72-4990

TAMARIBUCHI, Albert Yoshio, 1934-
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE OF INFLUENCE OF TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS IN COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1971
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE OF INFLUENCE OF TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS IN COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR

by
Albert Yoshio Tamaribuchi

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1971

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Frederick W. Bertolaet, Chairman
Professor James A. Lewis
Assistant Professor Gerald G. Mansergh
Professor Arnold S. Tannenbaum

PLEASE NOTE:

Some Pages have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To the many people who have contributed their assistance, wisdom, encouragement and patience to the completion of my doctoral program and this dissertation, I would like to express my deepest gratitude.

To Professor Frederick W. Bertolaet, I owe my personal thanks for his encouragement, wise counsel, and support.

To professors James A. Lewis, Gerald G. Mansergh, and Arnold S. Tannenbaum, I owe my sincere appreciation for their constructive efforts and interest as members of my dissertation committee.

To Professor M. Clemens Johnson, Dr. Alan Ahola, Mr. Martin Weinrich, Mr. Rollie Hopgood, Mr. Anthony Kaiser, Mr. Kai Erickson, and Mrs. Helen Candiotti, I owe special thanks for their assistance in the study.

To my wife, Sally, I owe my deepest gratitude for her encouragement, understanding and assistance in this undertaking; and to Jay and Cyd who shared in all the moments during the period of this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF APPENDICES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	7
Statement of the Problem	7
Statement of Hypothesis	8
Statement of Research Questions	9
Design of Study	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	23
Theories of Administration and Organization	23
Collective Negotiations and Administrative Behavior	38
III. FINDINGS	48
Summary of Research Design	48
Statistical Analysis and Interpretation	49
Secondary Analysis of the Data	55
Summary of Secondary Analysis	62
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	66
Summary of Procedures	67
Summary of the Findings	67
Conclusion	71
Suggestions for Further Research	72
APPENDICES	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Correlation Coefficients Between Test and Retest Item Scores	15
2.	Summary of High Factor Loadings Based on Items .	20
3.	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Items Between Low, Medium, and High Influence Teachers Organizations	50
4.	Analysis of Variance for Factors Between Low, Medium, and High Influence Teachers Organizations	54
5.	Analysis of Variance for Significant Items Between Teachers in Small, Medium, Large, and Huge School Districts	57
6.	Analysis of Variance for Factors Between Small, Medium, Large and Huge School Districts	59
7.	Analysis of Variance for Significant Items Between Teachers in School Districts Previously Involved In a Work Stoppage and Teachers in School Districts Not Included in a Work Stoppage	61
8.	Analysis of Variance for Factors Between . . .	63
9.	Analysis of Variance for Significant Items Between Elementary and Secondary School Teachers	64

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A.	Administrative Style Profile Questionnaire	73
B.	Letter to Superintendents of School Districts in Sample	80
C.	Letter to Principals of Schools in Sample	82
D.	Letter to Teachers in Study	84
E.	Frequency Distribution of Total Score	86
F.	Summary of Items Response	88
G.	Discriminating Ability of Items	92
H.	Summary of Background Information of Respondents	94

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the last decade education in the United States has experienced a profound change in the introduction of collective negotiations. The full import of collective negotiations in education has not as yet been determined.

Increasing numbers of states and school districts are adopting the new practice. In 1960, not a single state had enacted a statute authorizing collective negotiations in public education. By 1970, twenty six states had enacted such legislation and many other states had legislation introduced to extend the practice. Three states specifically prohibit negotiations or bargaining for public employees. These are Texas, North Carolina, and Virginia. On the other extreme, Pennsylvania and Hawaii allow strikes by teachers under certain conditions.

Traditional forms of control and administration in public education have been described as antiquated and obsolete by many, including Cunningham,[1]

---

1. Luvern Cunningham, "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship," Theory Into Practice. VII, April, 1968, pp. 62-70.

Watson,[2] and Kuhn[3] to name a few. Collective negotiations had precipitated new relationships between administrators and teachers. Previous alignments based on hierachical authority lines seem dysfunctional and long-standing modes of organizational behavior require alteration. Authority as defined in bureaucratic models is no longer accepted without question. According to Anderson "authority comes into being when an individual accepts another individual's judgment, norm, or standard as legitimately governing his behavior."[4] The institutionalized authority and power long held by school boards and delegated to superintendents and principals are no longer unequivocal and unchallenged. Collective negotiations has undermined the absolute authority enjoyed by the administrative arm of education.

---

2. Bernard C. Watson, "The Principal - Forgotten Man in Negotiations," Administrator Notebook, Vol. 15, No. 2, October, 1966.

3. James Kuhn, "The Scope of Negotiations" Teacher-Administrator-School Board Relationships. Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitian Area, Inc., and the Department of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota, January, 1967, pp. 44-54.

4. James G. Anderson, "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority," Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 1, Winter, 1966, p. 8.

Prior to the coming of collective negotiations, teacher-administrator relationships had settled to a new equilibrium with the advent of the "human relations" and democratic administration concepts in the 1930's. According to Glass,[5] there were some stirrings of discontent during these years and even work stoppages quite regularly in the United States since 1940. However, the disruptions did not seriously affect education in general. Collective negotiations had disturbed the equilibrium of teacher-administrator relationships characteristic of education up to the 1950's. Administrators have been assigned to the board-management position in negotiations and many principals have felt excluded from involvement in the process. Painful observations have been voiced by some administrators who have felt betrayed in the board-teacher alignment in negotiations. Successful efforts to organize administrators have been increasing steadily in recent years to counteract the administrators' lack of influence characteristic of the present structure in negotiations.

---

5. Ronald Glass, "Work Stoppages and Teachers: History and Prospect," Monthly Labor Review. United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, August, 1967, p. 44.

The change in removing total policy making power and authority from the boards of education is one of the most important consequences of collective negotiations in education. The realignment of power will necessitate accomodation to the emerging practice of shared authority in education.

Blau and Scott[6] view service organizations such as schools and hospitals as differing from business or industrial organizations through the differing beneficiary of the organizational effort. In service organizations the beneficiary is the client as against the owner(s) or proprietor(s) in business concerns. However, collective negotiations has allowed the specter of self interest to creep into beneficiary designation which has clouded both the issue of the beneficiary in education and the basic assumption that the goals and purposes of education are identical for teachers and administrators. There seems to be disagreement as to whether negotiable issues make for better education or seek to placate militancy and self interest of teacher groups.

---

6. Peter M. Blau and Richard W. Scott, Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962, p. 63.

Filmed as received

without page(s) 5 .

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

Cogen further maintains that the non profit argument is fallacious; the principle of the market place for consumer dollars is just as applicable to schools as to manufacturers.[10]

The National Education Association (NEA) has not accepted the labor-management model as applicable to education. Professionalism is the major argument against the trade union model. The process of bargaining was labeled "professional negotiations," and other terms such as "sanctions" in place of strikes are used in explanations of the uniqueness of collective negotiations in education.

Lieberman and Moskow[11] have not found substantial differences between the NEA and AFT actions in collective negotiations nor significant differences in the contracts negotiated by the two organizations.

In any case there is an apparent need for further research in this rather new phenomenon in education.

---

10. Ibid.

11. Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations For Teachers. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

It seems evident that the process of instituting negotiations in education was effected with little thought of broad implications for educational administration and the role and responsibilities of teachers organizations within the new milieu.

Need For the Study

Because collective negotiations made its appearance nationally in education about a decade ago and in Michigan approximately five years ago, earlier studies may have reflected resistance to change, attendent emotion-laden reactions, and general growth pains which should have somewhat subsided at the present time. There is a need to examine the emerging relationships precipitated by collective negotiations as it relates to educational administration and determine its implications.

Statement of the Problem

Most authorities in organization and management theory suggest that greater productivity and general

overall efficiency are attained when workers feel secure and creative within a framework of supportive and cooperative relationships with management. Although there are different degrees of emphasis between production and individual need satisfaction, it is generally held that structuring interaction and warmth, mutual trust, and respect in the leader-subordinate relationship are the marks of the successful organization.

Collective negotiations has added new dimensions to the administrator and teacher relationships. This study will examine these relationships in terms of structuring interaction and the maintenance of a supportive, cooperative atmosphere which are major components of management or administrative style.

Statement of Hypothesis

Teachers generally have made gains in participation in decision making through collective negotiations as evidenced by inclusion of participatory issues in master contracts. However, the effects of the nature of the bargaining process and the con-

flicting positions on the part of teacher groups and boards of education have not been clearly established. Some teachers feel that they should have a greater voice in the governance of education by virture of their professional training and knowledge. Boards of education view with dismay the erosion of management prerogatives and the legal basis for their responsibility for education established by state law.

Increasing gains made by teacher organizations in winning demands in master contracts including issues concerning shared authority may or may not engender similar gains in mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between teachers and administrators. Although there are valid reasons on both sides, it is not known what relationships do exist.

The null hypothesis for this study will be that there is no significant relationship between influence of teacher organizations in collective negotiations and management styles of principals are perceived by teachers.

STATEMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study specifically addresses itself to the

following questions:

1. Are there significant differences in perceived management styles under varying levels of influence characteristic of teachers negotiating units?

2. Are there significant differences in teachers' perceptions concerning styles of management of school principals according to school district size, previous involvement in a work stoppage, and teachers' school level.

For the purpose of this study the following terms are defined as listed:

1. Collective negotiations (collective bargaining, professional negotiations) - A process whereby a group of organized employees and their employers negotiate on the conditions of employment relationships in good faith for the purpose of reaching agreement.

2. Management style (administrative style) - The manner in which a principal is perceived as behaving along specific variable continuums in the framework of Consideration or Structure.

3. Organizational influence - The degree of success teacher organizations have had in obtaining major demands concerning participation in decision making or strengthening the teacher organizations as determined by master contract provisions.

Design of the Study

The design of this study consists of five phases: 1) the development of a scale instrument to measure

management styles; 2) the determination of criteria to identify degrees of influence of teacher bargaining units; 3) determination of a sample of school districts, schools, and teachers in the state of Michigan; 4) administration of the instrument to random samples of teachers in the selected school districts and 5) analysis of the results.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE PROFILE

The administrative style profile was developed in five steps. First, it was decided that the focal point of the study would concern the perception of administrative styles of principals by teachers. The phenomenological viewpoint has been reviewed by Tannenbaum and Smith who state "..that the question 'How does the social situation seem to the actor?' rather than the question 'What are the objective facts about the situation?' should precede analyses of behavior."[12]

---

12. Arnold S. Tannenbaum and Claggett G. Smith, "Effects of Members Influence in an Organization: Phenomenology Versus Organizational Structure" Control in Organization. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1968, p. 199.

It was recognized that perceptions of the teachers may vary as determined by elements operant within each perceiver, however, each teacher reacts to a situation as he perceives it. Halpin assumes that "how the leader really behaves is less important than how members of his group perceive that he behaves: it is their perception of his behavior that will determine the behavior of the group members..."[13]

Second, the theoretical base for the instrument was developed to include the concepts of Consideration and Structure as defined by Fleishman and Harris.

> Consideration includes behavior indicating mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. This does not mean that this dimension reflects a superficial "pat-on-the-back," "first name calling" kind of human relations behavior. This dimension appears to emphasize a deeper concern for group members needs and includes such behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in

---

13. Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools. Midwest Administration Center, the University of Chicago, 1963, p. 13.

> making and encouraging more two-way communication.
>
> Structure includes behavior in which the supervisor organizes and defines group activities and his relation to the group. Thus, he defines the role he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production. This dimension seems to emphasize overt attempts to achieve organization goals.[14]

Third, the format for the scale was developed following Likert's Profile of Organizational Characteristics.[15] Included were items relating to the following dimensions. Under the factor of Consideration, the dimensions are: 1) mutual trust, respect, warmth; 2) Participation in decision making; and 3) openness of communications. The factor of Structure includes the dimension concerning definitions of group activities; tasks, plans, organization and emphasis on achievement of organization goals.

---

14. Edwin G. Fleishman and Edwin F. Harris, "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover." Personnel Psychology. Vol. 15, 1962, p. 43-44.

15. Rensis Likert, The Human Organization. McGraw Hill Book Company, New York, 1967, pp. 197-211.

Fourth, a pilot study was conducted mainly to improve the instrument. The questionnaire was administered to teachers and some former teachers presently graduate students at the University of Michigan. The purposes of the pretesting were to improve the clarity of the items, to improve the wording of responses along the continuum to establish separations along the continuum, to delete non-discriminating items, and to check the face validity of the instrument.

Fifth, the final questionnaire was prepared with deletions of redundant items and additional items to approximate more closely the factors to be measured.

The reliability of the questionnaire was determined by the test-retest method. The instrument was administered twice within a four day period to seventeen teachers. A correlation coefficient computer program was used to determine the stability of responses on all items. The results are presented in Table 1. The range of variation on the items are from .96 to .43 with a mean of .73.

Developing the Criteria of Influence

The criteria to determine degree of influence of

TABLE 1

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN TEST AND RETEST ITEM SCORES (N=17)

ITEM	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	ITEM	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
1.	.88	16.	.64
2.	.87	17.	.94
3.	.79	18.	.76
4.	.59	19.	.81
5.	.82	20.	.64
6.	.90	21.	.43
7.	.77	22.	.90
8.	.65	23.	.73
9.	.60	24.	.96
10.	.74	25.	.59
11.	.72	26.	.72
12.	.60	27.	.86
13.	.44	28.	.64
14.	.74	29.	.69
15.	.80		
Σ =	21.14		
$\bar{X}$	.73		

teachers bargaining units were developed through consultation with several officials of the two teacher organizations in Michigan, the Michigan Education Association (MEA) and the Michigan Federation of Teachers (MFT). Included in the final list were criteria agreed upon by both parties as being currently the most significant, the most difficult, and the most important for teachers aside from salary considerations. The criteria are as follows:

1. Binding Arbitration in Grievance Procedure - A method of settling grievance through recourse to an impartial third party, whose decision is final.

2. Due Process for Probationary Teachers - Access to the grievance procedure for probationary teachers who are not offered contracts.

3. Agency Shop - A collective agreement provision which requires that all employees in the negotiating unit who do not join the exclusive representative organization pay a fixed amount, usually the equivalent of organization dues, as a condition for employment.

4. Class Size Limitations - Limitations for class size with established alternatives such as hiring an

additional teacher or aide if limit is exceeded, payment procedure, or other alternatives or access to grievance procedure.

5. Instructional Policy - A joint instructional policies council or instructional or curriculum committee is established in the contract.

Teacher bargaining units were described as low influence if none or one of the five criteria was met in the master contract; medium influence if two or three of the criteria were met; and high influence if four or all five of the criteria were met.

Determination of the Sample

The sample was designed as a three stage random sample stratified by size of school districts as reflected in the number of public school students enrolled in the school district.

The first stage was a random sample of twenty school districts in Michigan stratified into four categories. The categories were small, medium, large, and huge. Eight school districts were selected from the small and four school districts from each of the remaining three categories for a total of twenty school districts.

The second stage included a random selection of one school in each of the small districts, two school in the medium districts, three schools in the large school districts, and three schools in the huge school districts for a total of forty schools.

The third stage of the sample required the selection of all teachers in schools having twenty or fewer teachers and fifteen teachers randomly selected for schools having more than twenty teachers on the faculty.

The Random Sample Selection computer program was used to select the school districts, the school within the district and teachers within the schools where the number of teachers exceeded twenty.

Administration of the Instrument

After completion of the sampling design, letters were sent to superintendents of the selected districts explaining the study and requesting approval for inclusion of their teachers in the study. Three districts refused to be included in the study.

The instrument with a letter of explanation and

a stamped, self addressed envelope were enclosed in a sealed packet for the teachers in the sample and mailed to the participating school districts. In the school districts with large schools selected, one trip or several trips were necessary to work out the teacher sampling procedures.

Factor Analysis of the Instrument

A computerized factor analysis program was run to confirm the presence of the factors of Consideration and Structure. The scores from all respondents were submitted to the factor analysis program. Four factors contained twenty four items or eighty three percent of the common variance. The results of the rotated factor loadings are presented in Table 2.

Factor I was identified as Supportive Behavior. This factor contained eleven items or forty four percent of the common variance. It was noted that high factor loadings on this factor also included high loadings on other factors in nine out of the eleven items.

Factor II was labelled Participation and Cooperation. This factor included four items, one of

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF HIGH FACTOR LOADINGS BASED ON ITEMS

ITEMS	LOADINGS	ASSOCIATED FACTOR
FACTOR I: Mutual Trust, Respect, Warmth, and Supportive Behavior		
15. Extent to which principal displays supportive behavior toward teachers	.674	
11. Amount and character of interaction between principal and teachers	.670	II
17. Extent to which teachers, have confidence and trust in principal	.624	III
10. Psychological closeness of principal to teachers i.e; friendliness between principal and teachers	.575	II
16. Type of communication between principal and teachers	.568	
18. Extent to which teachers feel free to discuss important things about their jobs with principal	.564	II
5. Extent to which principal has confidence and trust in teachers	.522	III
6. Degree to which principal knows and understands problems faced by teachers	.490	II
29. Description of the principal's actions	.456	III
7. Extent to which communications are accepted by teachers	.444	II
2. Principal's awareness of teachers efforts	.426	II

TABLE 2 (Continued)

ITEMS	LOADINGS	ASSOCIATED FACTOR
FACTOR II: Participation in Decision Making and Cooperation		
19. Extent to which principal, in solving problems, generally tries to get and use teachers' ideas and opinions	.635	
1. Attempts by the principal to encourage cooperation	.501	I
13. Character of planning. Manner in which it is usually done	.429	
28. Consensus and the principal's action	.428	
FACTOR III: Structure		
20. Principal's influence in school district and central administration	.596	
22. Principal's view of collective negotiations	.539	
23. Manner in which principal accepts, resists, or rejects change proposed by teachers	.530	
21. Degree to which one part of organization may influence other parts (non-professional staff, faculty, administration)	.509	
25. When public controversy arises concerning teacher	.496	
24. Reasons for which data (test scores, pupil attendance, grades, comments from students and parents) are used	.479	
3. Prime consideration for decision making by principal	.362	

which had a high loading on Factor I.

Factor III was designated as Structure and included seven items with high factor loadings. None of the items in Factor III had high loadings in other factors.

A fourth factor contained three items. It was not used in the analysis because of a low eigenvalue which would have made for meaningless and insignificant interpretation.

None of the factors can be considered orthogonally pure. The items in Factor I had high factor loadings on both Factor II and Factor III. Factor analysis did verify the theoretical dimensions of Consideration and Structure in the instrument.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature is presented in two parts. The first part deals with the management theories developed concerning individuals in organizations and management or leadership styles in organizational theory. This portion if the review will generally cover the period of the early 1900's to the present. The second portion will deal with collective negotiations and administrative behavior.

The first influential theorist in the classical organization theory was Frederick Winslow Taylor. Taylor's Scientific Management[1] expressed his ideas mainly around tasks performed on the production floor of industrial organizations. The aims of the scientific management movement were 1) to improve the efficiency of the worker through study of physiological variables in determining the largest average production output, 2) to have specialized experts plan and establish the work tasks, and 3) to provide

---

1. Frederick W. Taylor, Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947.

incentives to continously insure performance in a specifically prescribed manner.

Luther Gulick, Henri Fayol, Lyndall Urwick, and James Mooney were some of the leading exponents of the expansion of the scientific management movement to include administration and organization. Their ideas include specialization, departmentalization, coordination, delegation, and authority. However, the theories of the classical school failed to recognized the worker as more than a task-performing instrument of production.

The conceptulizations of Max Weber[2] concerning bureaucracy fitted the ideas of the administration management theories of the classical or scientific management group. The Weberian formulations followed the rational approach to organizations and suffered the earlier encountered lack of consideration of the employee as a human individual.

Mary Parker Follet is thought to be one of the first in the United States in the field of management theory to utilize principles of psychology and

---

2. Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York, Oxford University Press, Inc., 1947.

sociology in her conceptualizations. Her use of Gestalt concepts and explanation of integrative behavior may be considered rudimentary to a behavioral science approach in administration. Miss Follet believed that a continously productive industrial organization must be based on recognition of the motivating desires of the individuals and the group.[3]

At about the same period, as historic research project was initiated by the Western Electric Hawthorne plant in Chicago. The results of the study, the purpose of which was to measure production under different quantities and qualities of illumination, were quite unexpected. The puzzling results spurred the company to obtain the services of Elton Mayo, a professor of industrial psychology, and Fritz Roethlisberger, a sociologist, both from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

---

3. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follet. Edited by Henry C. Metcalf and Lyndall Urwick. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940.

Roethlisberger and Dickson[4] reported on the Hawthorne experiments, the major ones being the Relay Assembly Test Room and the Bank Wiring Observation Room. In the Relay Assembly Test Room the experimental conditions were clearly unlike the conditions of work in the plant. Supervision was relegated to the investigator and was quite relaxed as compared to the supervision the shop floor. Higher wages and attention from high officials were given the workers in the experiment. The Bank Wiring Observation Room experiment group in contrast was accorded no special favors. The Bank Wiring Observation Room experiment tried to resemble the actual conditions of the plant. The employees would report to their regular supervisors and be subject to the same rules and regulations as before the experiment. Outsiders and high officials were not allowed in the room during working hours. The times had also changed with the onset of the depression. In the Relay Assembly Test Room experiment output in-

---

4. Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Management and the Worker: An Account of a Research Program Conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939, p. 552.

creased under various changes of the variables (hours per week and rest periods). In the Bank Wiring Observation Room the workers restricted output.

The significant contribution of the Hawthorne studies was the introduction of the human relations concept in administrative theory and practice. Roethlisberger and Dickson theorized that industrial organizations had two major functions. 1) producing a product and 2) creating and distributing satisfactions among the members of the organizations.[5]

Chester Barnard in his great classic in administrative theory, Functions of the Executive,[6] introduced the concepts of effectiveness and efficiency. Effectiveness is defined as accomplishment of the cooperative purpose and efficiency the satisfaction of individual motives.[7]

Barnard's formulations concerning formal and informal groups extended the ideas of Mayo and

---

5. Ibid.

6. Chester I. Barnard, Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.

7. Ibid. p. 55.

Roethlisberger. He concluded that informal groups are universal and are created within formal groups. Informal groups are structureless and indefinite yet maintain an essential role in the existence of organizations.[8]

Herbert Simon further extended the boundaries of the study of administration into the social sciences. His attempts at developing a scientific base for administrative behavior includes mathematical models and philosophic considerations. His writings were numerous and ranged from public administration, social group interaction, measurement of political power, rational choice, and group pressures. An important aspect of his writing is the inclusion of early formulations of organization theory.

Argyris in following a more psychology oriented approach theorizes that organizations and individuals have incompatible goals. He hypothesized that organizations in placing emphasis on tight control and directive leadership expected employees to be

---

8. Ibid. p. 115

submissive and passive, provided employees with minimal control over their work tasks, and expected employees to produce under psychologically detrimental conditions.[9]

Douglas McGregor maintains that traditional organization principles reflect definite limitations in their views of human beings and their motivations. He labels the traditional outlook as Theory X, which states that the average human being has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if he can.[10] McGregor proposes assumptions of human beings under the label Theory Y, which states that people are not lazy and are capable of self control, acceptance of responsibility, and setting objectives.[11] He concludes that the participation in Theory Y offers substantial opportunities for ego satisfaction of the worker and can affect motivation toward organizational objectives.

---

9. Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between Systems and the Individual. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

10. Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1960, p. 33.

11. Ibid. pp. 47-48.

Rensis Likert developed his research-based theories of supportive relationships and participatory management which are not unlike those of McGregor. The principle of supportive relationships states:

> The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interaction and all relations with the organization, each member will, in the list of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one that maintains his sense of personal worth and importance.[12]

Blake and Mouton have developed a model utilizing two variables in the preparation of a grid. These variables are "concern for people" and "concern for product."[13] Their managerial grid model utilizes these two quite generally accepted factors similar to those earlier termed by Barnard as effectiveness and efficiency, and also allows for descriptions and prescriptions through the use of grid

---

12. Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1961, p. 103.

13. R.R. Blake and J.S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid. New York: Ronald Press, 1962, p. 9.

positions.

Research concerning styles of administrative or management behavior has been noted under various typologies. Some have been categorized as leadership styles, leadership behavior or administrative style and others have been called patterns or styles of management. To date there has not been an organized body of literature nor a universally accepted basis in the discussion of styles. The early studies by Lewin, Lippitt, and White with groups of young boys in the late 1930's described three styles of leader behavior, namely autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire.[14]

In the 1940's and 1950's the Ohio State University Personnel Research Board conducted studies in leadership with a behavioral emphasis. The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed by Hemphill and Coons[15] and modified

---

14. Kurt Lewin and Ronald Lippitt, "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy: A Preliminary Note," Sociomentry, January-April, 1938, Vol. 1, Nos. 3 and 4 pp. 292-300.

15. John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons, "The Development of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire," Leader Behavior: Description and Measurement. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons (eds.) Columbus, Ohio, State University, 1957, pp. 6-38.

by Halpin and Winer in their study of Air Force personnel involved in bomber aircrafts.[16] Halpin and Winer worked out a final form of the LBDQ which designated the factors of Consideration and Initiating Structure.

Fleishman and Harris'[17] study contrasted Consideration and Initiating Structure and included Participation as a dimension of Consideration.

Fleishman, Harris and Burtt[18] reported on the contrary effect of training on the behavior of foremen using the factors of Consideration and Initiating Structure.

---

16. Andrew W. Halpin and Hames B. Winer, "A Factorial Study of Leader Behavior Description," Leader Behavior: Description and Measurement. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, (eds.) Columbus, Ohio, State University, 1957, pp. 39-51.

17. Edwin G. Fleishman and Edwin F. Harris, "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology. Vol. 15, 1962.

18. E.G. Fleishman, E.F. Harris and H.E. Burtt, Leadership and Supervision in Industry: An Evaluation of a Supervisory Training Program, Bureau of Education Research Monogram, No. 33, Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1955.

The Getzels and Guba model of administration depicts administrative behavior as a social process and defines it as a function of idiographic and nomothetic dimensions of a social system.[19] The idiographic dimension reflects the individual's personality as differentiated from the nomothetic dimension, which reflects the institutional role. The theory views administrative behavior as the outcome of the conflict between the individual and societal role sets.

Lipham[20] likens the Getzels-Guba model to the earlier formulation of effectiveness and efficiency of Henry Barnard. He sees efficiency, relating to the satisfaction of individual motives, as similar to the idiographic dimension and effectiveness or the accomplishment of the cooperative effort as likened to the nomothetic dimension.

---

19. J.S. Getzels and E.G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review. LXV Winter, 1957, pp. 423-441.

20. James M. Lipham, "Leadership and Administration," in Daniel E. Griffiths, (ed.) Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education. 1964, P. II, pp. 119-141.

Guba and Bidwell[21] theorized three styles of leadership following the Getzels-Guba model. They labeled the styles as nomothetic, idiographic, and transactional. The nomothetic style stresses institutional requirements and conformity to expected role behaviors. Heavy emphasis is place on rules and procedural standards. The idiographic style, in contrast, stresses the needs structure and need motivated behavior of individuals. Organizational requirements are held secondary with authority delegated. The transactional style seeks a balance of achieving organizational goals and at the same time holds the personalities of the workers as important.

Blake and Mouton[22] maintain that managerial style is based on two factors, concern for people and concern for production. Variations in managerial style are dependent on differing degrees of the two factors in combination. Blake and Mouton hold that an individual's style reflects his dominant

---

21. Egon G. Guba and Charles E. Bidwell, Administrative Relationships. Midwest Administration Center University of Chicago, 1957.

22. Op. Cit.

set of assumptions which orient his thinking and behavior. Thus, they claim that changing the individual's managerial assumptions will produce shifts in managerial behavior or induce discrepancies in attitudes and actions.[23]

Bassett sees styles as strategies to be used in dealing with the demands of a situation.[24] He describes three styles, the authoritarian, permissive, and integrative. The integrative strategy is thought to be most useful. However, Bassett feels that a manager must be able to use all three types as circumstances demand.

Hemphill[25] states that the style of administration of a school principal may be understood in part as an

---

23. Ibid. p. 13.

24. Glen A. Bassett, Management Styles in Transaction. American Management Association. The Book Press, Inc., 1966, p. 101.

25. John K. Hemphill, "Personal Variables and Administrative Styles," in Daniel E. Griffiths, (ed.) Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1964, Pt. II, p. 178-198.

expression of measurable personality characteristics. Using a simulation problem method in studying administrative styles and personal variables of 232 principals, Hemphill indentified eight administrative styles. The styles are listed as follows:

1. High communication style. Principals characterized by this style of work stressed communicating with others about the problems they encountered in their work.

2. High discussion style. Principals characterized by this style placed unusually high emphasis upon the use of face-to-face discussion administration.

3. High compliance style. This style characterizes principals who generally followed suggestions made by others.

4. High analysis style. Principals who were high with respect to this style spent relatively more effort than others in analyzing the situation surrounding each administrative problem.

5. High relationships style. This style refers to a high concern with maintaining organizational relationships, especially relationships with superiors.

6. High work-organization style. This refers to the principal's emphasis upon scheduling and organizing his own work.

7. High outside-orientation style. Principals high on this style of administrative performance displayed greater readiness than others to responding to pressures from outside the school.

8. High work-direction style. Principals who followed this style tended to stress giving directions to others as an important part of their work.[26]

Brown and Anderson[27] used three dimensions - 1) job dimension, 2) person dimension, 3) a combination of job and person dimension - in their study to find the relationships between the behavior of leaders and satisfaction of teachers. They concluded: "Faculty consensus with respect to satisfaction with all aspects of the teaching situation turned out, as predicted, greater in schools whose principals exhibit person, rather than system oriented leader behavior.."[28]

---

27. Alan F. Brown and Barry D. Anderson, "Faculty Consensus as a Function of Leadership Frequency and Style," Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. 32, No. 2, Winter, 1967, pp. 43-49.

28. Ibid. p. 45.

Erickson[29] suggest a moratorium on labels for the redefinition of leadership. Such a moratorium seems necessary for the proliferating conceptualizations concerning administrative or management style.

Collective Negotiations and Administrative Behavior

Historically, the traditional role of principals was loosely structured, allowing for broad latitude in management styles. This loose structure and the semi-autonomous nature of the principalship lent itself to varying philosophic orientations and practices. As in most roles the delimiting factor was the setting of expectations by institutional or normative ideas.

With the advent of collective negotiations, the broad latitude of management styles was related to consequential factors of increasing teacher militancy. Once docile and acquiescent, teachers have recently struck a contrasting pose. Administrator reactions to the change have been varied but definitely perturbed.

---

29. Donald E. Erickson, "The School Administrator," Review of Educational Research. Vol. 37, No. 4, October, 1967, p. 422.

Erickson[30] found significant score changes in the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) of schools on a pre and post test analysis of teachers in districts introducing collective negotiations. Teachers perceived distinct movement away from the Open and Controlled climate toward the Closed climate. All schools in general showed significant increases in Disengagement, Intimacy, and Aloofness subtests while the Trust and Consideration subtests showed definite decreases. Erickson concluded that teachers perceived principals as being more aloof toward their staffs, less considerate of teachers, and less able to provide effective direction than they were prior to their districts' involvement in collective negotiations.

Wildman and Perry[31] visualize the outcome of collective negotiations as institutionalization of group conflict in the public organization. The adversarial nature of collective negotiations is given

---

30. Kenneth H. Erickson, "An Analysis of Organizational Climate Scores in Thirty-three Schools Before and After Collective Negotiations," unpublished PhD. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1969.

31. Wesley A. Wildman and Charles R. Perry, "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1966, pp. 244-251.

as the basis for their conclusion.

Lutz, Kleinman and Evans[32] state that the principal operates from a powerless base and has been stripped of most of his roles of leadership by the central administration. They state the principal is "out of the mainstream of the organizational line, being neither a part of the administrative oligarchy, nor the teacher collectivity."[33]

Watson[34] describes the similarity of the positions of the industrial foreman and school principal. He indicates that both have suffered loss of power through collective bargaining and further states that in education it is "at the building level that the confrontation between the administration and the instructional staff takes place."[35]

---

32. Frank W. Lutz, Lon Kleinman and Sy Evans, Grievance and Their Resolution. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publications, Inc., 1967.

33. Ibid. p. 84.

34. Bernard C. Watson, "The Role of the Principal in Collective Negotiations," North Central Quarterly Review. Winter, 1968, No. 3, pp. 233-243.

35. Ibid. p. 239.

Delmas Miller, President of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, reflected the concern of many principals when he expressed the organization's determination not to "stand by and see the principalship eroded and stripped of its potential effectiveness."[36]

Some of the previous positions may reflect a managerial concept questioned by Likert. This is labeled the fixed "influence pie" concept which holds that when "subordinates are permitted to exercise more influence as to what goes on in the organization, the superiors have correspondingly less."[37]

Watson[38] states that the coming of collective negotiations does not mean that the management function is less significant. He feels the question

---

36. Delmas Miller, "A Message from President Miller," NASSP Newsletter, National Association of Secondary School Principals, March-April, 1968, Vol. 15, No. 4, p. 1.

37. Likert, Op. Cit., p. 57-58.

38. Bernard C. Watson, "The Principal - Forgotten Man in Negotiations," Administrator Notebook, Vol. 15, No. 2, October, 1966.

should be, who will adapt the school organization to the new relationships brought about by collective negotiations. For the principal, he summarizes, "This dictates asking himself how he can adjust his role in order that he may maintain effectiveness for the exercise of professional and administrative leadership."[39]

Kuhn[40] believes that unilateral managerial functions of school administrators will be diminished sharply. He states that the absolute unilateral right to manage is an empty claim and that educational policy cannot be considered separately as something that does not affect conditions of work.

Bakke[41] differentiates the employment relationship

---

39. Ibid.

40. James Kuhn, "The Scope of Negotiations," Teacher-Administrator-School Board Relationships. Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitian Area, Inc. and the Department of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota, January, 1967, pp. 44-54.

41. Wright E. Bakke, "Teachers, School Boards, and the Employment Relationship," Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools. Robert T. Doherty (ed.) New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., January, 1967, pp. 41-59.

of the teacher to the board and the professional relationship of the teacher to the educational system. He sees the employment relationship as the area where certain organizational managerial responsibilities are delineated. In his view, the employment relationship lends itself to negotiations. Professional relationship is not seen as a negotiable area. Bakke feels that a conscious effort to separate the relationships is essential in bargaining.

Corwin[42] hypothesizes that professional persons have role conflicts regarding certain principles of bureaucracy. These principles are specialization and centralized authority. Teachers have received increased training and specialization. Administrators often supervise and evaluate teachers who are much more knowledgeable and competent than the administrators in many curricular and instructional areas. This role conflict is sometimes intensified when reputations are based on opinions of colleagues outside the organization, rather than the administration.

---

42. Ronald G. Corwin, "Professional Persons in Public Organizations," Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. I, No. 3, Autumn, 1965, pp. 1-22.

Related to specialization is the conflict in the bureaucratic dimension of centralized authority. In bureaucratic organizations, authority is derived primarily from the position held and the amount of deference due is determined by rank. In professional organizations, competence and knowledge is accorded the central place. This situation creates a split in loyalty between the organization and the profession.

Doherty[43] in interviewing labor relations specialists who had been involved in negotiations in both the private industrial sector and public schools observed some definite differences. About half of the specialists had confined their negotiations to supplemental plant agreements which lack the issue of wages and fringe benefits settled at the company, regional, or industry-wide level. In education the entire scope of negotiations has been limited to the school district level.

Another observation Doherty makes is the hasty generalization that bargaining relationships in the

---

43. Robert E. Doherty, "Labor Relation Negotiators on Bargaining: Factories vs. The Schools," Patrick W. Carlton and Harold I. Goodwin (eds.) The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles E. Jones Publishing Co., 1969, pp. 218-228.

private sector are pretty much the same. The differences among private sector negotiations are as great as differences between the private and public sectors. Teachers were even less persuaded than trade unionists by the argument of management prerogative. Teachers saw virtually all board decisions as having some effect on employment conditions. Teachers argued, as trade unionists did not, that teachers were more competent to make judgements on most matters than the school board. Another major difference was the teachers' basing their salary demands upon aid in recruitment of better teachers, whereas the trades unionists would not consider recruitment and better quality workmen in their justifications. The major similarities of teacher organizations and trade unions. were 1) the disagreement between employer-employee as to the appropriate scope or subject matter of collective bargaining, 2) demands concentrated on economic issues, and 3) the looking around at other negotiated contracts in determining issues to be bargained. Doherty found that the major problem in utilizing private sector experience for public school negotiations lay in the lack of the profit

motive, the product market place, and the lack of suitable criteria to measure productivity applicalbe to the school situation at the present time.

Cunningham[44] observes that collective action by teachers is based partially on the "emerging sense of collegial loyalty, identity and opportunity for the exercise of power.", He sees two basic authority systems, the bureaucratic and the collegial, as having to coexist in future school organizations. He also sees that opportunities for principals to participate in collective negotiations must be provided.

Carlton[45] identifies three stages in the process of growth in negotiations. First, the hesitancy and uncertainty on the part of teachers regarding implementation of negotiations. This stage is charac-

---

44. Luvern Cunningham, "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship," Theory Into Practice. VII, April, 1968, pp. 62-70.

45. Patrick W. Carlton, "Educator Attitudes and Value Differences in Collective Negotiations," The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education. Patrick W. Carlton and Harold I. Goodwin (eds.) Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1969.

terized by confusion and ineptness in negotiation actions. The second stage follows acceptance of the process and reflects a "hard-nosed" militant stance. This stage is characterized by hostility, frustration, and a "we-they syndrome." The third stage is described as displaying a spirit of accomodation following major gains in economic concessions. This stage shows the emergence of mutuality of educational interest.

Collective negotiations in Michigan has exhibited certain manifestations in the past that follow Carlton's initial stages. Whether the third stage is in Michigan's immediate future is open to speculation. The need for research in this area seems evident.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

The analysis of the data collected through the administration of the questionnaire instrument is presented in this chapter.

Summary of Research Design

The sample included four hundred seventy eight teachers from thirty three schools in seventeen school district within the state of Michigan. There were two hundred ninety four responses (62%) of which two hundred eighty nine (95%) were usable.

The questionnaire contains twenty nine items with responses on a nine point scale. The items were grouped into factors as determined by orthogonal rotation in a computerized factor analysis program. Three factors were identified and included in the analysis of the results. The three factors are Factor I - Supportive Behavior, Factor II - Cooperation and Participation, and Factor III - Structure.

The hypothesis for the study stated in the null form for statistical purposes proposes that there is no difference between the perceptions of teachers concerning administrative styles and the degree of influence of teacher organizations in collective negotiations.

Statistical Analysis and Interpretation

The analysis of variance statistic was used to test the hypothesis. The analysis of variance for all items between low, medium, and high influence teacher organizations showed two items with F-ratios significant at the five percent level and four items with F-ratios significant at the one percent level. The results are presented in Table 3.

It was noted that in twenty three items the low influence group had the lowest mean. In nineteen items the low, medium, and high groups had low, medium, and high means in that order. In five of the six significant items the order was low, medium, and high respectively. The remaining significant item showed the medium group having the lowest mean. This order of mean scores seems to indicate that low influence and favorable scoring of principals may have some relationship, though not found statistically significant in this study.

The analysis of variance for factors allowed analysis of a more generalized nature concerning the constructs of Consideration and Structure. The results for factors are presented in Table 4.

The analysis of variance statistic for twenty

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ITEMS BETWEEN LOW, MEDIUM, AND HIGH INFLUENCE TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS

ITEM		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	F RATIO
1. Attempts by the principal to encourage cooperation	Mean	2.64	3.22	3.54	3.10 *
	S.D.	1.22	1.80	1.77	
2. Principal's awareness of teachers efforts	Mean	2.98	3.83	3.90	3.18 *
	S.D.	1.78	2.14	2.06	
3. Prime consideration for decision making by principal	Mean	3.51	3.86	3.92	0.80
	S.D.	1.70	1.75	1.76	
4. Level of performance which principal seeks to have organization acheive	Mean	2.95	3.60	3.78	4.97 **
	S.D.	1.09	1.39	1.25	
5. Extent to which principal has confidence and trust in teachers	Mean	3.93	4.08	4.50	1.17
	S.D.	1.69	1.80	1.99	
6. Degree to which principal knows and understands problems faced by teachers	Mean	3.47	3.75	3.85	0.57
	S.D.	1.56	1.82	1.97	
7. Extent to which communications are accepted by teachers	Mean	2.95	3.51	3.60	1.89
	S.D.	1.68	1.83	1.75	
8. Extent to which principal shares information with teachers	Mean	4.07	4.41	4.50	0.58
	S.D.	1.58	2.16	1.96	
9. Direction of information flow	Mean	3.77	4.24	4.68	1.74
	S.D.	1.85	2.20	2.62	

TABLE 3 (Continued)

	ITEMS		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	F RATIO
10.	Psychological closeness of principal to teachers i.e.; friendliness between principal and teachers	Mean S.D.	3.55 1.56	3.94 2.09	4.15 2.06	1.03
11.	Amount and character of interaction between principal and teachers	Mean S.D.	2.89 1.50	3.51 1.98	3.51 2.10	1.93
12.	Extent to which teachers can influence the goals, and activities of their units and departments	Mean S.D.	3.61 1.59	4.01 1.76	3.95 2.12	0.89
13.	Character of planning. Manner in which it is usually done	Mean S.D.	3.91 1.29	4.01 1.49	3.76 1.42	0.52
14.	Level in organization where decisions formally made	Mean S.D.	5.04 1.82	5.42 1.99	5.48 2.14	0.15
15.	Extent to which principal displays supportive behavior toward teachers	Mean S.D.	3.91 1.70	4.04 1.92	3.83 1.63	0.27
16.	Type of communication between principal and teachers	Mean S.D.	3.93 1.96	3.94 1.96	3.95 2.14	0.76
17.	Extent to which teachers, have confidence and trust in principal	Mean S.D.	4.14 1.93	4.44 2.11	4.65 1.92	0.64
18.	Extent to which teachers feel free to discuss important things about their jobs with principal	Mean S.D.	2.95 1.45	3.56 1.83	3.50 2.21	1.94

TABLE 3 (Continued)

	ITEMS		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	F RATIO
19.	Extent to which principal, in solving problems generally tries to get and use teachers ideas and opinions	Mean S.D.	3.70 1.35	4.10 1.69	3.93 1.53	1.15
20.	Principal's influence in school district and central administration	Mean S.D.	3.60 1.55	3.96 1.50	4.30 1.54	2.14
21.	Degree to which one part of organization may influence other parts (non-professional staff, faculty, administration)	Mean S.D.	3.89 1.50	4.44 1.64	5.05 1.49	5.00 **
22.	Principal's view of collective negotiations	Mean S.D.	3.80 1.62	3.74 1.87	5.35 1.99	11.8 **
23.	Manner in which principal accepts, resists, or rejects change proposed by teachers	Mean S.D.	3.67 1.54	3.91 1.61	4.49 1.75	2.85
24.	Reasons for which data (test scores, pupil attendance, grades, comments from students and parents) are used	Mean S.D.	3.79 1.95	3.64 1.81	3.97 1.85	0.58
25.	When public controversy arises concerning teacher	Mean	3.28	3.37	4.56	5.60 **

TABLE 3 (Continued)

ITEMS		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	F RATIO
26. Principal's view of status and authority	Mean	5.10	4.81	5.03	0.52
	S.D.	1.86	1.95	1.76	
27. Operation of the school	Mean	5.88	5.24	4.80	2.36
	S.D.	2.20	2.34	2.32	
28. Consensus and the principal's action	Mean	3.26	3.55	3.98	0.38
	S.D.	1.95	1.99	2.00	
29. Description of the principal's actions	Mean	3.53	3.61	4.05	0.85
	S.D.	1.89	2.03	2.21	

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACTORS BETWEEN LOW, MEDIUM, AND HIGH INFLUENCE TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS

FACTOR		LOW (N=43)	MEDIUM (N=199)	HIGH (N=38)	F-Ratio
Factor I Supportive Relationships 2 Items	Mean	37.54	42.17	43.40	1.62
	S.D.	13.89	16.97	17.38	
Factor II Cooperation and Participation in Decision Making 4 Items	Mean	13.44	14.83	14.40	1.27
	S.D.	4.18	5.46	5.01	
Factor III Structure 7 Items	Mean	25.16	26.63	31.29	6.09**
	S.D.	7.62	8.52	9.00	

** Significant at the .01 level

three items indicated support for the hypothesis and six indicated rejection of the hypothesis of no difference. The F-ratio of Factor III - Structure was significant. Although there is a lack of conclusive rejection or non-rejection of the hypothesis, there seems to be more evidence in the analysis which supports non-rejection of the hypothesis.

The analysis of the factors of Consideration and Structure indicates that Structure was the only factor which was found to be significant. This finding is paradoxical since it tends to suggest that the difference found in teachers perceptions of administrative behavior between low, medium, and high influence teachers organizations is in terms of task organization and not Consideration or the interpersonal relations factor.

Secondary Analysis of the Data

Additional analysis of the data was attempted relating to the second research question. The data was analysed according to district size, previous involvement in a work stoppage, and the respondents school level - elementary or secondary.

For size of school districts, respondents were designated as belonging to small, medium, large, or huge school districts. For the purposes of this study, small districts are those having less than 1,225 public school students, medium districts are those with numbers of students between 1,226 and 2,150, large school districts are those having public school student populations between 2,151 and 4,700. and huge school districts are those with more than 4,700 public school students enrolled as of September, 1969.

The analysis of variance for items and factors were computed by school district size. There were six items with F-ratios significant at the five percent level and six items with F-ratios significant at the one percent level. The results are presented in Table 5.

Two factors were significant at the five percent level. These are Factor I - Supportive Behavior and Factor III - Structure. The results for factors are presented in Table 6. The small districts means were the lowest signifying favorable scores for principals. There was no pattern as to group scores, except that there was consistency in the rankings in all factors,

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIGNIFICANT ITEMS BETWEEN TEACHERS IN SMALL, MEDIUM, LARGE, AND HUGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

	ITEMS		SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	HUGE	F-Ratio
2.	Principal's awareness of teachers' efforts	Mean	2.96	4.13	3.93	3.56	3.40*
		S.D.	1.64	2.11	2.01	2.28	
4.	Level of performance which principal seeks to have organization achieve	Mean	3.13	3.75	3.80	3.29	4.06**
		S.D.	1.27	1.27	1.24	1.46	
5.	Extent to which principal has confidence and trust in teachers	Mean	3.60	4.72	3.99	4.02	4.16**
		S.D.	1.62	1.98	1.73	1.75	
8.	Extent to which principal shares information with teachers	Mean	3.98	5.06	4.37	4.02	4.14**
		S.D.	1.58	2.25	1.91	2.12	
10.	Psychological closeness of principal to teachers i.e.; friendliness between principal and teachers	Mean	3.38	4.03	3.65	4.32	2.87*
		S.D.	1.68	2.18	1.67	2.23	
17.	Extent to which teachers have confidence and trust in principal	Mean	3.64	5.13	4.30	4.38	5.26**
		S.D.	1.54	2.27	1.88	2.10	
20.	Principal's influence in school district and central administration	Mean	3.20	4.33	3.98	4.06	5.42**
		S.D.	1.18	1.38	1.40	1.78	

TABLE 5 (Continued)

ITEMS		SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	HUGE	F-Ratio
22. Principal's view of collective negotiations	Mean	3.74	4.30	4.33	4.49	3.29*
	S.D.	1.75	1.70	2.13	1.91	
24. Reasons for which data (test scores, pupil attendance, grades, comments from students and parents) are used	Mean	3.54	4.13	3.92	3.26	3.32*
	S.D.	1.66	1.98	1.84	1.72	
26. Principal's view of status and authority	Mean	5.28	4.42	4.77	5.15	2.68*
	S.D.	1.71	1.78	1.95	2.00	
27. Operation of the school	Mean	5.76	5.14	4.71	5.66	3.22*
	S.D.	2.44	2.14	2.40	2.25	
29. Description of the principal's actions	Mean	3.09	4.64	3.46	3.36	8.07**
	S.D.	1.71	2.21	1.82	1.99	

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACTORS BETWEEN
SMALL, MEDIUM, LARGE, AND HUGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

FACTOR		SMALL (N=44)	MEDIUM (N=68)	LARGE (N=82)	HUGE (N=86)	F-Ratio
Factor I Supportive Relationships 11 Items	Mean	36.25	46.06	40.50	41.94	3.35*
	S.D.	12.80	18.66	14.78	17.63	
Factor II Cooperation and Participation in Decision Making 4 Items	Mean	14.00	15.43	14.28	14.43	0.88
	S.D.	4.05	5.74	4.62	5.84	
Factor III Structure 7 Items	Mean	24.34	29.04	27.93	25.98	3.48*
	S.D.	7.55	9.16	7.94	8.90	

* Significant at the .05 level

the small districts having the lowest means and the medium districts having the highest. Analysis of the data by school district size indicated more items and factors with F-ratios falling within the critical area denoting some relationship between teachers' perceptions of administrative behavior and school district size.

The analysis of variance statistic was computed for items and factors between teachers of districts previously involved in a work stoppage and teachers in district not involved in a work stoppage. There were three items with T-values significant at the five percent level and one item with a T-value significant at the one percent level. The significant items are listed in Table 7. The item significant at the one percent level pertained to the principal's view of collective negotiations. Teachers in districts previously involved in a work stoppage had a mean of 4.64 and a standard deviation of 2.17 as compared with teachers in districts not involved in work stoppages with a mean of 3.69 and a standard deviation of 1.73.

The four significant items indicate teachers in districts with previous work stoppages as perceiving their principals as less willing to accept participation and shared authority than teachers in districts with no previous work stoppage.

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIGNIFICANT ITEMS BETWEEN TEACHERS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS PREVIOUSLY INVOLVED IN A WORK STOPPAGE AND TEACHERS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS NOT INVOLVED IN A WORK STOPPAGE

	ITEMS		INVOLVED	NOT INVOLVED	T-Ratio
22.	Principal's view of collective negotiations	Mean S.D.	4.64 2.17	3.69 1.74	3.70**
23.	Manner in which principal accepts, resists, or rejects change proposed by teachers	Mean S.D.	4.27 1.73	3.81 1.56	2.22*
26.	Principal's view of status and authority	Mean S.D.	5.30 2.08	4.68 1.80	2.50*
29.	Description of the principal's actions	Mean S.D.	3.28 1.88	3.84 2.08	2.15*

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

The analysis of variance for factors showed Factor III - Structure as significant at the five percent level. See Table 8.

The analysis of variance for significant items between teachers in elementary grades and secondary grades has but two items significant at the five percent level. See Table 9.

The favorable perceptions of elementary teachers concerning the amount and character of interaction between the principal and teachers may be explained partly by the general prevailing reality that elementary schools are usually smaller than secondary schools and the nature of the operation lends itself to closer interaction between principal and teachers. None of the factors had T-ratios in the critical range.

Summary of Secondary Analysis

In summary, the analysis of the data according to school district size, previous involvement or non-involvement in a work stoppage, and respondent's school level indicates that school district size has more items and factors of significance than any dimension analyzed. Twelve items and two of three factors had F-ratios in the critical range. This indicates that size of school

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACTORS BETWEEN TEACHERS
IN DISTRICTS PREVIOUSLY INVOLVED IN A WORK STOPPAGE AND
TEACHERS IN DISTRICTS NOT PREVIOUSLY INVOLVED IN A WORK STOPPAGE

FACTOR		INVOLVED (N=115)	NOT INVOLVED (N=165)	T-Ratio
Factor I Supportive Relationship 11 Items	Mean	41.46	41.70	.12
	S.D.	17.00	16.51	
Factor II Cooperation and Participation in Decision Making 4 Items	Mean	14.89	14.41	.70
	S.D.	5.95	4.87	
Factor III Structure 7 Items	Mean	28.56	26.34	2.01*
	S.D.	9.76	7.96	

* Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIGNIFICANT ITEMS BETWEEN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

	ITEMS		ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY	T-Ratio
11.	Amount and character of interaction between principal and teachers	Mean S.D.	3.21 1.87	3.71 2.00	2.14*
24.	Reasons for which data (test scores, pupils attendance, grades, comments from students and parents) are used	Mean S.D.	3.52 1.84	3.97 1.80	2.03*

* Significant at the .05 level

districts does have circumstances or factors operant that do affect the teachers' perceptions of administrative styles in ways that are significant.

The analysis of variance by factors for work stoppage involvement indicated Factor III - Structure as significant at the one percent level. This finding follows the results of the main research question where Factor III was found to be significant and the analysis of school district size where Factor III was also found to be significant.

The factors were not found to have any F-ratio in the critical range in terms of the teachers' school level. Only two items out of twenty nine were found to be significant in the analysis of the data according to the level of the teacher's school-elementary or secondary.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between perceptions of teachers of school principals and the degree of influence of teacher organizations in collective negotiations. A summary of the procedures and a summary of the findings are presented before the conclusions.

The instrument included twenty nine Likert type items on a nine point scale. The items included four factors as determined by orthogonal rotation in factor analysis. Three of the four factors contained eighty eight percent of the common variance and were labeled Factor I - Supportive Behavior (11 Items), Factor II - Cooperation and Participation (4 Items), and Factor III - Structure (7 Items).

The determination of degrees of influence of teachers organizations in collective negotiations involved the consultation of MEA and MFT officials to develop non-salary issues in negotiations deemed most significant and difficult to attain. Five issues were noted which were listed by officials of both organizations. Organizations having none or

one of the issues included in their master contracts were designated as "low" influence. Teacher organizations having two or three of the issues included in the master contracts were labeled "medium" influence. "High" influence was accorded teacher organizations having four or all five of the issues included in their master contracts.

Summary of Survey Procedures

The sample included four hundred seventy eight teachers from thirty three schools in seventeen Michigan school districts. The schools and districts were randomly selected. In schools with twenty or less teachers, all teachers were included in the study. In schools with more than twenty teachers on the faculty, fifteen teachers were randomly selected. The questionnaires were distributed through the mails in January, 1971 and returned by the end of February, 1971. There were two hundred ninety four returns (62%) of which two hundred eighty nine (95%) were usuable.

Summary of the Findings

The responses were analyzed employing the

analysis of variance statistic in a computerized program. The hypothesis stated in the null declares that there is no difference between perceptions of teachers of administrative style and degrees of influence of teacher organizations. The analysis of variance for all items of the instrument between low, medium, and high influence teacher organizations showed six out of twenty nine items with F-ratios significant at the five percent level or lower. Therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.

The responses of teachers in low influence teacher organizations had the lowest means in twenty three of twenty nine items which is interpreted to mean that teachers in low influence teacher organizations perceive their administrators in a more favorable manner than teachers in the medium or high influence organizations. In nineteen items the means of the low, medium, and high groups were low, medium, and high respectively. These results suggest that the level of influence of the teacher organization is inversly related to favorable perceptions of administrative style. The finding was not conclusive statistically.

The analysis of variance for the three factors

Supportive Relationships, Cooperation and Participation in Decision Making, and Structure, indicated that Factor III - Structure was the only factor with an F-ratio of significant probability. The low influence group had the lowest mean and standard deviation followed in order by the medium influence group and high influence group. This finding may suggest that groups contracting greater numbers of the criteria of influence may tend to be more critical of their principals in the performance of duties in the area of Structure. More generally, the finding may suggest the probability that success in collective negotiations in the five criteria influence has focused the teachers attention to the dimensions of Structure at this point in time.

The secondary research question involved analysis of the data according to size of school districts, involvement or non-involvement of the district in a work stoppage, and level of the teachers' school - elementary and secondary. The analysis concerning size of school district indicated twelve items with F-ratios in the critical range of five percent probability or lower. Two of the three factors were found

to have F-ratios significant at the five percent level. There was consistency in the ranking of the means of factors with the small districts always with the lowest or most favorable and the medium size school districts scoring the highest or least favorable perceptions of their principals' administrative style.

Extending the research into factors influencing size of school districts such as geo-economic conditions, rural-urban and geo-political considerations was not attempted. Further research in this area may prove fruitful in understanding differing perceptions of teachers.

Analysis of teachers responses according to previous involvement of the district in a work stoppage indicated four items found to have significant F-ratios. The four significant items seem to indicate that teacher in districts previously involved in a work stoppage perceive their principals as less willing to accept teacher participation and shared authority than teachers in districts never involved in a work stoppage. Factor III - Structure had a T-ratio significant at the five percent level.

Analysis if responses according to the level of

the teachers school - elementary or secondary showed only two significant T-ratios for items. No factors were found to be significant.

Conclusions

The non-rejection of the hypothesis may raise the question concerning the effect of winning demands concerning participation and shared authority on teacher-administrator relationships. Allowing teachers a role in the governance of the school via negotiations may not engender a feeling of cooperative effort between the teachers and administrators. The characteristics of a successful organization described as allowing for consideration or group maintenance and structure or task organization may not be enhanced through negotiated issues calling for shared authority.

This study is exploratory in nature and definitely pronounces the need to study aspects of collective negotiations and how it is affecting the relationship of teachers and administrators in the school organizations.

Suggestions for Further Research

Studies generally raise questions as well as provide some answers. In the course of this study some questions were generated which may be the subject of further research. The following are the more significant questions raised in the undertaking.

1. Does the structural organization of collective negotiations allow teachers the sense of involvement in the school's operation?

2. Do contractual agreements allow for meaningful participation?

3. How widespread is the feeling among teachers that they would like to have a larger role in the governance of the school?

4. Is their increased teacher interest or concern about the role and functions of the principal in the school?

5. What factors are significant in influencing teacher perceptions of administrative behavior?

APPENDIX A

ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE PROFILE

QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: On the line below each item, place an X at the point which, in your experience, describes your school at the present time. Treat each item as a continous variable from one extreme to the other.

1.	Attempts by the principal to encourage cooperation	Principal encourages cooperation and joins teachers in undertakings	Principal encourages cooperation	Principal desires cooperation but does not encourage it	Principal does not encourages cooperation and is not concerned about it
2.	Principal's awareness of teachers efforts	Principal encourages excellence in teachers efforts. Shows interest	Principal keeps informed of teacher effort	Principal is informed but places administration before teacher efforts	Principal knows little of teacher efforts. Does little to find out
3.	Prime consideration for decision making by principal	Considers what is best for children's education	Considers how teachers and children will react to decision	Considers how parents or public will react to decision	Considers most expedient way as basis for decision
4.	Level of performance which principal seeks to have organization achieve	Seeks and expects very high performance	Seeks and expects high performance	Seldom seeks and expects high performance	Does not seek nor expect high performance
5.	Extent to which principal has confidence and trust in teachers	Has little or no confidence and trust	Has condescending confidence and trust	Substantial but not complete confidence and trust	Complete confidence and trust in all matters
6.	Degree to which principal knows and understands problems faced by teachers	Knows and understands problems of teachers very well	Knows and understands problems of teachers quite well	Has some knowledge and understanding of problems of teachers	Has little or no knowledge or understanding of problems of teachers
7.	Extent to which communications are accepted by teachers	Generally accepted, but if not, openly and candidly questioned	Often accepted but, if not, may not be openly questioned	Some accepted and some viewed with indifference	Usually with indifference

8.	Extent to which principal shares information with teachers	Provides minimum of information	Gives teachers only information he feels they need	Gives information needed and answers most questions when asked	Seeks to give teachers all relevant information and all information they desire
9.	Direction of information flow	Mostly from the principal only	Mostly from teachers only	From principal to teachers and from teachers to principal	From principal to teachers, from teachers to principal, and from teachers to teacher
10.	Psychological closeness of principal to teachers i.e.; friendliness between principal and teachers	Usually very close	Fairly close	Can be moderately close if "proper roles" are kept	Far apart
11.	Amount and character of interaction between principal and teachers	Extensive, friendly interaction with high degree of sincerity	Moderate interaction, often with fair amount of sincerity	Little interaction and usually with some condescension by principal	Little interaction and limited to "favorites"
12.	Extent to which teachers can influence the goals, and activities of their units and departments	Nil, except through "informal groups" or cliques	Little except through "informal groups"	Moderate amount of influence possible	Substantial amount of influence possible
13.	Character of planing. Manner in which it is usually done	Except in emergencies, plans are usually established by means of group participation	Plans are set after discussion with teachers of problems and planned action	Plans are announced, opportunity to comment may or may not exist	Directives issued, comments discouraged

14.	Level in organization where decisions formally made	Bulk of decisions made by principal	Many decisions within prescribed framework made at departmental or grade level, approved by principal before action	Broad, general decisions by principal, more specific decisions made at departmental, grade level	Decision making spread throughout organization, along functional lines
15.	Extent to which principal displays supportive behavior toward teachers	Displays little or no supportive behavior	Displays supportive behavior in condescending manner and in certain situations only	Displays supportive behavior quite generally	Displays supportive behavior fully and in all situations possible
16.	Type of communications between principal and teachers	Concerned with tasks, formal and for official business only	Concerned with tasks primarily but includes some informal communication, officious	Concerned with tasks and informal activities, some what formal	Concerned with all aspects of school life. Informal
17.	Extent to which teachers, have confidence and trust in principal	Have little or no confidence and trust in principal	Have subservient confidence and trust, such as employee has to employer	Substantial but not complete confidence and trust	Complete confidence and trust
18.	Extent to which teachers feel free to discuss important things about their jobs with principal	Teachers feel completely free to discuss things about the job with the principal	Teachers feel rather free to discuss things about the job with the principal	Teachers do not feel very free to discuss things about the job with the principal	Teachers do not feel at all free to discuss things about the job with the principal
19.	Extent to which principal, in solving problems, generally tries to get and use teachers ideas and opinions	Always seeks ideas and opinions and tries to make constructive use of them	Usually gets ideas and opinions and usually tries to make constructive use of them	Sometimes gets ideas and opinions of teachers in solving problems	Seldom gets ideas and opinions of teachers in solving problems

20.	Principal's influence in school district and central administration	Principal is thought of highly and influences how things are done in the school district	Principal is respected and is able to influence how things are done to a certain degree	Principal is accepted and rarely influences how things are done in the school district	Principal not respected and has little or no influence in deciding how things are done
21.	Degree to which one part of organization may influence other parts (non-professional staff, faculty, administration)	Highly effective avenues exists enabling exercise of influence in all directions	Moderately effective avenues exists; influence exerted largely through departmental or grade level	Limited capacity exists; influence exerted largely via hierachical structure	Effective structure virtually not present
22.	Principal's view of collective negotiations	Principal views it as a harmful step backward. Vehicle to satisfy self interest	Principal views it as a necessary evil	Principal views it as a process doing more good than harm for education	Principal views it as a legitimate process to handle differences in education
23.	Manner in which principal accepts, resists, or rejects change proposed by teachers	Changes are rejected or resisted by principal	Changes are overtly accepted but are covertly resisted strongly by principal	Changes are overtly accepted but often covertly resisted to at least a moderate degree by principal	Changes are fully accepted both overtly and covertly by principal
24.	Reasons for which data (test scores, pupil attendance, grades, comments from students and parents) are used	Usually used for policing by principal	Used for policing coupled with praise or censure, used somewhat for guidance	Sometimes used for policing with emphasis usually on praise but with some censure; used for guidance	Used for self-guidance and/or for problem solving and evaluation
25.	When public controversy arises concerning teacher	Principal supports teacher publicly, confers with teacher	Principal supports teacher privately in conference	Principal takes neutral position	Principal takes board of education position

26.	Principal's view of status and authority	Authority and position status stressed	Status recognized, related to authority in hierachical structure	Status played down, authority delegated down hierarchy	Status and authority diffused along functional lines
27.	Operation of the school	Principal wants to know what is going on in the school at all times. Supervision constant	Principal wants to know what is going on generally. Supervises periodically	Principal keeps informed. Assigns supervision to assistant principals, department heads, etc.	Principal keeps informed, encourages individual teacher to take responsibility. Supervision loose
28.	Consensus and the principal's action	Principal attempts to achieve consensus before initiating action	Principal seeks but does not wait to gain consensus before action	Principal hopes for consensus but holds it secondary to action	Principal not concerned with gaining consensus before acting
29.	Description of the principal's actions	Principal is decisive and his position is readily recognized	Principal is decisive but cautious in selecting a position	Principal is cautious and wavers in his position	Principal shows little or no decisiveness in his actions and temporizes on most issues

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

2. Age: 22-25_____ 26-30_____ 31-40_____ 41-50_____

   51 or older _____

3. Marital Status: Married ____ Single ____ Divorced ____

   Widowed _____

4. Degree Held: Bachelors ____ Masters _____

   Doctorate _____

5. Teaching Experience: (Count this year as a full year)

   1-3 ____ 4-6_____ 7-15____ 16 or more _____

6. Do you have tenure? Yes _____ No _____

7. Membership in:

   Teacher Association ____ Teacher Federation ____

   Not a Member _____

8. Grade Teaching: K-3____ 4-6____ 7-9____ 10-12____

9. Secondary Teachers Only - Subject taught most of the day

   Language Arts ____ Social Studies ____

   Science ____ Math ____ Health & Phys. Ed. ____

   Music-Art ____ Vocational Educ. _____

   Foreign Lang. ____ Other _____
   Specify

10. Length of time you have worked under present principal

    1-3 Yrs. ____ 4-6 Yrs.____ 7 or more Yrs. ____

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN SAMPLE

January 5, 1971

Dear Superintendent _____:

The Central High, Maple Elementary, and Park Elementary schools in your district are among forty schools selected for a research study in the area of administrative style and collective negotiations. This study is under the direction of Dr. Frederick W. Bertolaet, Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, the University of Michigan.

The study is designed to investigate teacher perceptions of administrative style and collective negotiations. The data will include items in a brief questionnaire which will require about 10 to 15 minutes for a teacher to complete. All data will be held in the strictest confidence and the findings will be presented in a manner to assure anonymity of all respondents.

I can appreciate the heavy demands made on your time. Therefore, I am enclosing a packet of materials with instructions for the principals of Central High, Maple Elementary, and Park Elementary schools. These materials include envelopes for individual teachers which may be placed in their boxes.

I will call you within a week to answer any questions you may have. Your cooperation will be most gratefully received.

Yours truly,

Albert Y. Tamaribuchi
Mott Leadership Program
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS IN SAMPLE

Dear Principal:

Your school is one of forty selected in the state of Michigan for a research study in the area of administrative style and collective negotiations. The study is designed to investigate teacher perceptions of administrative style and collective negotiations.

The data will include items in a brief questionnaire which will require about 10 to 15 minutes for a teacher to complete. All data will be held in the strictest confidence and the findings will be presented to assure the anonymity of all respondents.

Please have one envelope placed in each individual teacher's box.

Your cooperation is gratefully received.

Yours truly,

Albert Y. Tamaribuchi
Mott Leadership Program
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO TEACHERS IN STUDY

Dear Teacher:

Your school is one of forty selected in the state of Michigan for a research study in the area of administrative style and collective negotiations. The study is designed to investigate teacher perceptions of administrative style and collective negotiations.

The data will include items in a brief questionnaire which will require about 10 to 15 minutes for a teacher to complete. All data will be held in strictest confidence and the findings will be presented in a manner to assure anonymity of all respondents. A code has been assigned to all questionnaires and envelopes solely to account for returns.

If you have any questions, please feel free to write to the following address:

Albert Y. Tamaribuchi
1228 McIntyre
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

Your cooperation will be gratefully received.

Yours truly,

Albert Y. Tamaribuchi

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

OF TOTAL SCORES

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL SCORES*

(N=199)

Score Interval	Frequency	Score Interval	Frequency
36-45	1	145-155	21
46-55	1	156-165	8
56-65	6	166-175	6
66-76	10	176-185	5
76-85	18	186-195	2
86-95	23	196-205	4
96-105	24	206-215	
106-115	21	216-225	
116-125	17	226-235	
126-135	18	236-245	
136-145	12	246-255	1

* 90 Returns were deleted for containing no response on one or more items

APPENDIX F

SUMMARY OF ITEMS RESPONSE

APPENDIX F

ITEM RESPONSE - NINE POINT SCALE*
(N=199)

		SCALE RESPONSES								
ITEM	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	3.27	32	39	54	27	25	14	4	2	2
2.	3.81	31	31	33	36	28	16	11	8	5
3.	3.95	20	25	36	40	40	23	11	2	2
4.	3.59	12	23	66	55	28	10	2	2	1
5.	4.12	9	31	41	40	34	24	11	6	3
6.	3.87	18	37	32	33	45	22	6	3	3
7.	3.59	18	58	31	23	37	18	10	3	1
8.	4.52	16	23	25	43	25	24	29	8	6
9.	4.34	10	40	40	24	27	17	16	16	9
10.	4.03	21	32	33	34	36	18	12	7	6
11.	3.59	18	58	37	38	13	9	13	9	4
12.	3.91	10	37	48	34	41	8	10	8	3
13.	3.95	6	28	46	52	32	26	9	0	0
14.	5.51	3	13	17	31	29	40	30	26	10

APPENDIX F (Continued)

		SCALE RESPONSES								
ITEM	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15.	4.12	14	29	35	40	38	20	15	4	4
16.	4.08	11	38	45	27	32	18	14	10	4
17.	4.59	8	25	41	29	34	21	19	10	12
18.	3.59	21	46	43	34	24	15	6	5	5
19.	4.06	7	23	52	47	34	20	10	4	2
20.	4.10	9	19	40	57	42	21	6	3	2
21.	4.52	3	15	35	44	54	32	8	4	4
22.	4.05	7	48	42	22	29	26	12	9	3
23.	3.99	5	33	49	42	37	16	11	4	2
24.	3.80	13	44	52	23	30	15	11	8	3
25.	3.70	19	59	35	21	21	15	16	8	4
26.	4.85	5	23	32	18	31	55	24	6	5
27.	5.21	6	30	27	12	15	41	32	27	9
28.	3.64	14	65	32	27	22	20	6	8	4
29.	3.79	22	44	40	33	20	11	11	12	6

* 90 Returns Deleted For Containing No Response on one or more items

APPENDIX G

DISCRIMINATING ABILITY OF ITEMS

APPENDIX G

DISCRIMINATING ABILITY OF ITEMS*

(N=199)

ITEM	UPPER N=66	LOWER N=66	DIFFERENCE
1.	4.68	1.95	2.73
2.	5.42	2.21	3.21
3.	5.21	2.79	2.42
4.	4.36	2.76	1.61
5.	5.77	2.64	3.14
6.	5.47	2.32	3.15
7.	5.27	2.23	3.05
8.	6.36	2.86	3.50
9.	6.18	2.86	3.32
10.	5.95	2.41	3.55
11.	5.76	2.11	3.65
12.	5.05	2.85	2.20
13.	4.86	3.03	1.83
14.	6.45	4.38	2.08
15.	5.89	2.59	3.30
16.	5.83	2.64	3.20
17.	6.73	2.61	4.12

APPENDIX G (Continued)

ITEM	UPPER N=66	LOWER N=66	DIFFERENCE
18.	5.48	2.18	3.30
19.	5.41	2.94	2.47
20.	5.08	3.26	1.82
21.	5.39	3.64	1.76
22.	5.39	2.80	2.59
23.	5.20	2.86	2.33
24.	5.08	2.53	2.55
25.	5.55	2.18	3.36
26.	5.55	3.82	1.73
27.	4.85	5.15	- 0.30
28.	4.71	2.80	1.91
29.	5.42	2.38	3.05

* 90 Returns deleted for containing no response on one or more items

APPENDIX H

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF RESPONDENTS

APPENDIX H

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF RESPONDENTS

1. Sex: Male 83 Female 197 No Response (NR) 9
2. Age: 22-25 74 26-30 61 31-40 50 41-50 40
   51 or older 54 NR 10
3. Marital Status: Married 208 Single 57
   Divorced 5 Widowed 9 NR 10
4. Highest Degree Attained: Bachelors 197 Master 79
   Specialists 2 NR 11
5. Teaching Experience: (Count this year as a full year)
   1-3 93 4-6 56 7-15 67 16 or more 64
   NR 9
6. Do you have tenure? Yes 187 No 93 NR 9
7. Membership in: Teacher Association 247
   Teacher Federation 5 Both 18
   Not a member 10 NR 9
8. Grade Teaching: K-3 88 4-6 74 7-9 41
   7-12 2 10-12 73 NR 11
9. Subject taught most of the day - (Secondary Teachers Only)
   Language Arts 26 Social Studies 17
   Science 10 Math 15 Health & Phys. Ed. 9
   Music Art 11 Vocational Educ. 16
   Foreign Lang. 2 Other 11
10. Length of time you have worked under present principal
    1-3 Yrs. 189 4-6 Yrs. 57
    7 or more Yrs. 34 NR 9

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

Argyris, Chris Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between Systems and the Individual. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Barnard, Chester I. Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Bassett, Glenn A. Management Styles in Transaction. American Management Association. The Book Press, Inc., 1966.

Blake, Robert R. and Mouton, Jane S. The Managerial Grid. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company, 1962.

Blau, Peter M. and Scott, W. Richard Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Blum, Albert A. Teachers Unions and Association. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1969.

Campbell, Roald F., Cunningham, Luvern L., and McPhee, Roderick F. The Organizational and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.

Carlton, Patrick W. and Goodwin, Harold I. The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles E. Jones Publishing Co., 1969.

Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin (eds.) Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, Second Edition. Evanston, Illinois: How Peterson and Company, 1960.

Charters, W.W., Jr. Teachers Perception of Administrators Behavior. Cooperative Research Project No. 929, USOE, 1964.

Collins, Barry E. and Guetzow, Harold A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision-Making. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Doherty, Robert T. (ed.) Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools. New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., January, 1967.

Elam, Stanley M., Lieberman, Myron, and Moskow, Michael H. (eds.) Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.

Fleishman, E.A., Harris, E.E., and Burtt, H.E. Leadership and Supervision in Industry: An Evaluation of a Supervisory Training Program, Bureau of Educational Research Monogram, No. 33, Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1955.

Gage, N.L. (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Gordon, Thomas Group-Centered Leadership. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1955.

Griffiths, Daniel E. (ed.) Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1964, Pt.II.

Gross, Neal and Herriott, Robert E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Gulich, Luther and Urwick, L. (eds.) Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Insitute of Public Administration. 1937.

Halpin, Andrew W. and Croft, Don B. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1962.

Heisel, W.D. and Hallinhan, J.D. Questions and Answers on Public Employee Negotiation. Public Personnel Association, Chicago, 1967.

Herzberg, Frederick, Mauser, Bernard and Snyderman, Barbara Black The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

Kuhn, James "The Scope of Negotiations," Teacher-Administrator-School Board Relationships. Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitian Area. Inc., and the Department of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota, January, 1967.

Lieberman, Myron and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations for Teachers. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

Likert, Rensis New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Likert, Rensis The Human Organizations: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Lutz, Frank W. and Azzarelli, Joseph J. Struggle for Power in Education. Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., New York, 1966.

Lutz, Frank W., Kleinman, Lon and Evans, Sy Grievance and Their Resolution. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publications, Inc., 1967.

March, James G. (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.

March, James G. and Simon, Herbert G. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Marrow, Alfred J., Bowers, David G. and Seashore, Stanley E. Management by Participation: Creating A Climate for Personnel and Organizational Development. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

McGregor, Douglas The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1954.

Metcalf, Henry C. and Urwick, Lyndall Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follet. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.

Redfern, George Improving Principal - Faculty Relationships. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Roethlisberger, Fritz J. and Dickson, William J. Management and the Worker: An Account of a Research Program, Conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Stinnet, T.M., Kleinmann, Jack H. and Ware, Martha L. Professional Negotiation in Public Education. MacMillan Company, New York, 1966.

Stogdill, Ralph M. and Coons, Alvin E. (eds.) Leader Behavior: Description and Measurement. Columbus, Ohio, State University, 1957.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Social Psychology of the Work Organization. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S. and Smith, Claggett G. Control In Organization. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1968.

Taylor, Frederick W. Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947.

Vroom, Victor H. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Weber, Max The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, edited with and introduction by Talcott Parsons, New York: Oxford University Press, Inc. 1947.

Wiles, Kimball Supervision for Better Schools. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Witney, Fred Government and Collective Bargaining. Lippincott Company, Chicago, 1951.

PERIODICALS AND ARTICLES

Anderson, James G. "Bureautic Rules: Bearess of Organizational Authority," Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 1, Winter, 1966.

Argyris, Chris "Organizational Leadership and Participation in Management, The Journal of Business, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1955.

Bridges, Edward M. "Teacher Participation in Decision Making." Administrator's Notebook. Vol. 12, May, 1964.

Brown, Alan F. and Anderson, Barry D. "Faculty Consensus as a Function of Leadership Frequency and Style," Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. 32, No. 2, Winter, 1967.

Brown, Alan F. and House, John H. "The Organizational Component in Education," Review of Educational Research, October, 1967.

Button, H. Warren "Doctrines of Administration: A Brief History," Educational Administration Quarterly. Vol. 2, No. 3, Autumn, 1966.

Chase, Francis S. "The Teacher and Policy Making." Administrator's Notebook. Vol. 1, May, 1952.

Cunningham, Luvern "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship," Theory Into Practice. VII, April, 1968.

Corwin, Ronald G. "Professional Persons in Public Organizations," Educational Administration Quarterly. Vol. I, No. 3, Autumn, 1965.

Erickson, Donald E. "The School Administrator," Review of Educational Research. Vol. 37, No. 4, October, 1967.

Fleishman, Edwin G. and Harris, Edwin F. "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology. Vol. 15, 1962.

Getzels, J.S. and Guba, E.G. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review. LXV, Winter, 1957.

Glass, Ronald "Work Stoppages and Teachers: History and Prospect," Monthly Labor Review.

Gollman, Harvey and Heald, James E. "Teacher Expectation of Administrative Behavior," Educational Administrative Quarterly. Vol. 4, Autumn, 1968.

Lewin, Kurt and Lippitt, Ronald "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy: A Preliminary Note," Sociomentry. January-April, 1938, Vol. 1. Nos. 3 & 4.

McEwan, William J. "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 1, September, 1956.

Miller, Delmas "A Message from President Miller," WASSP Newsletter, National Association of Secondary School Principal, March-April, 1968, Vol. 15, No. 4.

Parsons, Talcott "The Professions and the Social Structure," Social Forces. Vol. 17, May, 1939.

Peabody, Robert L. "Perceptions of Organizational Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly, VI, March, 1962.

Perry, Charles A. and Wildman, Wesley A. "A Survey of Collective Activity Among Public School Teachers," Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. II No 2, Spring, 1966.

Taylor, George W. "The Public Interest In Collective Negotiation in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 48, No. 1, Sept, 1966.

Watson, Bernard C. "The Principal-Forgotten Man in Negotiations," Administrator Notebook, Vol. 15, No. 2, October, 1966.

Watson, Bernard C. "The Role of the Principal in Collective Negotiations," North Central Quarterly Review. Winter, 1968.

Wildman, Wesley A. and Perry, Charles R. "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1966.

UNPUBLISHED

Erickson, Kenneth H. "An Analysis of Organization Climate Scores in Thirty-three Schools Before and After Collective Negotiations," Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, the University of Michigan, 1969.

Phelps, James L. "Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining Goals in Education," Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, the University of Michigan, 1970.

Steele, Marilyn H. "Has Collective Bargaining Contributed to Instructional Improvements in Michigan Schools?" Unpublished dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.