The Relationship of a State Teacher Negotiations Law to the Role Behavior of Elementary School Principals

Troy E. Bramlett
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations
Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/3004

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.
THE RELATIONSHIP OF A STATE TEACHER NEGOTIATIONS LAW TO THE ROLE BEHAVIOR OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

by

Troy E. Bramlett

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April, 1970
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is indebted to Ralph Stogdill, author of the LBDQ Questionnaire for his permission to use selected items of the LBDQ in the data gathering instrument of this study. Also, a special note of appreciation is given to principals and teachers in Kalamazoo County, Michigan and Delaware County, Indiana who participated in the study.

An expression of gratefulness is extended by the writer to the Mott Foundation and Western Michigan's School of Graduate Studies for their financial assistance during his graduate work at Western Michigan University.

The writer is thankful and appreciative of the valuable contributions and moral support given by his Major Adviser, Dr. Maurice Seay, Research Adviser, Dr. David Curl, and the other members of his doctoral committee, Dr. Albert Becker, Dr. Dale Faunce, and Dr. Eugene Kirchherr.

Finally, the writer dedicates this dissertation to his family and especially his wife Darlene whose patience and understanding were instrumental in its completion.

Troy E. Bramlett
BRAMLETT, Troy E., 1935-
THE RELATIONSHIP OF A STATE TEACHER NEGOTIATIONS LAW TO THE ROLE BEHAVIOR OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.

Western Michigan University, Ed.D., 1970 Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</th>
<th>ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF APPENDIX EXHIBITS</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose of the Study and Overview</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses and Rationale</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses relating to production</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses relating to initiation-of-structure</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses relating to human consideration</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses relating to teacher representation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses relating to tolerance-in-granting-freedom-to-teachers-for-decision-making</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of the Study</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>SURVEY OF THE RELATED LITERATURE</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose and Overview</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Negotiations</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional negotiations vs. collective bargaining</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of teacher negotiations</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes of the rapid growth of teacher negotiations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in teacher militancy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State laws requiring teacher negotiations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precedent for teacher negotiations established by the Labor Movement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Theory and Its Application to the Elementary School Principal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role concept</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of role to the elementary school principal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Effect of Teacher Negotiations on the Elementary School Principal's Role Behavior</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal's role in the negotiations process</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effect of teacher negotiations on the elementary school principal's day-to-day behavior toward teachers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III PROCEEDURES AND RESEARCH DESIGN</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Variables</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples and Populations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability and validity of the LBDQ</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary investigations</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures used in data gathering</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production-Related Hypotheses</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation-of-Structure Related Hypotheses</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Consideration Related Hypotheses</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Related Hypotheses</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance-in-Granting-Teachers-Freedom-for-Decision-making Related Hypotheses</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS; IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH; AND SUMMARY OF THE STUDY</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and Interpretations</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Further Research</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the Study</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Schools and Number of Principals and Teachers in the Study: Kalamazoo County</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Schools and Number of Principals and Teachers in the Study: Delaware County</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Selected Criteria for Determination of Comparability of Schools in Kalamazoo County to Schools in Delaware County</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship of Subscales and Items of the LBDQ to the Hypotheses of the Study</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rate of Questionnaire Returns</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Paradigm for Mean Comparisons, Testing the Hypotheses of the Study</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Analysis of Data Regarding Production</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Analysis of Data Regarding Initiation-of-Structure</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Analysis of Data Regarding Human Consideration</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Analysis of Data Regarding Representation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Analysis of Data Regarding Freedom-for-Decision-Making</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF APPENDIX EXHIBITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Principal's Self-Perceptions of His Behavior Prior to the Enactment of PA 379</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Principal's Self-Perceptions of His Current Behavior</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Teacher's Perceptions of Principal's Behavior Prior to the Enactment of PA 379</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Teacher's Perceptions of Current Principal's Behavior</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reliability Coefficients: Subscales of the LBDQ in Different Leadership Situations</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Letter of Confirmation that Indiana Has No State Teachers Negotiations Law</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Letter of Request for a Directory of Delaware County</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Letter of Request for Permission to Reproduce and Use Selected Items of the LBDQ</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Letter of Request to Involve District Participation in the Study</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Response Form of District Approval or Disapproval</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Letter of Request for Interviews with Indiana Superintendents</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Schedule for Interviews</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Letter of Explanation to Teachers Concerning the Purpose and Procedures of the Study</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Letter of Appreciation to Participants for Their Help in the Study</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

On July 23, 1965, the Michigan State Legislature enacted Public Employment Relations Act 379 commonly referred to as Public Act 379, or simply PA 379. This legislation has had special significance to teachers and to school administrators, although it applies to other public employees as well. For the first time, the Act declared it lawful for Michigan's public employees (including teachers) to organize into organizations and to bargain collectively with public employers over wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment. Lieberman and Moskow\(^1\) describe some of the features of the law as follows:

The act provides for the right of public employees to organize; protects employees from unlawful interference, coercion, or intimidation; authorizes the Michigan Labor Mediation Board to conduct representative elections; requires public employers to negotiate in good faith with the designated exclusive representative of the employees on "rates of pay, wages, hours of employment or other conditions of employment"; and establishes unfair labor practices. Strike prohibitions from previous legislation were continued, but public employers are no longer required to impose fines, firings, and jail terms on public employees who strike.

The Michigan Labor Mediation Board is authorized to determine appropriate units of representation, investigate unfair labor practices, issue cease-and-desist orders, and

provide mediation services when an impasse arises. Fact-finding with nonbinding recommendations is the terminal point of the impasse procedure.

A written agreement is required upon request of either party. Such an agreement can serve as a bar to future representation elections for a period of up to three years. Even if no agreement is reached, the law prohibits more than one representation election in any one twelve-month period.

Four significant trends or changes soon followed the passage of PA 379. First, Michigan teachers gained unusually large salary increases. Rehmus and Wilner\(^1\) in a study of 12 selected school districts report that during the three years preceding PA 379, minimum salary levels increased at a rate of 3 per cent per year. However, following the passage of PA 379, minimum salary levels have increased between 8 per cent and 10 per cent per year. A comparable increase was found also at maximum teacher salary levels.

Second, the teacher's public image has been altered as a consequence of public confrontations with school boards including such acts as strikes and name calling. Houts\(^2\) writes: "To many people, the idea of teachers going on strike has an unprofessional ring to it. The citizen is apt to ask if teachers are no more idealistic or professional than an auto worker or a coal miner."

Third, teacher negotiations under the provisions of PA 379 have drastically revised the decision-making process in schools.


\(^2\)Houts, P., "Professional Negotiations: Report from DESP." National Elementary Principal, LV (February, 1968), 64.
Prior to the enactment of PA 379, school boards had sole responsibility for policy decisions, while relying almost exclusively on professional recommendations of school administrators. In this regard, Epstein\(^1\) writes as follows:

For most of the history of American public elementary and secondary education, all power resided in the hands of the school board. The board far too often used its powers to keep costs down and to retain not-to-be-questioned control of all educational policy.

Teacher involvement in policy making was one of consultant and adviser, and even then their considerations were sometimes screened by school administrators. However, Kruger\(^2\) states, "Available evidence emerging from collective bargaining agreements suggests that teachers are now actively involved in decisions which shape the teacher-student relationship and which enhance the professional and economic status of teachers." Such a broad description provides no distinctive boundary for teacher involvement in decision-making, and indeed the boundary has been in many cases "whatever the market would bear" or simply whatever teachers could negotiate from the board.

A fourth significant change brought about by teacher negotiations has been in the role of the school administrator. Olson,\(^3\)

---


\(^3\) Olson, A.D., "Principals and Professional Negotiations." National Elementary Principal, XLVI (April, 1967), 31-2.
Lieberman,\textsuperscript{1} and Scott\textsuperscript{2} have written on this particular impact of teacher negotiations. It is the intent of this study to examine one part of this role change, that of the elementary school principal's behavior toward teachers.

**Purpose of the Study and Overview**

The purpose of the study is to determine if certain changes have occurred in the role behavior of elementary school principals in Kalamazoo County, Michigan toward teachers since the enactment of PA 379. Many opinions are found in the literature to indicate that the principal has been forced to alter his professional relationship with teachers because of pressures originating with teacher negotiations; however, there has been little empirical evidence to support or refute such claims.

This investigation is a field study involving 30 principals and 192 teachers in Kalamazoo County, Michigan and 33 principals and 237 teachers in Delaware County, Indiana. It is designed to test hypotheses which predict specific ways in which the principal's role behavior has changed.

Testing of hypotheses is accomplished by two approaches. First, Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals and teachers who were in

\textsuperscript{1}op. cit., pp. 50-1.

their present positions prior to the enactment of PA 379 will rate their recalled perceptions of principal behavior as well as their current perceptions of principal behavior. This comparison provides a "before" and "after" look at the same principal's behavior prior to and subsequent to the advent of PA 379.

Second, a comparison will be made between the current perceptions of those same Kalamazoo County principals and teachers on principal behavior to current perceptions of Indiana's Delaware County principals and teachers toward principal behavior. Delaware County was selected as a comparison county to Kalamazoo according to criteria which will be explained in Chapter III. This comparison looks at principal behavior in a state that has a teacher negotiations law (Michigan) to principal behavior in a state where no such law exists (Indiana). It attempts to provide a limited consideration of variables which have been introduced into school systems since the introduction of PA 379 in that such variables would have likely affected principals' behavior in both states similarly.

Chapter I states the scope of the impact of PA 379, and notes the aspect under investigation. An overview of the study is given and hypotheses are developed with accompanying rationale. A definition of terms is included in the chapter which includes both theoretical and operational definitions. Theoretical assumptions are then discussed with an emphasis on role theory as it relates to the school principal. A description of the implications of the research for educators is provided, and the chapter concludes with
Chapter II is a review of the related literature. Included in this review is a brief summary of the literature relating to the history of teacher negotiations with an emphasis on the causes of teacher militancy which led to teacher negotiations; the development of state laws requiring teacher negotiations, the basis of which was laid by the Labor Movement; role theory as it relates to the school principal; and lastly, the impact of teacher negotiations on the role of the elementary school principal.

Chapter III provides a description of the research design including source of data, instrument employed, procedures, and method of data analysis.

Chapter IV presents the analysis of data in reportable form. A table of data between the comparison groups is provided for each area related to a set of hypotheses (production, etc.). The table is followed by statements accepting or rejecting the research hypotheses which are in turn followed by a discussion of the table.

Chapter V interprets the data, reviews some of the limitations of the study, points out implications for principals who operate under teacher negotiations, and recommends areas for further research.

Definition of Terms

1. Michigan principals and teachers are full-time public elementary school principals and teachers (K-6) in Kalamazoo County, Michigan, who operate under a statewide teacher negotiations law, and who
have been employed in their present positions for four years or more.

2. Indiana principals and teachers are full-time public elementary school principals and teachers (K-6) in Delaware County, Indiana, who do not operate under a statewide teacher negotiations law, and who have been employed in their present positions for four years or more.

3. Production-centered indicates that the principal applies pressure for production, by stressing to teachers the importance of standardized test scores, and by urging teachers to work harder in the classroom.

4. Initiation-of-structure indicates that the principal clearly defines his role, and lets followers know what is expected of them. He is rigid in defining and enforcing the rules and regulations of the organization, and he views teachers as a work group rather than as individuals.

5. Human-centered indicates behavior that regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of teachers.

6. Representative of teacher groups indicates behavior which speaks and acts as the representative of the teachers.

7. Tolerance in granting freedom to teachers for decision-making indicates behavior which allows teachers scope for initiative, decision, and action.

8. Role behavior will be defined according to Sargent, who

---

writes, "A person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group."

9. Teacher negotiations will be defined according to Lieberman, who writes:

Collective negotiations is a process whereby employees as a group and their employers make offers and counter-offers in good faith on the conditions of the employment relationship for the purpose of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. A written document incorporating any such agreement is executed if requested by either party.

In this document teacher negotiations, collective negotiations and professional negotiations will be used interchangeably.

Hypotheses and Rationale

In general the hypotheses predict that the principal's role in schools having teacher negotiations under the provisions of PA 379 is perceived to be more organization-centered than it was prior to the enactment of PA 379. The principal perceives himself and is perceived by teachers to be more concerned with organizational needs than human needs when compared to his behavior before teacher negotiations. More specifically, five hypotheses predict the principal's role has changed in regard to an emphasis on the following areas: (1) production, (2) initiation-of-structure, (3) human-consideration, (4) representation-of-teacher-groups, and (5) tolerance-in-granting-freedom-to-teachers-for-decision-making. Each set

\(^{1}\) op. cit., p. 1.
of hypotheses is examined from the viewpoints of Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals and teachers and from the viewpoints of Indiana's Delaware County principals and teachers. Thus, the hypotheses dealing with each area (production for example) will be developed into a set of four related hypotheses labeled a, b, c, and d.

Each set of hypotheses is accompanied by a rationale for posing the hypotheses. The rationale is based on (1) authoritative pronouncements in the literature, (2) interviews with authorities in the area of teacher negotiations including principals and teachers, (3) speeches made by authorities in the area of teacher negotiations, and (4) the limited research available.

**Hypotheses relating to production**

**Hypothesis 1-a** The self-perceptions of behavior for Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals are more production-centered toward teachers than are the self-perceptions of Indiana's Delaware County principals.

**Hypothesis 1-b** Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers perceive the behavior of their principals to be more production-centered than do Indiana's Delaware County teachers.

**Hypothesis 1-c** At the date of testing (September through December 1969), Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals' self-perceptions of behavior are more production-centered than are their recalled self-perceptions of behavior prior to PA 379.

**Hypothesis 1-d** At the date of testing, Michigan's Kalamazoo County
teachers will perceive their principals' behavior to be more production-centered compared to their recalled perceptions of his behavior prior to PA 379.

Rationale for the above hypotheses derives from change in attitudes of school board members and the public toward the responsibility of the school principal for production. At a teacher negotiations presentation to the Mott Interns at Flint, Michigan, Groty\(^1\) indicated that when teacher negotiations first began in Michigan, school boards were almost unconditional in granting substantial salary increases to teachers. They realized that teacher salaries were out of line with other professional salaries. However, noted Groty, after three years of high salary increases, this discrepancy is no longer significant, and school boards are demanding something in return for salary increases, namely accountability and production. Perhaps, it should be pointed out that such demands for accountability are coming from parents and pressure groups also. Indeed, legislative demands for statewide testing and assessment may well have their roots in the citizen's expectation that he receive something in return for his tax dollars.

From whatever the source, the major responsibility for enforcement of demands for production have been delegated to the school principal.

**Hypotheses relating to initiation-of-structure**

**Hypothesis 2-a** The self-perceptions of behavior for Michigan's

Kalamazoo County principals are more initiation-of-structure-centered than are the self-perceptions of behavior for Indiana's Delaware County principals.

**Hypothesis 2-b** Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers perceive the behavior of their principals to be more initiation-of-structure-centered than do Indiana's Delaware County teachers.

**Hypothesis 2-c** At the date of testing, Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals' self-perceptions of behavior are more initiation-of-structure-centered than are their recalled self-perceptions of behavior prior to PA 379.

**Hypothesis 2-d** At the date of testing, Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers will perceive their principals' behavior to be more initiation-of-structure-centered when compared to their recalled perceptions of his behavior prior to PA 379.

Teacher negotiations have formalized the role relationship of principals to teachers, thus providing the basis for the above stated hypotheses. Prior to teacher negotiations, the principal was inclined to think of himself as a member of the teachers' team. His interaction with teachers was on a highly personal basis and often emphasized a minimum of organizational distance between his role and that of the teachers within his building.

Following PA 379 and teacher negotiations, this role relationship has changed. Now the principal more clearly defines his role as part of the management team, or at least this redefinition was
indicated by Frost's research as reported in Phi Delta Kappan.\(^1\) Perhaps this redefinition is due in part to the tendency of both teachers and principals to copy industry's labor-management model. Such a model calls for principal behavior that regards teachers as a work group rather than as individuals. Under the pressures of enforcing the negotiated contract, the principal is likely to use uniform procedures and to establish standard rules and regulations.

In describing the effects of teacher negotiations on the principal's behavior, Lieberman\(^2\) writes: "The dynamics of the situation lead to system-wide rules. If one principal has fewer and shorter faculty meetings than another, word gets around." "Thus," adds Lieberman,\(^3\) "there is an impulsion toward system-wide rules with consequent diminution of the principal's authority." Therefore the principal lets teachers know where he stands, and may be reluctant to overlook minor deviations by teachers from the provisions of the contract.

There are several causes of this somewhat less personal relationship between principal and teacher. One of these is the principal's fear that special allowances for an individual teacher can become the basis for precedent or past practice. For example, a principal who repeatedly allows one teacher to leave school early may be subject to grievances from other teachers who are denied similar requests at a future date.

\(^1\)ibid., "Employment Relations in Higher Education." Phi Delta Kappan, LI (September, 1969), 60.

\(^2\)op. cit., p. 368.

\(^3\)ibid.
Another cause of the formal relationship between principals and teachers, according to some principals, is the growth in power and status of teacher organizations. Such organizations have given teachers a new feeling of power, independence, and identity or cohesion. Part of this spirit derives its force from an adversary relationship between principal and teachers.

In short, the principal under the provisions of PA 379 is forced to assume a more distant and structured role than did his predecessors. Perhaps this role is well summed up by Nigro when he writes: "All public administrators, who are under collective negotiations, agree to deal with organizations of employees, rather than employees as individuals."

Hypotheses related to human consideration

Hypothesis 3-a The self-perceptions of behavior for Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals are less human-centered than are the self-perceptions of Indiana's Delaware County principals.

Hypothesis 3-b Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers perceive the behavior of their principals to be less human-centered toward teachers than do Indiana's Delaware County teachers.

Hypothesis 3-c At the date of testing, the self-perceptions of behavior for Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals are less

---

1Nigro, Feliz, "The Implications for Public Administration." The Public Administration Review, XX (April, 1968), 137.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
human centered toward teachers than are their recalled self-perceptions of behavior prior to PA 379.

**Hypothesis 3-d** At the date of testing, Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers will perceive their principals' behavior to be less human-centered when compared to recalled perceptions of their principals' behavior prior to PA 379.

Although, as pointed out by Halpin, human consideration can be a part of effective leadership style in conjunction with task orientation, it is not assured. Public Act 379 has had a traumatic impact on school principals. As noted by Langer, principals have had to change their "modus operandi" in dealing with teachers. Moreover, Cunningham reports that many principals whom she interviewed felt that teacher negotiations had impinged upon the authority of the school principal, bringing with them anger and frustration on the part of principals. For example, she quotes one principal as saying, "I was appointed to run this school and just can't accept giving away my authority to teachers. I'll get out first."

Cunningham goes on to write,

> The spectacle of two negotiating parties (the superintendent and the teachers) neither of which represents the principal,

---


4ibid.
reaching accord by swapping such things as work rules that have been the principal's prerogative until now, is the source of increased frustration, if not panic for the building principal.

There is some evidence from Frost's doctoral dissertation as reported by Phi Delta Kappan,¹ that the bitterness and alienation between principals and teachers have caused their personal relationships to deteriorate.

In short, the principal does not view his new role, that of the organizational leader, to be compatible with efficient human relations. His consequent behavior conveys such impressions to teachers.

Hypotheses related to teacher representation

Hypothesis 4-a The self-perceptions of behavior for Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals are less representative of teacher groups than are the self-perceptions of Indiana's Delaware County principals.

Hypothesis 4-b Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers perceive the behavior of their principals to be less representative of teacher groups than do Indiana's Delaware County teachers.

Hypothesis 4-c At the date of testing, the self-perceptions of behavior for Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals are less representative of teacher groups than are their recalled perceptions of behavior prior to PA 379.

Hypothesis 4-d  At the date of testing, Michigan's Kalamazoo County
teachers will perceive their principals' behavior to be less
representative of teacher groups when compared to recalled per­
ceptions of their principals' behavior prior to PA 379.

These hypotheses attempt to answer the question of whether or
not the principal's identity and loyalty with teacher groups has
been altered as a consequence of PA 379. Groty\(^1\) indicated that
prior to teacher negotiations, principals perceived themselves to
be part of the teachers' group. This association was natural in
that first, principals were former teachers, and second, principals
worked closely with teachers on a daily basis. Similarly, Houts\(^2\)
writes that the principal had a close psychological relationship
to teachers because of his father-figure symbolism and because he
had more contact with teachers than with central office personnel.
However, adds Houts, the "Big Daddy" role of the principal is
changing with teacher negotiations.

There appears to be a trend toward excluding principals from
teacher organizations, particularly during the negotiations process.
An NEA Research Bulletin\(^3\) stated that 61 per cent of classroom
bargaining units represent teachers only. Having been "booted out,"

\(^1\) op. cit.
\(^2\) op. cit., p. 66.
\(^3\), "Are Principals Represented in Bargaining Units?"
so to speak, of the teachers' group, the principal has shifted his loyalty from teachers to the school board because of his responsibility of enforcement of the negotiated contract. Consequently, school boards have been working more closely with principals than in the past. Keller\textsuperscript{1} agreed with Groty in some instances, but added that the principal's loyalty has shifted even closer to his professional association, mainly because school boards have often forgotten the principal during the negotiations process. In some cases, Keller added, principals have witnessed their administrative prerogatives negotiated away by school boards without any consultation. In cases like these, principals have been looking more and more to their professional association for power and security. Keller\textsuperscript{2} cites the minutes of the Executive Council Meeting which records the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP) disaffiliation with the Michigan Education Association (MEA), which reads as follows: "It was felt generally that a United Profession within MEA is no longer possible since the passage of PA 379 and that administrators can handle restructuring better by being outside the MEA, as MEA at present can only represent the classroom teachers." On September 14, 1967, the executive assistant to MAESP reported that its members had voted to disaffiliate with MEA

\textsuperscript{1} Keller, Ed, The Executive Secretary of the Elementary School Administrators Association of Michigan, Personal Interview, July, 1969.

\textsuperscript{2} Keller, Ed, Minutes from the Board of Directors and Executive Council Meeting of the MAESP, Lansing, Michigan, September 14, 1967.
by a margin of 85 per cent yes to 14 per cent no. This act officially ended the close professional association of the principals to teachers, at least in the state of Michigan.

Hypotheses related to tolerance in granting freedom to teachers for decision-making

Hypothesis 5-a The self-perceptions of behavior for Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals are more tolerant in granting freedom to teachers for decision-making than are the self-perceptions of Indiana's Delaware County principals.

Hypothesis 5-b Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers perceive the behavior of their principals to be more tolerant in granting freedom to teachers for decision-making than do Indiana's Delaware County teachers.

Hypothesis 5-c At the date of testing, the self-perceptions of behavior for Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals are more tolerant in granting freedom to teachers for decision-making than are their recalled self-perceptions of behavior prior to PA 379.

Hypothesis 5-d At the date of testing, Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers will perceive their principals' behavior to be more tolerant in granting freedom to teachers for decision-making when compared to recalled perceptions of the principals' behavior prior to PA 379.

Kruger, Houts, and others have pointed out earlier in this chapter that the days of the authoritarian principal are limited as a consequence of teacher negotiations. Perhaps the situation is
somewhat analogous to Galbraith's\textsuperscript{1} description of the "techno-structure" in industry. In this description, Galbraith points out that industry's management is unable to make unilateral decisions because they lack specialized knowledge. Similarly, as teachers become more necessary to the decision-making process because they possess knowledge that the principal does not have, they feel less inclined to accept the authoritarian principal. The principal who is perceptive to this change in teacher competence and attitude will necessarily involve teachers more in the process of decision-making. As for those who do not, teachers have now established the power base to assert their right to decision-making with or without the principal's "blessings."

Assumptions

1. Charters\textsuperscript{2} and Getsels\textsuperscript{3} point out that a leader's behavior is affected by role expectations and by the unique personality of the role participant. Within the school organization, the principal's role has definite expectations of behavior. Further, it is assumed that the principal's role is subject to change. It is the predictions of this study that the principal's role has changed


because of PA 379 and teacher negotiations. It is an assumption of this study that variance due to the idiosyncratic behavior of principals, or that behavior attributed to the unique personality of the individual principal will be controlled for by random sampling.

2. It is assumed that the samples from Kalamazoo County and Delaware County represent the populations within the states of Michigan and Indiana respectively.

3. Since the questionnaires used as the data gathering instrument are anonymous, it is assumed that the principals and teachers will answer them honestly.

Significance of the Study

The year (1969) marks the fourth year of statewide teacher negotiations in the state of Michigan. Since Michigan is one of the first states to have a teacher negotiations law, principals and teachers throughout the country are looking at the effects of PA 379 on principals, teachers, and children. Numerous authors claim that the effects of teacher negotiations have changed the relationships between principals and teachers. However, a paucity of research is now available to determine the nature and extent of such changes, if indeed they exist at all. Hopefully, this investigation will provide some data on this issue.

If the research findings of this study indicate that the stated hypotheses are likely to be true, several questions come to mind. Does it mean that the de-emphasis on human considerations
will detract from the leadership function of the school principal?
As noted earlier in this chapter, Halpin indicated that both the
dimensions of human consideration and organizational consideration
are essential to successful leadership. A second question might
be, "Are there implications for in-service and pre-service educa-
tion for principals, emphasizing different styles of leadership
and approaches to deal with teacher demands and teacher negotiation?"
Surely another implication which might come out of the study is the
examination of selective criteria for building principals who
must operate under teacher negotiations. It may appear that the
authoritarian personality style will no longer be appropriate with
teacher negotiations.

Limitations of the Study

There are two basic limitations of the study. First, the field
study is ex post facto; that is to say that the independent variable
PA 379 has already occurred. Therefore, the researcher has been
unable to experimentally control for possible intervening variables
such as teacher militancy, school size, teacher salaries, state
statutes regulating school practices, and other variables which
could have affected the dependent variable, the principals' role
behavior. In consideration of this limitation, however, the
researcher has used a comparable county in Indiana in an attempt
to control for some of the possible intervening variables mentioned
above. It must be admitted that this is not a perfect comparison.
Indiana principals and teachers operate under different forces
than do Michigan principals and teachers. State laws regarding education are different. Salaries of professional educators are unequal between the two states. It is probable that there are even other differences between the forces bearing on the principals in the two states which might obscure the results of the investigation being attributed directly to PA 379.

A second limitation of the study is found in the sampling. The researcher has assumed that the two counties sampled represent the population throughout the states. This assumption may be fallacious. For example, in the case of Michigan, it is generally agreed that the southeastern industrial counties of Genesee and Wayne are "hotbeds" of teacher militancy. Therefore, it is likely that the principal's role has changed more in the southeastern part of the state than in the southwestern part, which includes Kalamazoo County.

This chapter has provided the purpose of the investigation, a general statement of the problem, an overview of the total document, the stated hypotheses and rationale, assumptions and limitations of the study, and the significance of the study to educators. The following chapter explores the literature to find out what various authors and research findings say about the impact of PA 379 on the role of the school principal.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Purpose and Overview

The purpose of Chapter II is to survey the literature in order to gain information from authoritative pronouncements and from research findings which will provide a better understanding of the problem under investigation.

The researcher investigated the following sources during the survey of the related literature:

2. Education Index (1965-1969).
7. Bibliographies from books and periodicals which related to the problem under investigation.

The reason for limiting the literature and research survey to the period 1965 to 1969 was simply that the independent variable of the study (PA 379) had not been introduced to Michigan schools until 1965.

Chapter II is composed of three parts. Part one, Teacher Negotiations, explains the difference between professional negotiations and collective bargaining; summarizes the history of negotiations; and states some causes of the rapid spread of teacher negotiations.
Part two briefly describes the concept of role and then applies the concept to the elementary school principal.

Part three describes the effect of teacher negotiations on the role behavior of the elementary school principal.

Teacher Negotiations

It is difficult to understand the impact of a teacher negotiations law such as PA 379 on the role behavior of school principals without some understanding of the historical development of teacher negotiations. At first glance, teacher negotiations have a very short history. Closer examination, however, reveals that the basis for teacher negotiations had its roots in the build-up of teacher militancy over a period of time and in the Labor Movement. Teacher militancy, for example, pressured school boards and state legislatures into allowances for teacher negotiations; and the Labor Movement created a public acceptance of every employee's right to have some say about his working conditions.

However, before delving into the history of teacher negotiations, a clarification is needed on the terms "professional negotiations" and "collective bargaining."

**Professional negotiations vs. collective bargaining**

In surveying the literature on teacher negotiations, one quickly encounters a problem in the differences of meaning which are attached to the terms "professional negotiations" and "collective
bargaining." These two terms denote procedures employed by the two major teacher organizations, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) to deal with school boards over wages and working conditions. Professional negotiations historically have been espoused by NEA, and involve certain procedural differences when compared to collective bargaining, the bargaining process advocated by AFT. Stinnet's description of the two major differences between the negotiations processes used by NEA and AFT reads as follows:

1. Professional negotiations can result in the removal of teachers and school boards from the operation of labor laws and labor precedent, whereas collective bargaining procedures adopted from the private sector will not.

2. For the purposes of mediation and appeal, procedures will go through professional education channels under professional negotiations, and labor channels under collective bargaining.

A third difference, observed by the researcher, that might be added to the two of Stinnet's is that administrative and supervisory personnel are generally excluded from the teachers' group during collective bargaining, but may or may not be part of the teachers' group during professional negotiations, depending upon a vote of the local organization.

Aside from these distinctions, however, the differences between the philosophies and tactics implied by NEA's professional negotiations and AFT's collective bargaining are minor indeed. Both
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organizations have competed for teacher membership, and both organizations have catered to teacher demands for higher salaries and better working conditions. Further, the two organizations have used pressure tactics including strikes and sanctions to reach their objectives. There is evidence that the advocated procedures and philosophies of the two organizations are coming closer together. In Flint, Michigan on September, 1969, the Flint Federation of Teachers and the Flint Education Association, local affiliates of AFT and NEA respectively, merged into one teachers' organization; thus becoming the first merger of these heretofore rival organizations in the nation.

History of teacher negotiations

Teacher negotiations have a very short history. The first mention of teacher negotiations found in the literature is reported by Kinsella¹ where a collective negotiations agreement was reached between the Norwalk, Connecticut Teachers Organization and the Norwalk Board of Education in 1946. However, as pointed out by Lieberman and Moskow² for most practical purposes 1960 marks the beginning of the collective negotiations movement in public education. At this date, a young and able group of high school teachers


²op. cit., p. 35.
pulled together the previously disorganized teacher groups in New York City, and threatened to strike unless the school board agreed to collective bargaining. The school board agreed, and Lieberman and Moskow\(^1\) write, "On December 16, 1961, the United Federation of Teachers won the exclusive right to represent the teachers of New York City in their negotiations with the board." Moskow\(^2\) reports the Act and the reaction that followed which depicts the fantastically rapid increase in the number of cases of teacher negotiations throughout the country:

In the fall of 1961, the New York City School Board made a decision that loosed an avalanche in American public education. It agreed to enter into a new relationship with its teachers similar to that existing between management and labor in private industry. The teachers would designate one professional organization to represent them exclusively in their dealings with the board and the organization would negotiate a written contract governing professional employment, compensation, and working conditions.

Within nine months, and after a brief strike, the UFT had negotiated a contract guaranteeing teachers, among other things, an average $700 in pay increases and a duty-free lunch period.

What happened thereafter made headlines in many communities. Teachers in all parts of the nation set out to see what collective negotiations could do for them. The American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association, while battling with each other on the national level, encouraged their local affiliates to agitate for recognition and the right to negotiate. Representative elections were held and negotiations begun in big cities and small.

\(^1\)lo. cit., pp. 36-40.

The teacher negotiations movement spread like "prairie fire" during the 60's until, as reported by Phi Delta Kappan, 1 "By September, 1969, over one-third of all U.S. teachers, kindergarten through high school are employed in districts where collective negotiated contracts are in force."

It is difficult to imagine the teacher negotiations movement spreading so rapidly in so short a period. Teachers, who had remained silent for years under the inhibiting cloak of professionalism, suddenly displayed a militancy that staggered even the most liberal school superintendents and school board members. An explanation for this phenomenon is given in the following section.

Causes of the rapid growth of teacher negotiations

The teacher negotiations movement had its basis in the following: (1) a growing teacher militancy, (2) the passage of state laws requiring school boards to negotiate with teachers, and (3) a public acceptance of the teachers' right to negotiate having been developed by the Labor Movement. These three causes of the rapid growth of teacher negotiations will now be looked at in more detail.

Increase in teacher militancy

The literature abounds with descriptions of the ever increasing militancy of teachers, and undoubtedly this militancy is an important factor in teacher demands for
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1 Phi Delta Kappan, LI (September, 1969), 60.
negotiations with school boards over wages and working conditions.

Perhaps the source of teacher militancy derives from the dis-
satisfaction of teachers with their status in schools and society.
Shanker,\textsuperscript{1} President of the United Federation of Teachers, New York
City, describes the low status of teachers and their eagerness to
do something to improve it:

Teachers have been accorded second-class citizenship
in the schools and in society at large. Only through organiz-
ization, through the collective bargaining process can teachers
hope to improve their condition so as to approximate the rights
 accorded and enjoyed by the other segments of our society.

This second-class citizenship of teachers can be viewed
from three distinct vantage points: economic, professional,
and civil. The economic citizenship of teachers deserves
special emphasis because the teacher is first an employee.
Too often a teacher's concern for economic well-being has
been chalked up as being unprofessional.

It is vital to realize that teachers are employees in
a school system working under uniform salary schedules, under
uniform pension plans, and under uniform policies and regu-
lations respecting sick leaves, holidays, transfers, discharge,
and the like—and that they cannot gain any productive in-
sight into their economic plight through a "professionalism"
applicable to the doctor, the lawyer, or the dentist. One
is self-employed, the other is not.

Salary improvement then becomes a prime goal. And first-
class citizenship for teachers requires that teachers cease
neglecting this economic self-interest. The economic well-
being of the teaching profession must frankly and openly
become a major concern of teachers and their organizations.

While the economic status of teachers has been too long
neglected, much discussion has revolved around the profes-
sional status of the teacher. And unfortunately this dis-
cussion has been too often of the myopic sort.

\textsuperscript{1}Shanker, Albert, \textit{Employer-Employee Relationship in the Public
Schools}. A Publication of the New York State School of Industrial

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The word "professionalism" has been bandied about in educational parlance until its meaning has been so changed that it now signifies the opposite of its sociological and dictionary definition. The teacher who voices mild criticism at a faculty conference may find that she is regarded as "unprofessional"; a teacher who refuses to take on an extra patrol also becomes "unprofessional." The term has degenerated into a concept signifying obeisance. Obey orders, remain silent, and don't dare to criticize or pursue an individualistic course—sadly this is what is expected of teaching professionals.

Shanker's pleas for teachers to mobilize their efforts through organization and collective bargaining implies the teachers' new search for power. Power, it might be added, that had eluded teachers for many years. In a speech to the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Epstein\(^1\) pointed out the powerless position of teachers as follows:

For most of the history of American public elementary and secondary education, all power resided in the hands of the school board. The board far too often used its powers to keep costs down and to retain not-to-be-questioned control of all educational policy. It kept wages as low as it possibly could, expected total obedience from its employees in all matters, sometimes even with respect to the conduct of their personal lives.

Understandably teachers resented the unilateral authority of school boards, and perhaps also the fact that the policies of authoritarian boards have been administered by equally authoritarian school administrators. For example, Redfern\(^2\) writes, "In some instances, principals have wielded executive authority and

\(^1\) op. cit., p. 3.

administrative power arbitrarily and unwisely. Some of the demands for contraction of that power can be traced to the principal's own performance as a leader." In all fairness, however, it should be noted that this implied dissatisfaction with principal behavior may have received more attention than deserved. NEA Research Journal\(^1\) reported that only 17.2 per cent of teachers surveyed on a national basis ranked ineffective administrators as a major problem and only 28.7 per cent ranked it as a minor problem.

Some other underlying causes of teacher militancy given by King\(^2\) are as follows:

1. A distressing feeling of anonymity among urban teachers.
2. A local conservatism which makes taxpayers recalcitrant in providing school support.
3. An increase in the number of teachers from labor-oriented families.

Whatever the causes of teacher militancy, its potency for action became more and more apparent. Moskow\(^3\) writes, "Teachers who formerly appeared like lambs now seemed like tigers, their demands unbelievable, their tenacity relentless, and while superintendents and board members were generally dismayed by the experience—the teachers were exhilarated." Teacher militancy gained momentum. Shocked by the early success of the UFT in New York City, and the growing teacher union influence in the cities, NEA changed its

\(^{1}\) King, James, "New Directions for Collective Negotiations." The National Elementary Principal, XLVII (September, 1967), 44.

\(^{2}\) King, James, "New Directions for Collective Negotiations." The National Elementary Principal, XLVII (September, 1967), 44.

\(^{3}\) op. cit., p.l.
philosophy towards teacher militancy. King\(^1\) quotes Carr, the 
Executive Secretary of NEA who reflects the newly acquired militant 
stance of NEA:

Teachers are determined to have a voice about the condi­
tions in which they work. They expect a more equitable share 
in this affluent society which their services have signifi­
cantly helped to create.

Most American teachers have not become cynical, grasping, 
clock-watching, even though some of them may sometimes act 
in ways that create this unfavorable image in the public mind. 
I think, however, that teachers are militant; that is ready 
to fight for public recognition and respect. They are not 
will ing to wait until retirement and be overwhelmingly grate­
ful for a set of matched luggage. They want action now, if 
not yesterday, and they are organized to get action.

And action they have taken! The teacher negotiations movement 
powered by a fierce teacher militancy began to snowball with the 
two rival organizations, the NEA and AFT, loudly trying to outbid 
each other for teacher membership with promises of more and more 
teacher benefits becoming the bidding currency.

Strikes and sanctions, relatively unheard of a short time back, 
ocurred with increasing frequency. Epstein\(^2\) writes that in the 
school year 1967-68, in 21 states and the District of Columbia, 
163,000 teachers carried out work stoppages. The extent of 
teachers' willingness to withhold their services is indicated in 
an article by the NEA Research Journal\(^3\) which reads:

The past school year from August 1967 through June 1968 
was a veritable explosion of teacher strikes and work stop­
pages--a total of 114.

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 47.
\(^2\)op. cit., p. 4.
\(^3\)op. cit., pp. 113-4.
These strikes accounted for over one-third of the number of strikes and 80% of the estimated number of man-days involved in strikes since 1940. They occurred in 21 states and ranged in length from one day to more than three weeks. Statewide strikes or work stoppages occurred in Florida, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania. Florida, New York, and Michigan led the nation in the number of man-days of instruction missed by rates of 3.90, 2.11, and 1.04 respectively.

It appears that teachers' attitudes about strikes being unprofessional have changed. As might be expected, this wave of increased teacher militancy led to the establishment of state laws providing for and regulating teacher negotiations. Such laws and their importance to the wide-spread diffusion of teacher negotiations are discussed in the following paragraphs.

State laws requiring teacher negotiations

Teacher negotiations under the provisions of state laws are a recent phenomenon. In fact, Nigro\(^1\) writes that prior to 1958 not a single state had a law providing for teacher negotiations. Moskow\(^2\) tells how quickly this condition has changed:

State teacher lobbies, meanwhile were pressing their legislatures. As a consequence, six states in 1965—California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, and Washington passed laws which required boards to negotiate with designated representatives of their teaching staffs. Rhode Island followed suit in 1966; at that time similar laws were under study in at least a dozen other state legislatures, and thousands of districts were already negotiating with teachers.

Similarly Epstein\(^3\) writes:

Teachers have exerted intensive political power to

\(^1\)op. cit., pp. 137-146.  
\(^2\)op. cit., p. 1.  
\(^3\)op. cit., pp. 4-5
convince legislatures of their states to write legislation either making it possible or more often, requiring boards to negotiate with their teachers. And state legislators responding to the political strength of the numbers of votes represented by teachers and even more to the public outcry for measures to prevent disruptive closing of the schools where their children were affected, have in accelerated pace passed laws Permitting, or mandating negotiations, spelling out procedures for such legislation, setting up or designating existing agencies which were to enforce and regulate such negotiations, and trying to create mechanisms for resolving impasses which might emerge from such negotiations. In a short period of less than 10 years from a condition where not even one such law existed, as of this date almost one-third of the states now have operating laws on negotiation--some involving public education only and others including educators with other public employees.

It is not a matter of great prophetic genius to predict that within less than the next ten years the remaining two-thirds of the states will have similar laws on their books.

The above descriptions of the rapid increase in the number of states requiring teacher negotiations by law do not necessarily mean that teacher negotiations were not going on before state laws requiring them were passed. Many school districts conducted teacher negotiations in the absence of state laws requiring them to do so. Nonetheless, the pervasive impact of state laws requiring teacher negotiations can not be overlooked. Most voluntary board agreements to negotiate had been in larger urban school districts. Almost overnight, statewide teacher negotiations required by law forced school boards in rural and suburban districts to negotiate with teachers.

Despite increased teacher militancy and the advent of state laws requiring teacher negotiations, it is doubtful if the phenomenally increased rate of teacher negotiations could have reached its present magnitude without a basis of public acceptance.
This acceptance probably grew out of labor's long and sometimes violent struggle over the worker's right to organize and have some say in his conditions of employment. In order to portray this struggle, the Labor Movement is briefly described in the following paragraphs.

Precendent for teacher negotiations established by the Labor Movement. Lieberman and Moskow\(^1\) deserve credit for an excellent summary of events leading to the present status of labor's right to organize and to negotiate with employers. They cite, for example, the Philadelphia Cordwainers Case to point out the early anti-labor attitude held by the courts. The court's ruling in this case determined that it was a conspiracy to form group action to raise wages. Similarly, Moskow and Lieberman\(^2\) write that the Sherman Anti-Trust Act in 1890 was used to limit union activity by alleging that such activity restrained trade.

Gradually, however, according to Lieberman and Moskow\(^3\) the courts changed their attitudes toward labor. In 1914, the Clayton Act removed unions from the application of the anti-trust laws, and this ruling was later upheld in the Apex Hosiery Company vs. Leader Case of 1940, which stated that the application of the Sherman Act was unjustified. Lieberman and Moskow\(^4\) add that the Norris-LaGuardia

\(^{1}\)op. cit., pp. 62-90.
\(^{2}\)ibid.
\(^{3}\)ibid.
\(^{4}\)ibid.
Act is generally regarded as a landmark in affirming the right of the worker to engage in collective bargaining through unions of their own choosing.

Such gains by labor were not without struggle, or even violence. Lieberman and Moskow refer to the LaFollette Committee Reports which point out the extent and nature of activities used to suppress union activity during the thirties:

One thousand, four hundred, seventy-five companies had detective agencies during the years 1933-36 for espionage, strike-breaking guards in connection with labor disputes, or similar services. Company arsenals were found to include pistols, rifles, tear gas, bombs, and even machine guns. Expenditures for weapons and strike-breaking services amounted to nearly 9.5 million dollars.

Perhaps as a result of such investigations as LaFollette's, the Congress of the United States felt that it could no longer remain neutral in the battle between employer and employee. Thus, the National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935, which imposed limits on the employer's rights to oppose employee organizations.

Despite such encouragements, labor did have its setbacks. Lieberman and Moskow write that in 1947 the Taft Hartley Act, reflecting the public's sentiment against the growing power of unions, included a list of unfair labor practices by unions to go along with those already established for management.

Nonetheless, union power continued to grow. Up to this point, all rights of labor to organize and to negotiate had been won in

---

1 ibid.
2 ibid.
the private sector. Little had been done to include public employees in such rights. Lieberman and Moskow write that the right of public employees to negotiate came with President John Kennedy's Executive Order 10988 on January 20, 1962, which guaranteed federal employees the right to join organizations of their choice. This order set the stage for state legislation permitting, or requiring state-employing agencies to grant public employees the right to organize and to negotiate over working conditions.

In summary of the teacher negotiations movement, the rapid and unprecedented growth of teacher negotiations had its basis in (1) the increase in teacher militancy, (2) state laws permitting, or requiring state-wide teacher negotiations, and (3) public acceptance of the employee's right to negotiate over terms of employment, which had been established by the Labor Movement. An understanding of these underlying causes of teacher negotiations is important to the development of insights into the impact of PA 379 on the role behavior of the elementary school principal. Having developed such understandings, the writer will now direct the reader's attention to the role theory as it relates to the elementary school principal.

Role Theory and Its Application to the Elementary School Principal

Role-concept

According to the definition of terms in Chapter I, role was

\[\text{libid.}\]
defined as follows: "A person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group." While this definition is sufficient for the context of this study, it may be worthwhile to look at the literature in order to describe the concept in more detail, and perhaps relate the concept more closely to the role behavior of the elementary school principal.

Gross\(^1\) defines role as "a set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a position." Further, he notes, "expectation is an evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position."

Similarly, Davis\(^2\) defines role as "what actors actually do as position occupants." He adds, "Role then, is the manner in which a person actually carries out the requirements of his position."

Thus Gross and Davis have added the dimensions of position to Sargent's definition, which was stated in the definition of terms.

Dreeben and Gross\(^3\) elaborate even further on role concept by introducing the social system factor:

Role is defined as the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships. In school settings, a number of clearly differentiated positions can be identified; those of teacher, parent, principal, guidance counselor, and custodian.
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A position is always a part of a network of positions. The principalship, for example, belongs to a network containing the position of teacher, parent, and pupil, among others.

Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell\(^1\) point out that the role expectations of a given position are inbedded in the values, the ethos, and the culture of the social system of which the position is a part. These authors also note, however, that there is some leeway for individual personality to operate successfully within role behavior of a particular position. They write:

Social systems are inhabited by living people with hates and loves, fears, and aspirations. Roles are filled by flesh-and-blood individuals, no two of whom are quite alike. Each stamps the role he occupies with the unique style of his own pattern of expressive behavior.

Every role position, then must have some flexibility for accommodating unique personality styles of its occupants; otherwise the role would not be able to endure. But Charters\(^2\) points out that leeway for idiosyncracies for most role incumbents is limited.

In short, role theory tells us that the occupant of a position in a social system must meet the expectations of the inhabitants of the social system as well as his own individual needs.

Relationship of role to the elementary school principal

The elementary school principal is expected to behave in a certain prescribed manner simply because of his position as a

\(^1\) op. cit., p. 105.

\(^2\) op. cit., p. 166.
principal. A group of elementary school principals\(^1\) attending a conference of the California Elementary School Administrators Association at Long Beach State College made the following statement concerning the role behavior often expected of the elementary school principal:

The expanding concepts of education in our complex society demand an increasingly competent school administrator. Because the educational process extends from the pre-school child through adult life, the professional position of educational administrator is one of important leadership, and the elementary school principal is at the strategic threshold. His is the concern for establishing the foundations for desirable habits, attitudes, personal adjustment, home-school relationships, and for introduction to the fundamental skills. He is looked to for leadership in classroom instruction, and individual pupil guidance, as well as skill in human relationships with his staff, parents and with school district personnel. This is in addition to the job of general school management, which was an earlier widespread idea of the principal's major responsibility.

In relating this broad description of the elementary school principal's role more specifically to his role behavior to teachers, Dodd\(^2\) writes:

The teachers are probably the most important group that affect the principal's behavior. Although the teachers are subordinate to the principal in the organization; they wield powerful sanctions. A principal who fails to meet the expectations of a majority of his teachers may find his authority undermined, if not openly flouted. Many teachers have tenure and can be dismissed or transferred only with difficulty. A "technical" freedom may exist at the elementary level, since


\(^2\)Dodd, Peter C., Role Conflicts of School Principals. Final Report No. 4, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, October, 1965, pp. 3-1B.
many principals have not taught at this level. Their lack of experience inhibits their control over the teachers and may make it more difficult for them to meet the teachers' expectations.

Under the provisions of PA 379, teacher negotiations apparently have changed teacher expectations, superintendent expectations, school board expectations, and perhaps even the elementary school principal's expectations of the elementary school principal's proper role behavior toward teachers. The next section of Chapter II looks at the elementary school principal's role in the negotiations process, and some of his consequent role behavior changes toward teachers.

The Effect of Teacher Negotiations on the Elementary School Principal's Role Behavior

There are authors who claim that teacher negotiations have had a profound impact on the role of the school principal. Lieberman\(^1\) writes, "The available evidence suggests that the collective negotiations movement is already having a major impact on the theory and practice of school administration."

McNally\(^2\) notes that there are two aspects concerning the principal's role in teacher negotiations: (1) the principal's role in the negotiations process and (2) the effect of collective negotiation arrangements upon the principal's staff relationships and the way he 'runs his school.' Each of these two aspects will be viewed in more detail in the following sections of this chapter.

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 20.

The principal's role in the negotiations process

There is some controversy over the principal's ideal role in the negotiations process. Olson describes the controversy as follows:

Some spokesman, such as Myron Lieberman and Calvin Grieder, believe that principals, as part of school management, must represent management if they are to participate in professional negotiations—that is, they must represent the board of education and not classroom teachers or an organization comprised chiefly of classroom teachers.

Others, such as Benjamin Epstein and the NEA's National association of Secondary School Principals, aren't that definite; but they indicate strongly that no professional negotiations should take place without the involvement of principals—even if principals have to negotiate solely for their own interests. Still others contend that principals must be part of the process as representatives of all-inclusive teacher negotiations.

In describing the state's role in defining the principal's part in the negotiations process, Olson adds:

Legal precedents are not particularly helpful; most states still do not have legislation bearing on collective action by public school employees. Of those which have it, only Rhode Island specifically prohibits the participation of principals. The Michigan Labor Relations Board interprets its state statute as also prohibiting participation by principals. Most states are silent on the matter of the principal's role.

Generally speaking, proponents of the principal being part of the management team argue that a basic conflict of interest arises when principals are part of the teachers' team during negotiations. Their claim is that principals are responsible for carrying out the

1 op. cit., p. 31.
2 ibid.
policies of the school board, and thus are administrative agents whose sympathies and actions will inevitably clash at certain times with those of teachers. Epstein$^1$ describes this inherent conflict as follows:

In some localities, the principal has been included as part of the general teachers' organization and joins in the negotiations as part of the teachers' negotiating team. There is, however, a contradiction that is subtly inherent in such an arrangement because it is inevitable that in seeking to expand their own role in the decision-making process, teachers will and must try to diminish any influence which restricts that role. Thus, there exists a dilemma for any principal or principal's groups that wants to be an integral part of a teachers' negotiating unit: in such a unit, the principal is, whether he is willing to admit it or not, put into the position of assisting in narrowing and lessening his own authority and power to carry out the educational and administrative functions for which he is held responsible, not only by law, but also by the school board and the community.

Moreover, there is some evidence that teachers do not want principals on their negotiating units anyway. A NEA Research Bulletin$^2$ states that 61 per cent of classroom bargaining units represent classroom teachers only. Likewise, Olson$^3$ writes, "Associations themselves, while embracing administrators as members, have not made any serious attempts to define the principal's role in the negotiating process. The record shows that, by and large, associations have evaded the problem by ignoring the principal."


$^2$op. cit., pp. 84-5.

$^3$op. cit., p. 32.
McPeek\(^1\) found from his survey of elementary school principals in Ohio that the following attitudes were expressed by principals on their position during the negotiations process:

Most principals chose indeterminate roles in their stand between teachers and the superintendent and the board (53.2%). About 10.1% of the principals were teacher-oriented, and the remaining (36.7%) elected to be management-oriented and back the superintendent and the board of education.

Meanwhile, some authorities feel that the principal and the teacher should be on the same bargaining team in that any other arrangement places them in an adversary relationship. Olson\(^2\) writes on this philosophy as follows:

In the final analysis, the argument really could be resolved on moral grounds--the responsibility of the total school staff to the students. It is, after all, the welfare of the child which is ultimately at stake, and it is very unlikely that the child is best served in school systems where classroom teachers and principals are made to feel they are adversaries. Teacher-principal conflict anywhere is undesirable, but in a given school building it is tragic. Professional staffs must avoid conflict as much as possible, but especially in their day-to-day work with their students. Where principals and teachers are partners, this task is easier.

King\(^3\) provides some of the pros and cons of including principals in the bargaining unit of teachers as follows:

**Pros**

1. Administrative and faculty concerns cannot be separated rationally.

---


\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)Op. cit., p. 46.
2. A common sense approach to problems avoids coercion.
3. The process democratizes and actually strengthens administrative authority.
4. Both teachers and principals are agents of the board of education.
5. Involving principals assures that their major needs will be considered.

**Cons**

1. A fear of administrative coercion.
2. An apparent or assumed conflict of interests.
3. A weakening of the teacher position if the interests of the principal are considered.
4. A "suspect" attitude toward the principal as the superintendent's agent.
5. A feeling that the principal's role as a member of the teachers' group is incompatible with his role as the first rung of the administrative ladder in all grievance procedures.

Regardless of the principal's part in the negotiations process, it is recognized that agreements reached during bargaining sessions affect the principal's everyday role behavior. The following section describes this influence.

**The effect of teacher negotiations on the elementary school principal's day-to-day behavior toward teachers**

Much of the literature regarding this aspect of the principal's role behavior has been reported in support of the hypotheses in Chapter I. However, the following discussion looks at the impact of teacher negotiations on the behavior of the elementary school principal in a broader context than that stated in the support of hypotheses.

Perry and Wildman\(^1\) concluded from their recent survey of

collective activity in education that: (1) Collective action on the part of employees in education is growing, (2) School administration will have an increasing rather than decreasing set of responsibilities concerning collective behavior, and (3) The ultimate impact of collective activities on school systems is not known.

Cunningham\(^1\) while interviewing principals and administrators in Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan found that only two principals perceived positive outcomes from the altered principal-teacher relationship caused by the increase in teacher negotiations. With these two exceptions, principals stated that it would be more difficult for them to supervise the instructional program in individual buildings. She also noted that principals felt generally that the search for power among teachers is an attempt to usurp the prerogatives of the building principal. Reason\(^2\) concurs with Cunningham's findings when he writes that the two most important concerns of school administrators over negotiations are (1) the effect of teacher demands on the development and maintenance of other educational programs and services, and (2) the effects upon management's responsibility for the overall operation of the school system.

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 14.

On the other hand, Cunningham\(^1\) writes that a few administrators rather than responding to a threat, believe that contracts developed by negotiations would actually expand their roles and allow them to routinize many details that had been previously handled by the more time-consuming route of individual considerations.

In writing on the effect of teacher negotiations on the principal's staff relations, McNally\(^2\) states:

First of all, it seems obvious that numerous decisions over which the principal has been accustomed to exercise authority will be no longer his prerogatives. These include such matters as: book duty, cafeteria duty, lunchroom duty, supervision, teaching assignments, teaching hours, professional meetings, and length of school day. Probably the chief implication is that the authority which traditionally has been the principal's by reason of his position will be considerably altered by collective negotiations.

Collective negotiations in education herald a new day. Administration of schools is suddenly a new ball game, with many old rules and relationships becoming obsolete almost overnight, as collective negotiations agreements rewrite the rule book in a rapidly increasing number of school systems.

A very important provision of PA 379 and other teacher negotiation laws affecting principals' behavior is the grievance procedure. Lieberman\(^3\) describes the potency of the grievance procedure in the teachers' dealing with their principal:

Initially at least, collective negotiations weakens the authority of the line personnel. Before negotiations there were only administrative limits on their discretion. Afterwards, there are limits set by the agreement. Furthermore, appeals from a decision of the principal are no longer made to another line administrator. Appeals from a decision of

\(^{1}\) op. cit., p. 34.
\(^{2}\) op. cit., p. 35.
\(^{3}\) op. cit., pp. 366-7.
The principal may go to an assistant superintendent in charge of a geographical area or to a division head. With some variation in the agreement, however, they will ultimately go to an arbitor if the organization desires to pursue the matter this far.

The principal naturally wants to avoid being overruled, either by his own administrative superior or the arbitrator. Therefore, he is less likely to insist upon what he believes are or should be his administrative prerogatives. This is especially true if the case is not clear-cut.

Langer\(^1\) writes that the emerging role of the elementary principal in Michigan is still blurred. He does predict, however, the following:

1. There will be an elementary principalship.
2. The role will be somewhat more clear-cut in its administrative aspects; duties and responsibilities will be more specifically outlined; and the principal will have to make some changes in his method of operation.

*Phi Delta Kappan*\(^2\) in reference to a doctoral dissertation by Frost indicates that negotiations have given the principal an improved status and moved him toward a management position. According to Frost's findings, the principals' personal relationships with other principals and superintendents have improved.

The survey of the related literature indicates that authors claim the principals' relationship has changed because of teacher negotiations. But, as pointed out earlier, there is a paucity of empirical evidence to substantiate or refute such claims. Data is

\(^1\) op. cit., pp. 160-1.

\(^2\) op. cit., p. 60.
so scarce in this area, that a check by the investigator with DATRIX, a computer assisted search of doctoral dissertations throughout the nation, revealed but one study (McPeek's) related to teacher negotiations and its impact on the role of the elementary school principal. With this limitation of research in mind, the reader's attention will now be directed to the research procedures employed in this investigation.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This investigation was a field study involving a sample of 63 elementary school principals and 429 elementary school teachers from 63 schools of Kalamazoo County, Michigan and Delaware County, Indiana. The procedures were to compare ratings of principals' behavior by principals and by teachers. These ratings were measured by anonymous, self-administered questionnaires, which were selected on the basis of their relatedness to the hypotheses of the study.

The Variables

The independent variable of the study (the cause) was the influence of teacher negotiations under the provisions of PA 379. The dependent variable of the study (the effect) was the role behavior of Michigan's Kalamazoo County elementary school principals toward teachers.

Samples and Populations

The population for the subject under investigation (the elementary school principal) consisted of Michigan's Kalamazoo County elementary school principals. However, in order to make comparisons and to consider intervening variables, the populations of Michigan's Kalamazoo County elementary school teachers and...
Indiana's Delaware County elementary school principals and teachers were considered also.

The four samples selected for the study were as follows:
(1) all elementary school principals from Kalamazoo County, Michigan having four or more years experience as elementary school principals (30 in number), (2) up to seven elementary school teachers having four or more years experience as classroom teachers from each of the schools which had principals involved in the study (192 in number), (3) all elementary school principals from Delaware County, Indiana having four or more years experience as elementary school principals (33 in number), and (4) up to seven elementary school teachers from each of the schools which had Indiana principals involved in the study (251 in number). The schools in the study from the two counties and the number of personnel from each school have been listed in Table 1 and Table 2 on the following pages.

It was necessary that principals and teachers in Michigan have four or more years experience in order for them to have had opportunities to observe principal behavior prior to the enactment of PA 379 in 1965. The same requirement for Indiana principals and teachers was for control purposes.

The reason for limiting the number of teachers to seven per school was based on Halpin's study. Halpin\(^1\) found that seven subordinate ratings of a leader via the LBDQ questionnaire provided

\(^1\) op. cit., p. 2.
Table 1

Schools and Number of Principals and Teachers in the Study
Kalamazoo County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arcadia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Barclay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Climax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Comstock North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Edison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fulton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Grand Prairie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Indian Prairie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lake Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lakewood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lincoln</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. McKinley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Northwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pershing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ramona Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Richland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Spring Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. South Westnedge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Vicksburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Vine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Waylee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. West Main</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Westwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Wilson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Winchell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Woodland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Woodward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Yorkville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Schools and Number of Principals and Teachers in the Study
Delaware County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anthony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Albany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Blaine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Claypool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DeSoto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. East Longfellow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Eaton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emerson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Eugen Field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Forest Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Garfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gaston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Harrison (Muncie)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Harrison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Jefferson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lincoln</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. McKinley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Mitchell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Monroe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Morrison-Mock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Perry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Riley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Roosevelt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Royerton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Salem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Selma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Stevenson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Sutton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. West Longfellow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. West View</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Yorktown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an adequate standard for the reliable measurement of leader behavior in a particular setting. Therefore when schools had more than seven eligible teachers, only seven were chosen randomly from a list of those eligible for the study. It was assumed that teachers who desired not to participate would not return the questionnaires, and thus would be reflected by the non-returns. All eligible teachers were chosen in those schools having fewer than seven eligible teachers. All but one principal selected for the study agreed to participate. One principal from Kalamazoo County asked not to participate because of ill health. Kalamazoo County, Michigan and Delaware County, Indiana were chosen for sampling because of their apparent representativeness of populations in their respective states and because of their similarity. Both counties have a large city school system with about the same number of students, a similar sized suburban school district, and about the same number of small surrounding rural school districts. Furthermore, both counties have a teacher training institution within their borders. Unfortunately, efforts to establish the representativeness of the two counties of their respective populations were unsuccessful in that there were no data available to make such determinations. Nonetheless, it appeared that the two counties were in some ways typical of counties within Michigan and Indiana. For example, both counties have diversified occupational and socio-economical strata. The researcher realized that a random sampling from the populations of the two states would have provided more likely representative samples.
It was important to establish the comparability of Kalamazoo County schools to Delaware County schools. It was difficult to determine which of the infinite variables that affect principal behavior toward teachers should be examined in order to determine such a comparability. The researcher selected the two variables of school size (in terms of number of students) and school district wealth (in terms of equalized valuation) to determine the comparability of schools between the two counties. School size was chosen as a variable because Hemphill's study indicated that the size of an organization has an important impact on the leader's behavior toward subordinates.

The other variable considered, school district wealth, was selected for comparison purposes because studies have indicated its relationship to so many different variables which might affect the principal-teacher relationship including: (1) principal and teacher salary levels, (2) educational and professional backgrounds of principals and teachers, and (3) over-all expenditures for education.

The comparison of schools between the two counties according to the variables of school size and wealth is presented by the data in Table 3 on the following page.

Table 3 indicates that, according to the variable of school size, the two counties have comparable school districts. However, 

1Hemphill, John K., Situational Factors in Leadership, Bureau of Educational Research Monograph No. 32, Columbus, Ohio, The Ohio State University, 1949, p. 83.
Table 3

Selected Criteria for the Determination of Comparability of the Schools in Kalamazoo County to Schools in Delaware County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Student Enrollment K-12</th>
<th>Equalized Valuation in Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kalamazoo County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Kalamazoo City</td>
<td>19,742</td>
<td>381,725,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Portage</td>
<td>10,727</td>
<td>155,913,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comstock</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>98,172,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vicksburg</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>28,472,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gull Lake</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>29,573,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parchment</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>36,744,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Climax-Scotts</td>
<td>833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delaware County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Muncie City</td>
<td>18,155</td>
<td>147,296,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Delaware Metropolitan</td>
<td>3,663</td>
<td>24,630,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>20,139,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Liberty-Perry</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>11,933,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Harrison-Washington</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>9,278,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Salem</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>6,026,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monroe</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>6,405,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
according to the variable of school district wealth, the comparability of schools between the two counties was less than desirable.

Instrumentation

The data gathering instrument used in this study was a self-administered anonymous questionnaire comprised of 45 selected items from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Although the LBDQ contains 100 items, only 45 of these were cogent to the hypotheses of the study. These items were grouped according to five subscales or divisions. Each subscale consisted of related items which also corresponded to a set of hypotheses. The subscales, number of items within each subscale, and the corresponding sets of hypotheses are indicated by the data in the following table.

Table 4
Relationship of Subscales and Items of the LBDQ to the Hypotheses of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Set of Hypotheses Related to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Initiation-of-Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Human Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Freedom-Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The wordings of items from the LBDQ were modified slightly in order to make the items more relevant to the study and to the comparison groups. The modified forms of the LBDQ which comprised the data gathering questionnaires are found in the Appendix under the following exhibits:

1. Exhibit 1 The Principal's Self-perceptions of His Behavior Prior to the Enactment of PA 379.
2. Exhibit 2 The Principal's Self-perceptions of His Current Behavior.
3. Exhibit 3 The Teacher's Perceptions of Principal Behavior Prior to the Enactment of PA 379.
4. Exhibit 4 The Teacher's Perceptions of Current Principal Behavior.

Since the questionnaires in Exhibits 1 and 3 were dealing with recalled perceptions, it was necessary to change the verb to past tense (He acted). Also the pronoun had to be changed according to the ratings of principal behavior by the principal (I act, or acted) or ratings of principal behavior by teachers (He acts or acted). Other slight modifications of the original LBDQ were the changing of terms in order to make the questionnaires more applicable to school situations. These changes were as follows: (1) leader changed to principal, (2) work groups changed to teachers, and (3) organization changed to school.

Reliability and validity of the LBDQ

Stogdill\(^1\) author of the LBDQ gives credit for its preliminary development to Hemphill, Coons, Shartle, Fleishman, and Halpin.

\(^1\)Stogdill, Ralph, Manual for the LBDQ, 1958, p. 2.
The questionnaire has demonstrated high validity as a measurement of leader behavior in a variety of situations such as: (1) military organizations, (2) industry, and (3) education. Halpin reports that "in several studies where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a 'between group vs. within-group' variance, the F ratios all have been significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly." The instrument has therefore established its ability to detect leadership behavior in a variety of situations and consequently a high validity.

According to Stogdill, the reliability of subscales of the LBDQ were determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula, which yielded the reliability coefficients displayed in the Appendix, Exhibit 5.

Scoring of the data gathering questionnaires was accomplished by giving quantitative values to various responses. Most items were scored as follows: A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, and E=1. Some responses, however, as indicated by the answer key of the LBDQ Manual were

---


4 op. cit., p. 2.

5 op. cit., p. 1.
scored in the reverse order of: A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4, and E=5. This reversal was due to the fact that some items of the questionnaire were stated negatively. The mean score for each subscale was computed by adding the assigned values of each item within the subscale and dividing by the number of items in the subscale.

Procedures

Comparisons

Two basic approaches involving four comparisons were used in the study to test the research hypotheses. In the first approach, Michigan's Kalamazoo County elementary school principals and teachers rated their perceptions of principal behavior prior to and subsequent to the enactment of PA 379. In doing so, these principals and teachers completed two questionnaires: one concerned with their recalled perceptions of principal behavior before PA 379 (Exhibits 1 and 3 in the Appendix), and the other questionnaire concerned with their perceptions of current principal behavior. This approach provided two comparisons: (1) principals' self-perceptions of their behavior "before" and "after" the passage of PA 379, and (2) teachers' perceptions of their principals' behavior "before" and "after" the passage of PA 379.

The above comparisons had two limitations. First of all, it is unreasonable to expect principals and teachers to accurately recall such an emotionally laden perception as principal behavior. Surely the selective forgetting or remembering phenomenon would be
operating here. Unfortunately, the investigator was unable to control for this particular bias of the study.

A second limitation of the "before" and "after" ratings is that of intervening variables introduced into schools since the enactment of PA 379 in 1965. For example, school districts have been increasing in size because of consolidation or unification. It appears that teacher militancy has increased, and that federal monies have been made more available to schools. Undoubtedly there are other examples. The point is that such intervening variables as these could have accounted for differences in the "before" and "after" ratings of principal behavior rather than the advent of teacher negotiations.

In considering such intervening variables, a second approach was used in the study which involved the following two comparisons: (1) Michigan's Kalamazoo County elementary school principals' self-perceptions of their current behavior as principals compared to comparable ratings by Indiana's Delaware County elementary school principals, and (2) Michigan's Kalamazoo County elementary school teachers' ratings of their principals' current behavior compared to comparable ratings by Indiana's Delaware County elementary school teachers. This procedure compares principal behavior in a state that has a state teachers negotiations law (Michigan) to principal behavior in a state where no such law exists (Indiana). Since it is assumed that principals and teachers in Michigan and Indiana have been subjected to more or less the same variables introduced into school systems since the advent of PA 379, this comparison provides
a limited check on such intervening variables. This is a limited
check in that the schools of the two counties involved are not
ideally comparable. Political patterns differ between Michigan
and Indiana and socio-economic strata differ also. Undoubtedly
there are other differences. Nevertheless, the comparison of
principal behavior between the two states provided the most prac­
tical check on the intervening variables which might have affected
the "before" and "after" ratings of Michigan principals and teachers.

Preliminary investigations

Prior to commencement of data gathering, some preliminary in­
vestigations were necessary. Among the first decisions that had
to be made were the choices of a comparable state to Michigan
which had no state teacher negotiations law and then samples from
that state and the state of Michigan. Following the suggestions
of members of the doctoral research seminar, Indiana was selected
as the comparison state because of its proximity to Michigan and
it was believed not to have a teacher negotiations law. Later,
in a response to a letter of inquiry by the researcher, Tom Northey,
research assistant to MEA, confirmed the fact that Indiana did not
have a state law requiring teacher negotiations (Appendix-Exhibit 6).

Kalamazoo County was chosen as the sample from Michigan because
of its proximity to the researcher's residence, and because of its
apparent representativeness of counties throughout Michigan. Dela­
ware County was selected as the sample from Indiana because of its
similarity to Kalamazoo County.
The researcher had some difficulty in obtaining names and addresses of school personnel in Delaware County, Indiana because in 1968 Indiana eliminated all county intermediate offices, which had heretofore published directories from each county. Finally, however, a directory of Delaware County was obtained from Dr. Roland Young, Superintendent of Middlebury Community Schools, Indiana (Appendix-Exhibit 7).

Another important consideration which preceded data gathering was the choice of a data gathering instrument. The decision had already been made to use a self-administered anonymous questionnaire in order to encourage honest ratings of principal behavior by principals and by teachers. Following an extensive survey of questionnaires, the LBDQ was chosen for the study. However, as pointed out earlier, only 45 items of the original 100 items of the LBDQ were germane to the hypotheses of the study. Therefore, permission was requested and received from the author of the LBDQ, Ralph Stogdill, to reproduce the relevant items of his questionnaire for the study (Appendix-Exhibit 8).

Procedures used in data gathering

Contacts were made with the schools in the study. A letter was sent to all local district superintendents of Kalamazoo County explaining the purposes and procedures of the study (Appendix-Exhibit 9). An enclosed return form with a pre-addressed, stamped envelope was used to determine the superintendent's decision to grant or deny district permission to participate in the study (Appendix-Exhibit 10). After a one-month wait, two district
superintendents had responded "no," one director of curriculum on behalf of his superintendent had responded "yes," and the other five superintendents contacted for the study had responded not at all. It appeared that a revised approach was needed.

The investigator decided to try a more personal approach. Each superintendent who had replied negatively or not at all was telephoned for an interview in order to further explain the study. During these interviews, the superintendents were assured of the following conditions of the study: (1) the returns would be anonymous, (2) the study would be important to educators, (3) the study would require a short amount of principal's and teacher's time, (4) principals and teachers would participate on a voluntary basis, and (5) schools would be informed of test results. This approach was considerably more effective than the first approach in that all superintendents who were interviewed granted permission for district participation in the study. Further, each superintendent supplied a list of eligible school principals.

Having learned the value of personal contact, the researcher sent letters to all district superintendents of Delaware County, Indiana requesting an interview for purpose of explaining the study (Appendix-Exhibit 11). Due to the distance involved in traveling, superintendents were asked to indicate hours available for interviews (Appendix-Exhibit 12). Otherwise, the procedures for interviewing Indiana superintendents were similar to those used for interviewing Michigan superintendents. As was the case in Michigan, all Indiana superintendents gave district permission to cooperate in the study.
It was now time to begin data collection in the schools. An earlier decision to use anonymous questionnaires to be returned by mail raised the concern for the typical low rate of returns by mailed questionnaires. In this regard, Travers\(^1\) writes:

The central difficulty in all direct-mail techniques is that the percentage of returns is small. A questionnaire of some interest to the recipient may be expected to show only a 20 per cent return, even when conditions are favorable. If non-respondents are contacted a second and third time, the return may be increased to 30 per cent. Only rarely does it reach 40 per cent.

Not only does a low rate of returns curtail the amount of data available for analysis, it also raises the question as to bias of selectivity of the respondents. Therefore, the procedures described in the following paragraphs indicate how the investigator contacted principals and teachers in an effort to gain their interest and involvement in the study and consequently insure a high rate of returned questionnaires.

The first step was to arrange an interview with each principal. During the interviews with principals, the purposes and procedures of the study were explained. The principal was informed of his role and that of his teachers in filling out the questionnaires. The reassurances previously given to school superintendents were reiterated. All the principals who were contacted agreed to fill out a questionnaire and to seek participation from teachers within their buildings.

---

The next step was to select teachers from each school building. Principals provided a list of eligible teachers in their building who had four or more years classroom experience. Random selection occurred when schools had more than seven eligible teachers.

In the original research proposal, the plan was to interview each teachers' group in order to explain the study and their role in completing the questionnaire. However, preliminary interviews with Michigan principals discouraged this approach. One concern they raised was that the time available for teacher meetings was regulated by the master contract and therefore usually filled by concerns for the daily operation of the school. Further, principals were concerned that any individual approach in contacting teachers might interfere with the teacher's performance in the classroom.

Because of these reservations on the part of principals, the following procedures were used to involve teachers in the study. Each principal was provided a list of teachers selected from within his school as well as a letter of explanation to be given to each teacher (Appendix-Exhibit 13). The principals contacted their teachers, requested their cooperation in the study, and gave them questionnaires and letters of explanation. Following completion of questionnaires, teachers and principals returned them via self-addressed stamped envelopes. The exceptionally high rate of returned questionnaires are indicated by the following Table 5 which also indicates the effectiveness of a personal approach.
Table 5
Rate of Questionnaire Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kalamazoo County</th>
<th>Delaware County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Returns</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Returns</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After all the schools had been visited, and about 80 per cent of the questionnaires had been returned, each school was sent a letter thanking the staff for its participation in the study and informing participants of the study's progress (Appendix-Exhibit 14).

Following data analysis, each school district superintendent, principal, and teacher who participated in the study received a summary of the research findings.

Data Analysis

Analysis of data and reporting of data were on two bases. On the first basis, personnel in Kalamazoo County and Delaware County were treated as populations and mean scores were reported between comparison groups.
The second basis of data analysis and reporting was to treat Kalamazoo County and Delaware County as samples from which inferences were drawn to the states of Michigan and Indiana. In this endeavor, the "t" test was used to determine the significance of differences between means of the five subscales of the questionnaire.

The "t" test is a commonly used inferential test to determine the probability of differences between means occurring by chance.

The paradigm in Table 6 which follows indicates the basic comparisons of the study and probability levels between means.

Table 6
Paradigm for Mean Comparisons
Testing the Hypotheses of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Michigan Principals</th>
<th>Indiana Principals</th>
<th>Levels of Probability</th>
<th>Michigan Teachers</th>
<th>Indiana Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Michigan Principals</th>
<th>Levels of Probability</th>
<th>Michigan Teachers</th>
<th>Indiana Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. __________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Michigan Principals</th>
<th>Levels of Probability</th>
<th>Michigan Teachers</th>
<th>Indiana Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre PA 379</td>
<td>Post PA 379</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter III described the design of the study and the procedures used. The independent variable and dependent variable were indicated and the samples and populations were delineated. The data gathering instrument which was comprised of selected items from the LBDQ was described in detail. The basic comparisons were explained and the procedures for data gathering were noted. A section on data analysis and the reporting of research findings concluded the chapter.

Having described the methods and procedures involved in data gathering and analysis, the investigator will now present the research findings in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of Chapter IV is to present and to explain the analysis of data. Five tables introduce the analysis of data regarding the hypotheses on production, initiation-of-structure, human-consideration, representation, and tolerance-of-freedom-for-decision-making. Data analysis is presented according to subscale means, item means, and levels of probability between subscale means. The subscale means provided the basis for computing the "t" test which yielded probability levels. The subscale means were computed by totaling the quantitative values of items in the subscale (1-5), and then dividing that figure by the number of item responses within the subscale.

Item means were computed by dividing the mean subscale by the number of items within the subscale. An item mean of 3.50 would indicate an average frequency rating of principal behavior midway between the ratings of "occasionally" and "often" on the following scale which was given on the questionnaire: always = 5, often = 4, occasionally = 3, seldom = 2, and never = 1.

Levels of probability were reported at .25 or lower, but were deemed significant at levels of .05 or lower. An asterisk accompanies those probability levels deemed statistically significant.

Tables pertaining to data analysis are divided into two parts. The upper portion of each table presents data analysis used to
accept or reject the hypotheses. The lower portion of each table presents data analysis indicating the extent of congruence between ratings of principals and teachers. Although congruence of ratings between principals and teachers was not under investigation, the differences in principal-ratings between the two groups may be of general interest to educators.

Production Related Hypotheses

The related hypotheses 1-a, 1-b, 1-c, and 1-d predicted the elementary school principal's behavior toward teachers subsequent to PA 379 to be more production-centered than it was prior to the enactment of PA 379. Data analysis regarding such hypotheses follows in Table 7 on the following page.

Data analysis as given in Table 7 did not substantiate the hypotheses regarding production emphasis of the elementary school principal. In fact the only significant difference found was in the opposite direction predicted by the hypotheses whereas Indiana teachers rated their principals higher in production emphasis than did Michigan teachers. In general, the ratings of principal behavior in the area of production were low, about midway between "seldom" and "occasionally."

It was interesting to note that the Michigan principals in their "before negotiations" and "after negotiations" as well as Indiana principals rated their behavior significantly higher in production emphasis than did their teachers.
Table 7
Analysis of Data Regarding Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
<th>Subscale Means</th>
<th>Item Means</th>
<th>Levels of Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Principals After Negotiations</td>
<td>25.43 2.54</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations</td>
<td>22.93 2.29</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Michigan Principals After Negotiations vs. Indiana Principals</td>
<td>26.00 2.60</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>22.23 2.22</td>
<td>&lt; .005 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations</td>
<td>25.43 2.54</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Michigan Principals After Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations</td>
<td>26.00 2.60</td>
<td>&lt; .005 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Indiana Principals vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>27.37 2.74</td>
<td>&lt; .01 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initiation-of-Structure
Related Hypotheses

The related hypotheses 2-a, 2-b, 2-c, and 2-d predicted the elementary school principal's behavior toward teachers subsequent to PA 379 to be more initiation-of-structure-centered than it was prior to the enactment of PA 379. Data analysis regarding such hypotheses follows in Table 8 on the following page.

Data analysis as given in Table 8 did not substantiate the hypotheses regarding initiation-of-structure emphasis of the elementary school principal. The ratings of principal behavior in this area averaged about 3.50 or midway between the ratings of "occasionally" and "often." There were no significant differences between the ratings of principal behavior by principals and teachers.
Table 8
Analysis of Data Regarding Initiation-of-Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
<th>Subscale Means</th>
<th>Item Means</th>
<th>Levels of Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Principals After Negotiations</td>
<td>35.36</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Michigan Principals After Negotiations vs. Indiana Principals</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations</td>
<td>35.36</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Michigan Principals After Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Indiana Principals vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Human Consideration
Related Hypotheses

The related hypotheses 3-a, 3-b, 3-c, and 3-d predicted the elementary school principal's behavior toward teachers subsequent to PA 379 to be less human-centered than it was prior to the enactment of PA 379. Data analysis regarding such hypotheses follows in Table 9 on the following page.

Data analysis as given in Table 9 did not substantiate the hypotheses regarding human consideration emphasis of the elementary school principal. The ratings of principal behavior in this area were relatively high, averaging about 4.10 or slightly higher than "often."

It was interesting to note that Michigan principals rated their behavior significantly higher in human consideration than did Michigan teachers in both the "before negotiations" and "after negotiations" ratings.
Table 9  
Analysis of Data Regarding  
Human Consideration  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
<th>Subscale Means</th>
<th>Item Means</th>
<th>Levels of Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Principals After Negotiations</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Michigan Principals After Negotiations vs. Indiana Principals</td>
<td>43.07</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>&lt; .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>40.64</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>&lt; .025 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Michigan Principals After Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations</td>
<td>43.07</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>&lt; .05 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Indiana Principals vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The related hypotheses 4-a, 4-b, 4-c, and 4-d predicted the elementary school principal's behavior toward teachers subsequent to PA 379 to be less representative of teacher groups than it was prior to the enactment of PA 379. Data analysis regarding such hypotheses follows in Table 10 on the following page.

Data analysis as given in Table 10 substantiated the hypotheses regarding the decreased representation of teacher groups by the elementary school principal. All comparison groups yielded differences which were significant at probability levels of .05 or lower. The ratings of principal behavior in this area averaged about 3.20 or slightly more than "occasionally."

There were no significant differences between the ratings of principal behavior by principals and teachers.
Table 10

Analysis of Data Regarding Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
<th>Subscale Means</th>
<th>Item Means</th>
<th>Levels of Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Principals After Negotiations</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>&lt; .025 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>&lt; .01 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Michigan Principals After Negotiations vs. Indiana Principals</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>&lt; .05 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>&lt; .001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Indiana Principals vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The related hypotheses 5-a, 5-b, 5-c, and 5-d predicted the elementary school principal's behavior toward teachers subsequent to PA 379 to be more tolerant-in-granting-freedom-for-decision-making than it was prior to the enactment of PA 379. Data analysis regarding such hypotheses follows in Table 11 on the following page.

Data analysis as given in Table 11 did not substantiate the hypotheses regarding the elementary school principal's increased tolerance-in-granting-freedom-for-decision-making toward teachers. The ratings of principal behavior in this area were relatively high, averaging about 4.10 or slightly more than "often."

There were no significant differences between the ratings of principal behavior by principals and teachers.
Table 11
Analysis of Data Regarding Freedom-for-Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
<th>Subscale Means</th>
<th>Item Means</th>
<th>Levels of Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Principals After Negotiations</td>
<td>40.54 40.44</td>
<td>4.05 4.04</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations</td>
<td>40.33 40.87</td>
<td>4.03 4.09</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Michigan Principals After Negotiations vs. Indiana Principals</td>
<td>40.43 40.50</td>
<td>4.04 4.05</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Michigan Teachers After Negotiations vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>40.87 41.61</td>
<td>4.09 4.16</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michigan Principals Before Negotiations vs. Michigan Teachers Before Negotiations</td>
<td>40.54 40.33</td>
<td>4.05 4.03</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Indiana Principals vs. Indiana Teachers</td>
<td>40.50 41.61</td>
<td>4.05 4.16</td>
<td>&lt; .25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The hypotheses related to the principal's decreased representation of teacher groups were accepted in each instance where comparisons were made. The hypotheses related to other areas of principal behavior were rejected.

Principals in Kalamazoo County, Michigan and Delaware County, Indiana rated their behavior significantly higher in the area of production than did their teachers. Also, Michigan principals rated their behavior significantly higher in the area of human consideration than did their teachers.

Principals and teachers in both counties rated principal behavior relatively low in the area of production, about 2.50. Conversely, principals and teachers in both counties rated principal behavior relatively high in the areas of human consideration and tolerance-in-granting-freedom-for-decision-making, about 4.10.
Conclusions and Interpretations

Generally, principals and teachers in Kalamazoo County, Michigan, at the time of this study did not indicate that teacher negotiations have had much impact on the principal's role toward teachers, except in his decreasing representation of teacher groups. The completeness of sampling and the high rate of anonymous questionnaire returns would indicate that data analysis represents the opinions of principals and teachers in the two sampled counties of Kalamazoo, Michigan and Delaware, Indiana. Furthermore, data analysis was corroborated by the observations of the investigator during interviews with principals and teachers in data gathering.

It was interesting to note, however, that Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals rated principal behavior significantly higher than did their teachers in the areas of production and human consideration. This difference between ratings is difficult to understand. Perhaps principals' intentions for behavior may have biased their assessment of actual behavior.

In the area of representation, significant differences were found between every comparison group of the study. The decrease in principal representation of teacher groups would indicate that the
principal has lost some identity with teachers of his building. Again, data analysis was consistent with the observations of the investigator during interviews with principals and teachers. For example, one principal commented on his despair and embarrassment shortly after teacher negotiations began in his district when he was asked to leave a teachers meeting in order that teachers might discuss matters confidential to teachers.

Implications

Some principals may have difficulty in adjusting to the separation of principals' loyalty, representation, identification, or whatever one might label it, from the teachers' group. Especially in the elementary school, principals have enjoyed a close personal relationship with teachers over the years. The principal and his staff have shared experiences inside and outside the school which molded a team feeling between them. But, it appears that the principal who operates under the provisions of teacher negotiations must content himself with the understanding that teachers have interests which are apart from those of the principal. Indeed, there may be times when a conflict of interests arises between principal and teachers such as those situations involving power struggles.

A challenge to the principal of the 70's will be to find areas of common interests to principal and to teachers where teamwork can be applied; while recognizing there are instances where the principal's presence or influence is unwanted by teachers. Such a
challenge may call for principals who are capable of sustaining isolation from staff during some circumstances; yet amicable and unharboring of resentment in working closely with staff under appropriate circumstances. Finally, it would seem that the principal operating under teacher negotiations must recognize and encourage leadership from teachers in their emerging role characterized by increasing organizational power and individual professional competence.

Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Further Research

The investigator does not imply that the elementary school principal's role in Michigan has been unchanged because of teacher negotiations. He simply states that with the exception of representation, he was unable to detect significant differences between the comparison groups of the study which might support claims that the principal's role has changed. Indeed, the investigator was astonished to find the lack of evidence from his research findings which might support the study's hypotheses in view of their overwhelming support in the literature.

There were several limitations of the study which might explain the failure to find significant differences in all but one area. First, the study was "ex post facto" in nature; that is to say that the independent variable (teacher negotiations) had already occurred. Therefore, it was difficult to control for variables and consequently draw causal relationships. A longitudinal study of principal role behavior under the influence of teacher negotiations...
would be the remedy for this particular limitation.

There was the questionable power of the data gathering instrument in picking up differences which might exist. In this regard, the investigator observed that several subjects requested on their returned questionnaires need for clarification of items related to the area of production. Perhaps a replication of this study might be preceded by a preliminary investigation with principals and teachers in order to find out their interpretations of the term "production" in school situations. A list of operational definitions might then be developed and attached to questionnaires to aid respondents in their clarification of terms.

A plausible explanation for not finding significant differences stems from comments of principals and teachers to the effect that a positive principal-teacher relationship had been established in their schools over many years. The influence of teacher negotiations apparently has not altered that relationship. They did indicate, however, that pressures created by teacher negotiations could lead to principal role behavior quite different than that now assumed. In short, the principals and teachers felt that the full impact of teacher negotiations on principals' behavior will be noticed on incoming principals and teachers having no experience prior to the advent of teacher negotiations. Therefore, a study similar to this one at a later date involving principals and teachers having no experience prior to teacher negotiations might better indicate the full impact of teacher negotiations on principals' behavior. Hopefully, data introduced by the present
investigation could be useful as baseline data for meaningful comparisons.

A limitation of the present study was in its restriction to Kalamazoo County, Michigan and Delaware County, Indiana. For example, the investigator would hypothesize that teacher negotiations have had more influence on principal role behavior in Wayne County, Michigan and Genesee County, Michigan where labor's union influence is more pronounced than in Kalamazoo County, Michigan. A replication of this study in such counties as Wayne and Genesee would provide valuable information in assaying the impact of PA 379 on principal behavior in industrial, urban school districts.

Another limitation of the study was the investigator's inability to establish or find an ideal comparable county in Indiana to the County of Kalamazoo, Michigan. There simply were too many differences between the social, political, and economical backgrounds of the two states to make ideal comparisons.

As noted earlier, the use of recalled perceptions by Michigan principals and teachers in their ratings of principal behavior before teacher negotiations raises some question as to the reliability and validity of such ratings. The principal-teacher relationship is emotionally laden, and is likely to be contaminated by the selective factors of remembering what one likes to remember. Baseline data free of this bias could be established with data of this study pertaining to the current ratings of principal behavior.
Summary of the Study

The enactment of PA 379 which provided for teacher negotiations in Michigan has raised conjecture as to its impact on the school principal. The investigator formulated five hypotheses predicting changes in the elementary school principal's role behavior as follows:

1. He is more production-centered toward teachers.
2. He is more initiation-of-structure-centered toward teachers.
3. He is less human-centered toward teachers.
4. He is less representative of teacher groups.
5. He is more tolerant-in-granting-teachers-freedom-for-decision-making toward teachers.

Briefly stated, rationale for the above hypotheses derived from authoritative pronouncements and the limited research available would indicate that the school principal is being forced into a managerial, organizational-centered style of leadership in compliance with his increasing responsibilities for enforcement of the negotiated master contract.

This research involved all elementary school principals with four or more years experience as principals in Kalamazoo County, Michigan and Delaware County, Indiana, as well as randomly sampled teachers from each principal's school. Sixty-three (63) principals and 429 teachers participated in the study.

Rejection or acceptance of the hypotheses was based on two types of comparisons. First, Michigan principals and teachers in Kalamazoo County completed questionnaires which rated principal behavior "before" and "after" the advent of teacher negotiations. The "before" ratings were based on recalled judgments. Differences
between the two ratings would seemingly indicate changes in principal behavior attributed to teacher negotiations. It was realized, however, that other variables have been introduced into schools since the advent of teacher negotiations in 1965. In consideration of possible intervening variables, a second comparison was made between ratings of principal behavior by Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals and teachers and similar ratings by Indiana's Delaware County principals and teachers. It was assumed that intervening variables would affect principals and teachers in both counties to about the same extent, and since Indiana has no state teachers negotiations law, such a comparison would provide a limited consideration of those variables other than PA 379.

The data gathering instrument was an anonymous, self-administered questionnaire comprised of 45 items from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire authored by Ralph Stogdill at Ohio State University (with permission). The questionnaire was designed to measure frequency of a leader's behavior under a variety of circumstances.

By contacting each school in the study, the investigator engendered a relatively high rate of questionnaire returns:

(1) Kalamazoo County principals = 100 per cent, (2) Kalamazoo County teachers = 79 per cent, (3) Delaware County principals = 91 per cent, and (4) Delaware County teachers = 74 per cent.

Data analysis utilized a "t" test to determine levels of probability between means of the comparison groups. With the exception of the hypotheses related to the principal's decreasing
representation of teacher groups, data analysis was unable to substantiate the hypotheses at probability levels of .05 or lower. Interviews with principals and teachers during data gathering provided information which supported data analysis. Principals and teachers indicated that a principal-teacher relationship had been established in their schools over many years which resisted pressures brought about by teacher negotiations. However, they also indicated that behavior of principals having no principalship experience prior to teacher negotiations might be quite different than that assumed by most principals with many years experience.

The hypotheses related to the prediction that principals operating under teacher negotiations would be less representative of teacher groups were supported by the data analysis between all comparison groups with the following probability levels: (1) Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals "before negotiations" vs. "after negotiations" = <.025, (2) Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers "before negotiations" vs. "after negotiations" = <.01, (3) Michigan's Kalamazoo County principals vs. Indiana's Delaware County principals = <.05, and (4) Michigan's Kalamazoo County teachers vs. Indiana's Delaware County teachers = <.001. Here again, data analysis was in harmony with observations of the investigator during his interviews with principals and teachers who generally commented that the principal is less representative of teacher groups than he was before teacher negotiations commenced in their school districts.
The investigator concluded that the principal operating under the provisions of teacher negotiations might necessarily change his behavior in his representation of teacher groups. The increasing power of teacher organizations and growth of teacher competency have led to more independence and initiative on the part of teachers. This change in teacher role would indicate that principals must be more aware of leadership from the teaching ranks. The situation may call for principals who are capable of withstanding isolation from teachers in some instances without harboring resentment while working with teachers under more appropriate circumstances.
Exhibit 1

The Principal's Self-Perceptions of His Behavior Prior to the Enactment of PA 379

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE FORM-XII

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe your behavior as a principal prior to PA 379. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, your behavior as a principal prior to PA 379.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently you engaged in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether you (A) ALWAYS, (B) OFTEN, (C) OCCASIONALLY, (D) SELDOM, or (E) NEVER acted as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always, B = Often, C = Occasionally, D = Seldom, E = Never

e. WRITE your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: I often acted as described..................A [B  C D E

Example: I never acted as described..................A  B  C D E

Example: I occasionally acted as described.........A  B  C D E

1. I acted as the spokesman of the teachers.........A  B  C D E
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2. I let teachers know what was expected of them...A B C D E
3. I allowed teachers complete freedom in their work.A B C D E
4. I was friendly and approachable......................A B C D E
5. I encouraged overtime work..............................A B C D E
6. I publicized the activities of the teachers........A B C D E
7. I encouraged the use of uniform procedures........A B C D E
8. I permitted teachers to use their own judgments in solving problems.................................A B C D E
9. I did little things to make it pleasant to be a teacher in the school..........................A B C D E
10. I stressed being ahead of competing schools.....A B C D E
11. I spoke as the representative of the teachers.....A B C D E
12. I tried out my ideas in the teachers' group........A B C D E
13. I encouraged initiative by teachers.................A B C D E
14. I put suggestions made by teachers into operation.A B C D E
15. I needed teachers for greater effort...............A B C D E
16. I spoke for teachers when visitors were present...A B C D E
17. I made my attitudes clear to teachers..............A B C D E
18. I let teachers do their work the way they think best..................................................A B C D E
19. I treated all teachers as equals......................A B C D E
20. I kept the work moving at a rapid pace.............A B C D E
21. I represented teachers at outside meetings.......A B C D E
22. I decided what should be done, and how it should be done............................................A B C D E
23. I assigned a task, then let teachers handle it....A B C D E
24. I gave advance notice of changes....................A B C D E
25. I pushed for increased production................A B C D E
26. I assigned teachers to particular tasks.........A B C D E
27. I turned teachers loose on a job, and let them
go to it.........................................A B C D E
28. I kept to myself..................................A B C D E
29. I asked teachers to work harder...............A B C D E
30. I made sure that my part in the teachers' group
was understood by teachers.....................A B C D E
31. I was reluctant to allow teachers any freedom of
action............................................A B C D E
32. I looked out for the personal welfare of teachers.A B C D E
33. I permitted teachers to take it easy in their
work.............................................A B C D E
34. I scheduled the work to be done...............A B C D E
35. I allowed teachers a high degree of initiative...A B C D E
36. I was willing to make changes..................A B C D E
37. I drove hard when there was a job to be done....A B C D E
38. I maintained definite standards of performance....A B C D E
39. I trusted teachers to exercise good judgment.....A B C D E
40. I refused to explain my actions................A B C D E
41. I urged teachers to beat their previous records..A B C D E
42. I asked that teachers follow standard rules and
regulations.......................................A B C D E
43. I permitted teachers to set their own pace......A B C D E
44. I acted without consulting teachers...............A B C D E
45. I kept teachers working up to capacity..........A B C D E
Exhibit 2

The Principal's Self-Perceptions
of
His Current Behavior

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-FORM XII

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe your behavior as a principal. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, your current behavior as a principal.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently you engage in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether you (A) ALWAYS, (B) OFTEN, (C) OCCASIONALLY, (D) SELDOM, or (E) NEVER act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters (A B C D or E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always, B = Often, C = Occasionally, D = Seldom, E = Never

e. WRITE your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: I often act as described.....................A B C D E
Example: I never act as described....................A B C D E
Example: I occasionally act as described.............A B C D E
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1. I act as the spokesman of the teachers .......... A B C D E
2. I let teachers know what is expected of them .... A B C D E
3. I allow teachers complete freedom in their work .. A B C D E
4. I am friendly and approachable .................. A B C D E
5. I encourage overtime work ........................ A B C D E
6. I publicize the activities of the teachers ....... A B C D E
7. I encourage the use of uniform procedures ...... A B C D E
8. I permit teachers to use their own judgments in solving problems .............................. A B C D E
9. I do little things to make it pleasant to be a teacher in the school ........................... A B C D E
10. I stress being ahead of competing schools ...... A B C D E
11. I speak as the representative of the teachers .... A B C D E
12. I try out my ideas in the teachers' group .......... A B C D E
13. I encourage initiative by teachers ............. A B C D E
14. I put suggestions made by teachers into opera­tion ............................................. A B C D E
15. I needle teachers for greater effort ............. A B C D E
16. I speak for teachers when visitors are present .. A B C D E
17. I make my attitudes clear to teachers .......... A B C D E
18. I let teachers do their work the way they think best ............................................. A B C D E
19. I treat all teachers as equals ........................ A B C D E
20. I keep the work moving at a rapid pace ........... A B C D E
21. I represent teachers at outside meetings .......... A B C D E
22. I decide what should be done and how it should be done ............................................. A B C D E
23. I assign a task, then let teachers handle it .... A B C D E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I give advance notice of changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I push for increased production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I assign teachers to particular tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I turn teachers loose on a job and let them go at it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I keep to myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I ask teachers to work harder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I make sure that my part in the teachers' group is understood by teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I am reluctant to allow teachers any freedom of action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I look out for the personal welfare of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I permit teachers to take it easy in their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I schedule the work to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I allow teachers a high degree of initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I am willing to make changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I drive hard when there is a job to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I maintain definite standards of performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I trust teachers to exercise good judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I refuse to explain my actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I urge teachers to set their own pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I ask that teachers follow standard rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I permit teachers to set their own pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I act without consulting teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I keep teachers working up to capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 3

The Teacher's Perceptions of Principal's Behavior Prior to the Enactment of PA 379

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-FORM XII

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe your principal's behavior prior to PA 379. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, your principal's behavior prior to PA 379.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently your principal engaged in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he (A) ALWAYS, (B) OFTEN, (C) OCCASIONALLY, (D) Seldom, or (E) NEVER acted as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always, B = Often, C = Occasionally, D = Seldom, E = Never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the example below.

Example: He often acted as described.................A (B) C D E

Example: He never acted as described.................A B C D E

Example: He occasionally acted as described............A B (C) D E
1. He acted as the spokesman of the teachers.
2. He let teachers know what was expected of them.
3. He allowed teachers complete freedom in their work.
4. He was friendly and approachable.
5. He encouraged overtime work.
6. He publicized the activities of the teachers.
7. He encouraged the use of uniform procedures.
8. He permitted teachers to use their own judgments in solving problems.
9. He did little things to make it pleasant to be a teacher in the school.
10. He stressed being ahead of competing schools.
11. He spoke as the representative of the teachers.
12. He tried out his ideas in the teachers' group.
13. He encouraged initiative by teachers.
14. He put suggestions made by teachers into operation.
15. He needled teachers for greater effort.
16. He spoke for teachers when visitors were present.
17. He made his attitudes clear to teachers.
18. He let teachers do their work the way they thought best.
19. He treated all teachers as equals.
20. He kept the work moving at a rapid pace.
21. He represented teachers at outside meetings.
22. He decided what should be done and how it should be done.
23. He assigned a task, then let teachers handle it...A B C D E
24. He gave advance notice of changes.................A B C D E
25. He pushed for increased production..................A B C D E
26. He assigned teachers to particular tasks............A B C D E
27. He turned teachers loose on a job, and let them
go to it..............................................A B C D E
28. He kept to himself..................................A B C D E
29. He asked teachers to work harder....................A B C D E
30. He made sure that his part in the teachers' group was understood by teachers....................A B C D E
31. He was reluctant to allow teachers any freedom of action............................................A B C D E
32. He looked out for the personal welfare of teachers..........................................................A B C D E
33. He permitted teachers to take it easy in their work.............................................................A B C D E
34. He scheduled the work to be done....................A B C D E
35. He allowed teachers a high degree of initiative...A B C D E
36. He was willing to make changes......................A B C D E
37. He drove hard when there was a job to be done.....A B C D E
38. He maintained definite standards of performance...A B C D E
39. He trusted teachers to exercise good judgment.....A B C D E
40. He refused to explain his actions....................A B C D E
41. He urged teachers to beat their previous records..A B C D E
42. He asked that teachers follow standard rules and regulations..............................................A B C D E
43. He permitted teachers to set their own pace.......A B C D E
44. He acted without consulting teachers................A B C D E
45. He kept teachers working up to capacity............A B C D E
Exhibit 4
The Teacher's Perceptions of Current Principal's Behavior

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—FORM XII

Purpose of the Questionnaire
On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe your principal's behavior. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, your principal's behavior.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently your principal engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he (A) ALWAYS, (B) OFTEN, (C) OCCASIONALLY, (D) SELDOM, or (E) NEVER acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around ONE of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always, B = Often, C = Occasionally, D = Seldom, E = Never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: He often acts as described......................A B C D E
Example: He never acts as described......................A B C D E
Example: He occasionally acts as described.............A B C D E
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1. He acts as spokesman of the teachers. A B C D E
2. He lets teachers know what is expected of them. A B C D E
3. He allows teachers complete freedom in their work. A B C D E
4. He is friendly and approachable. A B C D E
5. He encourages overtime work. A B C D E
6. He publicizes the activities of the teachers. A B C D E
7. He encourages the use of uniform procedures. A B C D E
8. He permits teachers to use their own judgments in solving problems. A B C D E
9. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a teacher in the school. A B C D E
10. He stresses being ahead of competing schools. A B C D E
11. He speaks as the representative of the teachers. A B C D E
12. He tries out his ideas in the teachers' group. A B C D E
13. He encourages initiative by teachers. A B C D E
14. He puts suggestions made by teachers into operation. A B C D E
15. He needles teachers for greater effort. A B C D E
16. He speaks for teachers when visitors are present. A B C D E
17. He makes his attitudes clear to teachers. A B C D E
18. He lets teachers do their work the way they think best. A B C D E
19. He treats all teachers as equals. A B C D E
20. He keeps the work moving at a rapid pace. A B C D E
21. He represents teachers at outside meetings. A B C D E
22. He decides what should be done and how it should be done. A B C D E
23. He assigns a task, then lets teachers handle it...
24. He gives advance notice of changes..............
25. He pushes for increased production............... 
26. He assigns teachers to particular tasks.......... 
27. He turns teachers loose on a job and lets them 
go to it........................................
28. He keeps to himself................................
29. He asks teachers to work harder...................
30. He makes sure that his part in the teachers' 
group is understood by teachers....................
31. He is reluctant to allow teachers any freedom 
of action........................................
32. He looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
33. He permits teachers to take it easy in their 
work................................................
34. He schedules the work to be done.................
35. He allows teachers a high degree of initiative...
36. He is willing to make changes...................
37. He drives hard when there is a job to be done....
38. He maintains definite standards of performance...
39. He trusts teachers to exercise good judgment....
40. He refuses to explain his actions................
41. He urges teachers to beat their previous records.
42. He asks that teachers follow standard rules and 
regulations........................................
43. He permits teachers to set their own pace........
44. He acts without consulting teachers............... 
45. He keeps teachers working up to capacity.........
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### Reliability Coefficients
Subscales of the LBDQ
in Different Leadership Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Army Division</th>
<th>Highway Patrol</th>
<th>Aircraft Executives</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th>Community Leaders</th>
<th>College Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Production</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Initiation</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Human</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Representation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tolerance</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 10, 1969

Troy E. Bramlett
100 Western Avenue
Apartment A-12
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dear Mr. Bramlett:

Indiana does not have a state-wide teacher negotiations law.

For the best information on Indiana, contact Charles Alexander, Executive Secretary of the Kalamazoo Teachers Association. Mr. Alexander recently moved into that position from that of Director of Field Services of the Indiana Education Association.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Northey
Research Assistant (MEA)
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Letter of Request
for a Directory of Delaware County

Kalamazoo, Michigan
September 29, 1969

Dr. Roland Young, Superintendent
Middlebury Community Schools
Middlebury, Indiana 46540

Dear Dr. Young:

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership Program at Western Michigan University, and I am in the midst of a doctoral dissertation entitled, "The Relationship of Public Law 379 (Michigan Teacher Negotiations Law) to the Role of the Elementary School Principal."

In this endeavor, I will be comparing principal behavior in Kalamazoo County, Michigan to principal behavior in a comparable county in Indiana (Muncie). Thus far I have been unable to obtain information from Muncie County Intermediate Schools Office regarding names of school districts, personnel, etc. What I really need is a directory of the schools within the county.

Dr. Paul Misner, acting chairman of the Teacher Education Department and supervisor of my graduate assistantship, suggested I ask your assistance in securing such information.

I appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

Troy Bramlett
Exhibit 8
Letter of Request for Permission
to Reproduce and Use
Selected Items from the LBDQ

Kalamazoo, Michigan
September 8, 1969

Bureau of Business Research
College of Commerce and Administration
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43200

Dear Sir:

I am a doctoral student enrolled in the Educational Leadership Program at Western Michigan University. Shortly, I begin a dissertation on the change in role of the elementary school principal as a consequence of teacher negotiations in Michigan.

For purposes of data gathering, I would like to have your permission to reproduce items from subscales 1, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII. The other subscale items are not germane to the study.

I would gladly acknowledge use of the LBDQ in the dissertation report and would also share with you the results of the study.

Thank you for your consideration of the request.

Sincerely yours,

Troy Bramlett
Dear Mr.

By way of introduction, I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership Program at Western Michigan University, and I am in the midst of a doctoral dissertation. In this behalf, please regard this letter as a request to involve selected elementary school principals and teachers from your district in a field study during the 1969-70 school year. Rather than providing a separate, formal abstract of the study, I have included in this letter pertinent data regarding the study. Do not hesitate, however, to phone me if you desire further information.

The purpose of the study is to determine if the elementary school principal's role behavior has changed as a consequence of PA 379 (teacher negotiations law). Briefly described, this purpose will be achieved by two different approaches. First, Michigan principals and teachers will rate principals' behavior prior to and subsequent to PA 379. Second, a comparison will be made of the ratings of principals' behavior given by Michigan principals and teachers, who operate under a statewide teacher negotiations law and those ratings given by Indiana principals and teachers who do not operate under such a law.

The procedures will be as follows. Approximately 30 principals and 200 teachers will be selected from each of the counties of Kalamazoo, Michigan and Delaware County, Indiana. In both cases, the principals and teachers will have at least four years experience in their current positions. The selected principals and teachers will complete two questionnaires (in the case of Michigan): one measures perceptions of principal behavior prior to PA 379 and the other measures perceptions of principal behavior subsequent to PA 379. In the case of Indiana principals, and teachers, they will complete one questionnaire describing the principals' current behavior.

Understandably, you may be considering implications for the school district in this study. Allow me to assure you that complete anonymity will be assured for the individual principal, teacher, and school district. Any differences which might be found in the investigation will be reported on a county wide basis and do not
necessarily connote "good" or "bad" value judgments. The estimated time required for completion of the questionnaire will be 15 minutes for Michigan principals and teachers and 8 minutes for Indiana principals and teachers. Finally, it should be noted that the questionnaires will be distributed by the investigator and returned by mail in self-addressed stamped envelopes.

If your response to this request is affirmative, would you consider sending me the names and school addresses of all elementary school principals (K-6) within the district, whose principalship experience extends back to the year 1965? Similarly, may I have the names and school addresses of teachers within the school buildings of the principals under consideration? It is not necessary that all their experience be within the same building or under the same principal. In short, I am looking for principals and teachers who have witnessed the advent and growth of teacher negotiations and its impact on the principal's behavior. However, in terms of time and expense, it is desirable that my investigation involve personnel within the same building. Additionally, I need to know the approximate size of the student population within each school building.

In the event that you grant permission for the study in your district, I would then contact the principals personally to request their cooperation in the study.

I would gratefully appreciate your district's cooperation in the study and would gladly share with you the final test results. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Enclosed you will find a response form to be completed and returned to me as soon as conveniently possible.

Sincerely yours,

Troy Bramlett
Home Phone 382-3135
W.M.U. T. ED. 383-1984
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RESPONSE FORM
OF
DISTRICT APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL

Name of the School District

Yes, our district is willing to participate in the study, realizing that principals and teachers will participate on a voluntary basis.

No, our district is unwilling to participate in the study.

More information is desired before our district can make a decision on your request. Could you provide additional information regarding the following:
Dr. Durward N. Cory  
Muncie Community Schools  
328 East Washington Street  
Muncie, Indiana 47383

Dear Mr. Cory:

By way of introduction, I am a doctoral student enrolled in the Educational Leadership Program at Western Michigan University. Shortly, I begin a research investigation on the impact of teacher negotiations on the elementary school principal. Part of this study involves a comparison of principals' behavior in the counties of Kalamazoo, Michigan and Delaware, Indiana.

I would like to arrange an interview with you or a member of your staff to discuss the study. Since I will be driving from Kalamazoo, it would be preferable if I can visit all the superintendents in the area during one trip. Therefore, I would appreciate your identification of hours that you might see me on the enclosed form and return it to me as soon as possible.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

Troy Bramlett
Exhibit 12

Schedule for Interviews

Please check the hours that are convenient to you for interviewing on Monday, October 20, 1969:

a.m.

10:00______

p.m.

3:00______

5:00______

evening ______

Tuesday, October 21, 1969

a.m.

9:00______

11:00______

p.m.

1:00______

3:00______

5:00______

Please call my home phone (collect) for any needed clarification.

616-382-3135
Exhibit 13

Letter of Explanation to Teachers
Concerning the Purpose and Procedures
of the Study

By way of introduction, I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership Program at Western Michigan University. Formerly, I was an elementary school principal, county schools supervisor, and classroom teacher in California.

Shortly, I begin a dissertation entitled, "The Changing Role of the Elementary School Principal as a Consequence of PA 379 (Teacher Negotiations Law)." I am requesting your assistance in this study, while realizing that you may or may not be in a school district that has teacher negotiations. You would be asked to complete 45 items on a questionnaire designed to measure leader behavior. First, you would complete the questionnaire as you remember your principal's behavior prior to PA 379, and second, you would complete the questionnaire as you now perceive your principal's behavior. It should take about 15 minutes to complete both questionnaires. An example of a question you will be expected to answer is:

1. He (the principal) acts as spokesman of the group. A B C D E

You are to circle one of the alternatives which have the following meanings,

A=always, B=often, C=occasionally, D=seldom, E=never.

Complete anonymity will be assured for the individual teacher, principal, and school. You will not be asked to put your name on the questionnaire and the test results will be reported on a county-wide basis and do not necessarily connote "good" or "bad" value judgments. Your principal will give you a questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope for its return. I will be sending you a summary of the test results shortly after the first of the year.

I know how busy you must be and the last thing in this world you need right now is a questionnaire to be filled out. I do feel, however, that this study will reveal worthwhile information for educators as to the impact of teacher negotiations on principals and teachers. I need your help. In turn, I would gladly share with you the test results.
Enclosed you will find a response form to be completed and returned to me as soon as conveniently possible. I do appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

Troy E. Bramlett
Allow me to express my appreciation for your help and that of your staff in my study.

You may be interested in its progress. All the schools that were asked to participate in the study agreed to do so. In total 30 elementary schools in Kalamazoo County, Michigan and 33 elementary schools in Delaware County, Indiana have 63 principals and approximately 378 teachers included in the investigation.

The rate of response so far has been exceptionally good for an anonymous questionnaire (about 85%). For this favorable response, I owe you and your staff a vote of thanks.

If you or a member of your staff should still have a questionnaire, I would be most grateful for its return as soon as possible. I hope to begin data analysis shortly after the first of the year. By the end of January or the middle of February, I will be sending you a summary of the results of the investigation. Further, I am willing to come to a district staff meeting at your request in order to interpret test results and to answer questions that might arise.

Sincerely,

Troy E. Bramlett
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