (the comparison group); and N_2 was equal to the number of scores on that same item from the group without non-management experience. To obtain t values for comparison with the confidence value of 1.96, the formula

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{S_{\text{diff}}}$$

was used,

where \bar{X}_1 equalled the mean score on an item by a group; \bar{X}_2 equalled the mean score on that same item by the comparison group, those without non-management experience; and S_{diff} equalled the value as computed for that item in the manner described above. The derived t value was then compared to ± 1.96 to determine significance.¹⁴

This study was based on a two tailed analysis of the data.¹⁵ Given the rating scale format, a negative t value indicated that a specific sub-group agreed with a statement listed under "General Impressions" to a greater degree than did the comparison group, those principals with no experience in non-management bargaining (group A). A negative t value for a topic listed under "Specific Impressions" indicated the identified sub-group believed bargaining had strengthened that feature to a greater extent than did the comparison group.

¹⁴C.I. Chase, Elementary Statistical Procedures, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976), 154-156, 164.

¹⁵Chase, p. 172.

Positive t values, on the other hand, indicated the reverse. A positive t value indicated that the identified sub-group 1. disagreed with the comparison group about the impact of bargaining on "General Impression" statements, and 2. believed more strongly than the comparison group that bargaining had weakened a topic listed under "Specific Impressions."

In either case, no significant difference was judged to exist until the critical value of ± 1.96 was reached or exceeded.

Based on the data provided by the respondents, mean scores and variance scores were obtained for each of the following groups:

A. Those without non-management bargaining experience, either personally or through family members. This group served as the comparison group.

B. Those with some non-management bargaining experience, either personally or through family members.

C. Those with non-management bargaining experience only through family members.

D. Those who claimed to have served as Spokespersons for a bargaining organization.

E. Those who claimed to have served as bargaining Organization Officers.

F. Those who claimed to have served as Silent Observers of the bargaining process.

G. Those who claimed to have served as Resource Persons in the bargaining process.

There was some overlap between groups B through G. Some individuals fell into several of the categories.

The obtained scores for each group on each item were then tested for significant difference, as outlined above, comparing groups B through G with group A.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A glance at the Bibliography of this research task would demonstrate one fact about the literature relating to collective bargaining: it has been the subject of much discussion.

Only a very small part of the work done on collective bargaining and principals dealt with the area of experience with bargaining and opinions about it. A methodologically weak piece of research by Pecarrere found a significant difference in the perceived impact of bargaining on a principal's job performance between principals with familial union memberships and those without such memberships.¹ A 1978 study of elementary principals in New York City concluded that a predominantly positive attitude toward teacher unions was due to the principals' identification with teachers and the principals' own membership in the Council of Supervisors and Administrators, which happened to function as a bargaining group for them.² An earlier account of New York schools by Lutz and Evans concluded that no experience aside from a contract-administration setting was likely to

¹Pecarrere, p. 1973A.

²B.S. Allen, "The Relationships Among Principals' Attitudes Toward Unions, Principals' Role Activities, and Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Management Style," Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (September, 1979), 1162A.

lead to different perceptions of the impact of collective bargaining on principals.³

Based on this limited body of work, one could only conclude that the area of experience as a factor influencing opinions about bargaining needed some disciplined study.

Discussion of the "bad impact" of bargaining was extensive. In typical fashion, the quality of the product was highly variable.

The strongest work on the subject was done by Gregory Benson and Nighswander. Benson found that 45% of his principal sample believed that the collective bargaining process and contracts had negatively affected the classroom instructional program (with the rest mostly seeing no impact), and 59% saw a negative impact on the total educational program.⁴ Tapping the same vein, Nighswander found that 78% of his principal sample felt that administrators were increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher groups; 58% felt that bargaining had weakened community support for education; and 55% felt that bargaining had weakened the fiscal condition of the school system that employed them. In all, only the areas of staff salaries, fringe benefits, curriculum planning, inservice programs, and job security were rated as strengthened by bargaining, though in some predictable cases the positive ratings were equalled by negative ratings.⁵

³F.W. Lutz and S. Evans, The Union Contract and Principal Leadership In New York City Schools, Center for Urban Education, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 029 400, 1968, 143-4.

⁴Gregory Benson, The Principal and Contract Management: A Survey Report, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 175 151, 1979, 3.

⁵Nighswander, pp. 37, 39-45.

Most of the areas of impact by bargaining were outlined by Nicholson and Nasstrom. They found that staff relations seemed to become strained, a point supported by a great body of medium quality research.⁶ They also commented on the increased time demands that result for principals from collective bargaining, a point that is also supported by others.⁷

While Nicholson and Nasstrom saw no proof of a lessening of the principals' role as school leader in their study, Stamp found opinions of an anticipated decrease in principals' leader roles. This requires some comment. Stamp's work suffers from trying to measure attitudes about an event that had not occurred at the time of the research: collective bargaining in Iowa. If there are conceptual problems associated with studying opinions about impact, then what troubles need to be considered when applying such methods of study to research on opinions of principals about anticipated impact or anticipated

⁶E.W. Nicholson and R.R. Nasstrom, "The Practitioner's Guide To Research: The Impact of Collective Negotiations On Principals," NASSP Bulletin, LVIII (October, 1974), 104-5; B. Epstein, Principals: An Organized Force For Leadership, (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974), 2; P.R. Peterson, "The Effects of Collective Bargaining Upon the Secondary Principal," (Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1977), 28; S.S. Smith, "Some Effects of Collective Negotiations On Principal-Staff Relationships As Perceived By the Secondary School Principals In Illinois," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXI (March, 1971), 4435A; J.J. Ancell, "The Effects of Collective Bargaining On the Role of the Principal As Perceived By the Principal and Central Administration," Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (September, 1979), 1163A; R.A. Cain, "Collective Negotiation Attitudes and Principal Leadership Style," Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (September, 1980), 862A.

⁷Nicholson & Nasstrom, p. 104; Peterson, p. 25; K.A. Newby, Collective Bargaining--Practices and Attitudes of School Management, (Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1977), 2.

opinions? Lutz and Evans, in looking at a real situation, found a perception of restriction on leadership by principals.⁸

Scattered results emphasized other bad impacts. Loss of administrator prerogatives was cited by Lutz and Evans, The American School Board Journal, Kruckenberg, and Heaton.⁹ Trouble over extracurricular activities was cited by Trost and Webner.¹⁰

This was an impressive inventory of research, though the quality did vary a great deal. One was tempted to simply say principals did not appreciate bargaining and be done with it, but...there was another side to the issue, and a middle position as well.

The positive impact adherents argued from ideology and research that bargaining did not harm principals or schools. Berg maintained that most of the generally accepted assumptions about the effects of bargaining were erroneous.¹¹ Roberts found in Eastern Kentucky that a

⁸Nicholson & Nasstrom, p. 103; K. Stamp, "Principals' Perception of Role After Implementing Collective Negotiations," (Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1975), 26, 57; Lutz & Evans, p. 142.

⁹Lutz & Evans, p. 142; "The Brewing Revolt of the School Principals," The American School Board Journal, CLXIII (January, 1976), 26; Kruckenberg, p. 21; R.S. Heaton, "The Perceived Loss of Power and Changing Roles of High School Principals In Colorado, As A Result of Collective Bargaining," Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (November, 1979), 2383A.

¹⁰J.R. Trost, "The Effects of Negotiations Upon the Role of Selected Michigan Secondary School Principals," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXX (April, 1970), 4207A; D.L. Webner, "Iowa High School Principals' Perceptions of the Effect of Collective Bargaining On Selected Teacher Behaviors," (EdS. thesis, University of Northern Iowa, 1977), 45, 57.

¹¹P. Berg, "The Impact of Collective Bargaining Upon the Principal," Administrator's Notebook, XXI (June, 1973), 3.

majority of surveyed principals favored collective bargaining legislation and bargaining for teachers.¹² No significant difference between attitudes of principals and teachers about labor and management was found by Randles. He also strongly argued that contracts legitimized principal power.¹³ A study of supervision impacts by Krey found that bargaining did not negatively affect supervisory responsibilities.¹⁴ Three recent studies by Heaton, Allen and Makuria found a predominantly positive attitude toward unions and collective bargaining in their samples.¹⁵ Butkiewicz saw an increase in instructional leadership, and maintained that decision making became more effective under bargaining in his study of Maryland.¹⁶ An analysis of the California bargaining experience by Williams claimed that given the "right" leadership style, school functioning would be seen as very successful under collective bargaining.¹⁷

All this work counterbalanced the "bad impact" studies nicely. Hitting the middle ground, as discussed above in the Assumptions area,

¹²C.H. Roberts, "An Analysis of the Attitudes of Chief School Administrators, Principals, and Classroom Teachers Toward Collective Bargaining In Eastern Kentucky," Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (March, 1981), 3821A.

¹³H.E. Randles, "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts," National Elementary Principal, LV (November/December, 1975), 58.

¹⁴R.D. Krey, et. al. "Master Contracts of Teachers and the Supervision of Instruction," Educational Leadership, XXXIV (March, 1977), 470.

¹⁵Heaton, p. 2383A; Allen, p. 1162A; K. Makuria, "Human Values and Attitude Toward Collective Bargaining of School Principals," Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (October, 1980), 1788A.

¹⁶Butkiewicz, p. 2195A.

¹⁷R.C. Williams, "The Principal and Collective Bargaining," Thrust, VII (October, 1977), 12.

Sobel, Missman and Franklin all stressed the lack of impact of bargaining on principals.¹⁸ Once again the conclusion that some disciplined study was needed seemed justified.

There was one other related issue that should be reviewed. Cunningham hypothesized that "career-bound" principals would feel less identification with a particular school system and more toward a "professional" role.¹⁹ Relative experience in a position, and the associated issue of age might tie into this "career-bound" orientation and affect opinions and perceptions about collective bargaining. Longevity and age were found to be factors in the opinions tapped by McNeill, Roberts, and Rooks.²⁰ Webner found indications of younger, less experienced Iowa principals seeing more impacts than older ones.²¹ Missman contradicted Webner by having found more negative responses from Iowa principals with over five years of experience. The value of this discrepancy was weakened by the geographic concentration of Missman's sample, versus Webner's statewide sample.²²

¹⁸Sobel, p. 6458A; Missman, pp. 73-76; Franklin, p. 6393A.

¹⁹L.L. Cunningham, "Implications of Collective Negotiations For the Role of the Principal," Readings On Collective Negotiations In Public Education, eds. S.M. Elam, et. al. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967), 305.

²⁰M.C. McNeill, "The Perceptions of Secondary Public School Principals In Nassau and Suffolk Counties About the Effect of Teacher-School Board Negotiations On Their Role As Building Principals and of the Role They Play and Would Like to Play In These Negotiations," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVII (March, 1977), 5499A; Roberts, p. 3821A; D.O. Rooks, "Attitudes of Teachers, Principals, Superintendents, Board Members and Legislators Toward Collective Bargaining For Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (December, 1980), 2392A.

²¹Webner, pp. 39, 70.

²²Missman, pp. 75, 5-6; Webner, p. 36.

The no-impact sector was represented by Pecarrere and Sargent who discovered no significant differences on the basis of age or experience in principals' opinions.²³

A new breed might be coming on the scene, or not coming on the scene, depending on which of the cited works one chooses to believe. Some sources thought a new view would be needed. "New competencies and fresh outlooks represent the key to future leadership roles for the principal."²⁴

To find out if any new breed has been showing up in Iowa was one of the purposes of this enterprise. The above review of the state of the collective bargaining opinion industry demonstrates a need for some resolution of the contradictions and discrepancies in the large amount of available information.

²³Pecarrere, p. 1973A; E.E. Sargent, "The Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining Upon the Role of Selected Elementary and Secondary Principals," Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (February, 1981), 3369A.

²⁴S.J. Knezevich, Evolution of Faculty-Principal Relations: A Look At What's Happening From the National Perspective, Arizona State University, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 181 589, 1976, 8.

CHAPTER 3

SUMMARY OF THE DATA

The marketing strategy used for this research was quite successful. Of 150 surveys distributed, 134 were returned by the February 17 deadline. This translates into a return rate of 89%. Of these, two were unusable due to refusals to participate by the respondents. No follow-up was done, as this initial rate of return was judged sufficient for the purposes of this study.

The Respondents. A general summary table of the totals for all items on the survey is provided as Appendix B, pp. 44-48. All sizes of attendance centers were represented in the sample. No schools organized as 9-10 or 11-12 buildings were caught by the sample, but all other organization schemes were represented. All levels of administrative experience were tapped by the sample. More than 80% of the principals surveyed worked in bargaining districts. It should be noted that the sample did touch some districts more than once, so the percentage of bargaining districts probably does not equal the obtained 83%. A small majority (53%) of the respondents help their school districts bargain with teacher organizations. The most common role that they play if they help bargain was listed as "Resource Person."

Most of those responding had no personal non-management experience with collective bargaining. Of the one-third who had such experience, four out of five had been members of the bargaining organization. Of those who had been members, four out of five were

members of an education association. Of all the organization members, almost all had ten or less years of membership. These members were an active group in bargaining. Fourteen claimed to have been Spokespersons. Twelve were Organization Officers. Many had served as Resource Persons, or categorized themselves as Silent Observers. Several had held multiple roles over time.

In addition to personal non-management experience, 21% of those who answered the item on family member experience (#12) claimed to have at least one such "experienced" family member. Most of the relatives mentioned were principals' spouses. The role most commonly associated with the relatives was that of Silent Observer, but a few were listed as Spokespersons, Resource Persons, and Organization Officers.

Only four individuals claimed management experience with bargaining outside of education. One was a Spokesperson, one a member of a management team, and the other two provided no understandable role information.

"General Impressions." Most of the surveyed principals did not feel bargaining had been beneficial to schools. Most of the principals did not believe that administrators are increasingly defenseless against teachers and teacher organizations, but the plurality is not large. Of those surveyed, two out of three believe that bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities being given to principals. A very slight majority of those surveyed maintained that secondary principals should be actively involved in bargaining. Two out of five respondents agreed that it was unfortunate that bargaining had forced shared decision making on administrators. Most of the principals responding disagreed with the idea that grievance procedures are often used to harass them.

"Specific Impressions." Twenty-six items directed to the specific impact of bargaining were asked on the survey. Of these, only five had mean impact ratings that were in the "strengthened" category. This would suggest that bargaining may have helped in the areas of inservice (#24), staff salaries (#32), staff fringe benefits (#33), staff evaluation (#45), and supervision of instruction (#46) according to reported principal opinions.

Three areas garnered mean ratings very close to no impact (.10 or closer), suggesting that intra-staff communications (#30), physical facilities (#34), and policy development (#49) have not been affected by bargaining in principals' opinions.

The other seventeen areas all gathered mean ratings in the "weakened" area. The highest mean opinion rating (5.25) was for the area of community support of education (#25), which was judged as weakened by the bargaining process by three out of four of the responding principals.

Principals With Some Non-management Experience (Group B). This group showed significant differences in opinions on administrator defenselessness (#18), staff fringe benefits (#33), and extracurricular program (#48). This group did not see administrators as increasingly defenseless against teachers and teacher organizations; they thought bargaining had strengthened fringe benefits; but they believed that bargaining had weakened school extracurricular programs.

Family Non-management Bargaining Experience (Group C). This group provided only one area of significant difference--extracurricular program (#48). Administrators who responded to this item and had family

member experiences under bargained contracts were more critical of the impact of bargaining on these programs than the comparison group of principals without non-management bargaining experience.

Former Bargaining Spokespersons (Group D). This group reported opinions significantly different from the comparison group in the areas of shared decision making (#21), student academic achievement (#28), setting school goals and priorities (#38), and extracurricular program (#48). These former bargaining luminaries disagreed that more shared decision making was unfortunate. They maintained that student academic achievement had been strengthened by bargaining to a greater degree than those who had no non-management bargaining experience. Former Spokespersons saw more strengthening of school goal and priority setting because of bargaining than did the comparison group. In keeping with previously noted groups, Spokespersons were more critical of bargaining's impact on extracurricular programs than the comparison group.

Former Organization Officers (Group E). This group showed statistically significant differences in their opinions about the "unfortunateness" of shared decision making due to bargaining (#21) and bargaining's impact on extracurricular program (#48). The pattern was the same as that of former Spokespersons; the officers disagreed with the idea that shared decision making was unfortunate, and they were more critical of bargaining's impact on extracurricular programs.

Self-described Silent Observers (Group F). This group showed significant differences in the areas of administrator defenselessness against teachers (#18), personnel promotion (#42), and staff evaluation (#45). This group also disagreed more with the idea of defenselessness

than did the comparison group. Personnel promotion was rated as more weakened by bargaining, though former Observers believed that staff evaluation had been strengthened more by bargaining than did the comparison group.

Former Resource Persons (Group G). This group disagreed more with the idea that principals should be more actively involved in teacher negotiations (#20). They saw more of a strengthening of personnel promotion (#42) due to bargaining than did the comparison group. Finally, they were more critical of the impact of bargaining on extracurricular program (#48) than were the comparison principals.

For all of the groups considered, all other items on the survey yielded no significant difference in the rankings of agree-disagree or strengthened-weakened because of bargaining. On all other items the groups were statistically indistinguishable.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DATA

The results of the research conducted demonstrate that opinions about bargaining are generally not subject to variation because of prior personal experience with bargaining. The differences in opinions that were found do not show a pattern of differences, except in one case. Of six groups compared with the group without non-management bargaining experience, five were significantly more critical of the impact of bargaining upon extracurricular program than the comparison group. Possibly prior history highlights this problem area and heightens critical judgments of bargaining impact in this area.

Former Spokespersons and Officers both disagreed significantly with the comparison group over the "unfortunateness" of shared decision making as a result of bargaining. This should not be a surprise. These were the people that decision making was shared with through bargaining. The item resembles asking a big lottery winner what he/she thinks about gambling; the result is rather predictable, and not very enlightening.

Former Silent Observers and the entire group who had some kind of non-management experience with bargaining had opinions about the defenselessness of administrators at the hands of teachers and teacher organizations that significantly differed from the comparison group. These principals with prior bargaining experience, either directly or through family involvement, disagreed with the idea that defenselessness

was increasing. It is possible that after having served on both sides in the bargaining wars, these principals felt better armed and armored for the battles that occur. If this is true, then bargaining may have been beneficial for these individuals. The fact that other categories more closely associated with the skirmishes, such as Spokespersons and Officers, do not show this difference casts some doubt on this interpretation.

Other items did show differences that were statistically significant for at least one group. Not much can be made of these; it is quite possible that they showed significant values randomly since over 180 individual t tests were done. Proper interpretation of former Spokespersons' opinions that student academic achievement has been strengthened as a consequence of bargaining is difficult. A more interpretable result from the same group showed setting school goals and priorities as strengthened by bargaining. Former Spokespersons would have had a voice in the setting of goals and priorities done through bargaining, and thus the vested interest consideration of the winning gambler would again come into play.

The prevalence of "weakened" total sample means on the opinion items dealing with "Specific Impressions" indicates a general attitude that bargaining has not been good for schools. This matches the 4.81 "disagree" mean on item 17 dealing with the "beneficial effect" of bargaining on schools. There were also a large number of comments directed to the same point. One principal evaluated bargaining as "Probably the most negative thing that has happened to education..." Another commented: "My primary objection to collective bargaining is simply that it de facto sets up an 'adversary' relationship between

educators of various functions, and quite honestly often gets in the way of effective total school programming."

With the exception of opinions on bargaining's effects on extra-curricular program, the stated hypothesis that "there will be no difference between the opinions held about collective bargaining by current Iowa public secondary school principals with prior non-management collective bargaining experience and public secondary school principals without such experience" is supported by this research. No major opinion differences were found.

While there are differing views about the impact of bargaining on schools in the literature on principals' opinions, few such differences appeared in the random sample of 132 Iowa public secondary school principals. Only a difference in the level of criticism of bargaining's impact on extracurricular program clearly stood out. The general view held by the principals surveyed was that bargaining had weakened public schools. For Iowa, this seems to settle the Good Impact/No Impact/Bad Impact argument outlined in the Review of the Literature.

Principals who had non-management bargaining experience seem either never to have had opinions differing from the comparison group, or they have altered their opinions. The former possibility, while intriguing, has no empirical basis. For the latter possibility, the survey provided some support. Pre-service education, professional administrator groups, professional publications, and/or administrative experience could have contributed to the "re-socialization" of these principals. Two comments from the survey seem to imply this. As one principal wrote: "My response is from Management's perspective."

In a similar vein, "I was an advocate of collective bargaining in 1970 when I was one of four EA Officers that spent one day in jail for refusing to obey a court injunction to return to work in the only school strike in Iowa....Now, as an administrator, I feel that the Master Contract is too large...It impedes good working relationships." The shift in jobs seems to shift the perspective, which probably shifts the opinions.

Emotional investment in bargaining activities seems not to provide any long term capital gains for school administrators in the form of opinion currency. It appears that opinion investments are shifted into a different "role specific" portfolio.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

This research was carried out to examine the question of whether secondary school principals in Iowa have opinions about bargaining that are functions of prior non-management bargaining experience or are dependent on some other variable or variables. By establishing a null hypothesis that "there will be no difference between the opinions held about collective bargaining by current Iowa public secondary school principals with prior non-management collective bargaining experience and public secondary school principals without such experience," the issue was subject to means difference analysis by a t test approach.

Three goals were accomplished by the research: 1. author curiosity was satisfied; 2. the relatively unstudied area of principals' opinions origin was examined; and 3. an Iowa-based answer to a conflict in the literature over principals' opinions about bargaining was resolved.

A mail research survey was developed to gather opinions and prior histories. It was pilot tested and revised. On February 1, 1982, it was mailed to 150 Iowa secondary school principals. By February 17, 134 had been returned, of which 132 were usable. No follow-up was seen as necessary. A postcard "thank you" was sent to respondents who replied by the deadline of February 17.

A large, but not unanimous, body of work in the literature stated that principals perceived a bad impact on schools by bargaining.

This was borne out by the survey results. Most respondents did not believe bargaining had been beneficial to schools. Bargaining was viewed as strengthening only the areas of inservice, staff salaries, staff fringe benefits, staff evaluation, and supervision of instruction. The greatest weakening effect was seen in the area of community support of education.

In the area of extracurricular program, a pattern of significant differences in opinions appeared. Principals with non-management experience with bargaining (as Spokespersons, Organization Officers, Resource Persons, and/or having close family members with such experiences) perceived bargaining as having a greater weakening effect on extracurricular program than did those principals without such experience. It is speculated that the history of bargaining conflict over this area highlights it for increased criticism when roles change.

Principals who at one time played Spokesperson and/or Organization Officer roles did not see shared decision making as being unfortunate. This result may be due to the fact they would have been the people with whom decision making was shared.

All of those with some non-management experience with bargaining saw themselves as less defenseless in the face of teachers and teacher organizations. Possibly bargaining provides some "innoculation effect" or the equivalent of combat experience to this group.

In general, the significant differences that were found were so few and so scattered that the hypothesis of no difference in opinions on the basis of experiences with bargaining was considered upheld. No major areas of opinion differences were found.

Principals' opinions thus seem to be a function of either administrative training, "re-socialization," or possibly they never did differ from non-management bargainers' opinions. Several indicated through comments on the survey that their opinions were based on the role that they play in the bargaining process. Any role shift would thus "adjust" opinions and explain the results of this research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, B.S. Jr. "The Relationships Among Principals' Attitudes Toward Unions, Principals' Role Activities, and Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Management Style." Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (September, 1979), 1162A.
- Ancell, J.J. "The Effect of Collective Bargaining On the Role of the Principal As Perceived By the Principal and the Central Administration." Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (September, 1979), 1162-1163A.
- Bailey, S.K. "Political Principles For Political Principals." NASSP Bulletin, LX (January, 1976), 17-21.
- Bartlett, L. ed. School Laws of Iowa. Des Moines: Department of Public Instruction, State of Iowa, 1980.
- Benson, George L. The School Principal and Negotiations: A Middle Management Dilemma. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 079 845, 1970.
- Benson, Gregory. The Principal and Contract Management: A Survey Report. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 175 151, 1979.
- Berg, P. "The Impact of Collective Bargaining Upon the Principal." Administrator's Notebook, XXI (June, 1973), 1-4.
- Bradburn, N.M., & Sudman, S. Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Brandt, D.A. "The Effect of Collective Negotiations On the Role of the Principal." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVI (May, 1976), 7075-7076A.
- "The Brewing Revolt of the School Principals." The American School Board Journal, CLXIII (January, 1976), 25-27.
- Brown, B.F. "American Education: The Problems Ahead." NASSP Bulletin, LIX (May, 1975), 25-32.
- Butkiewicz, C.A. "A Study of the Effects of Professional Negotiations On the Role of Selected Secondary School Principals In Maryland." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIV (November, 1973), 2194-2195A.

- Cain, R.A. "Collective Negotiation Attitudes and Principal Leadership Style." Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (September, 1980), 862-863A.
- Chase, C.I. Elementary Statistical Procedures. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.
- Clark, C.E. Random Numbers In Uniform and Normal Distribution. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1966.
- Cresswell, A.M., et. al. Teachers, Unions, and Collective Bargaining In Public Education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1980.
- Diederich, W.F. "The Effect of Collective Negotiations On Selected Areas of the Principal's Role As Perceived By Connecticut High School Principals." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (June, 1979), 7073-7074A.
- Dillman, D.A. Mail and Telephone Surveys. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Elam, S.M., et. al. Readings On Collective Negotiations In Public Education. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.
- Epstein, B. What Is Negotiable? Professional Negotiations Pamphlet Number One. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969.
- _____. Principals: An Organized Force For Leadership. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974.
- _____. "A Rebuttal: More Productive Options Are Available For Principals." NASSP Bulletin, LXIV (May, 1980), 71-75.
- Franklin, E.H. "The Relationship Between Principals' Leader Behavior and Their Perceptions of Changes Under Contractual Agreements." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVI (April, 1976), 6393A.
- Ford, P. "The Principal--Contract Administrator and Instructional Leader." NASSP Bulletin, LXIV (February, 1980), 37-43.
- Gilroy, T.P., et. al. Educator's Guide To Collective Negotiations. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.
- Gould, E.N. The Principalship: Role Expectation and Leadership Styles: Draft Outline. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 182 812, 1980.
- Hayford, S.L., & Sinicropi, A.V. Collective Bargaining and the Public Sector Supervisor. Chicago: International Personnel Management Association, 1976.

- Heaton, R.S. "The Perceived Loss of Power and Changing Roles of High School Principals In Colorado, As A Result of Collective Bargaining." Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (November, 1979), 2383A.
- Hill, D. "Professional Negotiations In Iowa." Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1978.
- Hutton, D.R. "Principals' Attitudes Toward the Collective Bargaining Process: An Analysis." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (June, 1979), 7077-7078A.
- Kanner, L.T. "The Changing Role of Administration." NASSP Bulletin, LXI (April, 1977), 34-40.
- Knezevich, S.J. Evolution of Faculty-Principal Relations: A Look At What's Happening From the National Perspective. Tempe AR: Arizona State University, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 181 589, 1976.
- Kramer, L.I. Principals and Grievance Procedures. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1969.
- Krey, R.D., et. al. "Master Contracts of Teachers and the Supervision of Instruction." Educational Leadership, XXXIV (March, 1977), 464-470.
- Kruckenber, L.L. "How Iowa School Principals View Professional Negotiations." Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1977.
- Lutz, F.W., & Evans, S. The Union Contract and Principal Leadership In New York City Schools. Center for Urban Education, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 029 400, 1968.
- Makuria, K. "Human Values and Attitude Toward Collective Bargaining of School Principals." Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (October, 1980), 1788A.
- McCumsey, N.L. "The Effects of Professional Negotiations On Secondary School Principals' Decision Making Functions." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXVIII (February, 1968), 2951-2952A.
- McGowan, F. Collective Negotiations and the Subsequent Flight of the School Principal. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 119 349, 1976.
- McNeill, M.C. "The Perceptions of Secondary Public School Principals In Nassau and Suffolk Counties About the Effect of Teacher-School Board Negotiations On Their Role As Building Principals and of the Role They Play and Would Like To Play In These Negotiations." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVII (March, 1977), 5499A.

- Michels, M. "The Changing Role of the Principal As a Response To Teacher Unionism In Educational Organization." Thrust, V (May, 1976), 23-25.
- Missman, C.H. "Effects of Collective Negotiations On the Role of the Secondary Principal In Selected Rural Iowa School Districts." Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1980.
- Newby, K.A. Collective Bargaining--Practices And Attitudes of School Management. Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1977.
- Nicholson, E.W., & Nasstrom, R.R. "The Practitioner's Guide To Research: The Impact of Collective Negotiations On Principals." NASSP Bulletin, LVIII (October, 1974), 100-107.
- Nighswander, J.K. The Perceived Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining On Schools And Colleges--A Survey of North Central Association Administrators. Final Report. Chicago: North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 136 416, 1977.
- Ortiz, F.I. The Impact of Collective Bargaining Upon the Principal. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 140 414, 1976.
- Ostby, J.R. "The Role of the Principal In Professional Negotiations." Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1971.
- Pecarrere, J.F. Jr. "The Impact Upon Principals' Job Performance of a Union Agreement Between Teachers and the School Board In a Large Urban School System." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (October, 1978), 1973A.
- Peterson, P.R. "The Effects of Collective Bargaining Upon the Secondary Principal." Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1977.
- Randles, H.E. "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts." National Elementary Principal, LV (November/December, 1975), 57-61.
- Reed, R.J. School Principals: Leaders Or Managers? U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 145 518, 1977.
- Roberts, C.H. "An Analysis of the Attitudes of Chief School Administrators, Principals, and Classroom Teachers Toward Collective Bargaining In Eastern Kentucky." Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (March, 1981), 3821A.

- Rooks, D.O. "Attitudes of Teachers, Principals, Superintendents, Board Members and Legislators Toward Collective Bargaining For Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (December, 1980), 2392A.
- Sargent, E.E. "The Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining Upon the Role of Selected Elementary and Secondary Principals." Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (February, 1981), 3368-3369A.
- Shreeve, W. ed. Negotiations In Public Education. Cheney, WA: Eastern Washington State College, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 033 475, 1969.
- Smith, S.S. "Some Effects of Collective Negotiations On Principal-Staff Relationships As Perceived By the Secondary School Principals In Illinois." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXI (March, 1971), 4434-4435A.
- Sobel, I.L. "The Principalship--Enlarged Or Diminished When Examined Within the Context of Collective Negotiations?" Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVIII (May, 1978), 6458A.
- Stamp, K. "Principals' Perception of Role After Implementing Collective Negotiations." Research paper, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1975.
- State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction. Iowa Educational Directory: 1981-82 School Year. Des Moines: Author, 1981.
- Trost, J.R. "The Effects of Negotiations Upon the Role of Selected Michigan Secondary School Principals." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXX (April, 1970), 4207A.
- Urich, T., & Hewitt, M. The Role of the School Principal In Collective Negotiations. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 055 354, 1971.
- Vyskocil, J.R., & Goens, G.A. "Collective Bargaining and Supervision: A Matter of Climate." Educational Leadership, XXXVII (November, 1979), 175-177.
- Webner, D.L. "Iowa High School Principals' Perceptions of the Effect of Collective Bargaining On Selected Teacher Behaviors." EdS. thesis, University of Northern Iowa, Department of School Administration and Personnel Services, 1977.
- Weldy, G.R. Administering a Negotiated Contract. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 078 571, 1973.
- Williams, R.C. "The Principal and Collective Bargaining." Thrust, VII (October, 1977), 11-14, 29.

Williamson, M.R. "The Effects of 'Perceived Success' and 'Union Militancy' On the Opinions of School Principals." Dissertation Abstracts International, XLI (June, 1981), 4931A.

Wood, C.L., et. al. The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND SURVEY

Principal Jerry Duea
Price Laboratory School
Cedar Falls, IA 50614

February 1, 1982

Dear Principal Duea:

I am a graduate student at the University of Northern Iowa, working on a Master's program in School Administration. In conjunction with Dr. James Albrecht, I am engaged in a research project concerned with principals and collective bargaining. Bargaining is one of the most widely and ineffectively studied topics confronting administrators. I would like to beg some of your time to find out if some life experiences have affected your opinions about collective bargaining.

You were specifically selected to be contacted for this project on the basis of your listing in the Iowa Educational Directory as an administrator of a school containing all or part of grades seven through twelve. It is very important that you try to find time to respond to the enclosed survey, so that experiences that you have had can be included in the survey analysis. A stamped envelope is provided for you to use to return the survey. If possible, please respond by February 17, 1982.

Your response will be held in complete confidence. A code number has been placed on the upper right corner of the first page of the survey to facilitate follow-up procedures. When you return the survey, the code number will be immediately detached to assure anonymity.

If you would like a summary of the results of this study, please write your name and address on the back of the return envelope, and one will be sent to you. Please feel free to comment on any of the items or issues in the survey.

Thank you for your time and consideration. With your responses and those of others, some of the questions raised about bargaining by this research project should be answered. Should you have any questions about this study or its survey, please contact me at the locations listed on the letterhead or below.

502 E. Charles
Oelwein, IA 50662
(319) 283-1712

Sincerely,

Paul W. Massman

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBES YOUR PRESENT POSITION.

1. Size of your attendance center (student enrollment): under 100 _____ 100-249 _____ 250-399 _____ 400-549 _____
550-699 _____ 700-849 _____ 850-999 _____ 1000 and over _____
2. School organization: 7-12 _____ 7-8 _____ 7-9 _____ 9-10 _____ 9-12 _____ 10-12 _____ 11-12 _____
Other, please list: _____
3. How many years of administrative experience in Iowa have you had? (Include this year, please)
1-4 _____ 5-9 _____ 10-14 _____ 15-19 _____ 20 or more _____
4. Does your district engage in collective bargaining with teachers? Yes _____ No _____
5. If you answered yes to number 4, do secondary school principals in your district actively participate in the collective bargaining process? Yes _____ No _____
6. If you answered yes to number 5, what roles do they play? Spokesperson _____ Resource person _____
Silent observer _____ Other, please list: _____

7. Have you had non-management experience with collective bargaining, either inside or outside of education? (Have you held any position, where the wages, hours and working conditions were specified by a collectively bargained contract?) Yes _____ No _____
8. If you answered yes to number 7, were you a member of the bargaining organization? Yes _____ No _____
9. If you answered yes to number 8, what organization were you a member of? _____
10. If you answered yes to number 8, how many years were you a member? 1-5 _____ 6-10 _____ 11-15 _____ 16-20 _____
21 and over _____
11. If you answered yes to number 8, what roles did you play in the bargaining process? (Mark all that apply, please.)
Spokesperson _____ Resource person _____ Silent observer _____ Organization officer _____
Please list office(s): _____ Other, please list: _____
12. Has any member of your immediate family (spouse, children, parents, parents-in-law) had any non-management experience with collective bargaining? Yes _____ No _____
13. If you answered yes to number 12, what member(s) of your immediate family has (have) had this experience?

14. If you answered yes to number 12, what role(s) has (have) your family member(s) played in collective bargaining?
Spokesperson _____ Resource person _____ Silent observer _____ Organization officer _____
Please list office(s): _____ Other, please list: _____
- * * * * *
15. Have you had any management experience with collective bargaining outside of the education profession? (Have you held any position that was excluded from coverage by a bargained contract by the contract or by law?)
Yes _____ No _____
16. If you answered yes to number 15, what role did you play in the process? _____

***** GENERAL IMPRESSIONS *****
PLEASE INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE THAT: (if you have no opinion, please omit the item.)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	MILDLY AGREE	NO IMPACT	MILDLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
17. Collective bargaining has had a beneficial effect on schools.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. The school administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities being given to principals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Secondary principals should be <u>actively</u> involved in the teacher negotiation process.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Unfortunately, collective bargaining has forced administrators to share decision-making with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Grievance procedures are often used to harass principals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

***** SPECIFIC IMPRESSIONS *****

PLEASE INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU BELIEVE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING HAS AFFECTED EACH OF THE BELOW: (If you have no opinion, please omit the item.)

	GREATLY STRENGTHENED	STRENGTHENED	MILDLY STRENGTHENED	NO IMPACT	MILDLY WEAKENED	WEAKENED	GREATLY WEAKENED
23. Instructional program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Inservice program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Community support of education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Staff morale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Student discipline	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Student academic achievement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Student morale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Intra-staff communications	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. Public relations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. Professional staff salaries	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. Professional staff fringe benefits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Physical facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. Fiscal condition of the district	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. General decision-making	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. Building management	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. Setting school goals and priorities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. Budgeting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. Personnel selection	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

***** SPECIFIC IMPRESSIONS CONTINUED *****

	GREATLY STRENGTHENED	STRENGTHENED	MILDLY STRENGTHENED	NO IMPACT	MILDLY WEAKENED	WEAKENED	GREATLY WEAKENED
41. Personnel assignment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. Personnel promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. Stimulation of innovation and change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. Curriculum planning	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. Staff evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. Supervision of instruction	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. Coordination of school activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. Extra-curricular program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. Policy development and implementation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

50. Do you have any comments on any of the above topics, or on the topic in general?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT. IF YOU WOULD LIKE A SUMMARY OF THIS PROJECT, PLEASE WRITE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS ON THE BACK OF THE RETURN ENVELOPE PROVIDED, AND THE SUMMARY WILL BE SENT TO YOU IN MAY. YOUR HELP IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

SUMMARY DATA

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

PLEASE CHECK WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBES YOUR PRESENT POSITION.

1. Size of your attendance center (student enrollment): under 100 ^{N/%} 8/6% 100-249 41/31% 250-399 35/26% 400-549 17/13%
550-699 14/11% 700-849 6/5% 850-999 5/4% 1000 and over 7/5%
2. School organization: 7-12 39/29% 7-8 11/8% 7-9 11/8% 9-10 0/0% 9-12 38/29% 10-12 9/7% 11-12 0/0%
Other, please list: 25/19%
3. How many years of administrative experience in Iowa have you had? (Include this year, please)
1-4 25/20% 5-9 33/26% 10-14 25/20% 15-19 18/14% 20 or more 27/21%
4. Does your district engage in collective bargaining with teachers? Yes 110/83% No 22/17%
5. If you answered yes to number 4, do secondary school principals in your district actively participate in the collective bargaining process? Yes 59/53% No 53/47%
6. If you answered yes to number 5, what roles do they play? Spokesperson 6/10% Resource person 45/74%
Silent observer 14/23% Other, please list: 6/10%

The first number given is always N for that item or choice. The second number given is always the percentage of the total responses on that item that N is equal to. Some item percentages add to more than 100% due to multiple answer possibilities.

7. Have you had non-management experience with collective bargaining, either inside or outside of education? (Have you held any position, where the wages, hours and working conditions were specified by a collectively bargained contract?) Yes 47/36% No 85/64%
8. If you answered yes to number 7, were you a member of the bargaining organization? Yes 37/84% No 7/16%
9. If you answered yes to number 8, what organization were you a member of? Ed.Ass'n 31/84% UAW 2/5% AFL-CIO 4/11% AFT 1/5%
10. If you answered yes to number 8, how many years were you a member? 1-5 25/69% 6-10 9/25% 11-15 2/6% 16-20 0/0% 21 and over 0/0%
11. If you answered yes to number 8, what roles did you play in the bargaining process? (Mark all that apply, please.)
Spokesperson 14/41% Resource person 13/38% Silent observer 14/41% Organization officer 12/35%
Please list office(s): Pres. 3 V.P. 2 Treas. 1 Chair. 2 Other, please list: Comm. Member 1
12. Has any member of your immediate family (spouse, children, parents, parents-in-law) had any non-management experience with collective bargaining? Yes 26/21% No 98/79%
13. If you answered yes to number 12, what member(s) of your immediate family has (have) had this experience?
Wife 15/54% Child 6/21% Parent 6/21% Husband 1/4% Parent-in-law 3/11%
14. If you answered yes to number 12, what role(s) has (have) your family member(s) played in collective bargaining?
Spokesperson 5/19% Resource person 7/27% Silent observer 16/62% Organization officer 3/12%
Please list office(s): Pres. 1 Treas. 1 Other, please list: Member 1
- * * * * *
15. Have you had any management experience with collective bargaining outside of the education profession? (Have you held any position that was excluded from coverage by a bargained contract by the contract or by law?)
Yes 4/3% No 126/97%
16. If you answered yes to number 15, what role did you play in the process? _____
Spokesperson 1/25% Member, Man. Team 1/25% Private business 1/25% Union member 1/25%

***** GENERAL IMPRESSIONS *****
 PLEASE INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE THAT: (If you have no opinion, please omit the item.)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	MILDLY AGREE	NO IMPACT	MILDLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%
17. Collective bargaining has had a beneficial effect on schools. $\bar{X}=4.81$	0/0	18/14	25/19	1/1	27/21	40/30	20/15
18. The school administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations. $\bar{X}=4.05$	7/5	19/14	41/31	5/4	19/14	32/24	8/6
19. Collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities being given to principals. $\bar{X}=3.12$	10/8	60/45	19/14	9/7	14/11	13/10	5/4
20. Secondary principals should be actively involved in the teacher negotiation process. $\bar{X}=3.84$	10/8	35/27	22/17	5/4	13/10	27/21	18/14
21. Unfortunately, collective bargaining has forced administrators to share decision-making with teachers. $\bar{X}=3.83$	1/1	14/11	40/30	20/15	16/12	31/24	4/3
22. Grievance procedures are often used to harass principals. $\bar{X}=4.42$	4/3	15/11	21/16	25/19	11/8	45/34	5/4

***** SPECIFIC IMPRESSIONS *****

PLEASE INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU BELIEVE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING HAS AFFECTED EACH OF THE BELOW: (If you have no opinion, please omit the item.)

	GREATLY STRENGTHENED	STRENGTHENED	MILDLY STRENGTHENED	NO IMPACT	MILDLY WEAKENED	WEAKENED	GREATLY WEAKENED
	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%
23. Instructional program $\bar{X}=4.43$	0/0	3/2	14/11	61/46	29/22	20/15	2/2
24. Inservice program $\bar{X}=3.90$	1/1	10/8	35/27	49/37	20/15	11/8	1/1
25. Community support of education $\bar{X}=5.25$	0/0	1/1	2/2	20/15	56/42	39/30	10/8
26. Staff morale $\bar{X}=4.7$	0/0	11/8	23/17	13/10	32/24	37/28	10/8
27. Student discipline $\bar{X}=4.36$	0/0	0/0	3/2	92/70	20/15	10/8	3/2
28. Student academic achievement $\bar{X}=4.31$	0/0	1/1	3/2	86/65	27/21	5/4	2/2
29. Student morale $\bar{X}=4.28$	0/0	0/0	1/1	100/76	19/14	4/3	3/2
30. Intra-staff communications $\bar{X}=4.09$	1/1	10/8	40/30	24/18	30/23	19/14	2/2
31. Public relations $\bar{X}=5.18$	0/0	1/1	8/6	18/14	46/31	39/30	10/8
32. Professional staff salaries $\bar{X}=2.83$	8/6	38/29	60/46	19/14	3/2	1/1	1/1
33. Professional staff fringe benefits $\bar{X}=2.64$	12/9	42/32	60/46	15/11	2/2	0/0	0/0
34. Physical facilities $\bar{X}=4.07$	0/0	0/0	10/8	105/80	12/9	2/2	1/1
35. Fiscal condition of the district $\bar{X}=4.97$	0/0	1/1	5/4	28/21	60/46	23/17	7/5
36. General decision-making $\bar{X}=4.37$	1/1	6/5	22/17	32/24	47/36	17/13	1/1
37. Building management $\bar{X}=4.42$	0/0	4/3	20/15	38/29	47/36	17/13	0/0
38. Setting school goals and priorities $\bar{X}=4.13$	1/1	3/2	25/19	56/42	33/25	7/5	1/1
39. Budgeting $\bar{X}=4.42$	1/1	7/5	24/18	27/21	45/34	17/13	5/4
40. Personnel selection $\bar{X}=4.30$	0/0	9/7	15/11	61/46	21/16	16/12	6/5

***** SPECIFIC IMPRESSIONS CONTINUED *****

	GREATLY STRENGTHENED	STRENGTHENED	MILDLY STRENGTHENED	NO IMPACT	MILDLY WEAKENED	WEAKENED	GREATLY WEAKENED
	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%	N/%
41. Personnel assignment $\bar{X}=4.61$	0/0	6/5	19/14	27/21	50/38	17/13	8/6
42. Personnel promotion $\bar{X}=4.31$	0/0	1/1	18/14	66/50	28/21	13/10	2/2
43. Stimulation of innovation and change $\bar{X}=4.47$	0/0	1/1	13/10	58/44	36/27	16/12	2/2
44. Curriculum planning $\bar{X}=4.2$	0/0	3/2	19/14	67/51	24/18	10/8	2/2
45. Staff evaluation $\bar{X}=3.31$	6/5	31/24	50/38	20/15	11/8	11/8	2/2
46. Supervision of instruction $\bar{X}=3.4$	5/4	27/21	39/30	35/27	20/15	2/2	2/2
47. Coordination of school activities $\bar{X}=4.17$	0/0	4/3	19/14	66/50	28/21	7/5	2/2
48. Extra-curricular program $\bar{X}=4.57$	0/0	1/1	4/3	61/46	45/34	12/9	3/2
49. Policy development and implementation $\bar{X}=3.96$	0/0	14/11	23/17	52/39	27/21	8/6	1/1