To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Barbara Godley Fulmer entitled "The Relationship of Collective Bargaining to the Decision-Making Power of the Public School Principal." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Gerald C. Ubben, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

The Graduate School

4

THE RELATIONSHIP OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING TO THE DECISION-MAKING POWER OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Barbara Godley Fulmer

March 1984

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Gerald C. Ubben, chairman of her doctoral committee, for his guidance, support, and direction in this research study. Gratitude is also expressed to the rest of the committee, Dr. Arthur J. D. Cook, Dr. John M. Peters, and Dr. Robert K. Roney, for their interest and assistance.

The author is also indebted to Dr. Dan Quarles, Dr. Mohammad Ahmadi and Dr. James Macomber for sharing their expertise throughout the research period. Special thanks goes to Mrs. Roberta Crum without whom the task would have been much more difficult.

My deepest gratitude is expressed to my parents, Alice and Cecil Godley who have always encouraged me to pursue my educational goals, and to my husband John and children Russell, Shannon and Zack whose support, patience and understanding made this study possible. This dissertation is lovingly dedicated to them.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if the existence of teacher unionization and collective bargaining in the state of Tennessee has had an effect on the principal's perception of his/her decision-making power. Such information can be used to help educational administrators in focusing on the proper role for the principal in relation to the collective bargaining process and the administration of the negotiated contract.

A questionnaire designed to survey the principal's perceived power in the exercise of administrative prerogatives was distributed to 274 randomly selected public school principals in the state of Tennessee. The data were categorized into three areas of decision making: (1) Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel, (2) Administration and Organization, and (3) Curriculum and Instruction. An aggregate category, the power coefficient, was also identified. The data were treated to statistical analysis involving a series of t-tests and stepwise regressions and the following results were found.

1. The t-test analysis revealed a significant difference existed between responses of principals employed by nonbargaining districts and principals employed by bargaining districts with regard to the aggregate category, the power coefficient. In addition, there were significant differences between the two groups of

principals with regard to two of the response categories: (1) Administration and Organization and (2) Curriculum and Instruction. No significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups to the third questionnaire category, Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel.

2. Through regression analysis, a specific relationship was found between the bargaining status of the school district and the principal's perceived power. Also, a significant relationship was found between collective bargaining and the questionnaire category, Administration and Organization.

From these findings, it can be concluded that collective bargaining inhibits the decision-making power of principals in Tennessee. Effort, therefore, should be made, on the part of district management teams, to encourage input from principals into the negotiating process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING	1
	Introduction	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Purpose of the Study	4
	Importance of the Study	4
	Assumptions	5
	Delimitations	5
	Definition of Terms	6
	Organization of the Study	8
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
	Descriptive Literature	9
	Empirical Studies	33
III.	METHODOLOGY	45
	The Subjects	45
	The Instrument	46
	Treatment of the Data	48
IV.	PRESENTATION OF DATA AND FINDINGS	51
	Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	51
	Findings from the Analysis of the Perceptual Variables	58
	Comments from Respondents	65
	Summary	68

CHAPTER PAGE

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 69

Introduction 69

Summary 69

Conclusions 74

Discussion 76

Recommendations 77

Suggestions for Further Study 78

REFERENCES 80

APPENDICES 87

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE 88

APPENDIX B. LIST OF AND COVER LETTER TO THE JURY OF EXPERTS 95

APPENDIX C. COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP TO RESPONDENTS 99

VITA 103

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. Bargaining Status of School Districts from the Random Sampling of Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 52

2. Age Categories of Respondents from the Random Sampling of Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 54

3. Sex of the Respondents from the Random Sampling of Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 55

4. Highest Degree Attained by Respondents from the Random Sampling of Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 56

5. Years of Administrative Experience of Respondents from the Random Sampling of Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 57

6. Types of Schools Served by Respondents from the Random Sampling of Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 59

7. Descriptive Statistics for the Three Attitudinal Response Categories of the Questionnaire Mailed to Randomly Selected Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 62

TABLE PAGE

8. Results from t-Tests of Perceived Power from a Comparison of Bargaining and Nonbargaining Principals from a Random Sampling of Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 64

9. Results of the Stepwise Regressions Computed on Data Obtained from a Random Sampling of Tennessee Public School Principals for the 1983-1984 School Year 66

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

1. INTRODUCTION

Passed by the Tennessee State Legislature on March 8, 1978, the Educational Professional Negotiations Act (EPNA) provided the framework for collective bargaining between school boards and professional employee associations. Although some school districts in the state had been negotiating contracts prior to the passage of the EPNA, this legislation required all districts to participate in collective bargaining when a majority of their employees so desired. The Act provided for recognition of professional organizations, negotiating procedures, establishment of unlawful acts, and penalties for the violation of these unlawful acts.

In order to maintain unity within its membership, members of the Tennessee Education Association (TEA) lobbied for the classification of most administrators, supervisors and teachers as a professional bargaining unit. As a result of this lobbying effort, the line separating the bargaining adversaries was drawn, in the EPNA, between the school board (with a limited number of system-wide administrators to bargain for the board) and the remainder of the professional employees. Included within this second group were teachers, supervisors, principals and all system-wide administrators who were not designated by the board to be management personnel. In this division,

Tennessee is unique among the states. Historically in management-labor situations, the line is drawn between those who supervise employees and those who do not.

Based on the opinions of educators in the literature, the fact that EPNA in Tennessee and similar legislation in other states has affected general educational policy is apparent. What is not so apparent is the effect of such legislation upon the participants including teachers, principals and central office personnel.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

According to educators who have written on the subject of collective negotiations, the principal, in the bargaining process, is often placed in an awkward situation, especially in the state of Tennessee where, according to the law, principals are placed in the bargaining unit with teachers. It is the job of the principal to administer, on the building level, the contract which is the result of the negotiations process between the school board and the teacher association. Since the principal is included in the teacher association bargaining unit, a conflict of interest may ensue especially if the principal has had no real input into the process and/or if the contract is unpopular with teachers. This perceived dualism may be responsible for creating a conflict in the principal's perception of his/her role especially in the area of decision making. In other words, which role should be paramount in exercising administrative prerogatives, spokesperson for teachers or managerial employee of the board?

There is widespread agreement among published educators that the principal should occupy a key leadership role within the school system. Many of these same educators, however, have expressed much concern about the possible negative effect of collective bargaining on the principal's perceived power in exercising his/her administrative prerogatives.

In addition to the possibility of a perceived role conflict and its resulting effect on decision making, collective bargaining may also affect the perceived decision-making power of the principal in another way. Although some principals are included in the negotiation process as members of the bargaining team, there are many, according to the literature, who do not participate actively in this process. Perceiving the negotiation process as a fight for survival, many principals feel that when they are not directly represented in the process, their group will be the first to suffer. In other words, their prerogatives and decision-making freedom could be bargained away especially when negotiations include certain areas of administrative discretion.

Drawn from the descriptive literature, there is little doubt that many principals feel collective bargaining has limited or decreased their power to make decisions in some administrative areas. Coupled with the dualistic bargaining role of the principal in Tennessee, this feeling, if it is widespread in this state, could create a morale problem among principals. This condition could eventually lead to separate bargaining units for principals and/or the inability of the public school system to effectively achieve its goals.

3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This research proposed to determine if the existence of teacher unionization and collective bargaining, made possible in the state of Tennessee by enabling legislation, has had an effect on the principal's view of his/her decision-making power. Several questions were studied.

1. Is there a significant difference between principals in districts engaged in collective bargaining and principals in districts not engaged in collective bargaining with regard to their perceptions of decision-making powers relative to personnel and education matters in the districts?
2. If a difference in power does exist, can this difference be related to collective bargaining and the negotiated contract?

4. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

From the literature, one ascertains that a most pressing problem for school principals today is role ambiguity, a condition that affects principals' ability to provide effective leadership. As a result of this study, an attempt to look at the effects of collective bargaining on the decision-making power of the principal, information regarding the present perceptions of principals in Tennessee can be obtained. Such information should aid educational administrators in focusing on the development of their proper role in relation to the collective bargaining process and in the administration of the contract which is the result of this process. This study will add

to the body of knowledge in the area of collective bargaining with the result that school administrators will incorporate its findings into their administrative philosophies.

5. ASSUMPTIONS

Prior to undertaking this study the following assumptions were made:

1. The principal within the school system has a definite role to perform which is defined by the principal himself and the two major referent groups, the central administration and the teachers.
2. The principal has a key role within the educational system and the development of this role is desirable.

6. DELIMITATIONS

Delimitations of the study included:

1. Because of the impossibility of controlling certain variables in a multiple-state study, this study was limited to a population of principals within the state of Tennessee.
2. Twelve of the 13 largest Tennessee school districts (student enrollment $\geq$ 10,000) participate in collective bargaining; therefore, due to the lack of an appropriate control group, these 13 school districts were eliminated from the research population. In addition, since there is no appropriate control group for the special school districts (most of these

districts do not participate in collective bargaining), they also were eliminated from the research population.

7. DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of the study, the following terms were defined:

1. Administrative prerogative. Administrative prerogatives are exclusive rights or privileges peculiar to the person holding the position. In this study, the administrative position is that of the principal.

2. Administrator. In a school system, any person holding the position of principal, supervisor, or superintendent is an administrator.

3. Collective bargaining. The process of negotiating an agreement between the public employer and the union concerning the wages, hours, and conditions of employment of the employees in the bargaining unit is collective bargaining. Contracts negotiated through collective bargaining cover all employees in the bargaining unit including union and non-union members.

4. Negotiated contract. A negotiated contract is a written agreement that arises out of negotiations between a school district and a union setting forth the conditions of employment and benefits.

5. Decision making. The process of selecting the most promising of the available alternatives in order to prepare the way for effective action is decision making.

6. Middle management. This term can refer to more than one level in an organization. A principle responsibility of middle managers is to direct activities that implement the policies of the organization. In a school system, the principal is in a position of middle management.

7. Perception. The consciousness or awareness of objects or other data through the medium of the senses is perception.

8. Power. Power is the ability to do, the capacity to act, or the capability of performing or producing. In this study, power is defined to be the ability of the principal to exercise administrative prerogatives.

9. Principal. The principal is the person at the building level who is appointed by the Board of Education to assume ultimate responsibility for the operation of that school unit.

10. Professional bargaining unit. A group of employees that the employer had recognized and/or the state administrative agency had certified as appropriate to be represented by a union for the purpose of collective bargaining is a professional bargaining unit.

11. Power coefficient. The mean of the responses to all three categories of decision-making areas indicated on the survey instrument.

8. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study is divided into the following chapters:

Chapter I (The Problem and Its Setting) contains the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, importance of the study, assumptions, delimitations, definition of terms and organization of the study.

Chapter II includes the review of literature regarding the impact of collective bargaining on the principal.

Chapter III pertains to methodology. This chapter includes the subjects, the instrument, and treatment of the data.

Chapter IV contains the presentation of the data and findings.

Chapter V includes the summary, conclusions, discussion, recommendations, and suggestions for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The framework of this study is based on the wealth of opinionative information concerning the impact or anticipated impact of collective bargaining on the principal and the less abundant literature dealing with empirical studies that have focused on this topic. Literature which is nonempirical in nature and deals with opinions of the authors is addressed in this study as descriptive literature. On the other hand, the empirical literature includes those works reporting actual research studies. Most of these studies deal with surveys of principals who have responded to questions concerning their perceptions of how collective bargaining has affected them. There have been few longitudinal studies on this topic. Also, included in this review, as background information, is selected literature dealing with power, the role of the principal, and decision making.

1. DESCRIPTIVE LITERATURE

The descriptive literature includes topics such as the role of the principal and specifically role dualism (instructional leader versus administrator of the contract) which may lead to credibility gaps between the principal and central office. This literature examines the effect collective bargaining has had on these relationships and offers suggestions for overcoming the possible negative aspects

of this process and its outcomes. Also, to provide further information on the principalship, the area of power and authority are explored.

Power and Authority

Power, influence and authority are necessary elements of organizational life, including that of school systems. Stoner (1982) defined power as the ability to exert influence which is the action or example that either directly or indirectly causes a change in behavior or attitude of another person or group. According to this author, there are two views of formal authority. The classical view states that formal authority is a managerial right. On the other hand, the acceptance view, of which Chester Barnard is a proponent, bases the determination of authority on the influencee rather than the influencer. Stoner listed the five sources of power as: (1) reward, (2) coercive, (3) legitimate, (4) expert, and (5) referent. Effective management, he maintained, tempers the use of power with authority and self-control.

Agreeing with Stoner on the definition of power, Hersey and Blanchard (1982) added two more power sources, information and connection, and reported that power is finite. Managers only have a limited amount of power.

These authors also believed that the appropriate power base is affected by situational variables and that effective power should vary accordingly with the maturity level of the follower. In other words, with followers of below average maturity, the emphasis of the

leader should be compliance. With followers of average maturity, the emphasis should be compliance and influence. With followers of above average maturity, the emphasis of the leader should be influence. According to these authors, it is the perception followers have about power that is important.

Morphet and Johns (1967) defined power as the art of men going about the business of moving other men to act in relation to themselves or in relation to organic or inorganic things. After reviewing a study of power by Wiles, the authors concluded that power is used differently by persons with different concepts of leadership. The "power over" approach decreases the possibility of releasing the full potential of the group. The "power with" approach develops the group power so that the goals of the group can be reached. The authors also maintained that authority cannot be exercised effectively unless the person exercising the authority is perceived by the members of the organization as having the right to do so. In the case of schools, the authors believe that no school group is autonomous in power. The ultimate group having the authority to determine the goals of the school is the public.

With regard to the schools, Sergiovanni (1979) believes that newer forms of authority have emerged to challenge the traditional sources. A fourth source of authority, professional, has in recent years, been added to Weber's three sources, traditional, charismatic, and legal. According to a study by Peacock (Sergiovanni, 1979), teachers now value authority based on competence more than authority of person, position, or legitimacy.

Particularly vulnerable to change and erosion is the principal's position of authority. The increase in educational sophistication has required the principal to take an administrative position beyond the traditional roles.

Sergiovanni portrayed power, authority and political behavior as neither good nor bad; however, he did indicate, based on a study by Bachman, Bowers and Mauers, that expert and referent power provide the strongest positive correlation with worker satisfaction. Coercive power has the most negative correlation with worker satisfaction.

Schien (1977) defined power as the capacity of an individual or group to modify the conduct of others in the manner desired and to prevent this conduct from being modified in a way not desired. Individual power, the author maintained, is the manifestation of three variables: (1) bases of power, (2) intent of power holder, and (3) means of power holder. In agreement with the power bases mentioned before, Schien defined intent as the reason why the individual chooses to use a particular power base. Two types of intent are: (1) to bring about personal goals congruent with organizational goals and (2) to bring about personal goals incongruent with organizational goals. The means variable is the strategic maneuvers an individual uses to influence another. If the intent is to bring about congruent personal and organizational goals, the means will be overt. If the intent is to bring about personal goals incongruent to organizational goals, the means will be covert.

Organizational Management of the School District

Caldwell and Curfman (1979) wrote about the selection process regarding principals and the relationship of this process to collective bargaining. Large school systems, they believe, tend to hire principals from within. This sponsorship process produces administrators of like kind. On the other hand, small to medium systems seem to select more outsiders as principals due to the greater chance that teachers within the system have been involved in negotiations and, therefore, may not have the same outlook as management.

These authors also found that certain collective bargaining environments have significantly affected the organizational management of the public school system. In bargaining districts of medium size, more principals are chosen from outside the district than in nonbargaining districts of the same size. Also, bargaining districts with average local resources hire more outside principals than comparable nonbargaining districts. As a result of the difference in perception of administrators in bargaining and nonbargaining districts, the implications for teachers wishing to become administrators are clear. According to the authors, in medium-size school systems of average wealth, these teachers should keep a low profile in teacher organizations.

Howard Karlitz (1978) suggested that administrative and teaching personnel are moving toward mutual accommodation with regard to collective bargaining. According to this author, there are five phases in the development of accommodative behavior.

1. Primary Phase. The struggle for teachers to organize and gain recognition
2. Compensatory Phase. The formulation of short term negotiation goals geared toward better wages, hours and working conditions
3. Professional Phase. Increased professional authority in areas related to educational policy
4. Inter-Organizational Conflict Phase. Organized administrator resistance to broader contractual provisions
5. Accommodative Phase. Accommodative behavior at both individual and institutional levels

Karlitz believes that the cooperative behavior between teaching and administrative personnel serves as a buttress against pressures and threats from the environment which are a result of the accommodative processes. These dysfunctions may be the erosion of the traditional lines of authority at the building level or the exclusion of parents from the decision-making process (closed local unit environment).

Roles of the Principal

In Human Behavior in Educational Administration, Newell (1978) discussed the role of administrators. He defined role as the behavior itself plus attitudes and values inherent in the behavior. Explaining that it is impossible to perform a variety of administrative roles without these roles being, at times, in conflict, Newell cited a study by Dodd who found that secondary school

principals were exposed to more role conflict than were elementary school principals. Even though administrative role conflict often leads to low job satisfaction, it provides tension which may foster creativity in regard to new ideas and insights.

Newell also discussed the interpersonal roles of school administrators. He listed these roles as: (1) consultation, (2) counseling, and (3) supervision. In the consultation and counseling roles, neither party evaluates or has authority over the other. In the opinion of the author both of these roles have been neglected in education.

Morphet, Johns, and Reller (1967) believe that the role of the principal is determined by: (1) the role assigned to the school center, (2) the principal's perception of that role, (3) the perceptions of the local community, and (4) the perceptions of the staff of the school. Role conflicts exist because the principal is under pressure from superordinates to attain the goals of the organization and from subordinates to assist them in attaining goals. According to the authors, this conflict can be minimized by utilizing cooperative measures which include teachers and administrators in the decision-making processes at the systems level.

Another source of conflict is the definition of the role of the principal in regard to the central office staff. Believing that the principal is the executive head of the school, Morphet and associates recommended that the principal be responsible for managing the employees and the educational program of his/her school and for

executing board policies at this school. A cooperative relationship, however, should exist between the principal and the central staff.

The authors also gave five functions of the building level principal:

1. The principal and staff should organize a plan for the school.
2. The principal should work with the staff.
3. The most important task is to provide instructional leadership.
4. The principal should work with pupils.
5. The principal should work with the community.

Two roles of the principal, instructional leader and personnel administrator, were discussed by Sweeney (1982) and Castetter (1981). Sweeney quoted Miller and Lieberman in making the statement that principals have such an overload of duties and such contradictory roles that they are powerless to provide instructional leadership. According to Sweeney, there are two reasons why principals give so little time to instructional leadership. In the 1960s and 1970s as a result of the "relevance" movement, a principal had to be all things to all people, a jack-of-all trades. Secondly, the courses provided in principal training programs have generally provided the "nuts and bolts" of administration such as law and finance. Few training curricula provide methodology courses.

Sweeney maintained that the most effective principals, in terms of student growth, are task and result oriented. They understand the element of persuasion and influence and have a knowledge of the change process and learning theory.

In his discussion of the personnel function of the principal, Castetter said that the principal is probably the most important administrator in the school system in terms of achieving effective realization of human resources. In dealing with teachers, the personnel role is important in creating loyalty, achievement and satisfaction. In this personnel role, the principal must be able to deal with these areas:

1. staff relationships
2. matching people and positions
3. subordinate characteristics
4. position orientation
5. staff development
6. performance appraisal
7. supervision
8. collective bargaining.

Hughes and Ubben (1978) maintained that the position of the principal has developed during the years into one of the most important positions in the school system. They listed five functions of the principalship:

1. school-community relations
2. staff personnel development
3. pupil personnel development
4. educational program development
5. business and building management.

The authors also stated that there are two dimensions of the principalship. The first dimension is effective management of the

school for the purpose of accomplishing its goals. The second dimension is leadership. Two roles included within the leadership dimension are school-community relations specialist and educational engineer. In order to perform effectively in these roles, a principal needs to be able to organize and develop personnel and to delegate authority.

Drake and Miller (1982) wrote that the role of the principal has changed greatly in recent years. Because the principal has spent much of his/her time maintaining the organization rather than in leading it, it is important for today's principal to assume the responsibility of interpreting district policy for the school and to create an environment with which students, teachers and parents can identify. Based on a study of the Southwest Conference for Community Education Development, the eight task areas for principals were listed by the authors:

1. philosophy, goal setting and policy implementation
2. program development
3. program management
4. developing climate
5. personnel management
6. financial management
7. community relations
8. program evaluation.

On a pessimistic note, Unks (1983) stated that even though the principal is defined in every textbook as the curriculum leader of the school, he/she actually is "a paper pusher at best and a stifler

of creative, reflective teaching at worst." (Unks, 1983, p. 62). According to the author, the American school was patterned after the American factory and, therefore, adopted an industrial-managerial role model for its administrators. Maintaining that principals shuffle a great deal of paper and do little curriculum leading, Unks recommended that our schools, like the British ones, have two principals, a headmaster chosen by the teachers with authority over curriculum and instruction and a clerk with authority over business and financial aspects of the school. He also recommended that the central office adopt a "hands-off" policy toward school principals and that all professionals in the system be paid on the same salary schedule. School administrators, he believes, should also be taught the philosophy that theirs is a service job. They should be facilitators, not erectors of hurdles.

Collective Bargaining and the Role of the Principal

In a pamphlet published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Leslee Bishop (1967) suggested that the proponents of collective bargaining are trying to change the status of the principal and supervisor to staff and supporting roles instead of line roles. Since the persons occupying management roles may not be supported by teachers, Bishop believes it is likely that schools will continue to be administered by a hierarchy; however, a second structure may emerge in which teachers have a major thrust.

Agreeing with Bishop's views on the management role of the principal, George Redfern (1969) suggested that school systems vary widely in the way they define the duties and responsibilities of the

principal; therefore, there is little concensus as to what is actually included within the principal's realm of authority. Those who see the principal's role as strictly managerial believe that the educational concept of principal will weaken and the management-labor atmosphere will prevail. Others see negotiations as bringing about a different process for decision making. The fact that individual principals may feel reduced in importance is a phenomenon of a given situation, not a reduction in the status of the principalship alone. The issue for principals is one of adjustment and reallocation of responsibility.

In a second article, Redfern (1977) stated that collective bargaining has become the dominant medium of communication between educational management and the employees. Communication within the school system has deteriorated as the result of the use of adversarial and confrontational tactics. The author feels that collective bargaining has always aided the development of a disenchantment between building level administrators and central office.

In a discussion of the role of the principal and collective bargaining, Cunningham (1968) reminded the reader of Erikson's six images of the principal:

1. The "housekeeper" who seeks to run a smoothly operating building is not considerably upset by bargaining.
2. The "daddy", the teacher's protector, is shattered by collective bargaining.
3. The "superteacher" who passes along the secrets of teaching is compatible with collective bargaining.

4. The "foreman" who sees that teachers follow advice, is uncertain under collective bargaining.
5. The "change agent" is reasonably successful in collective bargaining.
6. The "systems analyst" knows the organization and is therefore not affected by collective bargaining.

Cunningham believed that the concern of the principal regarding collective bargaining is real and is not difficult to understand since the issues at the heart of bargaining have been linked directly to what he perceives as his prerogatives. As mentioned in Erikson's images, principals with closed belief systems probably do not respond to collective bargaining as positively as principals with open belief systems. In a similar vein, Cunningham found that principals who come up through the ranks of one particular school system and view authority as almost totally vested in the office they occupy feel considerably more threatened by collective bargaining than the career-bound principal who moves from system to system.

Using the nominal group technique with 250 administrators and supervisors, Hoyle (1978) identified collective bargaining as the most critical teacher-administrator relations problem in public schools. The major concern is the knowledge gap between teacher and administrator perceptions of the role each plays. Hoyle concluded that if the principal views his authority from the nature of this office rather than from his sense of human dignity and professional concern, he will most probably be threatened by and have trouble adjusting to collective bargaining.

King (1979) maintained that state legislatures are beginning to want to define more clearly the legal status of the building principal. The reorganization of the unique role of the principal is, in part, a reaction to the rapid buildup of a bureaucracy of administrative staff support positions. According to King, the intent of some state legislatures is to define the role of the principal in such a way as to place on the principal rather than on teachers and support personnel the burden of responsibility for assuring that appropriate educational programs are planned.

In regard to collective bargaining, principals have been more recently included with management. As such, they are excluded from bargaining in many states. Some states now permit separate bargaining by principals.

Wendall Sparkes (1981) suggested that collective bargaining has shattered the image of a united profession and has affected the leadership role of the principal. Because of his belief, he maintained that today's principal should play the role of a corporate executive who "serves as a plant manager in the designing, producing, packaging and marketing of the product--education." (Sparkes, 1981, p. 34) The principal should align himself with the central office and should be a part of decision making.

According to Harry Randles (1975), the principal's role dilemma can be partially explained by the fact that principals are usually former teachers. Their attitudes concerning labor and management are not significantly different from those of teachers. On the other hand, superintendents' management-oriented attitudes toward bargaining

are not significantly different from those of board members which are not the same as teachers and principals who are labor oriented. Principals, therefore, often find it difficult to deal with diverse expectations.

Many authors were concerned about the adversarial relationships between teachers and principals brought about by collective bargaining. In a discussion on the changing role of the principal, Lutz and Caldwell (1979) agreed that the principal's traditional role has been affected by collective bargaining. Middle management is, at this time, viewed negatively; therefore, the principal is often by-passed by the teacher organization and also not included in the management team by the central office.

In agreement with this basic premise, Wood (1969) stated that the basic task of principals has not been changed. What has changed is the environment in which the principal operates. Accordingly, the principal must be a manager of change and an instructional strategist.

Stone (1978) was also concerned about the principal as the instructional leader of the school. The fact that principals are now being used as spokespersons for the management bargaining team often plays havoc with the teacher-principal relationship. Believing that the principal should maintain credibility as an instructional leader, this author maintained that the provisions of the negotiated contract should be used to groom better teachers who will cooperate with the principal to bring about constructive change in the educational system.

McIntyre (1971) also agreed that the old idea of principal paternalism is out-of-date. A major change in the principal's professional life has occurred in his relationship with teachers who are now organized, aggressive, outspoken and self-assured.

Kraig (1981) agreed that adversarial relationships between teachers and principals are being brought about by collective bargaining. Like others, he feels that the decision-making discretion of the principal will be bargained away, and those who are hurt most by collective bargaining are those principals who do not use participative management policies. Since the learning supervisory role of the principal is in conflict with the situations of collective bargaining, the results and effects of negotiations are dependent upon the climate in which the process occurs.

Lester Anderson (1969) wrote that collective bargaining has disrupted one traditional role of the principal--that of official spokesperson for the interests of teachers. In the formation of labor associations, teachers have rejected administrators as their representatives to the board of education. This rejection, in some cases, has caused principals to feel unwanted by the people with whom they work daily. Although the school board should expect loyalty from its administrators, it should also be aware of the conflict of interest inherent in the position of the principal.

The loss of the principal's discretionary power was a topic of interest to many authors. Addelston (1969) maintained that collective bargaining has eroded the principal's authority without any corresponding decrease in responsibility. In other words,

accountability has increased while power has decreased. Each time teachers gain a right in the contract, the working conditions of the principal are affected. John Neill (1978) viewed this erosion of power through negotiation as the prime motivating factor in the movement to form a separate bargaining unit for principals.

Lutz and Caldwell (1979) viewed several factors as reasons for a decline in the principal's discretionary powers. First is the growing number of specialists with specific knowledge. The use of specialists within a school system causes a loss of the principal's discretionary power. Secondly, teachers are showing greater interest in management and thirdly, the move toward larger schools has encouraged more uniformity at the expense of the principal's discretionary power. The loss of power is most readily apparent in the day-to-day administrative operations. These authors feel that there is a gap between the principal's perception of strong leadership at the building level and the loss of power to both superiors and subordinates as a result of collective bargaining.

Ford (1980) found that two areas of the negotiated contract are especially troublesome to principals: (1) working conditions language and (2) maintenance of standards clauses. The restrictions demanded by teachers on the flexible use of their time and talents limit a principal's leadership alternatives. Also, the maintenance of standards clause requires that a majority of teachers must agree to act simultaneously on an innovation or change. Since this development is unlikely to occur, the imaginative teacher and principal can be held captive in the hands of the teacher majority. Highly

restrictive contract language can "replace human understanding and relationships that foster challenge, motivation and self-fulfillment." (Ford, 1980, p. 42)

Rudman (1969) discussed a dozen items which if included in the negotiated contract tie the hands of the principal. If included in the contract, these items may invite disaster and the end of educational leadership among principals. This dirty dozen includes:

1. textbook selection and use
2. curriculum improvement
3. achievement and intelligence testing
4. school building and district organization
5. class size
6. number and time of teacher meetings to be scheduled
7. reporting to parents
8. emergency weather conditions
9. committee participation
10. personnel assignments and transfer
11. discipline
12. building representatives and administrators.

In his previously mentioned discussion of the impact of collective bargaining on the principal, Cunningham (1968) stated that bargaining has:

1. intensified involving large numbers of power groups reflecting specialization
2. resulted in increased and sustained tension between bureaucratic authority and collegial authority

3. resulted in positive educational improvements in many school districts.

In the same vein, Pisapia contended that instead of incorporating principals' viewpoints, one result of teacher collective bargaining has been a tendency to centralize decision making in the central office.

Joining the ranks of the relatively few authors who feel that collective bargaining has had a positive effect on the principal, Randles (1975) stated that principals with negotiated contracts may have more power potential than they have ever had. The contract gives the principal more legitimacy in enforcing contractual provisions than the enforcing of rules and regulations over which the teacher had little influence. Resolving grievance procedures at the lowest level also is an exercise of power for the principal as it is precedent setting and tends to tighten up administrative processes. Administrators, then, according to Randles, have not lost power but have lost the right to be arbitrary.

Contending that collective bargaining has had a strong, although not necessarily detrimental, impact on the principal, Houts (1975) said that principals perceive themselves as "in the middle," a concept which has done more damage to the principalship than any other. He maintained, however, that bargaining may not be the original cause of the formation of a gulf between principal and teacher. Such a gulf is usually the manifestation of another problem within the school. Also, Houts believes that bargaining has succeeded in preventing some of the worst excesses of autocratic behavior.

Suggestions for Solving Current Problems

Many of the authors reviewed expressed the belief that team management is a sound concept in dissolving credibility gaps between the principal and teacher and the principal and central office. Also, a number of authors gave opinions on the roles the principal should assume in an attempt to bring about positive results from the process of collective bargaining.

After finding that 86% of principals favor administrative bargaining rights, James and Lovell (1982) proposed a team management bargaining model that recognizes and amplifies the role of the school principal in all stages of bargaining. The model allows the means for principals to add their input to bargaining proposals and to analyze proposed union contract provisions for building level implications. These authors maintained that the greatest loss of administrative power comes from poor contract management and not from the negotiating table. Anderson (1969) also espoused the team management plan and suggested that such a plan would involve all administrators in planning and policy formulation and would increase communication horizontally and vertically.

Salmon (1977) gave his reasons for supporting the administrative team approach. With this approach, each member has the opportunity and responsibility to analyze proposed policy from his respective point of view. Also, it requires responsible and continuing participation by each member of the team. Communication is the key. If middle management is involved with and respected by the board and superintendent, it will develop loyalty to those two.

Lutz and Caldwell (1979) agreed that the only viable role for principals in the future is that of board-administrative team member. The principal's new role as a member of the team and organizational administration at the building level should give this position even more importance. The principal, however, will no longer be "captain of the ship" but rather a creative administrator of work activity within the parameters of the contract. This new role is different from that of the traditional teacher trainer or inspector. Along this same line, Bennien (1969) who believes that the principal will not be able to function effectively as both a professional administrator of the schools and a clinical professor of teachers, advocated the role of manager and liaison contact with the central office.

In utilizing the team approach, Kehler (1980) stated that the ultimate success or failure of the negotiation process depends on the first level supervisor or principal. There are four reasons for this conclusion:

1. The principal is the day-to-day contract administrator.
2. The principal is the key management member in the resolution of every day work site employee management conflicts and problems.
3. The principal is the eyes and ears of management in obtaining information about and insights into employee feelings, attitudes and behavior accomplished through normal working relationships.
4. The principal communicates management policies obtaining employee acceptance and identification with management and district goals.

After describing the Dallas School System's model for shared decision making, Estes (1973) expressed the belief that all line administrators should be thought of as extensions of the superintendent with appropriate authority; therefore, he agreed with the use of the professional model for shared decision making. Lieberman (1977), on the other hand, warned that the administrative team should not be allowed to function as a legislative body. The individual administrator should not be allowed to undermine management's position before, during, or after negotiations.

In an attempt to counteract the negative impact of collective bargaining on the principal, Cunningham (1968) suggested that:

1. provisions be made for participation on the part of the principal
2. principal preparation programs need to include superior-subordinate relationships in complex organizations
3. assessment needs to be made of which administrative skills, conceptual, human, or technical have the highest payoff for the principal
4. research on the impact of collective bargaining is needed.

Expressing the same thoughts, Reed (1977) maintained that success in collective bargaining is determined by the degree to which the principal practices human relations. The principal should always consult with persons whose working conditions would be affected before changing a policy. He can accomplish this task by maintaining good relations with the building representative. Believing that sharing authority is not giving it away, Reed stated that living

successfully with a teachers' contract takes "a little common sense and a lot of human relations." (Reed, 1977, p. 81) It is also possible that administrators can manipulate a contract to serve their own interests.

According to Thomas George (1978), the broad interpretation of bargaining scope in many states has made possible the negotiation between teachers and school boards of items which have traditionally fallen within the principal's authority. In order to preserve his/her power, therefore, it would follow that the principal should have a role in the bargaining process either as a representative on the teacher bargaining unit or the board's bargaining team, or as a consultant to the board. A conflict of interest may ensue if the principal is a member of the teacher unit. On the other hand, adversarial relationships may result from a principal's membership on the board's team. The consultant role, therefore, may be the best one. Much controversy has arisen over the question of whether principals are supervisory or management employees; however, in the majority of school districts, they have been designated as management employees.

Ingils (1972) advised that the school principal should know his/her role and the labor contract. Stone (1978) agreed that the principal should be keenly aware of the provisions of the contract. He also advocated the use of negotiated agreements constructively to groom better teachers who, in cooperation with the principal, would bring about constructive changes in the educational program.

Ford (1980) suggested that a principal can be successful as both a contract administrator and instructional leader if he is assertive and uses participatory management. He recommended that the principal should:

1. study what constitutes a healthy organization
2. discuss ideas with teachers
3. share with staff implications of negotiated clauses
4. present oral and written information to the central administration.

Barkelew (1979) emphasized communication during the bargaining process. Good communication keeps the principal fully informed about the process of negotiation and issues being negotiated.

In discussing what the new role of the principal should be, Bennion (1969) suggested that the principal should: (1) do everything in his/her power to create conditions under which effective teaching and training can take place, (2) be a perceptive generalist and act as a catalyst, and (3) help clarify and interpret to the faculty the major educational aims of the district and school. According to Bennion, principals can participate actively in bargaining and still relate to teachers constructively and professionally since teachers have increasingly considered principals a part of management.

Lutz and Caldwell (1979) expressed the belief that the principal should use the grievance procedure to accentuate his role. Grievances are continuous feedback for negotiations and should be a valuable asset to the principal in the performance of his duty and the clarification of his emerging role.

Summary. The consensus of the authors reviewed here is that the role of the principal has indeed been affected by collective bargaining. The belief that collective negotiations has resulted in a decrease of the principal's power in exercising administrative prerogatives and in strained relationships between principals and teachers was generally held by the authors reviewed here. It is believed that in many cases, principals learn what has happened in negotiations only after the agreement has been reached.

In an effort to elevate the role of the principal, most authors agreed that principals must be included in every phase of collective bargaining that determines their own fate and the fate of the schools for which they are responsible. In turn, the principal should be communicative and fully knowledgeable about the process of negotiations and issues being negotiated.

2. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

Decision Making

Using 17 East Tennessee School districts as the research population, Ross (1981), LeCoultre (1979), Staff (1979) and Wilson (1979), in four individual studies, researched aspects of decision making and professional attitudes regarding collective bargaining. Ross (1981) researched the relationship between levels of participation in and satisfaction with the decision-making process and employee militancy or sympathy with collective action. Using two questionnaires, the Critical Decision Inventory and the Collective Action Scale, he surveyed teachers, principals and central office administrators and concluded that attitudinal

militancy cannot be predicted by any of the variables used in the study (participation in and satisfaction with decision making in the six areas studied).

LeCoultre (1979) studied male and female teachers in the same East Tennessee school systems with regard to their perceived participation in and satisfaction with the decision-making process and their potential for collective action. She found that a significant difference existed between male and female teachers in perceived level of participation and personal satisfaction in decision making. Female teachers were more dissatisfied with their perceived level of participation in decision making than were male teachers; however, females were not more inclined toward collective action. LeCoultre also found that teachers who had few years of service were more inclined toward collective action than those who had been employed a number of years.

Staff (1979) examined the extent to which job position, sex, and individual system membership affected opinions of teachers, principals and central office administrators toward professional negotiations. Using the school districts mentioned in the previous two studies, Staff compared five negotiating special school districts, five nonnegotiating special school districts and seven county school districts on the opinions of the respondents concerning agreement with items categorized as collective action, sanctions, and goal items. He found that males were more militant than females and that the respondents in county school districts showed the most overall agreement with the negotiation items. From the findings,

he concluded that a difference in opinion among teachers, principals and central office administrators would lead to disagreement in the collective bargaining process.

Using the same research population, Wilson (1979) studied how, by whom, and with what quality decisions were being made in the areas of: (1) curriculum and instruction, (2) pupil personnel, (3) school plant and facilities, and (4) community relations. He found that the area of pupil personnel was perceived by all three groups (teachers, principals, and central office personnel) as the area of greatest participation in decision making. All size groups (small, medium and large) had significant relationships between participation in decision making and satisfaction with decisions made. Nonnegotiating teachers reported higher levels of perceived participation and satisfaction with decisions in each decision area. From the findings, he concluded that increased participation in decision making is necessary.

Peach (1978) also investigated the levels of participation in and satisfaction with decision making in six policy areas. Using a random sample of teachers and all principals and central office personnel in the Knox County School System as the research sample, Peach found that higher levels of participation had produced higher levels of satisfaction. Central office personnel reported the highest level of participation and satisfaction. Next, in descending order, were the superintendent/board, principals and finally teachers. Teachers had the highest correlation between levels of participation and satisfaction. Principals had the second

highest correlation. All three groups perceived the central office personnel to have the highest level of participation in decision making in all areas except for finance and business. Also, the three reference groups perceived the principal's level of participation to be higher than the teacher's level of participation in all six areas. The three groups reported the highest levels of satisfaction in the area of school-community policy and pupil personnel.

Impact of Collective Bargaining on the Principal

As previously mentioned, empirical studies regarding the effect of collective bargaining on the power of the principal have been relatively scarce. These studies vary considerably in the quality of their design, analysis and reporting. The findings have been mixed.

The American School Board Association, in a national study of the principal's perception of his/her role in school management (Williams, 1979), found that bargaining has had a negative effect on the principal. Of the principals surveyed, 86% favored legislation to form their own bargaining unit. According to Williams, the conclusion was not clear and the dictates of good research were not followed.

After examining 150 teacher contracts, McDonnell and Pascal concluded that administrators have accommodated to collective bargaining just as they have to other forces such as desegregation and declining enrollments. They concluded that collective bargaining has produced mixed results in most school districts.

In a study conducted under the auspices of the Pennsylvania School Board, Heddinger (1978) found that the majority of principals

polled believed that their authority to make decisions that count is adequate. Also, power over monetary decisions was found to be adequate. The data indicated that principals feel they have less authority in collective bargaining than in the other two areas studied (staffing and budget). Only 23% felt their direct participation in the bargaining process was sufficient. The results, however, are difficult to generalize to Tennessee because in Pennsylvania, the principal is often included in the school district management team.

In another Pennsylvania study, Caldwell and Hartzog (1981) looked at the job satisfaction of secondary principals as related to collective bargaining. They concluded that participation in the bargaining process has a positive effect on the principal's role satisfaction; however, at the table bargaining roles of principals may damage the principal-staff relationship. The findings supported the use of principals in the managerial aspects of the bargaining process. The authors also concluded that the perceived level of dissatisfaction with the negotiations process was not sufficient to decrease the overall job satisfaction for a majority of principals. In addition, they found that 72.5% of the principals considered self-interest bargaining as most beneficial and desirous for items such as salary and working conditions.

In 1977, Nighswander and Klahn (Williams, 1979) surveyed principals, superintendents, and community college presidents in the North Central Association to determine the effect of collective bargaining on administrator roles and functions, institutional quality variables, and problems and issues of education. From the

data, it appears that principals feel that collective bargaining has a smaller influence on their ability to manage than do superintendents and community college presidents.

Berg (1973) studied the effect of collective bargaining on principals in Illinois. He compared bargaining and nonbargaining principals on their perceptions in four areas: (1) rules orientation, (2) status anxiety, (3) role ambiguity and (4) perceived locus of factors influencing behavior between principals. Using questionnaires and interviews, he found no statistically significant differences; therefore, he concluded that collective bargaining has had little or no impact on the principal.

Miskel (1974) proposed the question: Are the demographic variables of age, sex, experience, and marital status and the attitudinal variables of primary life interests, satisfaction, voluntarism, aspiration and teacher association support significantly related to teacher and administrator attitudes toward the scope of collective bargaining? Using the Collective Negotiations Index (CNI), the author found that these demographic and attitudinal variables are poor predictors of the relative legitimacy that educators place on bargaining issues.

In a nation-wide study conducted by the Bureau of Research of the U.S. Office of Education (Becker, 1970), the researchers found that the most important problem of the elementary school principal today is role ambiguity. The principal must enforce policies which he/she often has no voice in making. The researchers also predicted that negotiations will change the role of the elementary principal from that of instructional leader to management.

Holley, Serekra and Rector concentrated on the proper role of the school principal in professional negotiations. The study approached the role of the principal in professional negotiations from five perspectives (chairman of school boards, superintendents, presidents of teacher associations, teachers, and principals) related to the following categories: (1) salaries and compensation, (2) fringe benefits, (3) personnel policies and procedures, (4) internal control of the schools and (5) curriculum change. The authors concluded that superintendents and board chairmen are strongly opposed to allowing principals to join teachers in negotiating salary but are not so strongly opposed to their joining to negotiate fringe benefits, personnel procedures, internal control and curriculum changes. Based on the results of this study, the authors recommended that if the principal is a part of the management team, he/she must be given legitimate managerial rights. If, on the other hand, the principal is a part of the teacher bargaining unit, the degree to which he/she is granted managerial authority should be limited.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1980) attempted to assess the current supervisory practice and the impact of certain factors on supervision. Collective bargaining was included as one of these factors. After gathering data by questionnaires and interviews from sixteen districts (urban, suburban and medium size cities), the researchers concluded that principals in large cities strongly associated collective bargaining with the decline in supervisory service; however, superintendents and teachers

did not feel this way. The results were not significant for principals in other categories.

A study of the principalship by the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1980, p. 9) determined that principals viewed their real and ideal roles as administrative. Instructional leadership was given secondary emphasis. These principals also gave low priority to evaluating school programs, providing in-service education and interviewing and recommending new personnel.

In the Oregon School Study Bulletin, Robinson (1971) reported a study to determine the role expectations among principals, superintendents, teachers and board members in two suburban school districts in Oregon. Specifically, as one objective, the study attempted to determine the level of agreement of these groups in regard to the principal's role in decision making. The data indicated that principals are in moderate agreement regarding their role in decision making. They were in high agreement regarding their roles in matters pertaining to personnel. Teachers, superintendents and board members vary in their agreement on the behavior of principals. Also, Robinson found that principals are in closer agreement with superintendents regarding the role of the principal than are teachers and board members. Principals and teachers are in the greatest disagreement. Selected demographic factors appeared to have no effect on the views of the principal. Also, principals, superintendents and board members are not willing yet to have teachers involved in the decision-making role of the principal to the extent that the teachers desire involvement.

In a study of states that have public and higher education collective bargaining, Pisapia (1975) gathered data based on the content analysis of the clauses in contracts to determine the degree to which practitioners in management and in teaching are free to exercise their own judgment in specific cases (autonomy). The evidence indicated that while management still controls, teachers and professors have emerged with their own power. Pisapia concluded that we are in the midst of realignment of power relationships in educational institutions involved in collective bargaining.

Peach and Reddick (1981) studied the principal's perceived level of participation in decision making in the state of Tennessee and their degree of satisfaction with decisions made. They divided principals into three categories: (1) those engaged in collective bargaining before 1978, (2) those engaged in collective bargaining after 1978 and (3) those who have never participated in collective bargaining. The policy areas of decision making studied related to: (1) finance and business management, (2) curriculum and instruction, (3) certificated personnel, (4) educational facilities--auxiliary services, (5) school-community relations, and (6) pupil personnel. The authors found no significant differences among groups of principals with regard to their satisfaction with decisions in any policy area except certificated personnel. In this area, principals in group one perceived a lesser degree of participation in decision making and less satisfaction than did principals in the other two groups. Also, the data indicated that principals in group three (never bargained) participated least with decision making in two

areas: (1) finance and business management and (2) facilities and auxiliary services. The authors concluded that the perceived levels of satisfaction among the principals within the school systems were not clearly affected by the negotiation process.

In a study on administrator morale, Kline (1974) tested the hypothesis: there is no difference in administrator morale due to perceived school board operations among administrators operating under traditional, procedural or comprehensive bargaining agreements. He asked middle administrators to respond to the School Administrator Morale Measure III and found that his hypothesis could be rejected. Administrators associated with procedural bargaining have the lowest morale. Next are those in comprehensive bargaining. The highest morale was found in the traditional bargaining group.

In a study of the elementary school principalship in 1978, Pharis and Zakariya found a positive correlation between teacher bargaining and principals' morale and sense of job security. Eighty-four percent of the principals with low morale and 67% of principals with high morale worked with teachers who had a negotiated contract. The authors also asked the question: "Does collective bargaining have a good effect on the quality of education?" The authors determined that if ten principals are asked that question, one would respond "good," four would respond "bad," three "little," and two "don't know." The answer does not depend on age, sex, or experience but varies depending on the section of the country.

Blumberg, Brannigan and Nason (1981) focused their study on the extent to which superintendents and principals feel the negotiated

contract has constrained their power to act on particular issues and the extent to which this constraint has hampered their ability to do their jobs. They found that principals were more affected by the contract than superintendents; however, the contract in no way renders them impotent. Also, neither the superintendents nor the principals found the constraints produced by the contract severely hampered them in their jobs. The more powerful and less hampered one felt, the more freedom one seemed to have to speak and act freely. The authors concluded that because of the contract, the superintendent's job may be easier. He no longer has to make personal decisions about teacher requests which vary from district policy. Although not prisoners of the contract, principals appear to be less sure of themselves and their prerogatives than are superintendents.

According to Gregory Benson (1979), contract management emerged as a major concern of New York state school administrators on a needs and interest survey. Forty-four percent of the principals surveyed saw themselves as contract managers, not instructional leaders. Forty-five percent of the principals felt collective bargaining has had a negative impact on classroom instruction and 59% felt that the total educational program has been negatively affected.

Nicholson and Naestron (1974) reviewed empirical studies on collective bargaining's effect on the principal and drew conclusions in four areas: (1) decision making, (2) the supervisory role, (3) functions and work load and (4) job satisfaction and working relationships. According to the authors, recent studies reported that the decision-making roles of the principal are affected by

negotiations. There was no indisputable evidence in these studies to indicate that collective bargaining has uniformly lessened the leadership role of the principal. Supervisory roles have changed in many places; however, negotiations have not necessarily reduced supervisory authority. As a result of negotiations, considerable variation was found in the work load and functions performed by the principal. Although, as a result of negotiations, teacher-principal relationships may become strained, the comprehensive negotiated agreement does not cause a serious decrease in the principal's job satisfaction or morale.

Based on these empirical studies, the effects of collective bargaining on the power of the principal are not clear. As already mentioned, the responses of principals to discussions concerning collective bargaining differ for various reasons, many of which are difficult to control in empirical studies. The belief that bargaining has had an extremely negative effect on the ability of the principal to make decisions has not been proven by these studies.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

1. THE SUBJECTS

The population of this study consisted of all principals (with the exception of those in the districts discussed below) who are employed by bargaining and nonbargaining public school districts in the state of Tennessee. As previously mentioned, no control group was available for the group composed of school districts with student enrollment $\geq$ 10,000. Since 12 of the 13 districts in this category participate in collective bargaining, leaving too few left for comparison purposes, these 13 districts were excluded from the sample population. Also, because a very large percentage (86.7%) of the special school districts do not participate in collective bargaining, they, too, were excluded from the population.

An examination of the 1982-1983 State Department of Education Directory of Public Schools indicated that within the parameters constructed for the population of this study, there are 930 principals of public schools in Tennessee. Of these principals, 624 are employed in bargaining districts and 306 in nonbargaining districts. The sample size obtained from Hauskin's "Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population" (Hauskin, 1963, p. 3) was 272. This

determination was based on the use of Hauskin's formula:

$$n = \frac{X^2 N \emptyset (1-\emptyset)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2 \emptyset (1-\emptyset)}$$

Where:

N = population size

n = sample size

X^2 = chi-square, with 1 d.f. and desired confidence level

d = error range

$\emptyset$ = (.50 for largest sample size or percent of population with a given characteristic)

and: the level of confidence of 95% of selecting a sample that will represent the true distribution of the population.

A random numbers table was used to select the sample.

2. THE INSTRUMENT

The researcher developed a questionnaire, based on a role-norm inventory constructed by John W. Robinson of the Oregon School Study Council (Robinson, 1971) and a study of selected contracts negotiated in Tennessee school districts (see Appendix A). This questionnaire was designed to survey the principal's perceived power in the exercise of administrative prerogatives. The principal was asked to react to his/her ability to control and to make decisions in various areas of school management by means of a nine-point rating scale, a continuum from "practically no power concerning" to "almost complete power concerning." The instrument was also used to obtain information on these demographic variables: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) number of

years of administrative experience, (4) highest degree earned, (5) type of school in which employed, and (6) bargaining status of the school district. Extracted from the literature, these particular variables were cited by researchers in this field as worthy of further study.

To determine its validity, the instrument was submitted to a panel of eight experts. Included on this panel were three university professors, the chief negotiator for the Hamilton County, Tennessee School Board, and four Tennessee public school principals. The school principals represented both bargaining and nonbargaining districts and elementary and secondary school levels (see Appendix B). This panel was asked to eliminate any concepts that were irrelevant, add any that appeared to be missing, and change any that were ambiguous (see Appendix B).

Based on the comments from the jury of experts, subsequent revisions were made before the instrument was field tested in a doctoral-level education class in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and a masters-level class in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga. The students in these classes were asked to complete the questionnaire and give their opinions of statements which were not clear. After the questionnaire was developed and field tested, it was mailed along with a cover letter to the randomly selected principals. Two follow-up mailings were sent to nonrespondents in two week intervals after the first mailing (see Appendix C). In

order to evaluate the reliability of the questionnaire, a Chronbach's alpha score was statistically computed. Using the 219 questionnaires returned, a Chronbach's alpha of .92 was obtained.

3. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The data obtained from the questionnaire were treated in the statistical analysis in terms of the three categories indicated in the survey instrument. These categories were: (1) Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel, (2) Administration and Organization, and (3) Curriculum and Instruction. Since the three categories did not contain equal numbers of items, a true comparison among them could not be accomplished without addressing this inequality. In this regard, responses to the items within each category were summed and divided by the total number of items minus the number of missing responses. This computation allowed the researcher to make comparisons among the three groups and to provide means which were in the same numerical form as the nine-point scale on the questionnaire. A fourth category, the power coefficient, which consisted of the mean of the total responses on the questionnaire, was also computed.

The categorized data were summarized and reported as frequencies. In an effort to determine if there were significant differences in the responses of the two groups studied (bargaining and nonbargaining) and to relate this difference, if any, to collective bargaining, the data were submitted to two statistical tests.

To determine if there were differences in the perceived power of the principals in bargaining and nonbargaining districts, the data were analyzed through the use of t-tests. Each division of school management included in the questionnaire (Selection, Evaluation, and Development of Personnel; Administration and Organization; and Curriculum and Instruction) were subjected to this analysis. Also, responses of the two groups to the questionnaire as a whole (power coefficient) were subjected to t-test analysis. A confidence level of .05 was selected as an indication of significant difference.

Stepwise regression analysis was used to determine the extent to which the independent variables (age, sex, highest degree earned, number of years of administrative service, type of school in which employed, and bargaining status of the school system) explained the variability in four dependent variables: (1) power coefficient (the responses of principals to all of the items on the questionnaire), (2) Category I (Selection Evaluation and Development of Personnel), (3) Category II (Organization and Administration), and (4) Category III (Curriculum and Instruction).

With this analysis, the variables which were not actually involved in this study (all independent variables except bargaining status) were evaluated in an effort to eliminate them as predictors of perceived power. Stepwise regression entered the independent variables in their relative order of explanatory power. In other words, the independent variable that explained the most variability in the dependent variable entered the regression first. The second most explanatory variable entered the regression second and the

process continued. Using this process, the researcher was able to explain the variability in the power coefficient that was associated with collective bargaining. In addition, a determination was made in regard to the statistical significance of the collective bargaining variable.

The principals surveyed were also asked to write on the questionnaire any comments they might have. These comments were reported in the findings.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND FINDINGS

1. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

As previously mentioned, the data used in this study was obtained with the use of an instrument designed to survey the principal's perception of his/her power in the exercise of administrative prerogatives. In the initial mailing, questionnaires were sent to 274 randomly selected principals in the state of Tennessee (see Appendix A). As a result of a follow-up postcard and a second mailing of the instrument to nonrespondents in two week intervals following the initial mailing, a response rate of 80% was achieved (see Appendix C).

Of the 219 principals responding, 146 (66.7%) were employed by districts involved with collective bargaining. Seventy-one (32.4%) were employed by nonbargaining districts and 2 (.9%) did not indicate the bargaining status of their districts (see Table 1).

Of the 930 principals composing the population of this study, 624 (67.1%) were employed by bargaining districts and 306 (32.9%) were employed by nonbargaining districts. This composition of the respondents in these categories, therefore, corresponded very closely to the composition of the study population.

The respondents were asked to indicate their ages by category. Five respondents (2.3%) listed their ages as 20-29 years, 80 (36.5%) indicated their ages were 30-39 years, 76 (34.7%) responded in the

TABLE 1

BARGAINING STATUS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS FROM THE RANDOM SAMPLING OF TENNESSEE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE 1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Bargaining Status	Frequencies	Percent
Bargaining	146	66.7
Nonbargaining	71	32.4
No response	2	.9
Total	219	100.0

40-49 year group, 49 (22.4%) were between the ages of 50-59 and 9 (4.1%) were ages 60 and above. The 30-49 age group comprised 71.2% of the respondents. Table 2 summarizes the age categories of the respondents.

With regard to the sex of the respondents, 23 (10.5%) of the respondents were female, and 193 (88.1%) of the respondents were male. This item on the questionnaire was left blank by 3 (1.4%) of the respondents (see Table 3).

The highest degree earned by the respondents was indicated on the survey instrument. Seventeen (7.8%) of the respondents had a Bachelor's degree, 89 (40.6%) held a Masters degree, 81 (37.0%) had attained the Masters +45 level, 30 (13.7%) held the Education Specialist degree, and 2 (.9%) had attained a doctorate. Table 4 summarizes these data.

Respondents were asked to supply information concerning their years of administrative experience. Thirty-one (14.2%) had been in an administrative position from 0 to 3 years, 53 (24.2%) had 4 to 7 years administrative experience, 53 (24.2%) had 8 to 11 years experience, 34 (15.5%) had held an administrative position 12 to 15 years, 25 (11.4%) had 16 to 19 years experience, and 22 (10.0%) had held an administrative position 20 years or longer. One respondent (.5%) failed to indicate years of administrative experience (see Table 5).

Concerning the type of school in which the respondent principals are presently serving, 127 (58.0%) indicated they are presently employed as the principal of an elementary school, 23 (10.5%) are holding an administrative position at a middle or

TABLE 2

AGE CATEGORIES OF RESPONDENTS FROM THE RANDOM SAMPLING OF TENNESSEE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE 1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Age Category	Frequency	Percent
20-29	5	2.3
30-39	80	36.5
40-49	76	34.7
50-59	49	22.4
60+	9	4.1
Total	219	100.0

TABLE 3

SEX OF THE RESPONDENTS FROM THE RANDOM SAMPLING OF TENNESSEE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE 1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	193	88.1
Female	23	10.5
No response	3	1.4
Total	219	100.0

TABLE 4

HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED BY RESPONDENTS FROM THE RANDOM SAMPLING OF TENNESSEE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE 1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Degree	Frequency	Percent
Bachelors Degree	17	7.8
Masters Degree	89	40.6
Masters +45	81	37.0
Education Specialist	30	13.7
Doctorate	2	.9
Total	219	100.0

TABLE 5

YEARS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS
FROM THE RANDOM SAMPLING OF TENNESSEE
PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE
1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Years of Administrative Experience	Frequency	Percent
0-3	31	14.2
4-7	53	24.2
8-11	53	24.2
12-15	34	15.5
16-19	25	11.4
20+	22	10.0
No indication	1	.5
Total	219	100.0

junior high school, 48 (21.9%) are high school principals, and 21 (9.6%) indicated they are serving as principal in another type of school. Within this "other" category, 11 respondents were principals in a K-12 school, 6 were principals of a vocational center, and 4 were principals of special education centers. A response of a combination of elementary and junior high grades was classified as elementary as long as the lower elementary grades were included. In the same manner, a response which indicated a principalship of a school comprised of junior high and senior high grades was classified as senior high as long as the eleventh and twelfth grades were included. Junior high and middle school principals were combined into one category due to state-wide differences in grade levels in these two types of schools. Table 6 summarizes these findings.

2. FINDINGS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTUAL VARIABLES

To study the relationship of collective bargaining to the principal's perceived power in exercising administrative prerogatives, the administrative tasks were categorized into the three response areas designated on the questionnaire. A fourth category, the power coefficient, was also established as a mean of the three response categories.

The data were first analyzed by categories. Means were computed for each of the four categories. Within each category, the means for bargaining and nonbargaining principals were then compared by t-tests. This aspect of the analysis corresponded to the first research question in Chapter I (see page 4).

TABLE 6

TYPES OF SCHOOLS SERVED BY RESPONDENTS FROM THE RANDOM SAMPLING OF TENNESSEE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE 1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Type of School	Frequency	Percent
Elementary	127	58.0
Middle--Junior High	23	10.5
Senior High	48	21.9
K-12, Vocational Center, Special Education Center	21	9.6
Total	219	100.0

To determine if collective bargaining accounted for any of the variability in the power coefficient, a stepwise regression was computed using the power coefficient as the dependent variable and the demographic variables as independent variables. Since a low mean of responses in one of the three questionnaire categories could possibly neutralize a high mean of responses in another category, the stepwise regression was also computed for each of the three categories of administrative tasks. In these regressions, the mean of responses in each category served as the dependent variable and the demographic variables served as the independent variables. This aspect of the analysis corresponded to the second research question addressed by the author (see page 4).

In all cases while determining the mean, missing data were simply counted and subtracted from the total responses in each category. Also, the mean of responses within a particular category was not computed if the number of items left blank exceeded 50%. This researcher felt that while some items in each category might have been nonapplicable to certain respondents, an omission of more than 50% of the items indicated a lack of serious intent on the part of the respondent to supply the requested information.

Findings From the t-test Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed for the responses in each of the questionnaire categories. A mean of 6.044 was found for Category I (Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel), a mean of 6.915 was computed for Category II (Administration and

Organization), and a mean of 5.454 was computed for Category III (Curriculum and Instruction). A mean of 6.210 was also computed for the power coefficient (see Table 7).

To determine any significant difference between the means of the bargaining and nonbargaining principals with regard to their perceived power, the data were treated to t-test analysis. For Category I (Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel), a t-value of -.66 indicated a probability of .508. Since the confidence level for the study was set at the .05 level, there appeared to be no significant difference between the mean for bargaining principals (5.9763) and the mean for nonbargaining principals (6.1419).

With regard to Category II (Administration and Organization), a t-value of -3.02 indicated a probability of .003. Therefore, a significant difference was found between these two means (6.7312 and 7.2598) with nonbargaining principals perceiving greater power.

For Category III (Curriculum and Instruction), a t-value of -2.23 indicated a probability of .027. Again, a significant difference was found between the bargaining and nonbargaining principals with nonbargaining principals perceiving more power in this area. The mean response for bargaining principals was 5.2680 and the mean for nonbargaining principals was 5.7459.

In the t-test used to compare the means of bargaining and nonbargaining principals with regard to their responses to all of the items on the questionnaire (power coefficient), a t-value of -2.48 indicated a .014 probability. A significant difference existed between the two groups of principals with nonbargaining

TABLE 7

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE THREE ATTITUDINAL RESPONSE CATEGORIES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE MAILED TO RANDOMLY SELECTED TENNESSEE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE 1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Category	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel	6.044	6.316	5.550	1.600
Administration and Organization	6.915	7.048	7.762	1.228
Curriculum and Instruction	5.454	5.501	5.000	1.506
Power Coefficient	6.210	6.259	3.873	1.235

principals again perceiving less restriction in decision making. The mean for bargaining principals was 5.2680 while the mean for nonbargaining principals was 5.7459. Table 8 summarizes the results of the t-test analysis.

Findings From the Stepwise Regression

The stepwise regression was calculated to determine if the collective bargaining variable could be associated with perceived power. With Category I as the dependent variable and demographic variables as independent variables, no variable entered the regression at the .05 level. With Category II as the dependent variable, only one variable, bargaining status, entered the regression at the .05 level. In this regression, the R^2 of .029 was significant at the .01 level. A beta coefficient of .38613 was produced. This stepwise regression yielded the equation: $Y = 6.39980 + .38613X$.

Based on this equation, if the number assigned to bargaining principals (1) is placed in the equation for X, the perceived power with regard to administrative tasks in this category would be 6.78593. If the number assigned to nonbargaining principals (2) is placed in the equation for X, the perceived power is 7.17206. Nonbargaining principals, therefore, perceive themselves to be more powerful than bargaining principals. Since the response scale ranges from 1.0 to 9.0, a comparison of 6.8 to 7.2 indicates only a slightly higher perceived power (4.3%).

With Category III as the dependent variable and the demographic variables as independent variables, only one variable, sex, entered

TABLE 8

RESULTS FROM t-TESTS OF PERCEIVED POWER FROM A COMPARISON OF BARGAINING AND NONBARGAINING PRINCIPALS FROM A RANDOM SAMPLING OF TENNESSEE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE 1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Categories	Bargaining Mean	Nonbargaining Mean	t-value	Probability
Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel	5.9763	6.1419	-.66	.508
Administration and Organization	6.7312	7.2598	-3.02	.003*
Curriculum and Instruction	5.2680	5.7459	-2.23	.027*
Power Coefficient	6.0501	6.4884	-2.48	.014*

* = significant t-value at the .05 level

the regression at the .05 level. The R^2 of .036, significant at the .005 level, indicated the beta value of .605. This regression yielded the equation: Y = 4.78036 + .60480X.

With the power coefficient as the dependent variable, only one variable, bargaining status, entered the regression at the .05 level. The R^2 value of .022 was significant at the .029 level. Also, the beta coefficient of .335 was significant at the .029 level. This regression yielded the equation: Y = 5.76313 + .33543X.

From this regression equation, if 1, the number assigned to bargaining principals, is placed in the equation for X, the resulting power coefficent is 6.09856. If 2, the number assigned to nonbargaining principals is substituted for X, the resulting power coefficient is 6.43399. Nonbargaining principals, therefore, perceive themselves to be more powerful than bargaining principals with regard to their perceived ability to exercise administrative prerogatives. Again, since the response scale ranges from 1.0 to 9.0, a value of 6.4 compared to 6.1 indicates only a slightly higher perceived power (3.7%). The findings from the stepwise regressions are summarized in Table 9.

3. COMMENTS FROM RESPONDENTS

Comments from the respondents were generally found to pertain to two areas: (1) state laws and board policy and (2) the negotiated contract. In regard to laws and policies, several respondents commented that the decision making regarding certain items on the questionnaire that dealt with the system as a whole is left to the

TABLE 9

RESULTS OF THE STEPWISE REGRESSIONS COMPUTED ON DATA OBTAINED FROM A RANDOM SAMPLING OF TENNESSEE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE 1983-1984 SCHOOL YEAR

Variable	Independent Variable Entering Regression	R^2	F Probability
Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel	none		
Administration and Organization	Bargaining Status	.02934	.0111*
Curriculum and Instruction	Sex	.03564	.0051*
Power Coefficient	Bargaining Status	.02187	.0287*

* = significant F Probability at the .05 level

Board of Education. "I have input but not 'almost complete power'" was indicative of the comments in this area, although one respondent felt that he/she has no input on board decisions.

Another typical comment was, "Except for specifications set by the state, I have almost complete control on matters that concern my school." One principal wrote that he believes he has input in establishing or changing state policy. In the same vein, another principal commented that the ratings would have been higher if he were invited for input by the school board and central office.

Concerning the negotiated contract, the second general topic of comment, several principals stated that they feel collective bargaining restricts or limits them. One said, "The negotiated contract limits power." Another respondent felt that there is little authority to make decisions due to rules imposed by the contract and by TEA (Tennessee Education Association). This particular respondent also felt that the principal should have more authority in regard to terminating tenured teachers.

One respondent listed the items in the questionnaire which are addressed in his master contract. Feeling that the negotiated contract has greatly affected a principal's decision making in the areas of scheduling and transfers, another principal commented, "I personally have seen no benefit of the bargaining unit to our school system."

Two principals indicated that a strong superintendent definitely limits the decision-making power of the principals within their systems. Also, one respondent commented on his special situation in which he holds a principal/teacher position.

4. SUMMARY

In the analysis of the categorized data by t-tests, several significant differences resulted. At the .05 probability level, bargaining and nonbargaining principals were significantly different in their responses to items on the questionnaire that corresponded to administrative tasks concerning the areas of administration and organization and curriculum and instruction. Also, the two groups responded with significant difference to the total of the items on the questionnaire. In all cases, the mean responses for nonbargaining principals were higher than the mean responses for bargaining principals.

Further analysis using stepwise regression resulted in the variable, bargaining status, as the only variable entering the regression at the .05 probability level when the administration and organization category and the power coefficient were used as dependent variables. The variable, sex, was the only variable to enter the regression at the .05 level when the curriculum and instruction category was used as the dependent variable. In all cases the resulting R^2 values were low.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes a summary of the study and a discussion of the conclusions which were drawn from the findings. Recommendations based on these conclusions are made and suggestions are given for further study in the area of collective bargaining and its effect on the decision-making power of the public school principal.

2. SUMMARY

The Problem

Collective bargaining is, by its own definition, an adversarial procedure in which one party attempts to gain power held by the second party. In the case of collective bargaining in the public school sector, the two parties are the local school board and the teachers' association. Based on collective bargaining legislation in the state of Tennessee, the principal is associated with the teacher bargaining unit, a fact which often produces role confusion and a resulting dilemma. To whom does the principal give allegiance, the school board for which he/she is a management employee or to the teachers with whom he/she acts as instructional leader? This role confusion may be the source of concern among many principals especially when they

are excluded from the collective bargaining process. In addition, many principals fear that a loss of their administrative power may be the direct result of their limited input into the process of negotiating a contract. Since school principals have a major responsibility in the education of the young people of Tennessee, their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on their decision making power are critical for those seeking to improve public education in this state.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to provide information which could be used to help understand the perceptions of public school principals in the state of Tennessee in regard to the area of collective bargaining. An understanding of the perceptions of these principals could and should be used by school boards and central office personnel to improve the working relationships between principals and other school system personnel so that the goal of public schools, the education of students, can be reached more efficiently and more effectively.

Specific outcomes of the study included:

1. A review of current literature to determine the effects of collective bargaining on the principal and recommendations for improving the process with involvement on the part of the principal
2. A survey of Tennessee public school principals with regard to their perceptions of their decision-making power

3. An analysis of differences between bargaining and nonbargaining principals in regard to their decision-making power
4. A determination of the relationship of the collective bargaining factor to the perceived decision-making power of the principal

Procedures

In the initial stages of the study, a review of the literature was undertaken to provide the researcher with background information and opinions. From the literature, the researcher extracted the demographic variables and the administrative tasks used on the questionnaire. The survey instrument was designed to determine the perceptions of principals with regard to their decision-making power in exercising administrative prerogatives.

Before the questionnaire was distributed, it was reviewed by a panel of experts and field tested in two graduate classes. Revisions were made and the questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of 274 public school principals in the state of Tennessee. From the 219 responses, a Chronbach's alpha coefficient of .92 was computed.

Treatment of the Data

Based on the divisions within the questionnaire, the data were divided into three categories: (1) Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel, (2) Administration and Organization, and (3) Curriculum and Instruction. A fourth category, the power coefficient, was computed from responses to all items on the questionnaire.

Frequencies and percents were computed for the demographic variables (age, sex, highest degree attained, years of administrative experience, type of school, and bargaining status of districts) and for the four categories of attitudinal responses indicated above.

T-tests were computed to determine if any significant differences resulted from the responses obtained from two groups, bargaining and nonbargaining principals. These t-tests compared the means of the responses for bargaining and nonbargaining principals in each of the three response categories and for the power coefficient. A t-value was calculated for each category and a .05 level of significance was established.

A series of stepwise regressions were computed to determine the association between the collective bargaining factor and perceived power. Each of the stepwise regressions consisted of one of the three response categories or the power coefficient as the dependent variable, and in all of the regressions, the demographic variables were used as independent variables. An R^2 was calculated for each variable that entered the regression at the .05 probability level. The resulting regression equations were used to demonstrate the relationships.

Findings

Based on the literature reviewed for this study, the effects of collective bargaining on the principal's perception of his/her decision-making power is inconclusive. The consensus of authors reviewed in the descriptive literature was that the role of the

principal has indeed been affected by collective bargaining. The belief that bargaining has resulted in a decrease of the principal's power in decision making and in strained relationships with teachers was the feeling of many of the authors. On the other hand, the results of the empirical studies reviewed here indicated mixed findings. The belief that bargaining has affected principals in an extremely negative way was not proven by these studies.

The findings from the analysis of the data gathered from the questionnaire were used to answer the two research questions proposed by this study. These two questions with their appropriate findings follow.

Question 1. Is there a significant different between principals in districts engaged in collective bargaining and districts not engaged in collective bargaining with regard to their perception of decision-making powers relative to personnel and education matters in the district?

Significant differences did exist between bargaining and nonbargaining principals with regard to their ability to exercise administrative prerogatives. Specifically, the significant differences were found in these response categories:

(1) Administrative and Organization

(2) Curriculum and Instruction

(3) Power Coefficient (total items)

In all of the above categories, the mean response of principals who are employed by nonbargaining districts was higher

than the mean response of principals who are employed by bargaining districts. There was no significant difference found between the two groups of principals in their responses to items in Category 1, the Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel.

Question 2. If a difference in power does exist, can this difference be related to collective bargaining and the negotiated contract?

Collective bargaining was the only variable to enter the stepwise regression at the .05 level when the power coefficient and Category II (Administration and Organization) were used as dependent variables. The variable, sex, was the only variable to enter at the .05 level when Category III (Curriculum and Instruction) was used as the dependent variable. In all cases, the resulting R^2 values were low. No variable entered the stepwise regression at the .05 level when Category I (Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel) was used as the dependent variable. The resulting regression equations indicated that the power coefficient for nonbargaining principals is a higher number on the response scale of one to nine than the power coefficient of bargaining principals.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study were the basis for the following conclusions:

1. Collective bargaining inhibits the decision-making power of the principal in Tennessee.

2. Principals employed by bargaining districts feel their decision-making power is restricted in two areas: (1) Administration and Organization, and (2) Curriculum and Instruction. It can be concluded, therefore, that principals' administrative prerogatives in these areas have been bargained away.
3. If not included in the bargaining process, principals may feel a loss of decision-making power.
4. Since there was no statistically significant difference between bargaining and nonbargaining principals in regard to the selection, evaluation and development of personnel, it was concluded that principals appear to have more input into negotiations in this area.
5. Since collective bargaining accounts for only a small percentage of the variability in perceived power, it was concluded that factors other than collective bargaining influence principals' perceived power.
6. Age, highest degree earned, number of years of administrative service and type of school in which employed can be discounted as factors which explain principals' perceived power.
7. In the decision-making area of curriculum and instruction, female principals feel they have more power to make decisions than male principals; therefore, it was concluded that school systems use the expertise of female principals more than they use the expertise of male principals in this particular area.

These conclusions support the majority view of the authors of the descriptive literature who maintained that collective bargaining does constrain a principal in the exercise of administrative prerogatives. This constraint cannot, according to the results of this study, be classified as severe. The findings of the previous empirical studies were inconclusive; however, the conclusions of this study support the evidence that collective bargaining is associated with a decrease in the principal's decision-making power.

4. DISCUSSION

It seems clear that, based on the results of this study, there does appear to be a relationship that exists between collective bargaining and a perception of principals that their decision-making power has been decreased. It is interesting that with regard to the categories of administrative tasks analyzed by t-tests, bargaining principals felt more limited in their power to make decisions in two areas: (1) curriculum and instruction and (2) administration and organization. As indicated on the questionnaire by a number of respondents, many of the items in these categories reflected district-wide or state-wide issues. The category of responses involved with selection, evaluation, and development of personnel perhaps included more items that pertained directly to the principal's domain, the individual school.

It may be the case that principals have never had much input into district-wide issues; however, one interpretation of the data could be that principals tend not to be a part of the negotiating

process, thereby limiting their input into district-wide issues. If left out of the negotiating process, principals could experience feelings of ambiguity and reduced power. In other words, the negotiation process may tend to limit the upward flow of the principal's influence on the system as a whole.

The low R^2 values resulting from the stepwise regression can be explained by the fact that although collective bargaining appears to be significantly related to perception of power, there are other factors which account for the additional 97-98% (see Table 9, p. 66) of the variability in perceived power. Although it is impossible, based on this study, to make a definitive statement about other influences, some possible factors may include: variations in school board policies under which principals work, differing leadership styles of principals, and different management philosophies of school board members and central office personnel.

To summarize, the data suggest that collective bargaining does contribute to the principal's perception of his/her decision-making power. Although it cannot be stated that the impact is a major one, it is, nevertheless, a significant one. Clearly, among public school principals in Tennessee, collective bargaining is associated with a perception of restricted decision-making power.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings and conclusions of this study supported the following recommendations:

1. Efforts must be made by the central office personnel in Tennessee public school systems to encourage input from

principals into the negotiation process. In order to decrease the "man in the middle" concept, the principal can best provide input during the bargaining process on a consultatory basis rather than as a member of either negotiating team.

2. Regarding the role of the principal in the day-to-day operation of the school district, the consensus of the literature surveyed in this study was that the principal is and should be considered management. It is recommended, therefore, that efforts should be made on the part of local and state school personnel to view the principal as a part of management.
3. Effort should be made by superintendents of local school systems to remain current with regard to empirical research in the area of collective bargaining, particularly as it relates to the principal. Based on the results of these studies, superintendents should analyze and revise, if necessary, their administrative philosophies.
4. The Educational Professional Negotiations Act (EPNA) should be revised to include principals in management bargaining units.

6. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study has contributed to the body of collective bargaining knowledge regarding principals in the state of Tennessee. There remain, however, other questions which need to be addressed in order to

increase the base of knowledge in this area and gain further insights into the impact of collective bargaining on the public school principal.

Since principals may not be able to assess reliably a situation in which they play a major role, one suggestion for further research would be to survey the perceptions with regard to the power of the principal of other people involved in the collective bargaining process. These others may be teachers, parents, superintendents, board members and supervisors.

It would be interesting also to study different principals who work under the same contract yet differ significantly in one aspect such as the number of grievances brought against them or in the philosophy of management they espouse. Also, in regard to management philosophy, another suggestion for further study is to compare the philosophy of management of the superintendent, school board members and central office personnel with the principal's perception of power. In addition, research on the effect of principals of varying school board policies would be beneficial.

Finally, a narrower, longitudinal study of the principal's perception of his/her power would no doubt prove to be worthwhile. Such a project might take the form of a long-term investigation of one school system or of a small group of principals.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Addelston, Lorraine W. "The Principal's Stake in Professional Negotiation." NASSP Bulletin, 53(May, 1969), 181-190.

Anderson, Lester W. "The Management Team and Negotiations." NASSP Bulletin, 53(October, 1969), 106-115.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Report of the Association. Organizing Schools for Supervision/Instructional Improvement. Overview of the Study. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum and Development, 1980.

Barkelew, Ann H. "Communications During Negotiations, Strikes, Impasses and Mediation." NASSP Bulletin, 63(January, 1979), 51-53.

Becker, Gerald, and others. Issues and Problems in Elementary School Administration. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1970.

Bennion, John W. "The Teacher and the Principal in Curriculum and Development." Professional Negotiation and the Principalship. Edited by the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA., 1969.

Benson, Gregory, "The Principal and Contract Management. A Survey Report." Unpublished report, New York, 1979.

Berg, Paul. "The Impact of Collective Bargaining Upon the Principal." Administrator's Notebook, 21(1973), 1-4.

Bishop, Leslee J. Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction-Questions and Concerns. Washington, D.C. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967.

Blumberg, Arthur, Marilyn Brannigan and David Nason. "Administrator Power and Collective Bargaining in the Schools." Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, 10(1981), 327-335.

Butkiewiez, Chester. "Superintendents, Are You Ready?" NASSP Bulletin, 59(September, 1975), 29-33.

Caldwell, William E. and C. Jay Hertzog. "Perceived Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Principals as Related to the Collective Bargaining Process." Paper presented to the American Education Research Association, Los Angeles, California, April 13-17, 1981.

Caldwell, William E. and Walter L. Curfman. "The Relation Between Collective Bargaining Environments and Principal Selection and Organizational Behavior Perceptions." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979.

Castetter, William B. The Personnel Function in Educational Administration. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1981.

Cooper, Bruce S. "Collective Bargaining Comes to School Middle Management." Phi Delta Kappan, 58(October, 1976), 202-204.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship." Theory Into Practice, VII(April, 1968), 62-70.

Drake, Jackson M. and Brian P. Miller. "The Expanding Role of the Principal in the 1980s." NASSP Bulletin, 66(October, 1982), 18-25.

Epstein, Benjamin. The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations Between Teachers and School Boards. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965.

Estes, Nolan. "How Can We Make the Administrative Team Concept Come Alive?" Paper presented to the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, San Francisco, California, March, 1973.

Ford, Paul. "The Principal--Contract Administrator and Instructional Leader." NASSP Bulletin, 64(February, 1980), 37-43.

George, Thomas W. "The Principal and Collective Negotiation." The School Principal and the Law. Edited by Ralph D. Stern. USA: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1978.

Hauskin, C.A. "Estimating Sample Size." Journal of Research Services, 3(1963), 3-4.

Heddinger, Fred M. "Do Your School Principals Have Enough Decision Making Power? In Pennsylvania They Do." American School Board Journal, 165(February, 1978), 30-32.

Hersey, Paul and Ken Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Holly, William H., Boyd Scebra and William Rector. "Perceptions of the Role of the Principal in Professional Negotiations." Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, 5(1976), 361-369.

Houts, Paul L. "The Changing Role of the Elementary School Principal. Report of a Conference." National Elementary School Principal, 55(November-December, 1975), 62-73.

Hoyle, John R. "Teacher Versus Administrator: A Growing Crisis." Planning and Changing, 9(Winter, 1978), 203-209.

Hughes, Larry W. and Gerald C. Ubben. The Elementary Principal's Handbook. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Ingils, C.R. "Administrators and the Negotiated Contract." The Clearing House, 47(October, 1973), 67-70.

James, Larry and Ned B. Lovell. "A Systematic Labor-Relations Model: Returning the Principal to the Driver's Seat." NASSP Bulletin, 66(February, 1982), 73-78.

Karlitz, Howard. "Educational Administrators and Teacher Unions: An Alliance of Convenience." The Clearing House, 52(November, 1978), 125-128.

King, Richard A. "Litigation, Legislation and the Principal." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979.

Kline, Charles E. and William Thomas. "Middle Administrator/School Board Relationships in Collective Negotiations." Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, 3(Winter, 1974), 49-55.

Kehler, Lewis T., editor. Negotiations and the Manager in Public Education. A Sourcebook for School Business Officials, School Board Members and Other School Administrators. Park Ridge, Illinois: Association of School Business Officials of the U.S. and Canada, 1980.

Kraig, Glen M. "The Effects of Collective Bargaining on the Climate of Administration and Supervision." Unpublished position paper. Tennessee State University, 1981.

LeCoultre, Margie Humphrey. "Female and Male Teachers' Perceived Participation and Satisfaction in the Decision-Making Process Of Selected East Tennessee School Systems and the Potential for Collective Action." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1979.

Lieberman, Myron. "Lieberman: It's An Invitation to Trouble." American School Board Journal, 64(June, 1977), 25-26.

Lutz, Frank W. and William E. Caldwell. "Collective Bargaining and the Principal" in The Principal in Metropolitan Schools. Edited by Donald A. Erickson and Theordore L. Reller. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979.

McDonnel, Lorraine M. and Anthony H. Pascal, "A Reply to Myron Lieberman." Phi Delta Kappan, 6(December, 1979), 258-259.

McIntyre, Kenneth E. "What Kind of A Person (If Any) Is Needed?" in The Principalship in the 1970s. Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph No. 23. Edited by Kenneth E. McIntyre. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas Press, 1971.

Miskel, Cecil. "Teacher and Administrator Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiation Issues," Education and Urban Society. 6(May, 1974), 284-295.

Morphet, Edgar L., Roe L. Johns and Theodore Reller. Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Neill, John F. "The Principal's Role in Collective Bargaining." Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees' Association Congress on Education, Toronto, Ontario, June 17-21, 1978.

Newell, Clarence A. Human Behavior in Educational Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1978.

Nicholson, Everett W. and Phillip D. Simons. "School District Defenses Used in Grievance Arbitration." NASSP Bulletin, 62(December, 1978), 95-100.

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

Peach, Larry E. "Perceptions of Participation in Decision Making and Satisfaction With Decisions Made in the Knox School System." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1978.

Peach, Larry E. and Thomas L. Reddick. "A Study to Determine Principals' Level Of Participation in Decision Making and Satisfaction With Decisions Made Within Selected Policy Areas." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington, Kentucky, November 1981.

Pharis, William L. and Sally B. Zakariya. The Elementary School Principalship in 1978: A Research Study. Report of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Arlington, Virginia, 1979. Arlington, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1979.

Pisapia, John Ralph. "Professional Autonomy in Educational Institutions." Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, 4(1975), 241-251.

Pisapia, John Ralph and Jack D. Sells. "Administrator Protection in Negotiated Contracts." NASSP Bulletin, 62(November, 1978), 43-54.

Randles, Harry E. "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts." The National Elementary Principal, 55(November-December, 1975), 57-61.

Redfern, George B. "Managerial Communication: Three Keys to Effectiveness." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Las Vegas, Nevada, February 25-28, 1977.

Redfern, George B. "Negotiations Change Principal-Teacher Relationships." in Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Edited by Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Reed, Vincent E. "The Dos and Don'ts of Living With a Teacher's Contract." NASSP Bulletin, 61(May, 1977), 80-84.

Robinson, John W. The Principal as Decision-Maker: Can Anyone Agree. Report of the Oregon School Study Council, Eugene, Oregon, March, 1971.

Ross, James Ray. "Participation In and Satisfaction With Decisions and Their Relationship to Militant Employee Attitudes in School Districts in East Tennessee." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1981.

Rudman, Herbert C. "The Dirty Dozen, the Principal, and His Teachers." in Professional Negotiation and the Principalship. Edited by Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Salmon, Paul S. "The Administrative Team? Salmon: It's A Step Forward for Schools." American School Board Journal, 64(June, 1977), 24-26.

Schien, Virginia E. "Individual Power and Political Behaviors in Organizations: An Inadequately Explored Reality." Academy of Management Review, 11(January, 1977), 64-72.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starratt. Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1979.

Sparkes, Wendell J. "The Role of the Principal in Decision Making." Education Canada, 21(Winter, 1981), 34-39.

Staff, Jack Lee. "A Study of Opinions of Professional Personnel in Selected East Tennessee School Districts Regarding Professional Negotiations." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1979.

Stone, Ronald F. "The Principal As Chief Negotiator: Some Concerns for the Supervision of Teachers." Educational Leadership, 35(April, 1978), 577-579.

Stoner, James A. Management. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Sweeney, Jim. "Principals Can Provide Instructional Leadership--It Takes Commitment." Education, 103(Winter, 1982), 204-207.

Unks, Gerald. "The Principal of the Thing." High School Journal, 66(December-January, 1983), 61-65.

Williams, Richard C. "The Impact of Collective Bargaining on the Principal. What Do We Know?" Education and Urban Society, 11(February, 1979), 168-180.

Wilson, William Chandler. "Participation and Satisfaction of School Personnel in Decisions Made in Large, Medium and Small and in Negotiating and Non-negotiating School Districts in Eastern Tennessee." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, 1979.

Wood, Thomas C. "The Changing Role of the Teacher--How Does It Affect the Role of the Principal?" Professional Negotiation and the Principalship. Edited by the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

I.D. _____
(1 - 3)

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to gather information regarding your decision making power as a public school principal. Your name is not required.

(4) A. Age

1. __20 to 29
2. __30 to 39
3. __40 to 49
4. __50 to 59
5. __60+

(5) B. Sex

1. __Male
2. __Female

(6) C. Highest Degree Earned

1. __Bachelor's Degree
2. __Masters Degree
3. __Masters +45
4. __Specialist
5. __Doctorate
6. __Other, Specify

(7) D. Number of years of Administrative Experience

1. __0-3
2. __4-7
3. __8-11
4. __12-15
5. __16-19
6. __20+

(8) E. Presently Serving Which Type of School?

1. __Elementary
2. __Middle
3. __Junior High
4. __High School
5. __Other, Specify

(9) F. Bargaining Status of District in Which You Are Employed

1. __Collective Bargaining District
2. __Non-Collective Bargaining District

Using the following rating scale, please indicate your response to each of the following administrative tasks by circling the number which best expresses your situation. Treat the horizontal line as a continuum from the extreme at one end to the extreme at the other. If the task is not applicable in your situation, please write NA in the right margin.

practically no power concerning — 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 — almost complete power concerning

I. Selection, Evaluation and Development of Personnel

(10) 1. In selecting new teaching staff — 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(11) 2. In identifying the nature of the position to be filled — 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(12) 3. In identifying any specific qualifications for the position to be filled — 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(13) 4. In selecting staff members for assignments which award extra compensation — 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(14) 5. In deciding which tenured teachers, if any, should be terminated — 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(15) 6. In deciding which non-tenured teachers, if any, should be terminated — 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(16) 7. In selecting teachers for grade level or department chairman — 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(17)	8.	In selecting which staff members will be hired for summer school teaching	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(18)	9.	In selecting non-certificated staff members	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(19)	10.	In selecting staff members for extended contracts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(20)	11.	In selecting a rating instrument for evaluating teachers	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(21)	12.	In selecting or rejecting transfer candidates	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(22)	13.	In selecting in-service education programs	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(23)	14.	In determining the number of observation hours for the purpose of evaluation	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(24)	15.	In determining when the principal should visit the classroom for the purpose of evaluation	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(25)	16.	In effecting grade level transfers within the school	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(26)	17.	In determining which staff members should be laid-off, if necessary	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(27)	18.	In selecting recalled staff members	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(28) 19. In administering teacher reprimands 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(29) 20. In recruiting professional personnel 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

II. Administration and Organization

(30) 1. In determining the number of teachers on supervisory duty 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(31) 2. In scheduling teachers on supervisory duty 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(32) 3. In assigning teachers to cafeteria duty 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(33) 4. In determining regulations concerning faculty attendance at PTA/PTO meetings 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(34) 5. In determining teacher association use of school facilities 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(35) 6. In determining the arrival time of teachers 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(36) 7. In determining the departure time of teachers 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(37) 8. In determining teacher work hours in the particular building 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(38) 9. In determining leave procedures or regulations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(39) 10. In determining criteria by which students are assigned to classes, sections and teachers 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(40) 11. In managing faculty meetings 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(41) 12. In developing a set of recommendations for educational specifications for an addition or remodeling of a building 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(42) 13. In deciding when faculty meetings should be held 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(43) 14. In determining priorities for that part of the system's budget which affects the building 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(44) 15. In determining the appropriate utilization of facilities for instructional purposes 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(45) 16. In covering classes for absent teachers 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(46) 17. In enforcing student discipline rules and regulations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(47) 18. In determining which staff members may be released on professional leave to attend workshops 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(48) 19. In scheduling planning periods 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(49) 20. In determining the length of planning periods 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(50) 21. In determining the utilization of planning periods 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

III. Curriculum and Instruction

(51) 1. In selecting instructional topics for children 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(52) 2. In determining whether lay citizens should participate on curriculum committees 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(53)	3.	In selecting supplementary teaching materials for classroom use	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(54)	4.	In selecting from state adopted textbooks	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(55)	5.	In selecting equipment for classroom use	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(56)	6.	In determining which teachers should serve on system-wide curriculum committees	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(57)	7.	In determining procedures for evaluating newly instituted educational programs within the school	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(58)	8.	In determining class size	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(59)	9.	In determining whether proposed resource units should be implemented	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(60)	10.	In determining whether proposed curriculum guides should be utilized	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(61)	11.	In determining whether recommendations of a system-wide curriculum committee should be implemented	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(62)	12.	In deciding whether a pilot project pertaining to an instructional program should be accepted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(63)	13.	In deciding which community drives or contests merit school participation	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(64)	14.	In determining the grade level of school programs	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Comments:

APPENDIX B

LIST OF AND COVER LETTER TO THE JURY OF EXPERTS

JURY OF EXPERTS

1. Dr. Dan Baker, Professor
   Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
   University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
2. Mr. Thomas Cross, Principal
   Dyersburg High School
   Dyersburg, Tennessee
3. Dr. John Lovell, Professor
   Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
   University of Tennessee, Knoxville
4. Mr. Tom McCullough, Principal
   Hixson High School
   Hixson, Tennessee
5. Mr. Ashley Smith, Principal
   Blyth Avenue School
   Cleveland, Tennessee
6. Dr. Robert A. Smith
   Assistant Superintendent for Finance
   Hamilton County Department of Education
   Chattanooga, Tennessee
7. Dr. Dewey Stollar, Chairman
   Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
   University of Tennessee, Knoxville

8. Mr. James Towater, Principal

   Union City High School

   Union City, Tennessee

May 25, 1983

Dr. Dan Baker
Educational Administration and Supervision
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee
37402

Dear Dr. Baker,

For my doctoral research project in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I am studying the impact of collective bargaining on the decision-making power of the principal in the state of Tennessee. In this regard, I am designing a questionnaire to determine the principal's perception of his/her decision-making power in the exercise of administrative prerogatives. As a result of your expertise and experience in this area, you are invited to serve as one of a panel of seven experts to review this instrument and insure its validity.

Please examine the enclosed questionnaire to determine how well it represents the intended content area. On the questionnaire or a separate sheet indicate any administrative prerogatives which have been omitted, any areas which should be deleted or areas which are not clear. Comments on the construction of the instrument would be helpful.

Thank you for your participation in this study. Your cooperation, time and assistance in this endeavor is greatly appreciated. I would appreciate your response within the next five days. Enclosed for your convenience is a stamped, return addressed envelope.

Sincerely,

Barbara Fulmer

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP TO RESPONDENTS

September 13, 1983

Dear Colleague,

As a part of my doctoral research at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I am conducting a state-wide survey of the decision-making power of the public school principal. I would appreciate your time in completing the enclosed survey and returning it in the attached self-addressed envelope within five days, if possible. The survey will take approximately ten minutes to complete.

The questionnaire has been coded for computer implementation and for the identification of non-respondents for follow-up contact. You can be assured that confidentiality will be maintained as the data will be aggregated so that the identification of any individual respondent will be impossible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Barbara G. Fulmer

September 30, 1983

Dear Colleague,

HELP! You received a questionnaire on the decision-making power of the public school principal several weeks ago (9-13-83). My records indicate you have not yet responded.

I really need your opinion to make the study truly reflective of Tennessee educators. Please take a few minutes of your time to respond and return the questionnaire.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

Barbara G. Fulmer
UTK Graduate Center
University of Tennessee
at Chattanooga

October 14, 1983

Dear Colleague,

I am again asking for your help! A questionnaire on the decision-making power of the public school principal was mailed to you approximately one month ago (9-13-83) and a postcard followed several weeks later (9-30-83). My records indicate that you have not responded.

In the event that the first questionnaire failed to reach you or was misplaced, won't you please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope. Your opinions are truly needed in making this study reflective of Tennessee educators.

Once again, I thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Barbara G. Fulmer

VITA

Barbara Godley Fulmer was born May 1, 1945 in Augusta, Georgia. She received her public school training in Clemson, South Carolina and her undergraduate training at Furman University in Greenville, South Carolina where, in 1967, she received a Bachelor of Science degree with a major in Biology. In 1968, she received a Masters of Arts degree from the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa.

After several years of teaching chemistry and science in junior and senior high schools in Alabama and South Carolina, she was employed by Wofford College in Spartanburg, South Carolina as a Lecturer in Education and Director of the Education Curriculum Laboratory. Upon moving to Chattanooga, Tennessee, she began work toward the Doctor of Education degree at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville while serving as a student teacher supervisor at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga.

She is married to John G. Fulmer, a professor of finance at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga. They have three children, Russell, Shannon, and Zack.