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This study investigated the impact that a middle management bargaining union had on the function of the management team concept as perceived by selected elementary school principals and selected superintendents of schools in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties in the state of Michigan. Perceptions were solicited from (a) school superintendents employed in school districts where a middle management bargaining unit exists, and (b) elementary principals in the same school districts who held membership in the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association. The objective of the study was to provide insights as to the impact that a middle management bargaining union had on the function of the management team. The major issues involving the impact of a middle management bargaining union on the function of the management team were communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition.

A self-designed instrument sought perceptions on the major issues via fourteen sub-variables. The surveys for superintendents and elementary principals were mailed.
the 180 surveys distributed, 76.0% were returned. Resultant data were analyzed by (a) the respondent's administrative position, (b) the years of experience at that level, and (c) the K-12 enrollment of the school district.

The primary hypothesis was that there is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact a middle management had on the function of the management team concept. It was concluded that superintendents of schools held different perceptions as to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team in the areas of communications, interpersonal relations, decision making, and role definition.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

With the enactment of Michigan Public Act 379 into law in 1965, public employees in the state of Michigan were granted the right to organize and bargain collectively in the areas concerned with wages, hours and other conditions of employment. During those early years of bargaining, teachers appeared to make significant improvements in wages and working conditions.

Several reports (Anderson, 1969, 1970; Barea, 1977a; Barea, 1977b; Butkiewicz, 1975; Coccia, 1977; Redfern, 1972) indicate that as teachers achieved improvements in working conditions, principals believed their authority was eroded. Middle level managers perceived themselves as having few opportunities for input into teacher negotiations and district policy decisions. Compounding this dilemma, principals were faced with reductions of authority as mandated by the courts and by arbitrators. Principals believed that they were increasingly in the position of having jobs which were being directed by the labor agreements of other employee groups (Barea, 1977a). As a result of the perceived loss of administrative authority,
and with the removal of legal restraints which prohibited public school administrator collective bargaining, a number of middle level administrators chose to actively negotiate signed agreements with boards of education (Cooper, 1979). Interestingly, of the administrator groups initiating formal bargaining procedures, the greatest number consisted of elementary principals (Smith, 1973b). While recognizing that there could be complex explanations for this, it could be attributed to their perceptions concerning the amount of authority they lost due to teacher bargaining.

According to Gabbert (1982) the sudden rise in middle management unionism, resulted in superintendents and school boards becoming seriously concerned about this trend. The sharp increase in middle management activism posed a serious threat to the authority, control and power of school boards and superintendents.

To discourage unionization, a team management concept was offered as a viable alternative (Rowedder, 1980). The concept was well received as readers were inundated with countless articles in professional journals. The concept gained further credibility, and its chances for implementation were improved when, many professional educational administrator organizations adopted positions of support for the team management concept (Cawelti, 1978).

As the phenomenon of middle management unionization
spread, and the development of the team management concept grew, many school districts were potentially in the awkward position of attempting to implement a team approach while middle management unionization proceeded. While superintendents were promulgating the district's commitment to a management team concept, privately they both feared and assumed that administrators who negotiate would be as militant as some members of teacher associations (Smith, 1973b). Adding to this concern was the available literature which addressed the issue. Reports by Anderson (1969, 1970), Cooper (1976), Knoester (1978), Salmon (1972), Sinclair (1977), and Smith (1973b, 1973c), indicated that middle management collective bargaining was incompatible with a management team approach.

Offering a contradictory point of view, Alexander (1971), Barea (1977b), and McGinley and Rafferty (1973), indicated that middle management unions did not diminish the effectiveness of the team management concept. Some went so far as to state that the bargaining process played a vital role in enhancing the level of input principals had in matters concerning school district policies and procedures.

Despite claims from both sides of the issue, Gabbert (1982) and Knoester (1978) reported that the limited research regarding the impact that school administrator associations had on the management team concept, was
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inadequate to support either of the extreme viewpoints.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact that a middle management bargaining union had on the function of the management team concept as perceived by selected elementary school principals and selected superintendents of schools in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties in the State of Michigan.

A study conducted by the Educational Research Service in 1976 advanced five reasons for the trend toward middle management unionization:

1. The erosion of middle management authority through teacher negotiation.
2. The lack of middle management impact in decision making.
3. The inadequate middle management communication with the superintendent and the board.
4. The unclear role definition for middle managers.
5. The absence of improvement in middle managers' salaries and fringe benefits.

Since the basic principles of the management team concept appear to address such issues as those listed in the Educational Research Report, the question of compatibility between the middle manager union and the management team concept still exists.
This investigation focused on the perceptions of selected elementary school principals and selected superintendents in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties in the State of Michigan. Also examined was the perceptions of the impact that a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept. Information was gathered through a mailed questionnaire of randomly selected superintendents and elementary principals who held membership in the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association (MEMSPA) and who were members of a middle management union in their school district from Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties.

The questionnaire attempted to determine whether a middle management union had a perceived impact on the management team concept in the areas of communications, interpersonal relations, decision making, and role definition, as viewed by selected elementary principals and superintendents. Attitudinal differences between superintendents and principals regarding the management team concept and middle management unions were examined. In addition, attitudinal differences between superintendents and between principals were investigated. These were based on years of experience in the position and the student enrollment of the school district.

In an investigation of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act, Else (1977) reported that superintendents
in larger school systems as well as superintendents with the most experience tended to view the impact of teacher bargaining more negatively than their counterparts in smaller districts as well as their counterparts with less experience as superintendents.

Since Else's study indicated some attitudinal differences based on district size and years of positional experience toward teacher bargaining, it raised the questions as to whether middle management bargaining was perceived similarly. Would the perceptions of members of middle management unions vary, based on the size of the district or years of experience as middle managers?

For the purpose of this study, the following questions were selected for investigation:

1. What are the perceptions of superintendents as compared with principals toward the middle management union, and its impact on the function of the management team concept specifically in the areas of communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition.

2. What are the perceptions toward the middle management union, and its impact on the function of the management team concept specifically in the areas of communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition of: (a) Superintendents with more experience as superintendents compared with
superintendents with less experience as superintendents?  
(b) Principals with more experience as principals compared with principals with less experience as principals?  

3. What are the perceptions toward the middle management union, and its impact on the function of the management team concept specifically in the areas of communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition of: (a) Superintendents in districts with a larger school district enrollment as compared with superintendents in districts with a smaller school district enrollment? (b) Principals in districts with a larger school district enrollment as compared with principals in districts with a smaller school district enrollment?  

Significance of Study  

Although there has been much speculation as to the impact a middle management union has on the management team concept, many questions remain empirically unanswered. As stated earlier, there is limited research available on this topic to support either extreme viewpoint. Since research findings, which might support various hypotheses, are difficult to find, more investigation appears to be needed. Given several national commission reports on the quality of education being offered in the United States today, it seems imperative that the various
managerial levels of public education need to work in close harmony to resolve those identified issues.

This study is important for the following reasons:

1. Districts can use the findings to reflect on the existing relationship between the middle management union and the management team concept in their school district, and act accordingly.

2. The findings can provide school boards, superintendents and principals with a greater understanding of the human dynamics involved when a district has a middle management union and attempts to operate from a management team concept.

3. The findings can serve as a catalyst for producing further study in the area of middle management unions.

Explanations and/or Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, and to provide a common basis of understanding, the terms used are explained or defined as follows:

Administrator association: The term administrator association is used interchangeably with the term middle management bargaining union.

Administrative team: The term "administrative team" is used interchangeably with the term "management team."

Chief executive officers: This term is used
interchangeably with the term "superintendents of schools."

**Communications:** The term communications is used to refer to the direction of verbal or written exchange of information between middle managers and their superordinates as a result of the formation of a middle management bargaining unit.

**Decision-making:** The term "decision making" refers to the degree of influence and involvement that middle managers have in the process of making decisions.

**Interpersonal relations:** The state or nature of the relationships developed between the middle managers and their superordinates.

**Management team concept:** An organizational pattern in which all levels of administration have a share in the authority or policy interpretation and organizational matters.

**Middle management:** School employees who have been employed by the board of education as administrators below the rank of superintendent and assistant superintendent and who hold teacher certification in the state of Michigan.

**Middle management bargaining union:** An association of middle managers who have organized either through official certification through the Michigan Employment Relations Commission, or through recognition granted by
the local board of education of a school district, for the purposes of bargaining wages, hours and other conditions of employment.

**Principals with less experience as principals:** Those individuals who have been employed 14 years or less as an elementary principal.

**Principals with more experience as principals:** Those individuals who have been employed 15 years or more as an elementary principal.

**Public Act 379:** A statute passed by the Michigan Legislature and enacted into law which granted public employees the right to organize and bargain collectively in the areas of wages, hours and other working conditions.

**Role definition:** The function to which an individual is assigned and held responsible for.

**School districts with a larger enrollment of students:** Those school systems where the full time equivalent enrollment is 6,000 students or more according to the 1985 *Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide*.

**School districts with a smaller enrollment of students:** Those school systems where the full time equivalent enrollment is less than 6,000 students according to the 1985 *Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide*.

**Superintendents with less experience as superintendents:** Those individuals who have been employed seven years or less as superintendent of schools.
Superintendents with more experience as superintendents: Those individuals who have been employed eight years or more as superintendent of schools.

Team: The term "team" refers to the management team.

Limitations

For the purpose of conducting this investigation, this study was limited to a random sample of elementary principals who hold membership in the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association (MEMSPA) and superintendents of Schools in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties in the state of Michigan. The persons surveyed were employed by public school districts where some form of a middle management union exists.

MEMSPA members were chosen for this study because it is the largest organization representing the greatest number of elementary principals in the state. Within the organization, numerous debates were held as to the appropriateness of middle management bargaining. It is recognized that principals who were not members of MEMSPA and were not included in this study might have different perceptions.

The study obtained the perceptions of superintendents and elementary principals. It was not determined to what extent respondents differed in terms of knowledge and experience relating to the impact of middle management...
bargaining on the function of the management team. The findings are accurate to the extent that the respondents were likely to complete the questionnaire on the basis of their experiences, beliefs and attitudes as well as their understanding of the variables.

Based on the adoption of resolutions supporting the management team concept by the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association, the national affiliates of the Michigan Association of School Administrators and the Michigan School Boards Association, (Cawelti, 1978) it was assumed that the districts fitting the conditions stated above, were advocates of some form of the management team concept in their respective districts.

An additional limitation is the exclusion of the Detroit public schools. Due to the very small percentage of Detroit elementary principals belonging to MEMPSA, a sampling from these members was not representative to the district's principals. It is recognized that the inclusion of this group might have influenced the findings of this study.

Another limitation of this study involves the review of the literature. This researcher did not attempt to review the history of unions. Additionally no attempt was made to find information which would support or refute that the causes for establishing middle management unions
in K-12 public education were similar to those resulting in the formation of middle management unions in industry or other settings.

Lastly, it is recognized that the research methodology and process selected for this study has inherent weaknesses, as do other methodologies, and consequently must be a study limitation.

Overview

The purpose of this chapter has been to state the problem, the questions for investigation, the definition of terms, the limitations and the organization of this dissertation. Reviewed in Chapter II are the available literature, studies and testimony. A review of the problem, the sample, the instrumentation and procedures used in this study are reviewed in Chapter III. The report of the findings is included in Chapter IV and Chapter V consists of a summary of the study, conclusions, implications and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Since the inception of middle management unions and the management team approach, varying opinions have arisen as to the impact administrator unions have had on the management team concept. It appears that much of the discussion is based on emotional rather than empirical data.

Reviewed in this chapter is the literature pertaining to: (a) causes of middle management unionization, (b) the management team concept, and (c) the effects of administrator unionization.

Causes of Middle Management Unionization

The causes for the establishment of administrative unions in public schools have not been extensively studied, despite the apparent, rapid increase in the number of administrative unions in the 1970s. Gabbert (1982) reported that only a limited number of researchers have studied the causes. Despite the limited number of research, many reasons have been suggested for the formation of middle management unions. While Redfern (1972)
believed that no single cause could be credited as the reason for the development of the administrator union, the erosion of authority resulting from the contractual outcomes of teacher negotiations was the most cited reason (Anderson, 1969, 1970; Barea, 1977a; Bridges & Cooper, 1976; Butkiewicz, 1975; Coccia, 1977; McNally, 1973; Redfern, 1972; Smith, 1972, 1973b; and Wagstaff, 1973).

Anderson (1969) reported that principals were largely ignored in teacher negotiations. One reason suggested was the apparent typical utilization of a downward only approach to communications. As a result of one way communication, Smith (1973b) discovered low morale to be a contributing factor toward the push for unionization. Contributing further to low morale, principals believed they had little or no impact in the decision making process. Smith believed this perception was the primary stimulus for encouraging the birth of administrator bargaining units in Michigan.

Butkiewicz (1975), meanwhile, determined the working conditions of principals in the 1970s to be quite similar to those of the teachers in the 1950s and 1960s. He identified three phenomena which abetted the movement toward administrator unions. Like their peers in the classroom, principals had a strong desire for improved wage and fringe benefits. In a comparison with managers in the private sector, principals were generally underpaid
in relation to their counterparts. Adding to the dilemma was the decreasing salary differential between teachers and principals, and the perception of principals that their responsibilities and the increased amount of time they worked should result in wider differentials. Another significant factor was the increasing percentage of males moving into administration. Butkiewicz reported that the militant teachers of the 1960s tended more often to be males and were now becoming the principals of the 1970s. This apparently led to a greater degree of administrator militancy. Consequently, principals were demanding a greater voice in the policy formation of the school district. After the formation of teacher unions, principals perceived they had little input in this area.

As researchers began investigating causes, the list of reasons for union formation expanded. Alexander (1971) found that principals believed they had little support from top level administration. Middle managers believed there was a need for being heard. Bargaining was viewed to be one tool which could force this to happen. Alexander also discovered a shift in the attitudes of state and national professional organizations. Whereas in the past these organizations were viewed as little more than social groups, new attitudes began to emerge. These groups called for their membership to have a greater voice and more participation in the affairs of the respective
school districts. To insure that membership had a greater voice, Dempsey (1975) pointed out both state and national professional organizations took more initiative. They began to offer stronger support to the membership by providing greater resources with regard to collective bargaining.

Adding credence to Alexander's findings, Coccia (1977) reported that principals were more often than not, rarely consulted on matters for which they were held accountable. He indicated that principals were typically ignored in the areas of district policies and procedures particularly in the realm of teacher negotiations.

Addressing the issue in a different manner, Smith (1973b) suggested poor morale as a common denominator found throughout the reasons given for initiating administrator unions. Smith's work revealed that teacher contracts created numerous problems for principals. Principals were in the awkward position of having to administer contracts while having no part in the creation of them. Despite being told they were important members of the team, time after time, decisions were made without their involvement (Smith, 1973b). This appeared to be a critical issue as his efforts revealed that principals wanted to be regarded as part of the team. They wanted to be involved in the decision making process of the school district particularly as it regarded decisions they were
charged to administer.

Offering a similar view, McNally (1973) pointed out that teacher bargaining resulted in role confusion and a sense of uncertainty among principals. It was his opinion that to a degree this was caused through the customary practice of leaving principals out of the bargaining process. Principals were reported to believe that various teacher contract provisions constituted significant inroads on their administrative authority and prerogatives. This apparently led to the perception that they were being bypassed in the process and were not being valued as members of the administrative team. As a result of bilateral decisions being made by school boards and teacher unions, principals were encouraged to alleviate this exclusion through the protection of a collective bargaining unit (Pisapia & Sells, 1978). This was viewed as a way of maintaining the principals' position in both the decision making and policy formation processes of the district.

The American School Board Journal (1976) reported that one rather bitter Michigan principal commented:

School boards and their mouthpiece superintendents had their chance to win us over and they flubbed it. They've given us volumes of empty talk about our being "managers", but absolutely no real authority to manage anything. They've left us alone and unsupported, while they've signed away everything to the teachers. And they've done it all directly--hardly even consulting us. Now they don't just want us to live with their actions; they actually expect us to
enforce them. For principals, the handwriting on the wall is in capital letters. It says: FORM YOUR OWN TOUGH UNION OR DIE ON THE VINE. (p. 25)

This commentary tended to support the work of Sweeney and Rowedder (1980). They proposed that the crux of the issue was a breakdown in communication between boards of education, superintendents and middle managers. It was their opinion that collective bargaining was viewed as a tool to more clearly define the principal's involvement in decision making, to open lines of communication with the superintendent and board of education. Lastly, they saw the process as helping the middle managers reach a clearer definition of their role in the school district.

Others such as Hinman (1976) listed improved job security as a major reason for administrators forming a union. Coinciding with this, Shannon (1980) saw the increasing impact of declining enrollment as a factor in the move toward middle management unionism. He indicated this to be a two dimensional problem. First, any reduction in the number of school age children could possibly lead to a decline in the promotion opportunities of administrators. Secondly, declining enrollment could have a negative impact on the actual number of middle management level positions in a specific district.

Bridges and Cooper (1976) identified several basic elements which they believe provided an incentive for initiating middle management unions. Bridges and Cooper
suggested that a period of inflation or rapid rise in the
cost of living in conjunction with a decrease in adminis­
trators' standard of living could possibly stimulate the
interest in unionization. They also pointed out that a
negative organizational climate could play a role in the
movement toward unionism, that is, a climate characterized
by mistrust and frustration. Community complaints and
harassment of school administrators were viewed as reasons
for seeking protection under a union contract. Without
this safeguard, some questioned the effectiveness of the
principal due to their vulnerability to pressure groups
and top management (Cooper, 1975b).

Specifically in Michigan, several grievances were
listed which tended to promote principal disenchantment
with nonunion conditions. After some informal research,
William Mays, Executive Secretary of the Michigan Asso­
ciation of Elementary School Principals in a speech to the
Michigan Association of School Administrators in January,
1977, identified specific reasons for the disillusionment
of school principals: (a) teacher contracts which denied
the accumulation of seniority for administrators, (b)
public chastisement of administrators, (c) failure to
achieve contracts on a timely basis, (d) lack of due
process in regard to discipline of administrators in the
reduction of personnel, (e) low salary increases, and (f)
the turn-over of school superintendents and boards of
education.

Whereas the major concerns of members of the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals, as perceived by Mays, focused on economic issues and job security, the Michigan Congress of School Administrators offered a different opinion. The results of a 1971 survey of administrative bargaining units in Michigan public schools, advanced three reasons for the formation of middle management unions: (a) the erosion of administrative authority, (b) inadequate communication with local boards of education and the superintendent of schools, and (c) the problem of unclear role definition and uncertain job responsibility (McNally, 1973). Going beyond these issues, the report issued a rather interesting conclusion to its investigation. The study proposed that the key factor in the creation of a middle management union was the superintendent of schools. According to McNally (1973) the Congress concluded the chief executive officer is the person who establishes the degree of trust, the degree of participation, the extent that open communications have been nurtured and the effectiveness of the communication within the system.

The Management Team Concept

Since the management team concept was identified as a means of diffusing the movement toward middle management unions, varying ideas regarding this topic have been
offered. While this issue had been discussed in numerous professional journals relating to school administration, proponents seemingly were unsuccessful in reaching a consensus as to what constitutes the management team. Whether it is referred to as the "administrative team" the "leadership team" or the "management team," Rowedder (1980) reported that few authors have been able to concur on a specific definition of the term.

Erikson and Rose (1973) identified team management as the framework from which a group of people "engage together, in tasks of management" (p. 4). McNally (1973) saw the framework of the team consisting of administrative/supervisory personnel comprised of both central office and middle level managers. In his opinion, the management team must not only be recognized by the board of education and superintendent, it must also be granted expressly stated responsibilities, as well as have the opportunity to participate in the district's decision making process.

Others, meanwhile, wrote of the concept in terms of some of its characteristics. Anderson (1969) stated that the management team suggests a pattern of close working relationships among and between administrators at all levels. He believed the association between the different levels needed to involve more than mere casual contacts. Further, Anderson (1970) indicated the team needs to be a
collaboration of school personnel working together for the purposes of facing and resolving school problems. Redfern (1972) reported that in addition to the successful team having to be carefully conceived and soundly designed, the structure of the group should be comprised of administrators and supervisors at all levels. The team must also have the ability to influence the system's decision making in two ways: (a) Members must be free to initiate agenda items and proposals, and (b) the team should have direct input in the final administrative deliberations which result in operational policies and procedures.

Complementing Redfern's views, Swift (1971) commented that:

Team management is more than just the infusion of football spirit. It is an organizational pattern in which administrators share power and responsibilities with each other and with subordinates. The hierarchy gains commitment, identification and flexibility while subordinates gain power, even autonomy, in their particular domain. (p. 26)

Boles (1975), meanwhile, commented that the "concept infers an involvement of administrators at all levels in planning, implementing and decision making when such activities directly affect the professional responsibilities of those who comprise the team" (p. 73). Further developing the idea, Boles recommended the use of Management By Objectives (M.B.O.) as the appropriate means for implementing the management team concept.

Menz (1973), more specifically, proposed several
characteristics which a management team must include. To be effective, a team must have:

1. Decentralization of authority.
2. Written job descriptions for each team member.
3. Clearly stated goals and objectives.
4. Team and individual evaluation based on performance objectives previously stated and mutually arrived at.
5. Good working relationships with peers, subordinates and superiors.
6. Effective communication to resolve differences and to insure general consensus and unified support.
7. Solid team support of and by the superintendent.

Most important, once a decision is reached, all team members must support the action and make positive contributions toward its success regardless of personal feelings.

8. A reasonably consistent pattern of involving team members in the decision making process.

As a result of the emergence of the management team concept, various professional organizations began to address the issue. Eventually associations adopted position statements regarding the team concept. One of the first organizations to develop and adopt a position concerning the topic was the National Association of Elementary School Principals. In a national meeting conducted in Detroit, Michigan, in 1973, the assembly representing
the general membership approved the following resolution:

Each community has a right to demand quality leadership from the total administrative staff. The administrative team concept is a promising approach for providing this leadership. The administrative team, consisting of elementary school principals and other administrators, is a formally-constituted de jure body of administrators who exercise collaboratively all the administrative functions: goal setting, organizing, planning, communicating, decision-making, coordinating, and evaluating. However, with rare exceptions, it does not direct programs within specific administrative jurisdictions. NAESP believes this concept is more than an organizational system for shared management and decision-making. It establishes a humanistic climate in which people are able to experience a feeling of belonging and a sense of identity.

The Association strongly urges that the administrative team concept be adopted in each school system to facilitate the formulations, implementation and attainment of system wide goals. (Cawelti, 1978, p. 7)

After NAESP adopted the above resolutions, other administrative organizations adopted similar resolutions. Cawelti (1978) in Educational Leaders Consortium reports that the National Association of Secondary School Principals was another forerunner in supporting the team concept in educational administration. In February of 1973, the NASSP adopted a resolution:

RESOLVED, that the administrative team concept enunciated by NASSP be further developed with encouragement to the several states and regions to adapt and implement cooperative structures which give promise of strengthening the secondary schools of the nation. (Cawelti, 1978, p. 7)

It is interesting to note that of the major national affiliations, who were the pioneers in adopting resolutions which supported the team concept, organizations
directly linked with higher levels of management were not among them. Two of the earliest higher level management groups to endorse the management team concept were the American Association of School Administrators and the Association of School Business Officials. According to Cawelti (1978) in the Educational Leaders Consortium, the AASA Delegate Assembly on February 28, 1977, in Las Vegas, Nevada, adopted a position which identified the key role that school superintendents play in relation to the team concept:

AASA recommends that superintendents take the initiative in working with their administrative staffs as teams. AASA recommends that: Administrative teams be established in each school district; these teams represent every category of administrator and supervisor; there be a carefully designed structure in which the rights and responsibilities of each party are clearly articulated and guaranteed and in which each party contributes to decisions on real issues, sharing information and planning together. (Cawelti, 1978, p. 7)

Similar to the AASA stance, the ASBO Board of Directors adopted a resolution in Boston Massachusetts on October 6, 1977:

ASBO recommends that superintendents take the initiative in working with their administrative staffs as teams. ASBO recommends that: Administrative teams be established in each school district. These teams be established in each school district. These teams represent every category of administrator and supervisor. There must be a carefully designed structure in which the rights and responsibilities of each party are clearly defined and guaranteed and in which each party contributes to decisions, sharing information and planning together.
The economic and welfare concerns of members be among the issues the team confronts; that agreement on these issues be reached with the board of education through a collaborative rather than an adversary negotiating procedure. (Cawelti, 1978, p. 7)

The ASBO also saw the superintendent as the person who set the tone for the management team approach. As the chief executive officer of the school district, the superintendent was the individual who could determine the success of the management team approach.

Surprisingly, it wasn't until the March, 1979 Delegate Assembly of the National School Boards Association in Houston Texas, that the NSBA addressed the issue. With an increasing number of national school associations supporting the team approach, the School Boards Association addressed the issue and approved resolutions supporting it. The Assembly called for the inclusion of all levels of management in the planning process of school districts. Included was the recognition of a need to establish a communication channel between the board of education and school administrators:

NSBA adopted resolutions specifically supporting the creation of an "administrative team in each school system" that would include "all supervisory, confidential, and managerial employees." This team, under the leadership of the Superintendent, would "have an opportunity to initiate, review, and recommend policies to the school board, thus helping assure sound administration of the school system." It is also recommended that local school boards should: (a) "include their personnel in the over-all planning process"; and, (b) "set up satisfactory procedures for communication with all personnel" in
establishing "general policies relating to the operation of schools, handling of personnel problems, and the general welfare of all personnel." (Cawelti, 1978, p. 7)

It appears that regardless of the format of the administrative team, key associations, connected with the administrative and managerial operations of school districts, believed that some form of the management team concept needed to be adopted at the local level. These groups believed that implementation of the management team concept was necessary in order to achieve a higher quality of education for students, and a more comfortable working environment for administrators.

Effects of Administrator Unionization

Cooper (1979) assumed that implementing the management team concept would avoid or reduce the interest in administrator unions. However despite the interest in the management team concept at the local level, his survey discovered a significant increase in the number of administrative unions. Many superintendents faced the delicate task of developing a management team while encountering the district's middle managers drive toward unionization. Burek (1982) reported that administrator unions and collective bargaining have produced a previously unknown structure with major effects upon the manner in which boards of education, superintendents and administrators interact. Attempting to analyze this phenomenon, the
literature offers contrasting views as to the actual effects of administrator unionization on the establishment of the management team concept. While some authors indicated that administrator bargaining has been beneficial, other reports disclosed the process to be divisive and disruptive to the operation of the team.

Glen Robinson, President of Educational Research Service (cited in "Administrators as Well as," 1976), commented that:

Assessments vary as to the possible effects of collective negotiations on administrators and the administrative process. Some observers believe that the collective negotiations process for administrators is incompatible with the management team concept, that the adversary approach antagonizes school board members and causes divisiveness within school management. Others believe that only through collective negotiations can administrators maintain their professional respect, keep their increases in compensation proportional to those of teachers, and prevent school boards from bargaining away to teacher unions the administrators' rights and responsibilities as school managers. (p. 4)

Reports of the impact that administrative negotiations have had on team management, appear to vary greatly. Several authors see serious implications for school districts when middle managers choose to unionize and negotiate a contract.

Paul Salmon (1972) suggested that collective bargaining as a process was basically adversarial. Identifying it as a bilateral procedure, Salmon commented that it pitted party against party. He argued that as a
practice, it isolated the superintendent from his team members. As a result, it required the superintendent or his designee to function as an adversary at the bargaining table. Because of this, Salmon suggested that the administrative team and collective bargaining are unmistakedly incompatible.

More specifically, Smith (1973b) identified several negative effects which can be attributed to collective bargaining and middle management unions. He believed districts undergo the following changes due to administrator bargaining:

1. The relationship between middle managers, and the superintendent and other central office staff will be more formal.

2. The trust diminished between those in the bargaining unit and those not in the unit.

3. The level of suspicion between the two groups will rise.

4. Union members will be placed in roles of conflict as representatives of the board of education and as representatives of the administrative associations.

5. The negotiations process will lead to an adversarial relationship due to what was given in the past to middle managers now has to be won at the bargaining table.

6. An almost irreversible atmosphere develops once
administrators initiate collective negotiations.

Since negotiations tend to result in a more formal and strained relationship, Smith (1973c) believed that both sides become less willing to deviate from formally negotiated contracts. In his opinion, there was more pressure to "go by the book" in terms of the school district's operating structure.

Lester Anderson (1970) argued that any form of collective bargaining should be viewed as being unhealthy for education. Sinclair (1977) suggested that the bargaining process had a negative impact for several reasons. First, some states have no statutory provisions which provide legitimacy to collective bargaining in public education. This has resulted in the formation of legal arrangements which deal with the issue. According to Sinclair, this flaunted the law and thereby promoted public resentment of the issue. Secondly, collective bargaining has resulted in the deterioration of professional staff relations. Sinclair suggested that except in those isolated situations where morale was devastatingly low, few improvements have been gained in regards to staff morale. Lastly, Sinclair believed that the net benefit of negotiations was minimal. The collective bargaining process gained no more for teachers than they would have received had there been no collective effort. In his opinion, administrators would do no better than...
teachers, and would face great antagonism as a result of the move toward unionization.

While some debated the merits of a middle management union from an emotional perspective, others disputed its value through the use of empirical data. Educational Research Service (1976) in an analysis of 100 administrative collective bargaining agreements listed seven perceived advantages of administrator negotiations and ten possible disadvantages of administrator negotiations. A summary of these findings are listed in Table 1.

Table 1
Impact of Administrator Negotiations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Advantages of Administrator Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collective negotiations can result in greater formal power for administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrators can bargain back the perogatives which have been given away to teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective negotiations can establish accountability for administrator performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collective negotiations can establish administrator rights and methods for dealing with disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collective negotiations can improve communications throughout the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collective negotiations can improve salaries, working conditions and fringe benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. An administrator bargaining unit can furnish the organizational vehicle for inservice training, re-search, and public relations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1—Continued

Possible Disadvantages of Administrator Negotiations

1. Collective negotiations can result in the development of adversary relationships within the school community.

2. Collective negotiations can result in the development of adversary relationships with non-educator supervisory bargaining teams which assist the board.

3. Collective negotiations can result in secretive and superficial communications.

4. Collective negotiations can result in the board of education perogatives being subjected to the bargaining process.

5. The morale of the entire organization may deteriorate due to disruptive working relationships.

6. The association leadership is visible and vulnerable.

7. Collective negotiations can result in counter-productive attitudes.

8. The traditional authority of principals can be diminished.

9. Unionized administrators may be unable to carry duties as a management representative.

10. Administrators can become less accountable for their performance.

Hahn (1980) in a study of unionized and non-unionized Michigan school districts noted differences in the perceptions of administrators with regard to organizational climate. His investigations suggest that a more participative approach to district management and a more positive organizational climate were found in non-unionized settings. Hahn's findings paralleled the earlier work of
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Knoester.

Knoester (1977) examined the impact of middle management unionization on district decision making. He found that unionized administrators were substantially less involved in decision-making than their non-unionized counterparts.

A similar study by Flannery (1979) supported Knoester's work. Examining the perceived impact of unionization on the degree of middle manager involvement in decision making, Flannery offered two major findings: (a) Non-unionized principals have more actual decision making authority over four of the five identified administrative decisions in their schools than their unionized peers, and (b) membership in a middle management bargaining unit does not guarantee a greater voice in the decision making process.

Presenting a contrasting view, McConnell (1978) studied the perceptions of superintendents and principals, in districts where bargaining already existed. Specifically he examined the influence middle managers had on the management practices of school districts in Michigan. McConnell suggested that middle management collective bargaining had a positive influence on the management practices of school systems. Both superintendents and principals identified positive changes in the level of involvement of middle managers in district decisions as
well as the degree of accountability to which they were held.

Consistent with McConnell (1978), Burek (1982) contradicted the works of Flannery (1979), Hahn (1980), and Knoester (1977). He stated that the unionization of administrators, as perceived by principals, did not result in a negative organizational climate or in a negative change in the variables associated with it, including middle management involvement in district decision making. According to Burek, boards of education, superintendents, and principals in unionized districts in Michigan were not necessarily confined to a continuous adversarial confrontation. They could and did work together in the same spirit of cooperation as their counterparts in non-unionized settings.

In a study of the relationship between administrative bargaining and the administrative team in Philadelphia, McGinley and Rafferty (1973) found the two to be compatible. Although there were times when an adversarial relationship developed at the bargaining table, disagreement did not result in disloyalty.

These findings appear to support a presentation given before the Michigan Negotiators Association at Shanty Creek, Michigan, in October 1976. Ray Howe, Deputy Superintendent of Dearborn Public Schools (Michigan), stated:

I do not regard either the invocation or the implementation of collective bargaining by
anyone as being disruptive, unless one or both of the parties wish, either consciously or subconsciously, that it be so, and unless they both insist that it be disruptive. (p. 1)

In Howe's opinion, the collective bargaining process did not automatically encourage conflict but rather provided an opportunity to channel and resolve it. If used properly, Howe believed the collective bargaining process could be a conflict-reducing mechanism.

Interestingly, a NASSP survey ("High School Principals," 1977), reported that secondary school principals believed that collective bargaining had a positive impact on the formulation of system wide policy. In direct contradiction to the findings of Knoester, a majority of the principals responding to the survey believed they had a greater amount of input in the curricular as well as in instructional and student personnel policies. These gains were attributed to collective bargaining.

Beyond studying the initial perceptions of school administrators, some investigators attempted to determine whether specific relationships could be identified based on the attitudes reflected in the responses. Factors such as position, size of district, years of experience, and age were noted in hopes of establishing whether these variables had any effect on the attitudes of the respondents.

As stated in the previous chapter, Else (1977), in an investigation of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act,
reported that superintendents in larger school systems tended to view teacher bargaining more negatively than their colleagues in smaller districts. Else also indicated that the longer a person was superintendent, he/she was more inclined to believe that bargaining would reduce job satisfaction. In a later study, Rowedder (1980) chose to expand this line of thinking by scrutinizing several variables as they applied to middle management bargaining. In an investigation of the attitudes of principals, superintendents and school board presidents toward administrator unions, Rowedder's data demonstrated some contrasting findings. According to Rowedder, size of the school district appeared to have little significance when analyzing the attitudes of superintendents and school board presidents in Iowa.

However, a difference was found at principals' level. Elementary principals from larger school districts tended to agree more with the perceived advantages of bargaining than their colleagues in smaller districts. Surprising the opposite was found at the secondary level. Principals from smaller districts tended to agree more with the proclaimed advantages of unionization than did those principals in larger districts.

Rowedder also reported that experienced elementary principals tended to be more in agreement with the perceived advantages of middle management bargaining than
their less experienced peers. While years of experience affected the response of elementary principals, little difference could be distinguished in the attitudes of secondary principals, superintendents and board presidents.

In a similar study of the opinions of superintendents and principals toward the unionization of educational middle managers in Illinois, Gabbert (1982) disclosed that apparently neither experience by position nor size of district resulted in significantly different responses between the groups. On the basis of these responses, he concluded that little or no difference existed between the respective responding groups. Gabbert did note however that a small difference did exist between principals in the largest districts compared to principals in districts with the least number of students.

In summary, researchers believe that many variables exist in settings where school districts operate under the management team concept and have a middle management union. The literature reviewed indicated that there apparently is no consensus as to the effects administrative bargaining might have on the function of the management team. Although investigators have examined the impact of collective bargaining on such variables as climate, communications, job satisfaction and decision-making, the findings appear to be contradictory and
inconclusive.

In order to facilitate the manageability of this study, four major variables were selected for this investigation. These were identified as a result of numerous interviews with experts in the field as well as a review of the work of experts. In addition these same variables were identified by the practitioners in the field.

Based on the research questions formulated for this study and presented in the previous chapter, and, based on the review of the literature, the following hypotheses were tested as the basis for determining selected administrator perceptions of the impact that middle management collective bargaining had on the function of the management team concept.

1. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

2. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

3. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools as compared to elementary
principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

4. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

5. There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience as superintendents with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

6. There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience as superintendents with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

7. There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience as superintendents with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the management team concept
in the area of decision making.

8. There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience as superintendents with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

9. There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

10. There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

11. There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

12. There is no difference in the perceptions of
elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

13. There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to superintendents in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communication.

14. There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to superintendents in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

15. There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to superintendents in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.
16. There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to superintendents in districts with smaller school district enrollment with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

17. There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to principals in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

18. There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to principals in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

19. There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to principals in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the
function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

20. There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to principals in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

Summary

The purpose of Chapter II has been to review the literature related to the problem identified in Chapter I. This chapter was divided into three sections: (a) causes of middle management unionization, (b) the management team concept, and (c) the effects of administrator unionization.

Discussed were the causes of middle management unionization. The literature suggested that many reasons have been given for the formation of middle management unions. While no single cause was credited as the reason for the formation of administrator unions, several authors believed the erosion of administrator authority as a result of teachers bargaining, played an important role in the shift toward middle management bargaining.

The management team concept was examined along with
various definitions of and characteristics attributed to the administrative team. According to Rowedder (1980), few authors have been able to agree on a specific definition of the term. While some chose to define the management team concept using a philosophical approach, others addressed it in terms of its characteristics. Despite the inability to reach consensus as to what constitutes the management team, by 1979 several major national associations affiliated with the administration of school districts, adopted resolutions which endorsed the concept.

Lastly an extensive review of the effects of administrator unionization was presented along with the hypotheses under investigation in this study. The reader is reminded that the extent and quality of research on the topic investigated by this study is extremely limited.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The design and methods which were used in this study are presented in five sections: (a) review of the problem, (b) population and sample, (c) instrumentation, (d) procedures, and (e) analysis of data.

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact that a middle management bargaining unit had on the function of the management team concept in the areas of communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition, as perceived by selected superintendents and selected elementary school principals of schools in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties in the state of Michigan.

Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of the superintendents of schools located in school districts in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties where a middle management bargaining unit existed, and of elementary principals in the same school districts who held membership in the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals
Association (MEMPSA). Districts who had middle management bargaining units but did not have at least one of its elementary principals holding membership in MEMSPA were not included in this study.

The population was drawn from the school districts in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties as published in the 1984-85 school directories by the respective intermediate school district administrative offices. Given the 84 public school systems in the tri-county area, a determination was made as to whether a district had a middle management bargaining unit. Utilizing the most recent Administrative and Supervisory Salary Survey as printed by the Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies (1985), it was determined that 51 systems had a middle management bargaining unit (see Table 2).

An analysis of the 1984-85 MEMSPA membership roster revealed that 44 of the 51 school systems with a middle management bargaining unit had at least one elementary principal who belonged to MEMSPA. The number of elementary principals holding membership in MEMSPA by school district and county is provided in Appendix E.

The Detroit public school system was excluded from this study due to the very small percentage of its elementary principals holding membership in MEMSPA. Thus for the purposes of this study the population consists of 43 superintendents and 222 elementary principals.
Table 2

School Districts in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties Having a Middle Management Bargaining Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wayne County</th>
<th>Oakland County</th>
<th>Macomb County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Centerline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn Heights #7</td>
<td>Bloomfield Hills</td>
<td>Chippewa Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Lake Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecorse</td>
<td>Clarkston</td>
<td>Lakeview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>Clawson</td>
<td>L'Anse Creuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>Mt. Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Woods</td>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>Roseville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>Hazel Park</td>
<td>Van Dyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkster</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Warren-Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livonia</td>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvindale-N. Allen Park</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth-Canton</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redford Union</td>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>Southfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus</td>
<td>South Lyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>Walled Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>West Bloomfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne-Westland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wayne County</th>
<th>Oakland County</th>
<th>Macomb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhaven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Districts</td>
<td>19 Districts</td>
<td>9 Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample

The sample population for this study was selected from a list of superintendents of schools, and from a list of elementary principals holding membership in MEMSPA who were employed in school districts in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties where a middle management bargaining unit existed. The Detroit Public School System was excluded from this study due to the small number of Detroit elementary principals who hold membership in MEMSPA. It was assumed that because of the limited number of MEMSPA members, they were not representative of the district's middle management bargaining unit.

The districts, investigated for this study varied in size due to the student membership count. Since Else (1977) reported that the size of the district may have an effect on the superintendent's view about the impact of bargaining, the school districts surveyed for this study were categorized into two classifications as indicated in
Table 3.

Table 3
Size Classification of Questionnaire Respondents by Student Membership Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Membership Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>800 to 5,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>6,000 to 25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to insure proper representation of the participants, a stratified random sample was utilized. According to Babble (1973), a stratified sample is likely to be more representative on a number of variables than would be the case for a simple random sample.

Based on the classifications of district size as described in Table 3, the school districts under study were stratified according to the membership count as listed in the 1985 Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide (see Appendix E).

Within these categories, the elementary principals and superintendents were stratified, based on the size of the school district where they were employed (see Table 4).
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Elementary Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>222</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilizing a formula for determining sample size as suggested by the *Survey Starter Kit*, as printed by the Macomb Intermediate School District (1978), an appropriate sample size was selected for this study. Given the population of 43 superintendents and 222 elementary principals of schools, this study surveyed a sample of 39 superintendents and 141 elementary principals of schools.

To achieve the acceptable representation within each strata, the stratified random sample was selected by placing the number of superintendents in each strata over the total population of superintendents and multiplying by the designated sample size of the superintendents. The same formula was utilized to compute the appropriate representation for each strata of principals (see Figure 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Elementary Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/43 x 39 = 19.95</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>67/222 x 141 = 42.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/43 x 39 = 19.04</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>155/222 x 141 = 98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 43</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>N = 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S = 39</td>
<td>Sample Needed</td>
<td>S = 141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Formula to Compute the Sample Size for Each Strata.

Instrumentation

In order to collect data as to the perceptions of superintendents and elementary principals of schools regarding the impact that middle management unions have had on the management team concept, a self-designed survey was utilized. To develop the instrument, the investigator undertook an extensive search of the literature. This was accomplished through an ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) search from 1968 to 1985, the use of University Microfilms International's Comprehensive Dissertation Database and personal interviews with experts in the field.

The variables included in the survey instrument were selected from an analysis of causes related to the causes of middle management unionization, the management team concept and the effects of administrator unionization. These items were noted in the review of the literature.
In addition to using the literature, personal interviews with experts in the field of labor relations (particularly middle management unions) and experts in the field of research were conducted to help formulate the instrument to be used.

Several variables identified, shared a common interest between the basic principles of the management team and the causes which reportedly led to the formation of administrative unions. Four variables were potentially in conflict with each other due to the differences in philosophical styles of the two approaches. Thus the survey was designed to determine if a middle management union would be perceived to have an impact on the function of the management team concept in the areas of (a) communications, (b) interpersonal relationships, (c) decision making and (d) role definition.

Using the techniques suggested by Babbie (1973) for question construction, survey statements were developed for each of the four categories listed above. The statements were derived from the literature and placed under the appropriate classification.

The intent of the instrument was to differentiate and compare the responses of the superintendents and the elementary principals. This was achieved in part through the use of a heading on the survey to indicate whether the respondent was a superintendent or elementary principal.
(see Appendix B). The individuals were requested to indicate the total years of experience as a superintendent or as an elementary principal and the school district enrollment. This information was used to make comparisons between the responses of superintendents and between the responses of principals based on years of experience in the position and with the size of the school district.

The question concerning total years of experience as a superintendent related to hypotheses 5, 6, 7, and 8; while total years of experience as an elementary principal was pertinent to hypotheses 9, 10, 11, and 12. The question regarding school district enrollment was relevant to hypotheses 13, 14, 15 and 16 for superintendents and hypotheses 17, 18, 19, and 20 for elementary principals.

Respondents were then requested to respond to a series of questions for the four areas previously identified by indicating whether the individual strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with each statement.

The first set of questions related to the impact that middle manager unions have had on the communications process between middle managers and those team members on the organization chart who hold higher organizational positions. The questions focused on the degree of honesty in discussions and the level of communications between middle managers and their superordinates. A third issue
which was investigated was the degree of access that middle managers have to the board of education. The three items addressed in this category were associated with hypotheses 1, 5, 9, 13, and 17.

The second segment of questions involved the issues related to the development of interpersonal relationships between members of a middle management bargaining unit and their superordinates. Specifically, the survey items examined the impact the bargaining unit had on such issues as the level of trust and degree of loyalty between team members.

Additional questions scrutinized information regarding whether the bargaining unit had helped improve relationships, and enhanced the management team concept or whether they had fostered an adversarial relationship between middle managers and their subordinates. The hypotheses related to these questions were 2, 6, 10, 14, and 18.

The third major variable in this survey involved issues relating to decision making. Items addressed the middle managers degree of influence in the decision making process and in management practices, the level of their involvement in decision making and their possible conflict of interests. These issues are addressed in hypotheses 3, 7, 11, 15, and 19.

Addressed in the final section of the survey was the
role definition of middle managers. The questions sought information regarding the impact that a union has had in clarifying and defining the roles of middle managers. These concerns pertained to hypotheses 4, 8, 12, 16, and 20.

To validate the questionnaire, the survey instrument was pilot tested on five elementary principals, three assistant superintendents and two specialists in the field of research and evaluation. The investigator hand delivered the questionnaire with a letter of explanation and directions (Appendix D). Each respondent was asked to review the survey and record their opinions regarding the clarity, comprehensiveness and face validity of the instrument.

After the responses were collected, the comments of the respondents were reviewed. Subsequently, some modifications were made in the questionnaire.

The same respondents were then asked to review the instrument again. To avoid contamination of the study, those individuals who participated in the pilot test, were not included further in the study population.

Procedures

Upon the completion of the pilot test of the survey instrument, the questionnaire was mailed with a self-addressed, stamped envelope to 39 superintendents and 141
elementary school principals of schools representing the various strata as identified in Figure 1, p. 52. Enclosed with the survey was a letter introducing the study, the questionnaire and the investigator (see Appendix A).

To insure the confidentiality of each respondent as well as to manage the collection of the data, the surveys were number coded. Administrators who did not respond by the imposed deadline were mailed a follow-up letter accompanied by another survey (see Appendix C). Overall 76% (137 of 180) of those selected for participation in the study responded by completing and returning the instrument. Specifically, superintendents of schools had an 87% (34 of 39) rate of return and elementary principals had a 73% (103 of 141) response rate.

Analysis of the Data

The survey instrument was designed to enable the investigator to categorize responses into several cells. Based on the information received which described each respondent and the school district, the data were analyzed by (a) the respondent's administrative position, (b) the years of experience at that level, and (3) the K-12 enrollment of the school district.

The next set of questions pertained to the four areas of concern of the study. The data were analyzed using inferential statistical testing for these areas classified...
as communications, interpersonal relations, decision making, and role definition. Mean scores were computed for these categories. The mean scores were determined by assigning a point value of 1 to the "strongly agree" response, a value of 2 to the "agree" response, a value of 3 to the "disagree" response and a value of 4 to the "strongly agree" response to each question relating to each of the four categories under consideration. The mean was obtained by totaling the value of the responses pertaining to each set of questions and dividing by the number of responses given.

A two-tailed t test for independent means at the .05 alpha level for Type I error was used in testing each of the hypotheses. Other data relating to the individual questions relating to each of the hypotheses were reported in a descriptive manner. Percentages were utilized to report the perceptions of the superintendents and elementary principals as to the impact that a middle management bargaining unit has had on the function of the management team concept.

Hypotheses

The research hypotheses designed for this investigation were stated in the previous chapter. For the purposes of this study, the null hypotheses are:

1. There is no significant difference in the
perceptions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact that a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

2. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact that a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

3. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact that a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

4. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

5. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents of schools with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

6. There is a difference in the perceptions of
superintendents of schools with more experience as super­
intendents as compared to superintendents with less ex­
perience with regard to the impact a middle management
union had on the function of the management team concept
in the area of interpersonal relations.

7. There is a difference in the perceptions of
superintendents of schools with more experience as super­
intendents as compared to superintendents with less ex­
perience with regard to the impact a middle management
union had on the function of the management team concept
in the area of decision making.

8. There is a difference in the perceptions of
superintendents of schools with more experience as super­
intendents as compared to superintendents with less ex­
perience with regard to the impact a middle management
union had on the function of the management team concept
in the area of role definition.

9. There is a difference in the perceptions of
elementary principals with more experience as principals
as compared to elementary principals with less experience
as principals with regard to the impact a middle manage­
ment union had on the function of the management team
concept in the area of communications.

10. There is a difference in the perceptions of
elementary principals with more experience as principals
as compared to elementary principals with less experience
as principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

11. There is a difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

12. There is a difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

13. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school enrollments as compared to superintendents in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communication.

14. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school enrollments as compared to superintendents in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of
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the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

15. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school enrollments as compared to superintendents in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

16. There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school enrollments as compared to superintendents in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

17. There is a difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to principals in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

18. There is a difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to principals in
districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

19. There is a difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to principals in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

20. There is a difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to principals in districts with smaller school district enrollments with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definitions.

Summary

The intent of Chapter III was to define the methodology of this study. The statement of the problem was reviewed and the population and the sample were identified. The instrument developed for this study was presented. The procedures for implementing the survey were described. The factors to be analyzed and the
presentation of the data were also noted. Lastly, the null hypotheses of this investigation were presented.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

In this chapter, the findings of this study are reported as they relate to each hypothesis. The findings are presented by the level of administrative position and other relevant factors such as years of experience and size of district. To determine if a significant difference existed in the means of the perceptions of the respondents, a two-tailed $t$ test for independent means with an alpha level of .05 for a Type I error was used. Each hypothesis was tested separately.

The data are presented for analysis in table form. In addition, responses to individual questions posed for this investigation are presented in percentage form under each appropriate area of study.

Superintendents and Elementary Principals

For investigation purposes, initial classification of responses was categorized according to the title of the administrative position held. A total of 34 superintendents' responses and 103 elementary principals' responses were studied to examine perceptions of the impact that unionization had on the communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition among upper
and middle management personnel.

Differences in the responses of superintendents in comparison to those given by elementary principals were found for each of the four categories listed above. Although differences were discovered, both groups had similar views on some specific items in a particular classification.

Communications

Three questions in the survey instrument dealt with communications between upper and middle management. The questions pertained to the honesty of discussions among the two groups, middle management's accessibility to the board of education and the issue of whether a union helped improve team communications. These items were related to the testing of Hypothesis 1: There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

Superintendents and elementary principals held different opinions on all three questions. The perceptions of superintendents regarding the impact of a middle management union on communications were more negative than those of the principals. The t test statistics revealed significant differences in the perceptions of
superintendents as compared to principals.

Data in Table 5 revealed that superintendents (mean, 8.29) tended to be less favorable in their views toward unions and the impact of unions on communications than were elementary principals (mean, 6.82). The responses displayed a consistent difference in the perceptions of the two groups as to the impact unions have on communications.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Collectively elementary principals tended to agree that unionization helped the communication process while superintendents generally were in disagreement with this premise.

Specifically, 66.6% of the principals agreed that due
to the union movement, more honest discussions occurred between upper and middle management. Of the 66.6% responding favorably to unionization, 34% strongly agreed with the statement. Only 30.3% of the superintendents responding agreed with this position. Principals also viewed unions benefitting communications in other areas as well. A majority of the principals tended to agree that the union had provided them with a means of maintaining regular access with the board of education (59.3%). They also perceived that a union helped improve communications between upper and middle management levels (54.5%).

In contrast, superintendents viewed survey items less favorably. Most superintendents did not agree that unions gave middle managers regular access to the board (79.4%). They also tended to disagree (87.5%) that communications between middle managers and their superordinates improved. Thus it may be concluded that superintendents and elementary principals differ in the perceptions of the impact a middle management union has on the function of the management team concept in the area of communication.

**Interpersonal Relations**

The impact of a middle management union on the interpersonal relations of middle managers and their superordinates was tested via five survey items. These corresponded to the testing of Hypothesis 2. There is a
difference in the perceptions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations. Three of the items: the manner which the two groups viewed unionism and its effect on improving relationships, the level of trust between the administrative layers, and the question of whether unions have enhanced the team concept, produced results with the greatest differences in responses between superintendents and elementary principals in the area of interpersonal relations. The results of the t-test denoted significant differences in the opinions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals.

As indicated in Table 6 elementary principals (mean, 11.48) perceived bargaining as having a more positive effect on the interpersonal relations between middle managers and their superordinates. Superintendents viewed the impact of the management union less favorably than the elementary principals (mean, 13.29).

A majority of elementary principals (55.1%) agreed that middle management unions have provided a positive step toward improved middle manager/superordinate relationships. In comparison, superintendents overwhelmingly disagreed with this posture (90.7%).
Table 6
Perceptions of Superintendents and Elementary Principals Concerning Interpersonal Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

While disagreement among the two groups was prevalent, both groups had some negative perceptions toward the union's impact on interpersonal relations. Less than half of the principals (47.4%) agreed that the level of trust strengthened between the two parties. An even smaller percentage believed the union enhanced the management team concept (45.1%)

The superintendents viewed middle management bargaining more negatively. Only 15.2% of the superintendents believed the level of trust improved and less than one in ten (6.3%) were in agreement that the union enhanced the team.

In contrast to the perceptions pertaining to trust and enhancing the management team concept, both
superintendents and elementary principals agreed that the degree of loyalty between the sides had not deteriorated. An overwhelming percentage of principals (78.4%) and superintendents (61.8%) agreed that bargaining had not reduced the loyalty among them. Further, a substantial majority of superintendents (57.6%) and principals (71.3%) did not believe the formation of a union helped foster an adversarial relationship between the sides.

Despite these similar perceptions, enough differences existed in the opinions of both superintendents and principals to reject the null hypothesis and retain the alternative hypothesis.

Decision Making

As discussed in an earlier chapter, the perceived loss of authority in the decision making process by middle managers was viewed as a contributing factor in the organizing of building level administrators. The effects of bargaining on decision making were analyzed through four questions on the survey instrument. These pertained to the testing of Hypothesis 3: There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

As seen in Table 7 elementary principals had a more
positive perception of the impact of a union on decision making (mean, 8.45) as compared to superintendents (mean, 9.97). The analysis revealed that the principals held more favorable opinions toward each individual issue than did the superintendents. The t test for these questions disclosed significant differences in the opinions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals.

Table 7
Perceptions of Superintendents and Elementary Principals Concerning Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

An overwhelming number of principals (76.4%) and superintendents (67.6%) perceived administrative unions to have influenced the management practices of school districts. As with questions in previous sections, elementary administrators held stronger, more positive opinions as to the impact of the union. Of those responding favorably, 18.6% of the building administrators strongly
agreed that unionization had influenced management practices. Superintendents viewed the effects somewhat differently. Only 2.9% of them strongly agreed that management practices had been influenced. Interestingly, a very small percentage (2.9%) of the superintendents strongly disagreed that a union influenced management practices.

Coinciding with this issue, most elementary principals (86%) and superintendents (76.5%) agreed that middle management unions had not reduced the degree of influence middle managers possess in the decision making process. Principals were stronger in this belief as 17% of them strongly agreed with this premise, as compared to no superintendents.

The greatest differences between principal and superintendent responses centered on the degree of involvement in decision making and the potential conflict between the union and the management team. Superintendents, despite their perceptions concerning the union's influence on management practices, overwhelmingly did not agree that middle managers, as a result of the union, had a greater degree of involvement in the decision making process (81.8%). Principals, meanwhile, held the opposite opinion. Many building administrators (55.9%) agreed that organizing a union did indeed enable them to become more involved.

Elementary principals did not believe that being in a
union resulted in taking positions which conflicted with the management team (63.3%). This view was not shared by superintendents. Superintendents perceived that situations did exist whereby a conflict occurred between the parties (60.6%). A small percentage of superintendents (9.1%) believed very strong about this. Thus it may be concluded that superintendents and elementary principals hold different perceptions of the impact a middle management union has on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

Role Definitions

The impact of a bargaining unit on the role definition of middle managers was tested through the use of two questions on the instrument. These items covered areas involving the clarification and definition of the roles, the rights and responsibilities of middle managers, and the development of specific job descriptions. The questions were related to the testing of Hypothesis 4: There is a difference in the perceptions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

Elementary principals perceived the impact of middle management unions on role definition more positively than
school superintendents. The data in Table 8 showed that elementary principals believed strongly that the role definition of administrators was effected by middle management unions (mean, 3.91). Superintendents were less strong in their opinions (mean, 4.79). The $t$-test statistics revealed significant differences in the opinions of superintendents as compared to elementary principals.

### Table 8

Perceptions of Superintendents and Elementary Principals Concerning Role Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

In the area of the unions' assisting in the clarification and definition of principal roles, rights and responsibilities of principals, 87.3% of the principals agreed that unions did assist. Of those, 25.2% of the principals strongly agreed that the union movement helped clarify and define the roles, and the rights and responsibilities of middle managers. While most superintendents
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also agreed that role definition was affected (60.6%), a sizeable number of the chief executive officers disagreed (39.4%).

Principals also believed unions were instrumental in the development of specific job descriptions for all school administrators (73.3%). Less than half of the superintendents (45.1%) credited the union movement as a cause of the development of job descriptions. Given the data, one can conclude that differences existed in the perceptions of superintendents and elementary principals as to the impact of a middle management union on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

Superintendents Based on Experience

The responses of the superintendents of schools were analyzed to establish if differences existed within their group. A comparison of their responses was made based on years of experience as a superintendent. Those respondents who had been a superintendent for seven years or less were identified as having less experience. Individuals who had been employed eight or more years as a superintendent were classified as having "more experience."

Communications

The questions contained in this section were
essential to the testing of Hypothesis 5: There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications. The responses of the superintendents based on years of experience indicated that there were few differences in their perceptions concerning the union's impact on communications. The results of the $t$-test indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups.

The findings in Table 9 disclosed that both sets of respondents tended to perceive that communications were not improved as a result of the union movement.

Overall the superintendents were in basic agreement that the union movement had not resulted in more honest discussions (less experience, 60.0%; more experience, 77.8%). Both groups were equally as strong in their attitudes regarding the other areas involving communications. The senior superintendents overwhelmingly believed that the union had not provided a means of maintaining regular access to the board of education (88.9%). They also did not support the idea that middle management unions helped improve communications (94.2%). Lesser experienced superintendents held similar views as 68.8%
did not see unions providing access to the board. They
too did not perceive unions to be a vehicle for improving
communications (80.0%).

Table 9
Perceptions of Superintendents Based on
Experience Concerning Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supts-More Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.645**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supts-Less Experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

Although slight differences between superintendents
existed they were not statistically significant. Thus it
is necessary to reject the null hypotheses and conclude
that there is no difference in the perceptions of super-
intendents based on experience in the area of communica-
tions.

Interpersonal Relations

The five questions in this classification pertaining
to interpersonal relations were examined in the testing of
Hypothesis 6: There is no difference in the perceptions
of superintendents with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience as superintendents, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

Responses to the questionnaire items revealed that overall, there were few differences in the opinions of the superintendents. Although responses varied in some questions, the t-test statistics did not indicate significant differences in the perceptions of the two groups of superintendents.

The data in Table 10 revealed that although superintendents with more experience (mean, 12.89) perceived the union's impact on interpersonal relations slightly more favorably than superintendents with less seniority (mean, 13.75), there were no significant differences in their attitudes. Therefore, the null hypotheses was rejected.

Superintendents, regardless of experience, believed strongly that the union did not help improve middle and upper management relationships (more experience, 94.1%; less experience, 86.6%). In addition they also perceived that the movement did not strengthen the level of trust (more experience, 83.3%; less experience, 86.6%). These attitudes provided further support for their perceptions that middle management unions did not enhance the team concept (more experience, 88.9%; less experience, 100%).
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Table 10

Perceptions of Superintendents Based on Experience Concerning Interpersonal Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supts-More Experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.368**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supts-Less Experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level

Minor disagreement, however, was found in two areas. Senior superintendents agreed that the union did not create an adversarial relationship (70.6%). They also believed that the degree of loyalty between upper and middle management had not deteriorated (72.2%). Those with less experience held slightly different views. Less than half (43.8%) agreed that an adversarial relationship had not developed. Only half of the junior superintendents (50.0%) believed that the degree of loyalty had not deteriorated.

Decision Making

The perceptions of the superintendents in the area of decision making were obtained though the use of four...
questions contained in the survey. These items were relevant to the testing of Hypothesis 7: There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience as superintendents, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

Responses to individual items disclosed only slight differences in the superintendents' perceptions. The results of the t test revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the opinions of the two groups of superintendents. The data from the t test are found in Table 11.

Table 11
Perceptions of Superintendents Based on Experience Concerning Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supts-More Experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.746**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supts-Less Experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.
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Throughout the superintendents' responses general agreement was found on most issues. In both groups, that is the more experienced superintendents and the less experienced superintendents, most agreed that middle managers had not had their degree of influence diminished (more experience, 83.3%; less experience, 68.8%). Based on their opinions, the management practices of the district were influenced by the existence of a bargaining unit (more experience, 66.7%; less experience, 68.8%). They also agreed on the issue of possible union/team conflicts. Superintendents with more experience (53.0%) and those with less experience (68.8%) both believed situations arose where the bargaining unit's position was in conflict with those of the management team.

There was one area where a slight difference in attitudes was noticed. Superintendents with more experience in position were nearly unanimous in their perceptions that the union did not give middle managers a greater degree of involvement in the decision making process (94.4%). Those with less experience held the same perception but by a slightly smaller percentage (66.7%).

Overall however, as indicated earlier, the data in Table 11 reveals that there was no statistical difference in the responses. Therefore, the alternate hypotheses, that there is no difference in perceptions was accepted as the null hypothesis was rejected.
Role Definition

Two survey items were instrumental in the testing of Hypothesis 8: There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents with more experience as superintendents as compared to superintendents with less experience as superintendents, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

Superintendents, with fewer years in the position, tended to be more in agreement that bargaining had an impact on the role definition of team members than their more experienced colleagues. The data in Table 12 showed that the less experienced superintendents believed more strongly that the role definition of team members was affected by middle management unions (mean, 4.33). More experienced superintendents perceived the impact differently (mean, 5.17). The t-test analysis for these questions disclosed that a significant statistical difference existed in the perceptions of the least senior superintendents as compared to those with greater experience.

The less experienced superintendents believed unions were instrumental in shaping the role definitions of administrators. They agreed that the unions played a role in the clarification and definition of roles, and of rights and responsibilities of administrators (66.7%). They also believed that a union played an instrumental
part in the development of job descriptions (69.2%). In contrast, 72.2% of the superintendents possessing more experience did not agree with its effect on job descriptions. Almost half (44.4%) of the senior superintendents believed that unions did not assist in clarifying roles and responsibilities.

Table 12

Perceptions of Superintendents Based on Experience Concerning Role Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supts-More Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supts-Less Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Since differences in perceptions were noted in t tests at the .05 level, one can conclude that superintendents with more experience differed in their perceptions of the unions impact on role definition as compared to superintendents with less experience.
Principals Based on Experience

The responses of elementary principals were examined and tested to determine if differences existed within their group. This comparison was based on the years of experience as an elementary principal. Those persons who had been an elementary principal 14 years or less were designated as having less experience. Individuals who had been an elementary principal for 15 years or more were identified as having "more experience."

Communications

Three questions contained in the survey instrument were utilized in order to compare the perceptions of principals regarding communications. These items were related to the testing of Hypothesis 9: There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

Years of experience did not appear to be an influence in the perceptions of elementary principals. Responses indicated there were no differences in their attitudes regarding the unions impact on communication. The t test administered for these questions disclosed that the
differences in responses between the two groups were not statistically significant.

Data in Table 13 reveal that elementary principals regardless of years of experience held similar perceptions as to the effects of a union on communication. Both groups had favorable opinions as to its impact.

Table 13

Perceptions of Elementary Principals Based on Experience Concerning Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prins-More Experience</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prins-Less Experience</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

As a whole, the responses of the less experienced principals had similar patterns to their more senior colleagues. Whereas 67.3% of the more experienced principals agreed that more honest discussions between upper and middle management were due in part to unions, 65.9% of the less senior building administrators held similar opinions. Both groups also agreed that the union provide
a means of maintaining regular access with the board of education (more experience, 60.0%; less experience, 59.6%).

The only item which resulted in somewhat different views pertained to improved communications. Most of the principals with 15 years or more years at this level agreed that communications improved (59.3%). Those with fewer years were not as agreeable. Only 49.0% believed unions contributed to improved communications.

Since differences in the responses were not shown to be statistically significant, the null hypothesis; there is a difference, was rejected.

Interpersonal Relations

The effects of a bargaining unit on the interpersonal relations between upper and middle management was examined through the responses of five items on the questionnaire. These corresponded to the testing of Hypothesis 10: There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

The t test for these questions indicated there were no differences in the responses of the elementary
principals based on years of experience. The data found in Table 14 resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 14
Perceptions of Elementary Principals Based on Experience Concerning Interpersonal Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \overline{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t ) value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prins-More</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prins-Less</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

A review of the responses disclosed that both groups were found to be in agreement on most issues. Most principals, regardless of their years of experience, believed that unions provided a positive step toward improved relationships (more experience, 59.6%; less experience, 50.0%). In their opinion unions did not create an adversarial relationship (more experience, 72.7%; less experience 69.5%). Principals in both groups also agreed that the existence of a union did not cause a deterioration in the degree of loyalty (more experience, 73.3%; less
Lastly, a majority of individuals in both groups agreed that a union did not enhance the management team concept (more experience, 51.2%; less experience, 58.7%). The responses pertaining to one issue did offer minor disagreement. More experienced principals agreed the level of trust was strengthened by the formation of unions (51.0%). In comparison slightly less than half of the less experienced administrators believed this to be true (43.4%).

Decision Making

A comparison of the opinions of principals regarding decision making was achieved through the use of four survey items. The responses were essential in the testing of Hypothesis 11: There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as elementary principals, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

The results of the t test for these questions revealed that there were no significant differences in the opinions of principals when based on years of experience. As found in Table 15, the perceptions of principals in both groups were positive toward the impact on decision
making. An analysis of the responses revealed agreement on all four questions. Most principals in both groups agreed that the formation of unions did not reduce the degree of influence (more experience, 83.4%; less experience, 89.1%). In addition they were in agreement that management practices were influenced by the creation of the union (more experience, 81.9%; less experience, 70.2%). The perceptions of principals were less strong in the areas of degree of involvement in decision making and conflict of interests. Those with more experience agreed more often that unionization had not put members in conflict with the management team (more experience, 70.4%; less experience, 54.6%). Principals with less experience were slightly more in agreement that unions enabled middle managers to have a greater degree of involvement in the decision making process (more experience, 52.7%; less experience, 57.6%). Despite these slight perceptual differences, they were not deemed to be statistically significant. Therefore one can conclude that there was no difference in the perceptions of principals as based on years of experience in the area of decision making.
Table 15
Perceptions of Elementary Principals Based on Experience Concerning Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prins—More Experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prins—Less Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.**

Role Definition

The perceptions of principals regarding the impact a union has on role definition were analyzed as a result of the two questions on the survey. These corresponded to the testing of Hypothesis 12: There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals with more experience as elementary principals as compared to elementary principals with less experience as principals, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

The $t$-test statistics disclosed that there were no significant differences in perceptions of elementary principals based on their years of experience as a
principal. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. The $t$ test data are presented in Table 16.

Table 16
Perceptions of Elementary Principals Based on Experience Concerning Role Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prins-More Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.068**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prins-Less Experience</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

Principals in both groups were quite favorable to the union's impact on defining the role of administrators. An overwhelming 92.9% of the principals with more experience agreed that the organizing of middle managers assisted in clarifying their roles. Of those responding favorably, 30.4% of the principals strongly agreed. Meanwhile principals with less experience also agreed that their responsibilities were defined due to their unionization (80.8%). Both groups found additional benefits as a result of forming a union. Principals, regardless of
experience, agreed that the union was instrumental in developing specific job descriptions for all administrators (more experience, 79.1%; less experience, 67.4%).

Superintendents by District Enrollment

The responses of superintendents were analyzed to determine whether perceptions would differ based on the size of the district according to K-12 enrollment. Those individuals who were employed in school systems with enrollments of less than 6,000 students were classified as being in districts with smaller enrollments. Superintendents working in systems with 6,000 students or more were classified as being in districts with larger enrollments.

Communications

The three items found in the communications section of the survey were essential to the testing of Hypothesis 13: There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to superintendents with smaller school district enrollments, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

The responses, based on size of enrollment, provided few differences in the superintendents' perceptions in the
area of communications. The t-test statistics revealed that there were no statistical differences between the two groups of superintendents. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis, "there is no difference..." was accepted. The findings in Table 17 disclosed that neither superintendents in larger nor superintendents in smaller districts agreed that there was an overall improvement in communications between upper and middle management due to middle management unions. The mean of each group on communications was relatively similar to the responses of the groups based on years of experience.

Superintendents in both groups (larger districts and smaller) did not agree that communications improved due to middle management bargaining. Superintendents from larger districts were slightly more in disagreement with the issues concerning communications than their counterparts from smaller districts. Larger district superintendents did not believe unions resulted in more honest discussions between upper and middle management (87.6%). They were equally firm in their belief that building level administrators did not gain regular access to members of the board of education because of unionization (82.4%). Overall they were very adamant that communications were not improved as a result of unionism (93.8%).
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Table 17
Perceptions of Superintendents Based on District Enrollment Concerning Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supts-Larger Enrollments</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.496**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Not significant at .05 level**

Smaller district superintendents held a slightly different opinion from superintendents in larger districts regarding the degree of honesty in discussions due to unionization. They were not as unanimous in their beliefs as 53.0% of them did not agree that unions resulted in more honest discussions. On other items, their responses closely patterned those of the superintendents from the larger districts. They too did not agree that a union provided a means of maintaining regular access with the board (76.5%). Superintendents from smaller districts also believed that unionism had not contributed to improved communications (81.3%).
Interpersonal Relations

The analysis of the items in the section pertaining to interpersonal relations was related to the testing of Hypothesis 14: There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to superintendents with smaller school district enrollments, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of interpersonal relations.

An examination of the responses showed only minor differences between superintendents from larger districts and those in smaller districts. The t test for these questions indicated that there was no significant statistical differences in how the superintendents perceived the interpersonal relations between the levels of management as a result of bargaining. The findings in Table 18 report that superintendents in both larger and smaller districts tended to disagree that a middle management union had improved the interpersonal relations between upper and middle management.
Table 18
Perceptions of Superintendents Based on District Enrollment Concerning Interpersonal Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supts-Larger Enrollment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.806**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supts-Smaller Enrollment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.806**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

Regardless of district size, superintendents believed that bargaining did not contribute to improved relationships (larger districts, 93.8%; smaller districts, 87.5%). They were also in agreement that the level of trust between the layers of management was not strengthened (larger districts, 87.6%; smaller districts, 82.4%). These perceptions supported their beliefs that a union did not enhance the team concept (larger districts, 100%; smaller districts, 87.5%).

Disagreement was noted in two areas. Whereas 70.6% of the superintendents in smaller districts agreed that the formation of a middle management union did not create an adversarial relationship, less than half of the superintendents from larger districts (43.8%) were in
agreement. Yet a higher percentage of larger district superintendents (70.6%) believed unions did not result in a deterioration in the degree of loyalty as compared to those from smaller districts (52.9%).

Decision Making

The responses of superintendents to four questions in the survey were vital to the testing of Hypothesis 15: There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to superintendents with smaller school district enrollments, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making. Few differences were found in the responses of superintendents. The results of the t-test revealed there were no statistical differences in opinions of superintendents when based on district enrollment. As is evident in Table 19 both larger and smaller district superintendents held similar perceptions as to the unions' impact on decision making.

Superintendents in both larger and smaller districts were in agreement that the formation of a middle management union did not diminish the degree of influence middle management had (larger districts, 88.2%; smaller districts, 64.7%). In contrast, most superintendents actually believed that unions influenced management practices...
(larger districts, 58.8%; smaller districts, 76.5%). Although unions were perceived to influence practices, middle managers were not viewed as having gained a greater degree of involvement in the decision making process (larger districts, 87.5%; smaller districts, 76.5%) as a result of unionization.

Table 19
Perceptions of Superintendents Based on District Enrollment Concerning Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supts.-Larger Enrollment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.913**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supts.-Smaller Enrollment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

Despite holding similar perceptions on the decision making items, slight disagreement among the superintendents was found on one issue. Half of the individuals from smaller districts did not believe unions put members in conflict with the management team concept (50.0%), while most (70.6%) of the superintendents from larger districts believed at times, members were put in conflict...
Role Definition

The perceptions of superintendents in the area of role definition were tested through the use of two survey items. These corresponded to the testing of Hypothesis 16: There is no difference in the perceptions of superintendents in districts with larger school enrollments as compared to superintendents with smaller school district enrollments, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

District size did not appear to effect the responses of the superintendents. Data in Table 20 revealed that superintendents held similar views on the impact that bargaining had on the role definition of administrators. The t test for these items disclosed, that there were no statistical differences in perceptions of superintendents.

Most superintendents were in agreement that the roles, rights and responsibilities of middle managers were clarified and defined in part due to the union movement (larger districts, 70.6%; smaller districts, 50.0%). Smaller district superintendents, however, agreed that the formation of a union was instrumental in developing job descriptions for all administrators (60.0%) than their counterparts from larger districts (31.3%). Due to the
small size of the samples, this difference was not deemed to be statistically significant.

Table 20
Perceptions of Superintendents Based on District Enrollment Concerning Role Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supts.-Larger Enrollments</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.830**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supts.-Smaller Enrollments</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

Principals by District Enrollment

The responses of elementary principals were examined and tested to determine whether differences existed within their groups based on the K-12 enrollment size of districts. Those principals who worked in school systems with enrollments of less than 6,000 students were classified as being in districts with smaller enrollments. Building administrators working in systems with 6,000 students or more were classified as being in districts with larger enrollments.
Communications

The questions in this section of the survey were essential to the testing of Hypothesis 17: There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to elementary principals with smaller school district enrollments, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of communications.

The responses of elementary principals based on enrollment provided few differences in their perceptions concerning communications. The $t$ test revealed that there were no statistical differences between the two groups of building administrators. As indicated in Table 21 the size of the school district had no effect on how principals perceived the impact of bargaining on the management team.

Principals in both groups believed that more honest discussions between the levels of management developed as a result of the union (larger districts, 65.7%; smaller districts, 68.8%). Administrators in both larger (57.2%) and smaller districts (65.7%) stated that a union gave them a means of maintaining regular access to the board of education. Lastly, principals in both larger and smaller districts believed that communications between upper and middle management had improved (larger districts, 55.1%;
smaller districts, 53.2%.

Table 21
Perceptions of Elementary Principals Based on Enrollment Concerning Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ele. Prin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Enrollments</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.634*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ele. Prin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller Enrollments</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

Interpersonal Relations

The effects of a middle management union on the interpersonal relations between upper and middle management were examined through the responses of five items listed in the survey. These corresponded to the testing of Hypothesis 18: There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to elementary principals with smaller school district enrollments, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of
interpersonal relations.

Responses to individual items disclosed that principals from smaller districts held more positive views toward a union's impact on interpersonal relations. The results of the t test denoted statistical differences in the opinions of principals. As indicated in Table 22 principals from smaller districts (mean, 10.66) perceived bargaining as having a more positive effect on the interpersonal relations between management levels than principals from larger districts (mean 11.85).

Specifically, differences were noted in four of the five survey items. Principals in smaller districts were in greater agreement that the level of trust between management levels had been strengthened (55.1%) since being unionized. Their colleagues from larger districts were in less agreement. Only 44.1% believed the level of trust strengthened. Smaller district principals were more positive in other areas as well. Most (87.5%) did not believe the creation of unions led to adversarial relationships between management levels. They also agreed that a deterioration of loyalty had not resulted (93.8%). Principals from smaller districts believed that unions enhanced the management team concept (59.4%).
Table 22
Perceptions of Elementary Principals Based on District Enrollment Concerning Interpersonal Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ele. Prin. Larger Enrollments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ele. Prin. Smaller Enrollments</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Although most principals in larger districts shared similar opinions with their colleagues from smaller districts, differences were found. A smaller percentage of principals from larger districts agreed that unions did not result in an adversarial relationship (63.7%). Fewer principals from larger districts agreed that unions did not cause a deterioration in the degree of loyalty (71.5%). The biggest difference came in the area of the effect of unions on the operation of the management team. Only 38.5% of the principals from larger districts saw unions enhancing the management team concept.

One issue did bring near identical agreement between
the two groups of principals. Elementary principals in both large and small districts agreed that unions provided a positive step toward improved management relationships (large districts, 55.9%; smaller districts, 53.3%).

Decision Making

The four questions associated with decision making were utilized in the testing of Hypothesis 19: There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to elementary principals with smaller school district enrollments, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of decision making.

The results of the *t* test for these questions revealed there were no statistical differences in the opinions of principals when based on school district enrollments. As seen in Table 23, principals in both groups held favorable perceptions as to the impact of a union on decision making.

Elementary principals, regardless of district size, perceived the union movement as having a positive impact on the decision making process. Both groups were in agreement that the formation of a union did not reduce the degree of influence middle managers had (larger districts, 83.1%; smaller districts, 93.1%). They also believed that
management practices were influenced by middle management unions (larger districts, 77.1%; smaller districts, 75.0%). Despite the belief that unions influenced management practices, only slightly more than half the principals in both groups believed middle managers had a greater degree of involvement in the decision making process as a result of the union (larger districts, 56.4%; smaller districts, 54.8%).

Table 23

Perceptions of Elementary Principals Based on District Enrollment Concerning Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ele. Prin. Larger Enrollments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.291**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ele. Prin. Smaller Enrollments</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

Finally, most principals in both groups agreed that the union had not placed them in situations which conflicted with the management team. Principals in smaller districts were more in agreement (69.0%) than
those principals from larger districts (60.8%).

Role Definition

The perceptions of principals concerning role definition were analyzed to determine whether differences existed when based on the size of the district according to K-12 enrollment. Their responses corresponded to the testing of Hypothesis 20: There is no difference in the perceptions of elementary principals in districts with larger school district enrollments as compared to elementary principals with smaller school district enrollments, with regard to the impact a middle management union had on the function of the management team concept in the area of role definition.

An examination of the responses showed only slight differences in the perceptions of elementary principals from both larger and smaller districts. The t test revealed that there were no statistical differences in the opinions of the two groups. As shown in Table 23, the enrollment of the school system had no effect on how building principals responded to the impact of a union on the management team in the area of role definition. Principals in both larger and smaller districts had positive views toward the impact of bargaining on the role definition of administrators. An overwhelming percentage of administrators in both groups agreed that the union
assisted in clarifying and defining the roles, rights, and responsibilities of middle managers (larger districts, 83.1%; smaller districts, 96.9%). They also believed that middle management unions were instrumental in the development of job descriptions for all administrators in school districts (larger districts; 70.4%; smaller districts, 80.0%).

Table 24
Perceptions of Elementary Principals Based on District Enrollment Concerning Role Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t ) value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ele. Prin. Larger Enrol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.148**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ele. Prin. Smaller Enro</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not significant at the .05 level.

Summary

Discussion in this chapter focused on the investigation of the perceptions of the impact of a middle management union on the function of the management team concept.
in the areas of communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition. This was achieved through an examination of the responses in five major areas. These included a comparison of: (a) superintendents to elementary principals, (b) superintendents based on years of experience as superintendent, (c) elementary principals based on years of experience as elementary principal, (d) superintendents based on the size of the district's K-12 enrollment, and (e) elementary principals based on the size of the district's K-12 enrollment.

A total of 20 hypotheses were tested in this investigation. Four of the hypotheses were developed to study the differences in the perceptions of superintendents and principals regarding communications, interpersonal relations, decision making, and role definition. Sixteen hypotheses stated that there were no statistical differences in the responses of superintendents and elementary principals when analyzing responses based on years of experience and the size of the district's K-12 enrollment.

A two-tailed $t$ test for independent means with an alpha level of .05 for a Type I error was used to test the hypotheses. Statistical differences were discovered in all four areas when comparing the responses of superintendents and principals. Differences were also noted in the area of role definition when the perceptions of superintendents based on years of experience were compared. A
dissimilarity of responses was found when the opinions of elementary principals toward interpersonal relations were based on the size of the district's enrollment.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The previous four chapters of this study have included an introduction to the problem, a review of the related literature, the design and methodology of this study, and a presentation of the data. This chapter consists of a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact a middle management bargaining union had on the function of the management team concept as perceived by selected superintendents and selected elementary school principals of schools in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties in the state of Michigan.

As a result of a comprehensive search of the literature, twenty hypotheses were devised and a self-designed survey instrument was utilized to collect the data needed for analysis.

To validate the questionnaire, the survey instrument was pilot tested with five elementary principals, three assistant superintendents and two specialists in the field of research and evaluation. After the responses were
collected, some modifications were made. The same respondents were asked to review the instrument again. With the completion of the pilot testing, the questionnaire was mailed to 141 elementary school principals and 39 superintendents as selected by a stratified random sample.

The responses of the superintendents and principals were analyzed and examined for differences in their perceptions as to the impact a union has on communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition. Comparisons of responses were completed on the following: (a) superintendents to principals, (b) superintendents based on years of experience as superintendent, (c) elementary principals based on years of experience as an elementary principal, (d) superintendents based on the size of the district's K-12 enrollment, and (e) elementary principals based on the size of the district's K-12 enrollment.

A two-tailed t test for independent means was used to test the hypotheses in order to determine whether statistical differences existed between the groups.

Superintendents and Elementary Principals

An analysis of the responses of superintendents and elementary principals indicated significant statistical differences in their perceptions in all four areas under investigation. The perceptions of the elementary
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principals toward the impact that a union had on the function of the management team concept were favorable in all four areas. According to the data, principals held positive views as to the union movement's effects on communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition between upper and middle management.

Since the formation of a union, principals believed communications with upper management had improved. Elementary administrators cited more honest discussions with upper management and the gain of regular access to the board of education as outcomes of unionization.

They also believed that unions provided a positive step toward improved middle/upper management relationships. Principals stated that the level of trust among all levels of management improved and that unionization did not create an adversarial relationship.

Principals also attributed their degree of influence in decision making to the formation of a union. In addition to obtaining a greater degree of involvement in the decision making process, they were able to influence the management practices of the district.

Lastly, principals believed middle management unions assisted in clarifying and defining the roles, rights and responsibilities of middle managers. This, in turn, had an impact on the development of job descriptions for all administrators.
In contrast, the superintendents' opinions were less favorable. Few superintendents perceived that communications improved either through the degree of honesty of discussion or via access to the board of education. Closely associated with this, the chief executive officers did not perceive the interpersonal relations among management to improve either. In their opinion, unions did not strengthen the level of trust between upper and middle management. They overwhelmingly stated that unions did not enhance the management team.

As for the decision making process, superintendents did not believe that administrative unionization had a major impact on management practices. Although the union influenced management practices, superintendents did not believe it resulted in a greater degree of involvement for middle managers. Unlike the principals, superintendents did believe that at times unions put their members in conflict with the team.

Another area of disagreement centered in the realm of role definition. While superintendents conceded that unions assisted in clarifying and defining the roles, rights and responsibilities of middle managers, they did not believe that unions were instrumental in the development of job descriptions for all administrators.
Superintendents Based on Experience

Years of experience as superintendent did not appear to be a major factor as to how superintendents perceived the impact of a middle management bargaining unit in the three of the four areas under investigation. The results of the $t$ tests revealed that there were no differences in the perceptions of superintendents regarding communications, interpersonal relations and decision making. As indicated in the previous section, superintendents did not believe that bargaining had a favorable impact on those concerns.

A difference of opinions was discovered in the area of role definition. Superintendents with the less experience as superintendents overwhelming agreed that unions were instrumental in the development of specific job descriptions for all school administrators. In comparison, a high percentage of those with more experience disagreed with this statement.

Principals Based on Experience

The perceptions of principals did not appear to be influenced by the number of years in which they were elementary principals. The data from the $t$ tests revealed that there were no statistical differences in any of the areas under investigation. As stated in an earlier section, principals believed that unionization had an overall
positive impact on the communications, interpersonal relations, decision making and role definition between upper and middle management.

Superintendents Based on District Enrollment

The data from this study indicated that the K-12 enrollment size of school districts did not influence how superintendents responded. Differences in the perceptions of superintendents were not found when using district enrollment as a basis for comparison. Overall the chief executive officers of the school districts shared similar opinions as to impact of the middle management union.

Principals Based on District Enrollment

Like their counterparts, there were no differences in the perceptions of principals regarding the unions impact on communications, decision making and role definition. A difference was noted, however, in the perceptions of principals when employed in districts with smaller enrollments as compared to those from districts with larger enrollments. Principals in the smaller districts held more positive views toward the union's impact on the interpersonal relations of upper and middle management than their colleagues from larger districts. An overwhelming percentage of principals in the smaller districts agreed that the union did not lead to an
adversarial relationship between upper and middle management. As a group, they were near unanimous in the belief that the union did not cause a deterioration in the degree of loyalty between levels of management. Most believed that the movement actually strengthened the level of trust between upper and middle management. For these reasons principals from smaller districts believed middle management unions enhanced the management team concept.

Principals from larger districts had different views. Most principals did not agree that the union strengthened the level of trust or enhanced the management team concept. They were also less in agreement that the union did not create an adversarial relationship or did not result in a deterioration of the degree of loyalty between the management team. There was one item on which principals from both sized districts possessed similar perceptions. Both groups agreed middle management unions provided a positive step toward improved upper and middle management relationships.

Conclusions

The creation of middle management unions has had an effect on the function of the management team concept. The data from the survey indicated that both principals and superintendents perceived the middle management union to have an impact on the management team concept.
The findings of this study provided evidence that elementary principals perceived unionization to have a positive impact on their assignment within the school district. They believed that the existence of a bargaining unit enabled them to recapture their previous position in some of the areas of concern which initially led them to organize.

In contrast, different perceptions were held by the superintendents of schools. They did not believe that middle management unions had the same impact on the management team concept that the elementary principals did. In their opinion, it did not have a favorable effect on the communications, interpersonal relationships and the decision making process between upper and middle management.

The conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data in this study are as follows:

1. Superintendents and elementary principals continue to hold different perceptions as to the impact a middle management union has on the function of the management team concept.

2. Neither years of experience in the position nor the size of the district in terms of K-12 enrollment, appeared to be a major factor as to how superintendents and elementary principals perceived the impact of the middle management union.
3. Middle management unions were not perceived to be a vehicle which assisted in the strengthening of the level of trust between upper and middle management.

4. Middle management bargaining was not perceived to result in an adversarial relationship between upper and middle management.

5. The unionization of middle managers was not viewed as causing a deterioration in the degree of loyalty between top management and middle managers.

6. Middle management unions were likely to influence the management practices of school districts.

7. Middle management unions were perceived to have assisted in clarifying and defining the roles, rights and responsibilities of middle managers.

8. As a result of having to interact with middle management unions for several years, it appears superintendents have developed a perception which allows for a tolerable coexistence between the management team and middle management unions.

Recommendations

The findings of this investigation provided answers to the questions raised in the first chapter. As a result of this study, additional questions have been raised. Further research is needed in the realm of middle management unions in public education. The following are
suggestions for possible areas to research as well as suggestions for practices to be implemented.

1. Since numerous differences existed in the perceptions of superintendents and elementary principals, further research is needed to determine the extent and causes of these differences.

2. An expanded study including the perceptions of high school and middle school administrators would provide additional insights into this topic.

3. Parallel studies from other regions in Michigan would provide valuable information to state professional organizations to which principals belong, and which offer assistance in the bargaining process to their membership.

4. Given the current discussion as to the merits or lack of benefits of belonging to a union, a study examining the growth or decline of public education middle management unions may be warranted.

5. It is recommended that further research be undertaken in the areas of causes of middle management unionization in schools in the management team concept, and effects of administrator unionization. This study could serve as a basis for such research.

6. Since this investigation examines the perceptions of the respondents, it is recommended that further research analyze the correlation between the perceptions of this study and the actual impact of a middle management
union on the function of the management team.

7. It is recommended that a parallel study be undertaken in other areas of the country. Michigan's school administrator union movement is entering its second decade of existence. Interestingly the growth of middle management unionism is still in its infancy. Since unions in Michigan are recognized for their aggressiveness, the new study will enable the findings of this study to have either greater generality or will regionalize their scope.

8. The Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association should share the findings of this study with those members contemplating forming a middle management bargaining unit.

9. The findings identify a need for the Michigan Association of School Administrators, the Michigan School Boards Association and the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association to sponsor a joint study and evaluation of current management practices used in school districts. These organizations could provide needed inservice in this area.

10. This survey could have substantial impact on school districts such as those identified in the research. The findings of this study could help both upper and middle management better understand the dynamics between the management union and the management team. It is recommended that school districts compare and contrast the
perceptions of the respondents with those of their own management personnel in order to strengthen the management practices of their district.
Appendix A

Letters of Transmittal
June 7, 1985

Dear Colleague:

Collective bargaining for principals, assistant principals and supervisors is approaching its second decade of existence. Over this span of time varying opinions regarding this topic have been expressed. Since members of administrative unions are typically considered to be a part of the management team, it is important to examine the impact a middle management union has on the management team concept. It is for this reason that I have chosen this topic for my dissertation study at Western Michigan University.

Your attitude relative to the impact administrative unions have had on the communications, interpersonal relations, decision making process, and role definition of team members is critical. Your response will provide information necessary to evaluate the effects of administrative unionization.

I am asking your cooperation in completing the enclosed survey. The statements were developed as a result of an extensive review of the literature addressing this subject.

Due to its brevity, only a few minutes should be required to complete the instrument. Your personal confidentiality and the anonymity of your district will be preserved in this study. Neither your name nor the district's name will be identified in the survey results or write-up of the research. The numbered instrument is merely intended to maintain accurate record keeping. Please return the completed form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by June 20, 1985.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Barresi

SB:bas

Enclosure
June 7, 1985

Dear Superintendent:

Collective bargaining for principals, assistant principals and supervisors is approaching its second decade of existence. Over this span of time varying opinions regarding this topic have been expressed. Since members of administrative unions are typically considered to be a part of the management team, it is important to examine the impact a middle management union has on the management team concept. It is for this reason that I have chosen this topic for my dissertation study at Western Michigan University.

Your attitude relative to the impact administrative unions have had on the communications, interpersonal relations, decision making process, and role definition of team members is critical. Your response will provide information necessary to evaluate the effects of administrative unionization.

I am asking your cooperation in completing the enclosed survey. The statements were developed as a result of an extensive review of the literature addressing this subject.

Due to its brevity, only a few minutes should be required to complete the instrument. Your personal confidentiality and the anonymity of your district will be preserved in this study. Neither your name nor the district’s name will be identified in the survey results or write-up of the research. The numbered instrument is merely intended to maintain accurate record keeping. Please return the completed form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by June 20, 1985.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Barresi

SB:bas
Enclosure
Appendix B

Survey Instruments
Please respond to the items below which best describes you and your school district.

1. Total years of experience as an Elementary Principal ______.
2. School district enrollment (K-12): ________.
3. In which county is your district located (please check)
   ______Wayne        ______Oakland        ______Macomb

Please indicate your response to each item by placing an "X" in the box which best describes your attitude toward each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle management unions have resulted in more honest discussions between middle managers and their superordinates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle management unions have provided middle managers with a means of maintaining regular access to the board of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Middle management unions have helped create improved communications between middle managers and their superordinates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVER....
### INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

1. Middle management unions have provided a positive step toward improved middle manager/superordinate relationships.

2. Middle management unions have strengthened the level of trust between middle managers and their superordinates.

3. Middle management unions have not created an adversary relationship between middle managers and their superordinates.

4. Middle management unions have not resulted in a deterioration in the degree of loyalty between middle managers and top management.

5. Middle management unions have enhanced the management team concept.

### DECISION MAKING

1. Middle management unions have not reduced the degree of influence that middle managers have in the decision-making process.

2. Middle management unions have influenced the management practices of school district.

3. Middle management unions have resulted in a greater degree of involvement for middle managers in the decision-making process.

4. Middle management unions have not placed middle managers in situations where the position of the bargaining unit has conflicted with those of the management team.

### ROLE DEFINITION

1. Middle management unions have assisted in clarifying and defining the roles, rights, and responsibilities of middle managers.

2. Middle management unions have been instrumental in the development of specific job descriptions for all administrators in school districts.
Please respond to the items below which best describes you and your school district.

1. Total years of experience as a Superintendent of Schools ________.
2. School district enrollment (K-12): ________________.
3. In which county is your district located (please check):
   ____Wayne  ____Oakland  ____Macomb

Please indicate your response to each item by placing an "X" in the box which best describes your attitude toward each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATIONS</th>
<th>STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle management unions have resulted in more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest discussions between middle managers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their superordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle management unions have provided middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managers with a means of maintaining regular access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the board of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Middle management unions have helped create</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved communications between middle managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and their superordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVER...
### INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

1. Middle management unions have provided a positive step toward improved middle manager/superordinate relationships.

2. Middle management unions have strengthened the level of trust between middle managers and their superordinates.

3. Middle management unions have not created an adversary relationship between middle managers and their superordinates.

4. Middle management unions have not resulted in a deterioration in the degree of loyalty between middle managers and top management.

5. Middle management unions have enhanced the management team concept.

### DECISION MAKING

1. Middle management unions have not reduced the degree of influence that middle managers have in the decision-making process.

2. Middle management unions have influenced the management practices of school district.

3. Middle management unions have resulted in a greater degree of involvement for middle managers in the decision-making process.

4. Middle management unions have not placed middle managers in situations where the position of the bargaining unit has conflicted with those of the management team.

### ROLE DEFINITION

1. Middle management unions have assisted in clarifying and defining the roles, rights, and responsibilities of middle managers.

2. Middle management unions have been instrumental in the development of specific job descriptions for all administrators in school districts.
Appendix C

Follow-Up Letter of Transmittal
Dear

Two weeks ago you received a response instrument entitled "The Impact of Middle Management Bargaining on the Management Team Concept." If you have not had the opportunity to complete and return it, I would appreciate your spending the ten minutes necessary to complete the attached questionnaire.

As a result of the small sample size being asked to participate in this study, it is very important that each person respond. Your personal confidentiality and the anonymity of your district will be preserved in this study. The numbered instrument is merely intended to maintain accurate record keeping.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Barresi
Appendix D

Letter of Transmittal for Pilot Study
Dear :

As part of my doctoral research at Western Michigan University, I have developed a questionnaire for the purposes of obtaining information pertaining to the attitudes of selected administrators toward the impact that a middle management bargaining unit has had on the management team concept.

I would appreciate if you would review the attached instrument and provide feedback relating to its clarity and comprehensiveness. Please write your comments on the survey and return it in the enclosed envelope.

For the purposes of reviewing this questionnaire, the following terms are intended to serve as a guide in examining it.

Clarity: If you were a respondent do you understand each question?

Comprehensiveness: Does each question limit its focus in order to obtain a clear response?

Appropriateness: Does each question appear to measure the attitudes of administrators as it relates to the impact a middle management bargaining unit has had on the management team concept?

Completeness: Is each question sufficiently narrowed to obtain a clear response?

I appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Samuel L. Barresi
Appendix E

Detailed Tables Pertaining to the Number of Elementary Principals in MEMSPA and Stratification of School Districts by Size
Table E-1

The Number of Elementary Principals by County and District Who Hold Membership in MEMSPA and Whose District Has a Middle Management Bargaining Unit in Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Elementary Principals in MEMSPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dearborn Heights #7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecorse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harper Woods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inkster</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln Park</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livonia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melvindale - North Allen Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plymouth-Canton</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redford Union</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romulus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Elementary Principals in MEMSPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne-Westland</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhaven</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomfield Hills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarkston</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clawson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazel Park</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Elementary Principals in MEMSPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb</td>
<td>Center Line</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chippewa Valley</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Shore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakeview</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L'Anse Creuse</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Clemens</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Dyke</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warren Consolidated</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E-2

**Stratification of School Districts Under Investigation by Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>12,397</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dearborn Heights #7</td>
<td>2,674</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gibraltar Rockwood</td>
<td>4,068</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harper Woods</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inkster</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livonia</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melvindale-N. Allen Park</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northville</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plymouth-Canton</td>
<td>15,217</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redford Union</td>
<td>4,794</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Buren</td>
<td>6,479</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne-Westland</td>
<td>16,289</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodhaven</td>
<td>4,559</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomfield Hills</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,014</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clawson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,822</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,832</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,890</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,420</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,685</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,472</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,842</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walled Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,866</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bloomfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,547</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb</td>
<td>Center Line</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chippewa Valley</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Shore</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakeview</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L'Anse Creuse</td>
<td>7,154</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Clemens</td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Dyke</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warren Consolidated</td>
<td>19,865</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43 Districts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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