



1968

Implications of Collective Bargaining Procedures on the Dimensional Aspects of the Principalship in Two Illinois Cities

Olga Kaszubowski
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kaszubowski, Olga, "Implications of Collective Bargaining Procedures on the Dimensional Aspects of the Principalship in Two Illinois Cities" (1968). *Dissertations*. 943.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/943

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1968 Olga Kaszubowski

IMPLICATIONS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCEDURES
ON THE DIMENSIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP
IN TWO ILLINOIS CITIES

by

Olga Kaszubowski

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

June

1968

LIFE

Olga S. Kaszubowski was born in Chicago, Illinois, May 9, 1932.

She was graduated from Tuley High School, Chicago, Illinois on January, 1950. She received the degree of Bachelor of Education from Chicago Teachers College South in August, 1953 and the degree of Master of Education in the Teaching of Science from Chicago Teachers College South in January, 1960.

From 1960 to 1966 she taught departmental science at the William Penn Nixon Public Elementary School in Chicago.

Since September, 1966 she has held the administrative position of principal at both the Joel Tyler Headley and the George Thomas Public Elementary Schools in Chicago.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express her gratitude to Dr. Melvin Heller, Dr. James Smith, and Mr. Douglas Van Bramer for their suggestions and encouragement in the preparation of this study.

She would also like to express her indebtedness to Dr. John T. Gunning, Superintendent of Schools, East Saint Louis, Illinois and Dr. Donald V. Strong, Superintendent of Elementary Schools, Joliet, Illinois, for their assistance in the improvement of the questionnaire used in this study and for their permission to administer it to the principals under their supervision.

Additional thanks are extended to the following principals in Chicago, Illinois: Mrs. Aileen C. Norton, Principal of the Isaac Arnold Upper Grade Center; Mr. Raymond B. Grashoff, Principal of the William Penn Nixon Elementary School; Mr. Donald Waters, Principal of the George Schneider Elementary School; and Mr. Eugene V. Beck, Principal of the Rene LaSalle Elementary School. They graciously gave of their time to weight the answers in the questionnaire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. | iii |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY | 1 |
| II. EVOLUTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN EDUCATION | 11 |
| Historical Aspects | |
| The Sherman Antitrust Act, 1890 | |
| The Railroad Labor Act, 1926 | |
| The Norris-LaGuardia Act, 1932 | |
| The National Labor Relations Act, 1935 | |
| Other Significant Acts | |
| Current Status of Collective Bargaining | |
| Legal Aspects of Collective Bargaining Today | |
| Collective Bargaining Acts Related to Teachers | |
| Collective Bargaining Generalizations | |
| Union Gains | |
| The Dilemma of Unions | |
| A Major Union Gain | |
| The Strike Issue | |
| III. THE CHANGING ROLES IN EDUCATION | 35 |
| The Board of Education | |
| Board Representation | |
| Grievance Procedures | |
| Use of Non-Salary Items in Negotiations | |
| The General Superintendent | |
| The Changing Role of Teachers | |
| Factors Contributing to Teacher Militancy | |
| Strike Tactics | |
| Sanctions | |
| Strikes | |
| The Role of the Principal | |
| Interests of the Principal | |
| Problems Arising from Negotiations | |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA | 79 |
| V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 119 |
| APPENDICES | 139 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 149 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The field of education is in a state of constant flux being influenced by world events, technological as well as scientific progress, community pressures, and the continuous re-evaluation by professional educators in the light of research and experience. Nowhere is this change more evident than in the altered role of teachers. Through their efforts a bold new concept is now emerging in the educational field and this concept is the object of mixed reactions. Many names have been attached to it, but one of the most popular is "Teacher Militancy." This movement is led by the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association.

Although teachers in the United States have joined union groups since 1916, it was not until 1961 that unionism began to exert a powerful force in the field of education. Until that time, the National Education Association and its affiliates were the dominant power. As this theme is developed in later chapters, it will become evident that the National Education Association affiliates have now adopted strong stands on many issues ranging from salary adjustments to formulating curricula. It appears that these strong stands are being taken by the

National Education Association as a result of member loss to the National Federation of Teachers and as a means of facilitating recruitment of new members. The professional literature cited in this research states this unanimously.

In the spring of 1966, seven school districts in Michigan were struck by over 2,500 teachers. These strikes were supported by both the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association. One of the problems involved in dealing with these strikes was the "intense open rivalry between the two organizations and the extremely high and, in some cases, unrealistic teacher expectations it engendered."¹

It is also stated by the authors of these articles that the goals of the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association are essentially the same. They both want exclusive representation rights, a collective bargaining contract, and more material benefits for the teachers. As these objectives are reached, both organizations strive for greater influence in areas that are historically the prerogatives of the administrator. This influence is desired in problems of class size, subject assignments, handling of disciplinary situations, and textbook selection.

¹Wesley A. Wildman, "What Prompts Greater Teacher Militancy?" American School Board Journal, CLIV (March, 1967), 31.

All evidence points toward an intensification of efforts by both of the teachers' organizations, and there is no doubt that a re-alignment in the power spectrum must occur among the board of education, the administrative staff, and the teachers. The object of this research is to determine the effect of the existing power struggle upon the role of the school building administrator.

The only research pertinent to this study was conducted by Luvern Cunningham and reported in a Seminar on Professional Negotiation in Public Education at the University of Chicago on August 3, 1966. The present research differs from it in that an in-depth study of the principals of two cities was made instead of a utilization of scattered responses from a three state area. The plan used in this instance should facilitate the drawing of conclusions and point out any differences due to special local conditions.

Two approaches are utilized in this study. The first is the search through current professional literature for the opinions and experiences of men who have been exposed to the process of collective bargaining. The second is the direct interrogation, through the use of a questionnaire, of principals in two cities who have known the effects of collective bargaining.

A series of questions was formulated based upon conclusions derived from a study of current literature. These questions

were submitted first to the superintendents of both cities for revisions and then to four principals in Chicago for weighting. Each principal was asked to give a credit of four to answers which would most likely be chosen by insecure, hard-pressed administrators. A weight of one was given to answers which would most likely be chosen by administrators who feel secure and unthreatened. Values of two and three would be accorded to intermediate answers. The questions pertaining to the six hypotheses were scattered throughout the questionnaire to minimize the possibility of influencing the responses and the choices for each of the questions were mixed for the same reason.

The city of East Saint Louis was one of the cities chosen for this study. It is located in the southwestern portion of the state of Illinois near the Mississippi River. It has a population of approximately 81,712 people (1960 census). It has two senior high schools, four junior high schools, and thirty-four elementary schools (1967 figures). The teachers of this city had granted exclusive bargaining rights to the East Saint Louis Teachers' Local 1220 in May, 1957. There were strikes in May, 1964, and August, 1967. A strike was averted in September, 1966, by the granting of large wage demands. More complete information about these strikes will be found in the appendix.

The city of Joliet is the second city chosen for this study. It is located in the northeastern portion of Illinois near the city of Chicago. It has a population of 66,780 people (1960 census). It has three senior high schools, one junior college, three junior high schools, and twenty-three elementary schools (1967 figures). There is no exclusive bargaining agent for the teachers in Joliet. There is instead, a Teachers Coordinating Committee of the Joliet Education Association and the Joliet Federation of Teachers, Local 604. There is no contract and no negotiations as such. There are instead annual negotiations relative to all matters pertaining to the professional staff and these decisions are incorporated in the rules, regulations, and policies of the District. The wording of this arrangement is found in the appendix. The Elementary School District 86 of Joliet has not experienced any strikes. Its neighbor institution, the Joliet Township High Schools and Junior College District 204 had a strike in 1966 but this district was not incorporated into this study.

In order to investigate the attitudes of the principals in these cities toward collective bargaining and their changing roles, the following hypotheses are formulated for investigation in this study:

1. The role of the principalship is now being diminished because this middle level of administration is not represented at the bargaining table when agreements are reached between the teacher groups and the board of education.

2. The principals feel that their administrative prerogatives are being divested from them and this situation is leading to a deterioration in rapport between them and their teachers.
3. The principals are abandoning their traditional role of alignment with the superintendent for an independent course of action.
4. The principals are employing bargaining techniques in dealing with their teachers and the teachers' demands.
5. The principals will indicate a need for specialized training in bargaining techniques as a background for themselves and for future administrators.
6. Principals feel that their role is most likely to diminish greatly in the future due to collective bargaining and the increased militancy of their teachers.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis deals with the degree to which principals feel secure in their role as building administrators. Do the superintendent and the board of education appreciate the value of the principals to the school system and are they aware of the problems inherent in the position of a school building administrator? Do the higher administrative personnel feel that principals can solve these problems efficiently if the latter are not represented at the bargaining table when agreements are reached between teacher groups and the board of education, agreements which may negate or change the scope of school administration? It is assumed that the principals feel frustrated in this situation and that they strongly resent being put into the same position as that of middle management in

industry. In this position the building administrators have no voice in decisions which directly affect them.

Only one article was found in which principals were mentioned as having a role to play in collective bargaining negotiations. In the article Calvin Grieder says:

...the superintendent should not be allowed to stand alone as the representative of management, and I mean literally alone. Rather he should be the head man of the administrative corps of the school system. This management team includes associate and assistant superintendents, directors of divisions and bureaus, and principals--in short, all who have administrative responsibility,² as distinguished from staff responsibility.

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis deals with the degeneration of rapport between the principals and their teachers. The contention is that the needs and the interests of the principals are not being considered and when expedient to do so, are traded by the superintendent and/or the board of education to please the teachers. As a result, principals are experiencing a sense of alienation and rejection from their teachers. The teachers have become more insistent upon their real or presumed rights under the negotiated contracts and because of this, they are making the administration of the schools more difficult for the principals than is necessary.

²Calvin Grieder, "Superintendents Can't Face Union Bargaining Teams Alone," Nation's Schools, LXXVIII (July, 1966), p. 6.

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis deals with critical issues such as the orientation of the principal in conflicts. Should he uphold the superintendent's position as tradition has dictated, or should he be completely nonaligned? What ends are most important to his teachers and how is the principalship affected by these ends? It appears that principals are abandoning their traditional alignment with the superintendent in favor of an independent course of action on their own behalf. They appear to want an independent bargaining group of their own and that group will then expect to have a representative present during collective bargaining sessions between the board of education and the teachers.

Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis is that of approach in working with the teachers. How can the principal further the educational program in his school when he meets with groups of his teachers to resolve their problems? It is expected that the accumulated data will indicate that teachers must be dealt with firmly and with as few commitments as possible, as is suggested in labor-management courses. The data will also be expected to reveal that the militant teachers with whom the principals must deal with are young, aggressive people who are furthering their own futures and with whom care must be exercised to prevent major incidents from occurring.

Hypothesis Five

The fifth hypothesis is that of competencies. It states that principals lack the necessary qualifications to be effective in a collective bargaining situation. This would bar school administrators from participating actively in collective bargaining sessions when issues are being discussed between the board of education and the teachers' group. The questions should indicate, however, a strong desire for some representation by the principals when such talks are being held so that, although actively not participating, such representation would be the channel through which communication would be maintained from the principals to the prime negotiators. The lack of formal education courses in bargaining techniques is expected to be indicated to be a disadvantage not only because it prevents full participation in collective negotiations on the highest levels but also because the lack puts principals at a disadvantage in working with their more militant staffs. It is therefore expected that principals will recommend the need for labor-management courses as part of the academic backgrounds of future principals, in addition to the training being given currently.

Hypothesis Six

The sixth hypothesis deals with ultimate results. From the principals' point of view, who in the school system is most likely to have a diminished role in the future of education?

Do principals feel that they will gradually be divested of their authority? If they feel that their role is changing, what is the best way to maintain their status in the school system? The assumption is that principals will indicate that it is their role which is diminishing in importance and that the best course of action is to attempt to keep the teachers' demands from becoming excessive.

CHAPTER II

EVOLUTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN EDUCATION

Historical Aspects

Until late in the nineteenth century, organization of workers was considered to be against the best interests of the country. This attitude dated back to the Middle Ages, when men were forbidden to organize and press for their rights with employers due to the decimation of the labor force by the great plagues which swept England and the continent. Workers were scarce and every one of them was needed to alleviate the shortage. Because work would stop entirely without workers, vagrancy and anti-loitering statutes were strictly enforced. Workers were legally forbidden to band together for the purpose of seeking improvements in working conditions and increased economic rewards. Violations of the anti-collective action laws were held to be criminal conspiracies and harsh penalties were meted out to violators.

Later, in America, the crime of conspiracy was eventually reduced to the lesser tortious act amenable to injunctive relief. The courts then considered collective action on the part of the workers a tort against the employer who might

successfully petition the court for an injunction against such positive action as work stoppage, picketing, the strike, and similar labor activities.

The Sherman Antitrust Act, 1890

In 1890 the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed by Congress. It was designed to break up combinations of capital and to eliminate monopoly control of the national economy in order to ensure free competition. Although not intended primarily to restrict union activities, it had that effect for some time. Nothing in the Act specifically excluded labor unions from legal jurisdiction and this omission enabled the courts, including the United States Supreme Court, to apply the Sherman Antitrust Act to businesses and to labor unions. The act thus prevented the unions from picketing and instituting boycotts which affected interstate commerce.

The Railroad Labor Act, 1926

In 1926 Congress passed the Railroad Labor Act which was favorable to organized labor. Although it applied to only one industry, the railroads, it was a major development and the inception of more favorable union policies. The Railroad Labor Act guaranteed the right of railroad workers to join unions of their choice and forbade the so-called "yellow dog" contract requiring new employees to promise not to join a union or to participate in a strike during their employment with the company.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, 1932

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, passed in 1932, provided another encouragement to labor unions. In the policy statement of the Act, Congress declared that the bargaining power of the employees must be equalized with that of management through the right of the workers to organize. Besides granting the worker the right to join a union, the Norris-LaGuardia Act stated that no agreement depriving him of that privilege could be enforced in federal courts. This act did not prohibit injunctions against unions in labor disputes, but it did render them more difficult to obtain.

The National Labor Relations Act, 1935

The National Labor Relations Act, or the Wagner Act, passed in 1935, was favorable to organized labor. A unique feature of the Wagner Act, not found in any previous legislation, was a statement and definition of unfair labor practices forbidden to employers. Another significant section specifically provided that representatives, chosen by the majority of the employees for the purpose of collective bargaining, should exclusively represent the workers in the unit. The National Labor Relations Act also declared that closed shop contracts with employers were legal provided they were entered into with a labor organization representing the majority of the employees in a unit.

The National Labor Relations Act provided for an enforcing agency, the National Labor Relations Board. The Board was composed of three presidential appointees and later it was expanded to five by the Taft-Hartley Act. The Board was empowered, (1) to determine the proper collective bargaining representative in an employee unit, (2) to investigate, conduct hearings, and decide charges of unfair labor practices, and (3) to order employers to cease any labor practice it found to be unfair.³

The National Labor Relations Act specifically excluded public employees from its provisions, thus denying to them the benefits of this process of settling problems of wages, hours, and conditions of work enjoyed by workers in the private sector.⁴

Other Significant Acts

In 1961 the legislature of the state of Wisconsin passed a law which recognized and guaranteed the right of public employees to organize and bargain collectively with their employers. The act is specifically applicable to school districts.

³"Labor-Management Relations," The Thirty-Ninth Discussion and Debate Manual, The Forensic Quarterly, XXXIX (April, 1965), p. 24.

⁴M. Chester Nolte, "Teachers Face Boards of Education Across the Bargaining Table Legally," American School Board Journal, CL (June, 1965), 10.

Another significant development was the January, 1962, executive order by President Kennedy providing for recognition of collective bargaining by organizations of federal employees. The right to strike and the union shop were forbidden.⁵

Current Status of Collective Bargaining

Legal Aspects of Collective Bargaining Today

Court decisions and executive orders indicate that in the majority of the states public employees have the right to join organizations of their own choosing. In some states, school boards are forbidden by statute or court or attorney generals' opinions to enter into collective bargaining arrangements with their employees. Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Texas, and West Virginia are examples of such states. In North Carolina, public employees are prevented by law from joining labor organizations.

In South Carolina municipalities have been empowered to enact ordinances prohibiting union membership. Indiana does not forbid organization but collective agreements negotiated by public employers and employees in that state do not, according to an attorney general's ruling, enjoy legal status. Similarly, in New Mexico, public organizations are authorized to negotiate and consult with their employers but the employer has no authority to enter into a collective bargaining

⁵Ibid., p. 11.

agreement with them.⁶

In June of 1962, the custodial staff sued the Board of Education of Wichita, Kansas, for an election which would determine whether their union, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, could bargain for them. The board refused, saying that it was not an "employer" under the labor relations law of that state. The board was upheld by the Supreme Court of Kansas.⁷

In 1963, the Rhode Island Supreme Court recognized the right of teachers to make collective demands and, contrary to the common law, recognized the right of employees to engage in concerted activity for the purpose of presenting their demands more effectively. Although such rights of organizations were not directly provided by common law, the Supreme Court of Rhode Island began to recognize advances in public policy with regard to the intrinsic aspects of common law. Within the common law context, it became evident that such organizational rights existed inherently.

Collective Bargaining Related to Teachers

Fundamentally, there appear to be two general categories of legislative acts. One category is illustrated by the

⁶Robert E. Doherty, "The Law and Collective Bargaining for Teachers," The Teachers College Record, LXVIII (October, 1966), 1.

⁷M. Chester Nolte, "Is the Board an Employer Under a State's Labor Relations Law?," American School Board Journal, CLI (September, 1965), 10.

statutes in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Michigan which include teachers along with other groups of public employees. These acts utilize state labor boards to determine bargaining units, establish election procedures, and initiate methods of resolving negotiating impasses. They tend to exclude administrative personnel from bargaining units (as stated in hypothesis six on page six of this work) and they list as bargainable issues only wages, hours, and other conditions of employment. These statutes are patterned after the industrial example, wherein the majority of the employees are blue-collar workers, and not professionally trained personnel. Furthermore, these acts basically establish the principle of collective bargaining and then create the mechanisms whereby the principle can be implemented. Since the labor boards have broad experience in coping with problems emerging from employment relationships in private industry, the legislators consider them to be the logical choice for administering the law as it applies to public employees.

The other category of legislation includes statutes such as those in Connecticut, Oregon, Washington, and California, which limit coverage to certificated school employees. They utilize education or ad hoc agencies for unit determination, election procedure and impasse breaking.

They stipulate that the subject matter of bargaining shall encompass such non-work items as curriculum, textbook

selection, in-service training, and student teaching. The legislatures in these states thought it best to separate teachers from other groups of public employees, evidently believing that the employment relationship in public education is so significantly different from that of other types of public employment as to warrant separate treatment.

California has an entirely different approach to the situation, one which is being watched with interest by states contemplating legislation in the area of collective bargaining by teachers. California is the only state which provides for "proportional" representation. Certificated school employees are represented on five-to-nine-man negotiating councils in proportion to the membership strength of the employees' organizations. This means that, in a school system with nine hundred "organized" employees, a negotiating council might consist of one member from the Administrators' Association and four members each from the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. This concept bears out hypothesis three (on page six of this work) which indicates an independent course of action for administrators.

The union is now boycotting the negotiating councils, and the National Education Association affiliate shares doubts about the implementation of this statute. The two groups, union and association, would have overlapping jurisdictions or classifications of employees trying to negotiate an agreement. Then, if

agreements could be reached, the problems of administering them jointly would be burdensome and inefficient. The consensus of opinion expressed by the authors investigated indicates that, in their estimation, having a sole bargaining agent with whom to deal is preferable.

There could be the additional problem of teachers seeking the organization that is willing to make the strongest anti-administration posture. The handling of grievances might then become seriously hampered.

As can be determined, the prime advantage of California's system is that it provides for representation of the minority organization. As has been demonstrated in New Rochelle, New York, the majority organization does not always enjoy the privilege of being in the majority. Moreover, the minority group, (1) could have the privilege of requesting elections from time to time, (2) could have the right to submit proposals to the board, and (3) could be heard. The minority group would always have the recourse to publicity when objections arose as to the actions of the majority organization.

Collective Bargaining Generalizations

Although there will be exceptions, some generalizations can be drawn which will cover the subject of collective bargaining from the legal aspect. They will be explained briefly.

1. Teachers and other school district employees are free to join professional associations, labor unions, or other

organizations even though no statute specifically gives them the right to do so. Any statute to the contrary would probably be unconstitutional because it would violate the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which permits the right to assemble.

Although a state may limit or circumscribe the right of organization for certain purposes, it is widely assured that blanket prohibition against public employee organizations would create grave constitutional difficulties. The trend is in the opposite direction.

2. In its relations with its employees, a school board cannot enter into an agreement that has the effect of contradicting a statute or constitutional provision. Laws that establish tenure or fix pension rights control cannot be superseded by negotiating agreements that conflict, nor can civil service laws be altered by collective bargaining.

3. Where laws provide for exclusive bargaining rights by an organization, a school board cannot enter into a union security agreement. The union cannot negotiate for non-members because this action would thereby deprive the independents of their constitutional right to petition the government.

A "union shop" or "union-security" provision in a collective bargaining agreement between the union and the employer states that all employees must join the union within thirty days after being hired or lose their positions. Federal laws permit

such a requirement although the states have the option to adopt "right-to-work" laws which forbid such an agreement between an employer and a union. At present, nineteen states have "right-to-work" laws which make most "union-security" provisions illegal.

Where the union shop is not sanctioned, it is reasoned that requiring union membership as a condition of public employment is irrelevant or inconsistent with the concept of merit. Court cases in several states indicate that it is illegal for a board of education in those jurisdictions to sign a rigorous union security agreement. A number of states that recognize the right of public employees to join labor organizations also provide for the right not to join in the same law. In at least ten states, the use of union-shop provisions in public employment agreements has been declared illegal by law, court decisions, or attorney generals' opinions.⁸

4. Dues deductions from union members' checks is a fairly common practice, and numerous state and local governments have legally authorized payroll deductions for public employees.

5. There is a trend toward the relaxation of the concept that boards of education cannot enter into collective bargaining agreements or submit disputes to binding arbitration because of

⁸ Lee O. Garber, "These Ten Principles Control Collective Bargaining," Nation's Schools, LXXVI (September, 1965), 67.

the traditional feeling that this is tantamount to relinquishing their authority to others.⁹

Doherty¹⁰ suggests a model statute which, in his opinion, would be equitable not only to the bargaining agents, but also to the general public. He believes that the following could be incorporated into a legislative act:

1. Empower the school board to enter into collective bargaining contracts.
2. Permit exclusive representation with the representative to be determined by a secret ballot election.
3. Authorize the state labor relations board to conduct the election.
4. Separate public school teachers from other public service personnel in the statute because of their unique advanced training and because of the nature of the problems with which they must deal.
5. Indicate that the scope of the bargaining should include working conditions and professional matters.
6. Provide some sort of an alternative to a strike so that teachers will not be forced into a law-breaking, last resort when an impasse is reached.

⁹Wesley A. Wildman, "Legal Aspects of Teacher Collective Action," Theory Into Practice, IV (April, 1965), 55-59.

¹⁰Doherty, loc. cit., pp. 6-10.

Membership in teacher organizations does not include the right to strike as a method for carrying out the demands of such groups, although strikes have been occurring in greater numbers in spite of the restrictions against them.

The preceding pages have dealt with the general organizing rights of teachers but basically they also apply to principals. There are organizations in every large city to which principals belong. Efforts are now being made by these large city groups to affiliate into a nationwide organization of principals striving toward common goals. Initial meetings are being held in Chicago during the summer of 1967 to lay a foundation for such an organization.

Union Gains

The Dilemma of Unions

The right of teachers to organize is still not universally accepted, but the trend is obviously in that direction. Since this is the case, the American Federation of Teachers has become strongly competitive with the National Education Association.

Public school teachers, besides being public employees and thus subject to legislative and other trends affecting this significantly large work force also occupy a strategic position in the labor force in that they are white-collar and professional employees. The unions need them.

In 1967 there were far more people to be unionized but year after year a smaller percentage of them is to be found in unions. Since 1945 the unorganized work force has increased three and a half times as fast as union membership.

The long-standing goal of the American labor movement has been to achieve more density of trade-union organization, similar to that of the one of two eligibles belonging to British unions and the three out of four unionized in Sweden.

At present, however, there is less density of organization, rather than more. Responsibility for this condition has been placed upon union leadership which is being characterized as "too much concerned with the old days and too busy trying to fit new situations to old formulas, with little success."¹¹ In spite of the unions' poor public image, its disunity, and current legislation which makes organizing more difficult the state of crisis is most primarily a result of economic conditions. About 85% of the union membership has always been highly concentrated in blue-collar or production-worker fields. Since there has been a steady decline of employment in the blue-collar occupations due to automation, a corresponding decline is reflected noticeably in union membership.

Even with the improvement of our national economy blue-collar union membership is not expected to make marked gains.

¹¹ Joseph A. Beirne-President of the Communications Workers of America, Collective Bargaining and Public Employees, AFT.

More plants are shifting into small communities and areas where opposition to unionism has been strongest. Besides, employment is rising in the professional, technical, and clerical groups and in the service trades. Because of these factors and because of their traditional reputation, that of being organizations for blue-collar workers, the unions have had difficulty in increasing their memberships among the white-collar workers and yet they must do so if they are to continue to gain strength.¹²

Because of the increasing numbers of teachers and because of the prestige that may be attained through recruiting them successfully, organizing teachers clearly becomes a major goal in union activity. Trade unionists hope that, if a relatively high-status, professional, white-collar group, such as teachers can be organized and can achieve bargaining gains, then the reluctance of other white-collar workers to identify and associate with the predominantly blue-collar image of organized labor may be significantly diminished.¹³

The extensive efforts of the American Federation of Teachers to organize teachers are being met by the National Education Association and the ensuing consequence is that the

¹²Edward T. Townsend, "Is There a Crisis in the American Trade Union Movement?," The Annals, CCCL (November, 1963), 7.

¹³Wesley A. Wildman, "Collective Action by Public School Teachers," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, XVIII (October, 1964), 8.

two groups are becoming increasingly more synonymous, with few differences other than the choice of vocabulary.¹⁴

William G. Carr, in his article for the National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin states that, for many reasons, professional educators should resist the organizing movement of unions. He contends that the best interests of the educational staff conflict with the primary motives of unions. He says:

In August, 1965, at its convention, the American Federation of Teachers directed its affiliates to protest to school boards purchasing school textbooks published by the Kingsport Press in Kingsport, Tennessee. An unresolved labor dispute of many years' standing continues in that plant although the National Labor Relations Board has not supported the union position. The American Federation of Teachers distributed a blacklist of one hundred seventy education textbooks to delegates. In Cleveland these books were not ordered although no principals or teachers were consulted about the value of the books, the accuracy and scholarship of their contents, or their relevance to the instructional program. A decision concerning textbooks for the schools of Cleveland, Ohio was determined by the failure of a typographical union in Kingsport, Tennessee to gain its objectives.¹⁵

Criticism notwithstanding, teachers are joining unions.

In the early part of the twentieth century, the teacher who

¹⁴Leslie Hughes Browder, Jr., "Teacher Unionism in America: A Descriptive Analysis of the Structure, Force, and Membership of the American Federation of Teachers," (Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Dept. of Education, Cornell University, 1965), 80.

¹⁵William G. Carr, "The Principal's Role in Professional Negotiations," NASSP Bulletin, C (April, 1966), 50.

joined the union was dismissed as an agitator, while the courts upheld the boards of education in their action. A relatively long period of time elapsed (from 1916 to 1960) before the American Federation of Teachers managed to raise its membership to sixty thousand. Yet, this figure represents only about four per cent of the nation's total instructional staff. Within the same period, the National Education Association had forty-nine per cent of the total number on its membership list.

A Major Union Gain

In 1961, developments reached a turning point. During an organizational election in New York City, the union defeated the National Education Association affiliate and became the sole bargaining agent for the teachers. Since that time, the National Education Association has been struggling to regain former members and to attract new ones. The rigorous rivalry between the two groups has paradoxically resulted in producing two almost identical organizations, stridently proclaiming their wares before the teachers of America.¹⁶

In 1965 when the teachers of Rochester, New York, pressed the board of education to hold an election to determine the exclusive representative of all the teachers, the following statement reveals the reaction they received from the state association with which they were affiliated.

¹⁶Townsend, loc. cit., p. 10.

Up to this point, we had acted without prior notification to or consultation with our state association or the National Education Association. Once the news was out, however, the reaction from the National Organization was enthusiastic. Almost immediately they supplied us with topnotch legal and professional organizational assistance. The New York State Teachers Association also expressed a willingness to help.¹⁷

In the election the board made the stipulation that no person who evaluated the teachers would be eligible to take part in the election. This restriction was the board's contribution toward the cleavage of principals from their teachers, firmly setting principals in the ranks of administrators.

Although the group was opposed to dividing the profession between administrators and teachers, it had no choice but to accept the decision as a temporary measure. In this instance, the demarcation between teachers and principals was enunciated by the board of education rather than by the teachers' organization.

During the campaign we received tremendous support from the New York State Teachers Association and the National Education Association. Both supplied trained personnel to help us with the huge organizational job which needed to be done. The campaign was a fine example of team work at all levels of the professional association and the final vote was almost two to one in our favor.¹⁸ --Arnold Cantor.

¹⁷Arnold Cantor, "Election and Negotiations in Rochester," NEA Journal, LIV (September, 1965), 22.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 23.

It should also be noted that the same resources are available to an organization member when disputes arise with principals. Thus, it is essential for a principal to verify his facts when he makes decisions which might later be subject to misinterpretation and appeal.

Again in 1965, the concept of teachers and administrators separated in different organizations was promulgated. An article by Arthur H. Rice¹⁹ reaffirmed that, although the role of the superintendent is not clearly defined because the situation in collective bargaining is in a state of flux, one thing is certain. The teachers do not consider the superintendent to be a champion of their rights in negotiations. As it is pointed out firmly in this article, the American Federation of Teachers insists that only classroom teachers, counselors, and department heads should vote for a teachers' representative and it demands that principals, assistant principals, directors, and other persons having similar administrative responsibilities be denied the right to vote on this issue. Clearly, this position is an acceptance of the labor union principle that classroom teachers are a vested group whose concerns might vary in many ways from other members of the teaching profession. The article also supports the conclusion that principals are considered to have interests in opposition to those of teachers

¹⁹Arthur H. Rice, "Why Teachers Do Not Accept the Superintendent as Spokesman," Nation's Schools, LXXV (April, 1965), 39.

and, therefore, should not be included in a teachers' bargaining group.

The change in the teachers' spirit and the increased competition forced both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers to attempt to develop highly visible agreements as showcases for the benefits to be gained through affiliation with their respective organizations.²⁰

The status symbol, the written agreement, whether achieved through negotiations or through collective bargaining is first in the order of importance because it is written proof that the teacher organization is working for its members; it is a viable, tangible, negotiable reason for joining the organization that has gained desirable benefits. Teacher organizations must have members to maintain their existence and power. Unions and associations must produce contracts or board policy changes to gain and keep members.²¹

Generally speaking, a negotiations agreement:

1. Officially recognizes the responsibility of the board and the administration to bargain in good faith with the teachers.
2. Identifies the topics that are considered negotiable, such as salaries and working conditions.

²⁰John Hopkins, "A Review of Events in Professional Negotiations," Theory Into Practice, IV (April, 1965), 52.

²¹Virgil E. Blanke, "Teachers in Search of Power," The Educational Forum, XXX (January, 1966), 234.

3. Defines the composition of the negotiating bodies.
4. Specifies negotiating procedure and delineates the superintendent's role during negotiations.
5. Contains provisions for action in the event of an impasse between teachers and the board.

The Strike Issue

The teachers, many of them dissatisfied with inadequacies of salary and poor working conditions of long standing, are faced with the two similar organizations vying for their membership dues. On the one hand, are the statutes which forbid them to strike when their negotiations reach an impasse, and on the other hand, are the organizations which insist that their members strike or impose sanctions in order to create pressure on the school board.

David Selden,²² Assistant to the President of the American Federation of Teachers, is very emphatic about teacher striking. He contends that closing the schools during a strike is not any more damaging than closing them for the usual spring recess or summer vacation or any of the customary holidays. In fact, it is his opinion that, at least when the children return after a strike closing, they will find better and more inspired teachers awaiting them.

²²David Selden, "Needed, More Teacher Strikes," (Flyer reprinted from the Saturday Review, May 15, 1965), AFT.

He concludes that in lieu of a strike there are four possibilities--all of them much worse than a strike. Disputes could be settled by:

1. Continuing the status quo which would lead to greater dissatisfaction among the teachers.
2. Waging a cold war between the teachers and school authorities.
3. Initiating political action, which is slow and uncertain.
4. Arbitrating which he declares will endanger collective bargaining because both sides will move slowly, hoping that the arbitrator will favor their particular position.

Myron Lieberman, Chairman of the Division of Professional Studies, Rhode Island College, writes in regard to teacher strikes:

...even in jurisdictions where a strike is illegal, there is no convincing evidence that teacher strikes have had any lasting impact on students because of the illegality factor.

...it is hypocritical to argue that teachers must not be permitted to strike because such strikes would endanger public safety or welfare while simultaneously supporting the right of other groups to strike in situations that constitute a far more serious threat to public safety or welfare.²³

²³Myron Lieberman, "Teachers' Strikes: Acceptable Strategy?," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (January, 1965), 238.

Unlike many other union men, James Mundy, Director of Organization of the American Federation of Teachers states that the use of the strike by public employees will probably not be too extensive for two reasons. The first is that most states and the federal government deny them the right to strike. The second is that the governmental body does not lose revenue when strikers are not paid. The net effect of the strike upon the governmental body is not an economic one.²⁴ Mundy does not take into consideration the aspects of inconvenience and public pressure.

In opposition to strikes is the article by W. A. Stumpf, Professor of Education, Duke University, North Carolina. In reference to strikes and sanctions he says:

This approach, new to the teaching profession, represents a repudiation of faith in education; it disavows the belief that facts communicated create understanding. It says that the educational processes to which children are subjected in school do not work in the real world. Reason and the appeal to intelligence have been the substance of formal education. The present approach of teacher organizations to problems that become difficult to solve is that of substituting coercion for the process of education. Power, in the last resort, replaces reason.²⁵

The fact remains that teachers are organizing and becoming more militant about their demands. Their increasing willingness

²⁴James Mundy, "Collective Bargaining and Public Employees," (Pamphlet produced by the AFT).

²⁵W. A. Stumpf, "The New World of Educational Administration," The American School Board Journal, CLII (February, 1966), 12.

to strike creates new problems for the administrative staff, especially evident in the case of the principal. He is still responsible for the school building and the children who attend it. These responsibilities do not cease even if there are few or no teachers in the building to help carry on the instructional program. Such a situation cannot help giving the principal a sense of isolation from the rest of the staff and causing him to think in terms of joining a principals' organization.

CHAPTER III

THE CHANGING ROLES IN EDUCATION

The Board of Education

The principal's position in the area of collective bargaining is influenced by the changing roles of the board of education, the superintendent, and the teachers. An understanding of these facets in the total picture is essential before the niche of the principalship in the educational hierarchy can be redefined.

There are two courses of action which a board of education may employ today. Passively, it may maintain the status quo, hoping that collective bargaining will not appear in its district. In view of current events this approach to the problem would appear to be short-sighted.

More actively, in districts where collective bargaining does not now exist, the board of education may take the initiative in originating negotiations with the teachers. Together, they can effect a formal arrangement for any future transactions. The board can set forth the machinery of such negotiations--who will represent the board, how meetings are called, where they are to be held, and when discussions should be completed. A

timetable, to ensure accomplishment of goals before the final budget appears, is advisable.

By taking the preliminary steps in setting up negotiations, the board, as the public sees it, is exerting its function of leadership in a progressive and enlightened manner. In the eyes of the staff, the board is showing itself to be eminently reasonable and cooperative. When conditions become difficult during negotiations, the teachers will not be able to accuse the board of being intractable and unprogressive. With this established order it should become easier for the board to maintain control of the situation.

The Board of Education in Geneva, Illinois, followed the path of initiative. It decided to use the bold approach toward the problems of the school system while everyone was calm and while the atmosphere was peaceful. A committee of teachers from an organization affiliated with the National Education Association prepared recommendations for procedures in calling meetings, channeling requests, and exchanging facts. During a series of sessions between the board and the teachers, definitive conclusions were reached. The final agreement was a statement of policies for a manual and a six-page memorandum of understanding approved by the board and certified by the Chicago Education Association. One of the most interesting of the agreements with the board was that the superintendent was

specifically identified with management, not with teachers.²⁶

The memorandum of understanding:

1. Asserts that mutual trust and dependability are vital.
2. States that the policy-making function of the board cannot be delegated or abrogated.
3. Provides for the superintendent as chief administrative agent and officer of the board in negotiations with the teachers.
4. Recognizes the Chicago Education Association as representative of its members.
5. Prohibits illegal collective bargaining.
6. Assures teachers of the right to join or not to join or not to join the Chicago Education Association or other organizations and the right to appear before the board represented by counsel, where it is appropriate, to ensure protection of the right of the minority.
7. Distinguishes between welfare matters and the routine democratic process in the development of educational policy.
8. Invites wide participation by teachers in planning for the district, authorizes released time and other considerations for teachers engaged in cooperative planning, and encourages joining action in decision-making.

²⁶Roy C. Turnbough, "How to Set Teacher Negotiation Policy," Nation's Schools, LXXVII (March, 1966), 134.

9. Establishes circumstances under which teachers may participate in the studies and discussion, in the formulation and revision of salary schedules and plans, in welfare proposals, and in definitions of general responsibilities.
10. Provides orderly procedures for complaints, appeals, or requests for special consideration.
11. Provides for a prohibition of strikes, slowdowns, or reduction of normal work during the life of the understanding.
12. Permits mediation from a third-party committee when appeals have been considered by the board, and the Chicago Education Association remains unsatisfied. The board retains its authority to accept or reject the recommendations of the committee.²⁷

Briefly stated, the board must seize and keep the initiative in collective bargaining through the following actions:

1. Anticipation of the teachers' demands.
2. Consideration of tentative counter-proposals in advance of the meetings.
3. Development of programs and list of demands and suggestions.

²⁷Ibid., p. 136.

4. Institution of immediate action because waiting until teachers initiate the program loses the advantage and makes it very difficult to regain.²⁸

It is wise to avoid a management clause, that is, a clause which reserves certain rights of management to the administrator. Since any management clause is subject to interpretation by a third party (a court or person with quasi-judicial power under the grievance procedure), the best technique seems to be to draft the contract so that management control is retained by being very specific about the exact rights it is ceding to the bargaining unit.²⁹

- The two remaining problems to be resolved by the board are,
- (1) who shall represent the board in negotiations sessions and,
 - (2) what rights are negotiable?

Board Representation

Who should represent the board during negotiations? The answers to this question vary widely. In areas where board members have assumed this role the results have been less than satisfactory. Negotiators for the teachers' organizations are not only carefully indoctrinated and trained but also are supported by specialists from the state and national

²⁸"How to Negotiate with Your Teachers - Without Surrendering," School Management, X (September, 1966), 112.

²⁹Harold W. Story, "Collective Bargaining with Teachers under Wisconsin Law," Theory Into Practice, IV (April, 1965), 63.

organizations. Members of the typical small town board are at a disadvantage in training and in available resource personnel. In many situations, the superintendent is the only full-time resource available to them.

As the burden of long periods of negotiations becomes heavy, more and more boards will probably discontinue efforts by board members to act as negotiators. Board members not only lack the time, but frequently are not qualified to judge the relative importance of various demands upon the educational program. Either the superintendent would have to be included or specialized personnel would have to be employed to perform the task.

Teachers generally have the full backing and resources of either one of two very large organizations, the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers. Board members and administrators have only a common responsibility, very limited experience, and, if they are wise, unanimity.³⁰

As state and national assistance for local teacher organizations increases, school boards, in self-defense, may seek protection by some method of uniting. If it is illegal for local boards to band together for purposes of negotiations with teachers' organizations, then there probably will be a movement to submit some problems, such as salary to the state legislature, as has already happened in Oklahoma. When state laws, like

³⁰"How to Negotiate with Your Teachers--Without Surrendering," School Management, X (September, 1966), 111.

those in Connecticut, provide for referral to outside mediators or arbitrators, situations that otherwise might have been settled locally will be referred.³¹

A more common alternative to the use of board members in negotiations has been the selection of the superintendent in this capacity. This point will be developed more fully in the next section.

There is a definite advantage in having an outside agent negotiate for the board and the superintendent, in addition to the factors of time and experience. The advantage gained is that the superintendent and the school board are in a position to make a commitment, whereas the teachers who are directly involved in bargaining must always refer to the entire membership of the organization, discuss proposals, take votes and make decisions. Their advantage is that of gaining extra time to reflect on matters before making a definite statement of acceptance. When the school board and superintendent are directly involved, they cannot defer their decisions so there should be an intermediary bargaining unit to represent both of them to equalize the advantages. Not only should there be a bargaining unit, but there should be discussion of all its

³¹Harry A. Becker, "Collective Bargaining May Force School Boards to Organize," School Board Journal, CLIII (October, 1966), 57.

actions before meeting with the teachers. This establishes a unified front with only one individual as the actual speaker.³²

Selecting only one person as the authorized oral delegate is very important. It means that those representing the board must be unanimous in their views and must do their preparatory work to anticipate problems. When two factions are in the midst of negotiations, it is futile for different people to be making conflicting statements. They must present a solid alliance. Differences of opinion among representatives of the board should never be allowed to erupt in the middle of negotiations. Having one spokesman eliminates this likelihood and prevents a display of possible weaknesses to the opposition.

After determining who shall represent the board in negotiations, the second problem is that of deciding what issues are negotiable. A survey, made by Richard H. Mosier,³³ lists a large number of items which teachers consider directly negotiable. Among these items are:

1. Determination of teacher work load.
2. Discipline of professional staff.
3. Standards for new professional staff positions.
4. Duties of professional staff members.

³²"How to Negotiate with Your Teachers-Without Surrendering," School Management, X (September, 1966), 114.

³³Richard H. Mosier, "Survey of Collective Bargaining Issues," School Management, X (September, 1966), 163.

5. Facilities for personal health and comfort of the staff.
6. Bases and levels of salary schedule.
7. Fringe benefits.
8. Leave programs.
9. Length of contracts.
10. Practices of pupil control.
11. The school calendar.
12. The curriculum content and quality of the instructional program.

Teachers agree that the following should be topics for regular consultation:

1. Determination of orientation procedures.
2. Length, content, and number of professional staff meetings.
3. Quality and quantity of instructional materials.
4. Buildings and facilities provided for the instructional programs.
5. Graduation requirements.
6. Standards for student dress and conduct.
7. Public relations programs.
8. Grade reporting practices.
9. Educational needs and plans.
10. Financial needs and expenditure plans.
11. The justification and presentation of the budget.

12. The supervisory program.

13. The guidance program.

The teachers mentioned the following areas as being important and they felt that the boards of education failed to give teachers adequate voice in final decisions concerning these matters:

1. Determination of the size and qualifications of the administrative staff.
2. Responsibilities of the administrative staff.
3. Building and maintenance program.
4. Promotion and retention of professional personnel.
5. Standards for substitute teachers.
6. Assignments of teachers.
7. Selection and recommendation of professional personnel.
8. Guidance program.
9. Construction and remodeling of the building.
10. Supervisory program.
11. Kind and amount of expense money.
12. Standards for professional staff positions.
13. Length of professional contracts.
14. Fees and fines charged students.
15. Justification and presentation of the budget.
16. Discipline of the professional staff.
17. Kind and size of the summer program.
18. Auxiliary services offered by the school.

19. Community service.
20. Teacher-pupil ratio.

It should be noted that many of the items mentioned in this third listing infringe directly upon the prerogatives of the principal. It is in the realm of this third listing that a great deal of uneasiness among principals arises. To some extent, resolution of some of these problems can be handled in the individual school building with groups of teachers and an interested principal working together. A wise principal should take advantage of every possible opportunity to work with his teachers in problem solving. This approach builds morale and establishes rapport. Since teacher involvement has been proven to be a very effective technique in improving education and obtaining total teacher commitment it should be utilized more fully by principals.

Teachers have a rather long and varied list of items which they consider negotiable, while the typical items which are discussed in industrial collective bargaining primarily center around salary and fringe benefits. The subject of working conditions does not lend itself to as rich an array of topics in the field of industry as it does in the field of education. This is basically the reason that analogies drawn between the two need definitive clarification.

Grievance Procedures

One of the most important aspects of collective bargaining is the procedure for handling grievances. Machinery for settling disputes must be set up so that problems are solved as near to the source as possible. In the event that they cannot be solved at lower levels, they become negotiable items.

Typical of grievance procedures is the one at New Rochelle, New York. Teachers first discuss their grievance with an immediate supervisor or the building principal, either directly or through the school representative. (A school representative is appointed for each school building from the staff by the executive committee of the New Rochelle Teachers Association. This person acts as an advisor to teachers on grievance matters and officially represents teachers in negotiations with the administration and the board.)

If the teachers are dissatisfied with the principal's disposition of their case, they file their grievance, in writing, with an ad hoc advisory unit within five days. The advisory unit is drawn from a Professional Rights and Responsibilities panel. This advisory group is broadly representative of the whole district staff. These units review grievances to determine their validity before negotiations are started.

The advisory unit has up to ten days to evaluate the merits of the complaint. If it concludes that the grievance is without merit or was properly adjudicated by the principal, it

so informs the teachers and their school representative. If the unit decides that the grievance does have merit and has not been treated fairly, it refers the problem to the superintendent.

The superintendent designates two persons, possibly including himself, to meet with the ad hoc unit and the school representative. The first meeting must take place within ten days of receipt of the written notice from the unit by the superintendent.

If the administration and the ad hoc unit are unable to solve the problem, they refer it to the board's review committee, which meets with the unit.

If the issue is still undecided after several meetings of the board's committee and the teachers' unit, either party may call for outside advisory arbitration. The arbitrator is selected by mutual agreement.

Special forms for filing grievance, serving notices, making appeals, writing reports, and issuing recommendations, along with other documents are easily available to facilitate smooth operation of this procedure. All communications dealing with the processing of a grievance are separated from the personnel files of the participants.

There are modifications of this procedure for the adjustment of problems. In large cities additional intermediary administrative personnel may have to enter into the discussions before the issue reaches the superintendent.

Basically, however, New Rochelle serves as an example of what is routinely done with grievances. Obviously, if a large number of teachers is aggrieved in the same situation, the union files its own complaint and uses it as a basis for future negotiations.

Use of Non-salary Items in Negotiations

It has already been noted that teachers regard as negotiable items many aspects other than salary and fringe benefits. Although this attitude is viewed with trepidation by most boards who consider that their prerogatives are being infringed upon, there are some good reasons for examining the teachers' point of view seriously. If the boards do not permit nonsalary items to be discussed, they have weakened their bargaining position. With only a limited amount of money available, school boards cannot always meet salary demands, but they can often satisfy teachers in some of the other areas under consideration. Thus, the board can gain some concessions by granting others.

Some examples of using non-salary items as bargaining possibilities are easily recognized. Increases in salary maxima, (1) can be connected with higher ratings by principals; (2) teachers can be prohibited from holding other positions if they receive increases; (3) labor peace can be obtained through a longer contract period in return for other concessions; and (4) teachers who resign before the termination of their contract can forfeit a set amount of money, which is part of

the annual salary but payable only upon completion of the contract. Other possibilities would be, (1) to cut costs by requiring medical information after three consecutive days or ten cumulative days of absence in a work year; (2) to require advanced training for salary increases; (3) to substitute full pay for summer leaves in order to reduce the number of sabbatical leaves; and (4) to issue regulations on the quantity and quality of lesson planning and instructional preparation.

Salary increases are usually the main negotiable factor, but even within this scope several fine points must be taken into consideration. As a rule, the teachers' organization will make numerous requests, asking for more than they feel they can obtain so they will have broader bargaining dimensions. The board must then equate the requests to eliminate demands which cannot be met and to select items which can be of value to the district as well as to the teachers.

Hidden, as well as obvious cost, must be considered when appraising a set of union demands. There may be escalator features in the proposals. For example, lowering class sizes means that proportionately more teachers must be employed in the future than would be necessary if the class size had remained the same.

Another example of increased costs is that of administrative expense. Life insurance benefits can be increased without much effort, but if teachers pay more tuition for courses that

they take, more accounting will be involved and administrative time will be more costly.

Straight salary increases do not always assure the elimination of inequities in the new salary structure. Teachers will continue to complain about these inequities and no real problems will have been solved. Injudicious planning may produce new inequities, as would the raising of the starting pay and dropping off a step at the top of the pay scale. If the salary structure is improved but working conditions are not, teachers will still be dissatisfied. If the salary increases are granted without teacher participation in planning them, they may cause teacher resentment. It is possible, with good planning in the collective bargaining sessions, to make teachers happy with a smaller salary improvement than they had asked for by increasing fringe benefits. The net result would be that teachers would have added security and the likelihood is that they would stay longer and be more satisfied than if they had simply received a higher salary. Such benefits might also be a selling point in recruiting new teachers.

There is also something to be said in favor of having collective bargaining sessions before budget recommendations are made so that a realistic salary and fringe benefit total is known. Taylor writes:

A reconciliation between the needs of the school teachers and other provisions for the improvement of the educational process as a whole is not possible

if the amounts expendable in the school teachers' interests are computed either as a residual share after all other expenditures have been made or as a prior claim on a future unknown total budget. It is recommended that collective negotiations in governmental agencies can be conducted prior to overall budgetary action by the legislative body. That body would then have before it a joint recommendation arrived at in collective negotiations or the recommendation arrived at in an impartial fact-finding board. The public interest will thereby be served by enabling the legislative body to carry out its governmental functions in an orderly manner.³⁴

There is definitely more challenge in the position of board member now than there was so recently as ten years ago. The responsibilities are greater and the amount of factual information and insight into current problems is greater.

The General Superintendent

One of the more complex problems facing the superintendent of schools today is the identification of his proper role in the area of teacher negotiations. Can he effectively serve as the executive officer of the board of education and provide professional leadership as well as administrative direction to the staff? Is it proper for the superintendent to serve only as a fact-finder for both the board and the staff and to refuse to act as a negotiator for any party? Is the desire of some teacher organization leaders to negotiate directly with the

³⁴George W. Taylor, "The Public Interest in Collective Negotiations in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII (September, 1966), 16.

school board and to bypass the superintendent a development that should be encouraged? What are the superintendent's obligations to the subordinate administrative staff in terms of communicating and disseminating information? These and related questions have not been answered to everyone's satisfaction.

The position that the superintendent should act behind the scenes is held by William R. Manning, Superintendent of the Lansing, Michigan School District. He states:

The superintendent does not necessarily have to conduct the actual face-to-face negotiating, but his leadership in the process should be felt...the superintendent could not exercise his total leadership role if he spent all his time at the negotiating table.³⁵

It was previously indicated that George W. Taylor³⁶ proposes that neither the board nor the superintendent do the negotiating. Taylor is the Chairman of the Governor's Commission on Public Employee Relations in the state of New York and is chief author of a report produced by the commission to guide the state legislature. George Taylor firmly advocates bringing in professional negotiators or using other members of the administrative staff, administrators who do not have the authority to make commitments. Including a representative from the principals' group on the negotiations committee would help

³⁵William R. Manning, "Negotiations: The Process in Collective Bargaining," School Board Journal, CLIII (August, 1966), 15.

³⁶Taylor, loc. cit., p. 18.

to make the school building administrator happier with collective bargaining.

An advocate of having the superintendent act primarily as a fact-finder is Alden H. Blankenship, Director of Administrative Services, Educational Research Council of Greater Cleveland. He feels that the role of the superintendent involves the obtaining of facts, analyzing the data, summarizing the expressed opinions of the teachers, and presenting his recommendations to the board.³⁷

Calvin Gross, formerly Superintendent of New York City (1964), indicates that the superintendent should do the negotiating but that he will find it advisable to seek some pertinent counsel from a competent, professional, labor-relations expert who is experienced in negotiating. This advice should help in preparing him to meet with the teachers' representative who certainly will have all manner of information at his disposal.³⁸

In Jefferson County, Colorado, both the board and the superintendent do the negotiating, a viewpoint directly opposed to that expressed by Taylor, Forbes Bottomly,³⁹ Superintendent

³⁷ Alden H. Blankenship, "The Role of the Superintendent in Teacher Negotiations," Theory into Practice, IV (April, 1965), 71.

³⁸ Calvin Gross, "Ways to Deal With the New Teacher Militancy," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (December, 1964), 149.

³⁹ "How to Negotiate with your Teachers-Without Surrendering," School Management, X (September, 1966), 113.

of Jefferson County, thinks that both should do the negotiating and this is the policy maintained by him during his tenure of office. Both the board and the superintendent not only conduct the negotiations but also originally initiated a collective bargaining agreement with their staff. Mr. Bottomly offers three reasons for approaching the teachers:

1. To give them the sense of professional status to which they are entitled.
2. To get a more extensive, accurate knowledge of the teachers' problems and the solutions they might have to offer.
3. To establish communications between themselves and the teachers so that the administration can make certain that the teachers understand the problems of the board and clearly perceive the reason for the solution chosen.

In summation, then, the superintendent today has to decide what his role in collective bargaining will be. The decision will vary depending upon his qualifications and personal convictions. At present the role of the superintendency is being redefined and collective bargaining will be an important facet of post.

The Changing Role of Teachers

Traditionally, teachers sought to achieve their goals by two methods. The first of these was the legislative lobby on

a statewide scale. Such items as tenure, sick leave, mandated minimum salary schedules, and pensions were acquired by state associations and state federations through statutory provisions passed by legislatures and governors.

The second method of gaining recognition of needs was on the local school district level. Teachers presented their requests to the local district board of education, usually through the superintendent, but in other cases directly to the board. Teachers were petitioners. The response to their requests was entirely dependent upon the discretion of the board. Pressures were brought to bear on board and board members by way of support solicited from parent groups, individual citizens, politicians, and newspaper advertisements. Often these pressures succeeded in convincing the board to give some degree of favorable response. Frequently such pressures ended with insufficient or no attainment of goals. Frequently, teachers felt that they were being subjected to the indignity of charity. They resented the fact that whatever successes they gained came as a result of a patronizing beneficence or the need of the board to be in a competitive position.

Factors Contributing to Teacher Militancy

In the last few years teachers have observed the effectiveness of organizations seeking to correct the evils of racial discrimination, of second-class citizenship, of denial of suffrage, and of economic depression suffered by Negroes and

other minorities. They have witnessed the rapidity of results in the passing of laws, extending sources of employment, and providing other benefits through boycotts, demonstrations, picketing, and similar processes.

After Sputnik, the first satellite launched by Communist Russia, the American educational system became the object of scrutiny by many concerned dignitaries and the contribution of teachers to the nation's well-being was realized. Teachers were suddenly made to feel that they were important contributors to America's civilization and that their services were most significant in maintaining the prestige and leadership of our nation in the world. The moment of glory was short but it had its effects upon the regard of teachers for themselves. Now again, the speed with which automation is creating demands for educated workers and casting aside the unskilled is causing teachers to appreciate the fact that their endeavor is one of critical value to the nation.

There are other factors contributing to teacher militancy. A primary one is the increased size of school systems which makes work forces larger, more compact, and more easily organized. Also, the centralization of administrative control has resulted in more government by mimeograph, a diminution of the opportunity for teachers to participate in policy-making and an increase in obstacles precluding the redress of grievances.

Another important factor in promoting the militancy of teachers is pointed out by Benjamin Epstein in a National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin.⁴⁰ The article states that, in 1925, over 83% of all American teachers were women. By 1956 the figures dropped to 73%. Along with these statistics, the historic exploitation of women in our society extended into education, with all of its implications for salaries. In 1965 the number of men becoming teachers increased to the point that male teachers are now a majority group in the secondary schools. They have contributed much to the educational scene and their more aggressive approach to problems is increasingly evident, especially in the area of collective bargaining.

Still another factor is that teachers are better educated. The typical classroom teacher has nearly five years of post-secondary education, a dramatic shift from the once dominant two-year normal school training. It would be expected that such highly trained personnel would seek higher salaries, especially since there is a shortage of teachers. The expenses of acquiring the educational requirements necessary to attain and maintain full professional status are much greater as well.

⁴⁰ Benjamin Epstein, "What Status and Voice for Principals and Administrators in Collective Bargaining and 'Professional Negotiation' by Teacher Organizations?," NASSP Bulletin, IL (March, 1965), 229.

Furthermore, teachers are more fully and effectively organized. Lacking power to improve school conditions by acting alone, members of the profession have turned to group representation in order to share in decisions affecting their conditions of service. They have joined unions and local chapters of the National Education Association. The latter organization is placing particular emphasis upon the development of local groups with sixty-five urban chapters having full-time secretaries.

In addition, teachers feel strongly that their time should be spent in teaching and not in performing clerical functions. Their resentment toward having to execute a multitude of tasks which could be delegated to less skilled personnel is increasing. They regard these extra duties as an onerous diversion of teaching time.

Moreover, the teaching profession has grown younger. As youth has always done, the new recruits in the profession are questioning the values and procedures of their elders. They are willing to take risks if they think they can make progress. Theirs is a more enterprising attitude.

For these reasons and others less obvious, teachers are organizing and applying pressure to school boards through the devices of strikes and sanctions. Very frequently they use the pressure tactics of the past. Whatever the method may be

called, it is part of collective bargaining, an interplay between two groups able to exert strong pressures to attain the desired ends.

Pure collective bargaining necessarily brings about a marked change in employers. Its essence is not the interplay of the negotiating table, the ratifying votes, or even the written contract as much as it is the acceptance by the opposing sides that each is obligated to gain the other's consent before changes of mutual interest are enacted.

Since many teachers feel that the board of education must understand this obligation, they have brought the matter to the fore by resorting to strikes. Just as the most bitter strikes in private industry occurred over this principle, most of the teacher strikes today can be traced to the same source. Sometimes, to prove their point, teachers employ this maneuver repeatedly as, for example, in Pawtucket, Rhode Island and East Saint Louis, Illinois.

Strike Tactics

It has been mentioned previously that teacher groups have had instructions in the employment of negotiating tactics. At this point, it is appropriate to discuss some of the major ones briefly, because administrators should be cognizant of them.

Random action is one of the most important tactics employed. If the board of education believes that teacher action is

inevitable, it will prepare its defenses rather than endeavor to reach an agreement. It is more strategic to keep the other side uninformed by not revealing the settlement position.

The second principle is the certainty of action. A strike should never be threatened unless conditions are auspicious for carrying out the threat. Once a side retreats from its stated position because it cannot do what it says it is going to do, then the next threat will be given no credence. The reason that so many agreements are reached without a strike is that the employees are sure to strike.

A third principle involves a combination of the first two. If an agreement is not reached, a strike is set. Then, as tension mounts to avert it, the negotiators are forced to come to some form of satisfactory compromise. The danger here is that compromises reached under duress are not necessarily in the best interests of the persons concerned.

The fourth principle is mass participation. Teachers in the schools are assigned to significant tasks which will involve them meaningfully in the preparation for the strike. The school union representative is the pivotal point of action. He instructs his teachers to organize letter-writing committees, holds meetings, promotes publicity for the cause, and solicits effective cooperation from the teachers by discussing the issues with them. If he can appear on television or in the newspapers, he can boost the morale of his members and obtain

their participation through identification, that is, by acting in such a manner and by speaking about those ideas that will appeal directly to them.

The last basic principle involves knowing the opposition and what is important to them. If publicity will not move them, perhaps the unexpected sit-in will do so. If members are politically motivated, one type of action may work better than another.

There are some tactics which can be used but are not considered effective. One of these involves inserting an advertisement in the newspaper. If teachers are willing to march, they can have their message on the front pages of the newspapers without cost. An advertisement obviously does not have the same emotional overtones as a front page story.

Mass resignations are sometimes indulged in, but neither the National Education Association nor the American Federation of Teachers favors this expedient because it is too difficult to control. Also, they do not have the cohesive quality of a strike. It is too easy for teachers to change their minds at the last minute. This leaves the organization in the vulnerable position of having made a threat without being able to carry it out effectively.

Packing a board meeting room with organization members tends to embolden the members toward stronger action, but an entrenched board can ignore them. Adverse publicity from

statements made in the heat of the moment may hurt, rather than help, the cause of the organization.

Sanctions

At this point the word sanctions will be defined as it pertains to this study. A sanction, herewith, is to be understood and interpreted as the branding of a particular school system as inferior to the point of urging incumbent teachers to leave their positions and prospective teachers to refuse to accept positions offered to them. The National Education Association but not the American Federation of Teachers supports sanctions. An investigation by outside experts, appointed by and responsible to, the national association, begins the process of sanctions. Such an investigation then becomes the basis for deciding if the district will be publicly castigated. This decision is made by the state or national association, although it is assumed that the local affiliate helped initiate the investigation. The procedure works best in publicity-sensitive areas. Because sanctions take a long time to apply, maximum publicity is the result. First, local sanctions are requested; then an investigation team is selected; and finally the sanctions are imposed. Meanwhile, all these events are being reported through the communications media. Politicians, trying to attract new industries to their area, want their community to have a good reputation for educational facilities. As a

result of publicity these political figures and their legislatures are then the prime targets for effecting sanctions.

This device is not effective in large urban areas which are heavily industrialized. An announcement that the local schools have been labeled as inferior by a certain educators' group and that college graduates have been asked not to enter the area for teaching positions has relatively little impact upon a board of education which must cope with demonstrations, strikes, riots, insufficient funds, and a high turnover of personnel.

The only way that sanctions can increase their effectiveness is for teachers to assume, locally, the responsibility for their success. They must penalize outside teachers who have come into the district by denying them association membership and they must make a serious effort to persuade all who can relocate to do so. Such relocation presents a problem whenever a large percentage of the teaching staff is made up of married women who are not free to leave the area because of familial responsibilities. There is also the disadvantage that if the sanction is truly successful and the teachers do leave the locality, a severe shortage of competent teachers is created and continues to exist even after agreements finally have been reached on the points of dispute.

Strikes

The people of the community are first to feel the major effects of a school strike, the politicians are second. Since

the public suffers serious inconvenience, it exerts pressure upon its elected officials to find a solution to the problem so that the schools can reopen with the utmost speed.

Frequently, the incommmodity the public must endure is due primarily to the need for the care of young children. When thousands of pupils are turned back to their parents for necessary supervision twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week, caring for them becomes a great burden. Our urban life does not provide enough tasks to keep idle children busy and out of mischief and there is a limitation to the amusement potential of the local neighborhoods. In addition to this, a large portion of the work force consists of working mothers who are not available to oversee their children's activities during a teachers' strike. There are also implications here of a possible imposition upon the police and fire departments for their unwarranted services at this time. Another relevant point is who can estimate the loss to pupils of valuable and continuous instruction?

From 1940 to 1965 the number of teacher strikes has increased and the duration of each has been extended. It seems likely that in the near future there will be many more strikes, despite the opinion of James Mundy, because more local groups will want collective bargaining rights. After this major objective is won, the few strikes that ensue will be more protracted because of the more difficult issues to be resolved. Politics

and personalities may play a part in the course of the events. On either side, someone may consider he is being so threatened by others in his own organization, that he must take a militant stand at the bargaining table to overcome such criticism.

Another person may have boasted extravagantly about how many concessions he could secure from the board, or how he could get the union to yield its position. A third individual may find himself unable to convince powerful persons or caucuses in his organization that the other side will balk if the offer is not increased or reduced substantially. Power shifts that will render a stable relationship fluid can occur within both organizations. In either group there may be those who will not deviate at all from their set purposes. If they are temporarily in the ascendancy, top negotiators may be helpless.

In spite of all the difficulties, involvements, and uncertainties of using work stoppage measures, all indications are that strikes will continue to be a formidable means of access to the better things of life.

When a principal has some knowledge of what occurs in the collective bargaining relationship he may feel less inclined to blame any particular group for his difficulties. The solution to problems may be affected by so many side issues that no one can totally foresee the outcome.

The Role of the Principal

Luvern Cunningham,⁴¹ Director of the Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago, conducted a series of interviews with principals in Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. The results of his findings show that principals feel strong resentment and anxiety about the total issue of collective bargaining by teacher groups, but specifically about its effects upon the office of the principal. The size of the group interviewed was not stated in the report, but almost without exception, the informants related that they found it increasingly difficult to supervise the instructional process in their individual buildings and that teachers were, seemingly, trying to usurp the prerogatives of the building principal.

In relation to these official privileges, Doctor Bernard E. Donovan, Superintendent of New York City Public Schools, states:

Too often we have mouthed the idea that you should consult with the faculty and then we gaily moved on our way without doing so. Or else we call 'consultation' telling them at the last minute what it is you are going to do. That is dictatorship. I think that when we give teachers proper voice, we strengthen the schools after a period of some stress.⁴²

⁴¹Luvern Cunningham, "Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," Paper read at a Seminar on Professional Negotiation in Public Education, co-sponsored by the NEA and the Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago, August 3, 1966.

⁴²"Collective Bargaining vs. Professional Negotiations," School Management, XI (November, 1965), 71.

It is obvious at this point that the prerogatives of the building administrator need redefining. What one principal feels is a vested right may simply be a traditional practice which has never been challenged. Other principals may not agree that that particular item is worth their consideration. To date, there has been no study about the practices and prerogatives which principals hold most dear, yet there would be value in such a study. When negotiating with teacher organizations, it would be most helpful for a board of education and/or the superintendent to know how principals feel about this subject.

As has been mentioned, when traditional patterns of conduct change there is bound to be stress and "the stress will be largely for the administrators because when you have an able group of teachers, talking to you on a new level of authority, you very often feel your control lessening."⁴³ (Doctor Donovan). Assuming that stress is inevitable, and that the roles of everyone in the educational profession are being modified, what then are the chief problems which face the principal at this time due to collective bargaining? They can be divided into two broad categories. The first one concerns the most effective way that principals can protect their interests now and in the future. How the principal can best use the teachers' interests to serve the needs of the educational program in his school is the second category.

⁴³Ibid., p. 72.

Interests of the Principal

Willingly or unwillingly, the principal is being classified as an administrator with the privileges and responsibilities of that office, rather than as a close ally of his teaching staff. Although he is considered an administrator, he has no voice in collective bargaining sessions. In fact, there seems to be a total lack of communication during negotiations. Frequently the principal is the last person to know about the issues being discussed, the progress being made, and the effects that the conclusions will have upon the administration of his school. While the union definitely wants him excluded from both the organization and the bargaining table, the association wants him to be a member of the organization but not to take part at the bargaining table. At the same time, the higher school administrative officials do nothing to offset this dual rejection. It would improve the morale of the principals if they or their representatives were asked for their reactions to the issues being decided.

Principals and other administrators have an important stake in the process of negotiation and agreement-writing. It is already too common a pattern for principals not to participate or even be consulted during the process. In most cases, principals learn what has happened only after the agreement has been reached and publicly announced.

If the process of negotiation is designed to democratize personnel relationships in public education, then this by-passing of principals reveals a serious inconsistency. It would seem

self-evident that the elimination of principals from negotiations is self-defeating. The principal is the key figure in the operation of a school. He is charged with a considerable number of responsibilities by state law, board rules, regulations of the state department of education, court decisions, administrative directives from the superintendent, and unwritten codes which emerge from practical experience, justifiable traditions, and community expectations. The principal is held accountable for every phase of a school's life--its professional staff, the efficiency of its educational program, the safety and security of its pupils, its plant maintenance, and its relationships with the community.⁴⁴ (Benjamin Epstein, President of the Neward Public School Principals' Association).

The union's position is clear; the exclusion of administrative personnel from classroom teacher organizations and bargaining units is preferred. This position is based on what may be termed the private industry or conflict-of-interest model of supervisor-supervisee relationships. The supervisor bears the responsibility of carrying out the programs, policies, and decisions of the organization and is empowered to dispense rewards and apply sanctions. It is precisely this power over rewards and the status differences that it implies which provide the basis for a conflict of interest between the supervised and the supervisor.

It appears that management is reluctant to see supervisors included in a broader bargaining unit, lest membership in such a unit lessen the willingness or ability of supervisors to

⁴⁴ Benjamin Epstein, "The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations Between Teachers and School Boards," (Pamphlet, NASSP), 1965.

distribute rewards and exercise sanctions in the interests of maximum progress toward organizational goals.⁴⁵

An interview with Peter Schnauffer,⁴⁶ American Federation of Teachers Director of Research, brought out another facet of the problem. He said that when the union has to send a representative into a school because of a dispute between teachers and a principal, it is the representative's function to support the teachers stolidly. As he is not meant to be a mediator, this unswerving support would be impossible to maintain if the principal were a member of the organization. Mr. Schnauffer feels that principals are already amply represented by the superintendent.

Insofar as the National Education Association's local groups are concerned, they have, in most cases, included principals and other administrators. Moreover, the major national organizations of administrators are historically very closely allied with the teacher association as departments within the organization. On the surface, it would seem that representation of principals and other administrators could be handled adequately and easily by the professional negotiations system proposed by the association.

⁴⁵ Wesley A. Wildman and Charles R. Perry, "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (January, 1966), 257.

⁴⁶ Interview with Peter Schnauffer, American Federation of Teachers Director of Research, August 13, 1966.

William G. Carr, Executive Secretary of the National Education Association says:

In school districts in which competing organizations seek to represent the staff, some people say that principals must remain strictly neutral. The American Federation of Teachers in conjunction with the Industrial Union Department of the American Federation of Teachers is exerting every effort to divide us. Nothing would suit this purpose more effectively than to have teachers and administrators follow separate and conflicting programs.⁴⁷

However, there are new problems arising which Mr. Carr does not take into account. In localities where there are bitter and provocative contests between the union and the association, the National Education Association affiliates on many occasions, in order to win teacher support, have had to answer charges that they are administration controlled. There may be a tendency to diminish or totally eliminate the role of administrative personnel in the association as proof of independence and militancy as great as that of the unions.

In the convention held in July, 1967, the teachers' use of the strike as a bargaining weapon was recommended by the National Education Association. This then becomes another line of demarcation between the administrators and the teachers in the association.

⁴⁷ William G. Carr, "The Principal's Role in Professional Negotiation," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals (The 50th Annual Convention), L (April, 1966), 49.

In the booklet outlining the association's guides for professional negotiations, this trend is also exhibited in the following remark: "In other communities experience may have shown that negotiations are more successful if carried on by an association of classroom teachers."⁴⁸ In Akron, Ohio, the association does not accept administrators into membership. In Joliet, Illinois, the principals have their own group affiliated with the association, and in Norwalk, Connecticut, administrative groups negotiate on their own behalf. The booklet⁴⁹ continues to suggest a tripartite arrangement for organizing negotiating unit. A joint committee of the local administrators' association, the local supervisors' association, and the local classroom teachers' association could work together on a committee and there could be proportional representation from each group. In this arrangement, however, the administrators would be in the minority and two problems might well arise.

The first problem might be that since administrators would have less voting power than classroom teachers, it would be possible that their welfare and concerns could be voted against or compromised with in cases where such decisions are expedient for teachers.

⁴⁸ Benjamin Epstein, "What Status and Voice for Principals and Administrators in Collective Bargaining?," NASSP Bulletin, IL (March, 1965), 249.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

The second problem involves the question of whether, in our type of economic and social system, employees in lower echelons of responsibility should have the right to play a crucial part in determining such items as salaries and conditions of employment for those who are at higher levels. Both of these problems are equally implicit in situations where an all-inclusive professional association negotiates with the school board on behalf of professional employees at all levels.

Principals are responsible for their schools in their entirety. They know the totality of their complex relationships more thoroughly than anyone else in the school. The principals are held responsible for everything--every event, every student, every staff member, and every corner of the building and its grounds. They are held accountable by the superintendent, by the school board, by the state department of education, by the parents and the community, by tradition, and by simple practicality.

To carry these burdens, principals must have the proper authority, which should not be undermined by imposing upon them unsound restrictions and procedures enacted by their boards and superintendents in order to terminate moments of extreme duress during negotiations with teachers' groups.

An example of difficulties which could arise would be in the handling of grievances. Procedures which might seem fair could terminate in an endless waste of valuable administrative

time because they are so complicated and involved. They may even encourage chronic complainants. A typical definition of the word grievance is a complaint by an employee in the bargaining unit "that he has been treated unfairly or inequitably by reason of any act or condition which is contrary to established policy or practice governing or affecting employees." This is so general a definition of a word to be found in a contract that it could lead to many interpretations and abuses. Whenever a teacher is displeased by almost anything, he can complain to the principal (with the union representative present). If he is still dissatisfied, he may appeal to an assistant superintendent and, finally, to the superintendent. All this involves hearings, written documents and copies of decisions. The administrative costs could become prohibitive, and the loss of a principal's time from supervising the educational program could never be redeemed.

More and more it would appear that the only recourse left to the principals is to have their own bargaining group. Calvin Gross, Superintendent in New York City (1964) writes, "Administration has to maintain consistency in its role of management and administrators should not be included in a teacher bargaining group."⁵⁰

W. A. Stumpf, Professor of Education, Duke University, writes, "Administrators are being forced into the uncomfortable

⁵⁰Gross, loc. cit., p. 150.

role of the managerial groups of industry, a management-versus-worker contest."⁵¹

If these statements are combined with one of the conclusions from Luvern Cunningham's report, it becomes evident that principals are giving their representation a great deal of thought. He writes:

The spectre of two negotiating parties, neither one of which represents the principal, reaching accord by swapping such things as work rules that have been the principal's prerogative until now is the source of increased frustration, if not panic, for the building administrator.⁵²

Therefore, administrators may find it not only valuable to speak as a distinct group, but also unavoidable if they are to have any representation at all.

Problems Arising from Negotiations

The institution of collective negotiations is widely viewed as a beneficial one for teachers but costly to the public who must eventually pay a higher price for educational services. Relationships among the school board, the administration, and teachers change rapidly, but whether this change improves the quality of education remains to be seen. The primary function of any employee organization is to improve the well-being of its membership and to enhance its established rights. At the

⁵¹ Stumpf, loc. cit., p. 10.

⁵² Cunningham, loc. cit., p. 8.

present time, this function involves a minimization of the impact of change upon incumbents. Whether the effective performance of that function by employee organizations can be reconciled with the public demand for extensive improvements in the quality of education and in the productivity of educators is a moot question. Even granting that satisfied teachers are an essential requirement for quality teaching, there are limitations to the proposition that what is good for the teachers is good for the students and the public.

Some agreements which seem acceptable on the surface can be very detrimental to the smooth functioning of the school, as can be observed in the following examples.

If class size is limited to a certain maximum number, like twenty-five, then how can one stimulate experiments with large group instruction or, if there is a limitation of twenty-five pupils per class, what happens when there are four or five more children than the accepted number in a class? Is an extra teacher hired for them? Or, supposing a forty-member orchestra is a regularly scheduled class, how do all the participants practice together, or must that group also be reduced to a total of twenty-five students, even if it constitutes an inadequate group? When using instructional television, must that group be limited, or if aides are supervising, does the maximum have to be observed for them too?

If seniority is to be observed in the assignments of classes, should the selection of teachers who will handle the honors and remedial sections be based upon the length of the teacher's service to the school or upon his proved success and potential effectiveness in the judgment of the principal and subject supervisors? Should the third grade teacher who has difficulty handling discipline be assigned to assume the responsibility of an older group because she has seniority and wants the free periods which accompany the other assignment? Should seniority be the prime requisite for choosing head teachers, departmental leaders, and other supervisory personnel?

If non-teaching aides are made available in limited numbers to relieve some but not all teachers from duties such as study halls and cafeteria supervision, shall the teachers relieved be chosen according to agreements in a negotiated contract specifying seniority or subject area rather than according to the judgment of the administrator in terms of the needs of the school? Who shall determine the qualifications of the aides? Will they be part of the faculty of a school, or what will their actual relationship be to the staff? Who will bargain for their rights?

Shall a transfer policy based on seniority permit the gradual loss of the most experienced teachers from a school with difficult problems? If the class sizes are to be limited by special restrictions on maximum numbers, does this mean that the

designation of schools which fit the description of "difficult" shall be a proper subject for negotiations?

The few illustrations given and the questions posed in them, have pointed out the frustrations possible when work rules are negotiated without benefit of the principal's voice to point out potential dangers.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

As was indicated in chapter one, page four of this work, the cities of Joliet and East Saint Louis were chosen for this study because they have engaged in teacher negotiations since 1956 and 1957 respectively. The Board of Education in East Saint Louis negotiates with Local 1220 and the Board of Education in Joliet (Elementary District 86) negotiates with Local 604, both affiliates of the American Federation of Teachers. There is a formal contract giving exclusive bargaining rights to the Local in East Saint Louis but in Joliet, there is no exclusive contract. There is a teacher coordinating committee in Joliet which is composed of the Local and an affiliate of the National Education Association. There have been strikes in East Saint Louis but no teacher strikes in Joliet. A more inclusive resumé of the collective bargaining history of both cities will be found in the appendix.

Twenty-two questionnaires were distributed and answered in Joliet for a 100% return. Thirty-five questionnaires were distributed by mail in East Saint Louis and twenty-six were returned, a return of 74%.

A suggestion was forthcoming in only one question. A principal in East Saint Louis pointed out the problem of what should be done with the school children when the teachers are on strike. The possibilities he suggested were:

1. Try to run the school by doubling the teaching load of the non-striking teachers.
2. Send the children of the striking teachers home, even though many of the working parents will not be home to supervise them.
3. Dismiss school entirely and send all the children home, an act which might involve some legal problems as a by-product.

He did not propose these as solutions but merely as rhetorical questions about a serious situation.

This is one problem which was completely ignored in all the professional literature screened for this study.

A comment made by another principal was, "The management of the schools should be in the hands of professionals and not in the hands of boards of education," a comment which may well indicate dissatisfaction with the way that the East Saint Louis Board of Education negotiated the last teachers' contract.

Another comment was, "Professional organizations are for professional people and are not tied to labor groups." This statement indicates the type of conviction which the unions are trying to overcome in order to increase their membership rosters.

The Questionnaire

As was indicated previously in chapter one, page four of this study, the questions pertaining to each of the hypotheses were scattered throughout the questionnaire to avoid influencing the responses of the principals. These questions will be properly grouped and identified in this chapter to facilitate the drawing of conclusions.

The answers to the individual questions are represented by numbers and lines. An example of how to interpret the questions is given below.

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| E.S.L. | (2) 7.71% | (1) 3.84% | (1) 3.84% | (7) 26.92% | (15) 57.69% |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Joliet | (1) 4.55% | (4) 18.18% | 0 | (9) 40.91% | (8) 36.36% |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

1. E.S.L. represents the answers from East Saint Louis.
2. Jol. represents the answers from Joliet.
3. The number in parenthesis represents the number of responses obtained for that choice.
4. The number next to the parenthesis is the number of choices converted to a percentage. For example, on the first line, the first item is (2) 7.71%. This means that two principals chose that answer and that they represent 7.71% of the twenty-six administrators who answered the questionnaire in East Saint Louis.

In line two, the last item reads (8) 36.36%. This means that eight principals chose this answer and that they represent 36.36% of the twenty-two administrators who answered the questionnaire in Joliet.

5. The numbers below the line are the assigned weights. As the numbers increase in value, so does the dissatisfaction of the principals. In line one most of the choices are above the weights three and four. This indicates more dissatisfaction than if they were listed above weights one or two. The zero below the lines at the left indicates the number of principals who chose not to respond to that question.
6. The weights are indicated next to the answer choices in the questions on each page.

After each set of three questions dealing with a specific hypothesis, a summary of the answers weighted three and four will be indicated through a chart which will break down the responses into five subgroups.

1. Column one will represent those principals who do not wish to be by-passed in grievance disputes involving their jurisdiction and who align with the superintendent on most issues.
2. Column two will represent those principals who do not wish to be by-passed in grievance disputes involving their jurisdiction and who align with the teachers on most issues.
3. Column three will represent those principals who are willing to be by-passed in grievance disputes involving their jurisdiction and who align with the superintendent on most issues.
4. Column four will represent those principals who are willing to be by-passed in grievance disputes involving their jurisdiction and who align with the teachers on most issues.

5. Principals who do not want to be by-passed in grievance disputes and who will not commit themselves in favor of either the superintendent or the teachers are indicated in column five.

Hypothesis I

The role of the principalship is now being diminished because this middle level of administration is not represented at the bargaining table when agreements are reached between the teacher groups and the board of education.

Questions one, four, and five pertain to this hypothesis.

These three questions explore the principals' attitudes toward, (1) representation at the bargaining table, (2) the lines of communication between the negotiators and the principals and, (3) the need to make opinions known to the superintendent before final agreements are made with teachers' groups. They also indicate indirectly just how much influence, if any, the principals have in a situation which affects them greatly.

It should be noted that on hypothesis one, regardless of the alignment in subgroups as indicated on the chart on page 85 of this chapter, sixty-three out of a possible seventy-eight choices in East Saint Louis were devoted to answers adjudged to be of a high frustration level. When the results of hypothesis one are further examined in terms of the principals' alignment with the superintendent and their willingness to be by-passed in grievance disputes, the results tend to indicate that these principals exhibit a definite concern for their security.

In Joliet, the result was forty-five choices out of a possible sixty-six. The indications are that the principals in both cities are definitely concerned about their standing as it is being determined at the bargaining table. Most of the principals insist that at no time should they be by-passed in the resolution of problems emanating from their schools, not only because the educational program is their direct responsibility but also because it is affected by everything that happens. The opinions of Grieder,⁵³ Carr,⁵⁴ and Epstein,⁵⁵ and Cunningham,⁵⁶ as quoted in the preceeding sections of this study, are thus confirmed. It can be seen that the firm advocates of grievance handling on the building level also feel strongly about the need for principal involvement in decision-making at higher levels.

Question 1

It seems likely that if an agreement is reached in a collective bargaining session, and there are portions of it which seem unreasonable to the school building administrator:

- +2 (A) The superintendent or the board of education will eliminate these portions in time. The advisable reaction is to remain calm and intrust negotiations to them.
- +3 (B) The superintendent or the board of education will manage to eliminate these portions in time. The best policy is to make them aware of the problems the agreement might cause so that they may better understand the situation.

⁵³Grieder, loc. cit.

⁵⁴Carr, loc. cit.

⁵⁵Epstein, loc. cit.

⁵⁶Cunningham, loc. cit.

| By-pass? Alignment? | No Sup. | No Teachers | Yes Sup. | Yes Teachers | No Neither | |
|------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Ques. 1 (ESL) | 8 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 1 | =22 |
| (Jol) | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | =17 |
| Ques. 4 (ESL) | 8 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | =20 |
| (Jol) | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | =17 |
| Ques. 5 (ESL) | 8 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 | =20 |
| (Jol) | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | =11 |

East Saint Louis Total responses for items weighted three and four are 62 or 80%.

Joliet Total responses for items weighted three and four are 45 or 68%.

Percentages are based upon 78 possible choices for East Saint Louis (26 questionnaires x 3 questions) and upon 66 possible choices for Joliet (22 questionnaires x 3 questions).

+4 (C) The superintendent or the board of education will probably not be able to retract concessions once they are made. Therefore it is wise for principals to make their concern known before any agreements are reached.

+1 (D) The superintendent or the board of education know what is reasonable and will not permit unreasonable concessions to be made.

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| E.S.L. | (2) 7.71% | (1) 3.84% | (1) 3.84% | (7) 26.92% | (15) 57.69% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (1) 4.55% | (4) 18.18% | 0 | (9) 40.91% | (8) 36.36% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

In question one, there was no marked disparity of answers between the two cities. In both cases, more than 75% of the respondents feel that it is not enough to stand by, waiting for developments to occur during collective bargaining sessions.

They realize that it is necessary to make their positions on various issues known before the agreements are reached. The principals must be aware that the possibilities for future revisions are negligible. This attitude seems to be justified in light of the experience of the contributors to professional journals.

Question 4

Principals: (when negotiations are being conducted with a teachers' group)

- +4 (A) Should have a representative at the collective bargaining table.
- +3 (B) Probably do not have the training to be included in the collective bargaining procedure but should be asked for suggestions on the issues to be decided.
- +2 (C) Should be notified of what transpires at the bargaining table as it occurs and the final results.
- +1 (D) Should be notified of the final results of a collective bargaining session only.

| | | | | | |
|--------|---|-----------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| E.S.L. | 0 | (2) 7.69% | (4) 15.39% | (2) 7.69% | (18) 69.23% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | 0 | (2) 9.09% | (3) 13.64% | 0 | (17) 77.27% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

Everyone responded to question four indicating that they have definite opinions about the issue. Overwhelmingly they chose answer A. It is apparent that they agree as to the urgency of having a representative at the collective bargaining session when contracts are being discussed with teacher groups.

This is interesting in light of the fact that the teachers are openly opposed to such representation by the principals. There is obviously a great difference of opinion on this subject, and as such, it is a potential and continuous source of friction.

The situation of representation at the bargaining table for principals in the State of Washington presents a different facet of the same problem.

In Washington, the employee organization which wins an electoral majority apparently must represent all the certificated employees of the district below the rank of superintendent. According to the attorney general's interpretation of the statute, an organization must accept administrators as members, as well as teachers, to qualify as an 'employee organization.'

Problems have arisen in Washington as a result of the fact that many local affiliates of the Washington Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers traditionally are teacher-only organizations.⁵⁷

From literature previously cited it would seem that a statute compelling the National Education Association affiliates and the American Federation of Teachers affiliates to accept supervisory personnel into their organizations would be doomed to failure, if not legally, then emotionally. It has been repeatedly pointed out in this study that feelings about this subject are intense in both organizations, especially the Union.

It would appear from the responses of the principals questioned in Joliet and East Saint Louis that representation at

⁵⁷ Wesley A. Wildman, "What Prompts Greater Teacher Militancy?" American School Board Journal, CLIV (March, 1967), 30.

the bargaining table is desired. If granted, it would firmly entrench them in the ranks of the administration, not that of the teachers. In spite of the Washington statute, it would appear from the evidence that the principal belongs with the administration and on the negotiating team.

Question 5

In most areas where collective bargaining occurs:

+2 (A) The principal is informed of what is occurring at the bargaining session and is assured that his interests and authority are being fully considered along with those of the teachers.

+3 (B) The principal is fully informed of what is occurring at the bargaining session but feels that his interests and authority are not being fully considered when agreements are being made.

+4 (C) The principal is neither fully informed of what is occurring at the bargaining session nor are his authority or interests being fully considered when agreements are being reached.

+1 (D) The principal is represented at a bargaining session so that he is not only fully informed of what is occurring but is also taking an active part in forming the agreements.

| | | | | | |
|--------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| E.S.L. | (2) 7.70% | (1) 3.84% | (3) 11.54% | 0 | (20) 76.92% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (3) 13.63% | (7) 31.82% | (1) 4.53% | (3) 13.64% | (8) 36.36% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

In Joliet, there is an arrangement whereby representatives from the central office, the principals' group, and the teachers' group meet simultaneously to suggest improvements in the administration of the educational system. This arrangement obviously

accounts for the less dissatisfied frame of mind of the principals there and the spread of their responses.

Contrast these responses with those from East Saint Louis where such an arrangement does not exist, and where the principals are totally excluded from any participation in educational policy making. The results are quite different. Almost 77% of the principals in East Saint Louis chose C as their response.

There appears to be more concern in East Saint Louis than in Joliet about representation at the bargaining table. Even those principals who chose to unite with the teachers in most disputes expressly desired this representation.

Through the interviews conducted in East Saint Louis, it became evident that the principals are disturbed by the contract negotiated with the teachers' union on August 28, 1966. They believe that it was approved at the last moment as an expedient to avoid a strike rather than as a judicious instrument to serve well in the future. The principals particularly resent item five under article seven which states: "Within any one building room assignments and other building privileges shall be determined by building seniority only."⁵⁸

Close examination of this agreement leads to the question of competence. Age alone does not automatically instill wisdom

⁵⁸ Agreement Between the Board of Education School District 189 and the East St. Louis Federation of Teachers, Local 1220, August 28, 1966., p. 12.

in coping with certain situations. Training and temperament are factors to be considered also. The principals are finding it difficult to abide by the concept of seniority rather than merit in position placement. This situation of seniority is one example of the type of problems which could be avoided if principals had a voice in negotiations, directly or indirectly.

Hypothesis II

The principals feel that their administrative prerogatives are being divested from them and this situation is leading to a deterioration in rapport between them and their teachers.

Questions eight, thirteen, and fourteen pertain to this hypothesis. These three questions explore the principals' attitudes toward, (1) teacher grievances, (2) supervision of teachers, and (3) strike issues.

There were differences of opinion about what constituted the main objectives of teacher to the administration of a school. The four problems which appear to cause the most dissension are, (1) representation on decision-making groups, (2) physical facilities and education equipment, (3) use of teachers for other duties during their free periods, and (4) class size and student discipline. The range of grievances alone complicates the administration of a school and is likely to cause feelings of insecurity in many principals. Some of the items such as class size and physical facilities can only be remedied through the action of the board of education and through higher

supervisory personnel. The other complaints can be remedied with varying degrees of success if the principal is willing to involve the teachers in problem-solving sessions. When the staff participates in suggesting solutions and has the opportunity to evaluate all the ramifications of a problem, they are much more likely to be satisfied with the end results.

Benjamin Epstein states:

The National Association of Secondary School Principals believes that teachers, through their representative organizations, should be involved in formulating policy for dealing with educational matters. On the other hand, discussions and decisions on purely professional problems cannot be considered in the atmosphere characteristic of the bargaining table. It is proposed that such considerations take place in an atmosphere of colleagues working together as a professional team. There should be an establishment of formal councils made up of representatives chosen by teachers, principals, and supervisors. The councils meet regularly and effect changes and improvements in any and all phases of the life of the schools.⁵⁹

On the national level,

...in detailed agreements that have been negotiated to date, salaries, grievance procedures, and sick leave are the subjects most often dealt with. Others were sabbatical leaves, transfer and assignment policy, after-school assignments, the school calendar, insurance, dismissal policy, organization of classes, length of the school day, and services and facilities. Most of the more professional matters, such as the structure of in-service programs, instruction and curriculum, and the health and safety of children, in general have not yet become the subjects of written bilateral agreements.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Epstein, loc. cit., p. 11.

⁶⁰ Wildman, loc. cit., p. 28.

It has been mentioned that building level councils made up of the principal and the educational staff would help prevent further deterioration of the relationship between the administrator and his teachers. It can also be assumed from the survey by Wesley Wildman of the University of Chicago, as quoted above, that the list of possible teacher grievances is likely to expand. Principals who are aware of this trend and prepare for it are the ones who will be in little danger of losing their importance to the educational system.

The breakdown of the responses is represented in the table below.

| By-pass? Alignment? | No Sup. | No Teachers | Yes Sup. | Yes Teachers | No Neither | |
|------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Ques. 8 (ESL) | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | = 7 |
| (Jol) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | = 3 |
| Ques. 13 (ESL) | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | = 4 |
| (Jol) | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | = 5 |
| Ques. 14 (ESL) | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | = 9 |
| (Jol) | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | = 4 |

East Saint Louis Total responses for items weighted three and four are 20 or 26%.

Joliet Total responses for items weighted three and four are 12 or 18%.

Percentages are based upon 78 possible choices for East Saint Louis (26 questionnaires x 3 questions) and upon 66 possible choices for Joliet (22 questionnaires x 3 questions).

There seems to be a growing concern about teacher infringement upon the prerogatives of the principal but the data does not reflect the severe stress as reported in professional journals. Although East Saint Louis has had a disruptive history of teacher strikes, question thirteen indicates that most of the principals there still feel that their teachers are highly receptive to supervisory control by the principal, an attitude which was unexpected.

Question 8

In which of the following areas are teacher grievances most frequently found?

- +2 (A) Class size and student discipline.
- +4 (B) Evaluation of teacher performance and teaching methods.
- +1 (C) Use of teachers for other duties during their free periods.
- +3 (D) Room and subject assignments in a building.

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| E.S.L. | 0 | (11) 42.51% | (8) 30.77% | (4) 15.38% | (3) 11.54% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (1) 4.53% | (6) 27.27% | (12) 54.54% | 0 | (3) 13.64% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

None of the principals from Joliet chose room and subject assignments as a grievance subject among their teachers. Their predominant choice was that of class size and student discipline with duty-free periods being chosen by one-quarter of them.

In contrast, the principals of East Saint Louis reversed these results by almost the same majority. Since the number of

respondents is relatively small, it may be safe to assume that these two items might well be of equal importance to teachers. Both should be considered seriously by principals when making decisions relating to these problems. That the responses obtained here are due to local differences may be verified by referring to Mosier.⁶¹

Question 13

With the increase of teacher groups assuming the role of making decisions, principals typically find that, in supervising their teachers, there is:

- +1 (A) Greater cooperation than formerly.
- +3 (B) More difficulty than formerly.
- +4 (C) Considerably more difficulty than formerly.
- +2 (D) No appreciable difference than formerly.

| | | | | | |
|--------|---|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| E.S.L. | 0 | (18) 69.23% | (4) 15.39% | (2) 7.69% | (2) 7.69% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | 0 | (9) 40.91% | (8) 36.36% | (5) 22.73% | 0 |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

A crucial factor in the area of teacher supervision is the attitude that the staff has toward the principal, and the attitude he has toward them. The administrator must earn the respect of his teachers by being highly professional and skillful in his dealings with the staff.

⁶¹Mosier, loc. cit.

It is of importance to note that more than 83% of the principals in East Saint Louis replied that either there was no appreciable difference in the teachers' attitudes toward supervision or that the teachers' attitudes had improved. Approximately 77% of the principals in Joliet had the same experience.

Question 14

Following the trend in current years in collective bargaining, teachers will most likely go out on strike about: (assuming salary schedules are satisfactory)

- +2 (A) Physical facilities and educational equipment.
- +3 (B) Administrative assignment of teachers.
- +1 (C) Representation on decision-making groups.
- +4 (D) Principal's supervision of teachers.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----|--------|------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|-------|
| E.S.L. | (6) | 23.08% | (6) | 23.08% | (5) | 19.23% | (7) | 26.92% | (2) | 7.69% |
| | | 0 | | +1 | | +2 | | +3 | | +4 |
| Jol. | (2) | 9.09% | (12) | 54.54% | (4) | 18.18% | (3) | 13.64% | (1) | 4.55% |
| | | 0 | | +1 | | +2 | | +3 | | +4 |

Of all the questions raised this one had the highest rate of persons who did not answer, 23% in East Saint Louis and 9% in Joliet. Apparently, once the factor of salary is removed from contention, the principals assume that no one of the other factors is likely to lead to a strike more so than any other. A group of administrators in Joliet (54%) felt that, if any factor was most likely to lead to difficulty, it would be the problem of representation in decision-making groups. This response is

exactly the kind one would expect to find, according to current literature in the field.

Hypothesis III

The principals are abandoning their traditional role of alignment with the superintendent for an independent course of action.

Questions two, ten, and sixteen pertain to hypothesis three. These three questions explore the principal's attitude toward, (1) the alignment with either the superintendent or the teachers on major collective bargaining issues, (2) the support of the teachers upon the issue of salary schedules, and (3) the evaluation of the motives of the teachers' representatives.

Upon examination of the results of these three questions it will be seen that the schism of the principal from the superintendent seems to be widening. The responses of the building administrators seem to point out a definite trend toward independence of action and their determination to evaluate each issue on its own merits is an indication of this. This objective approach to collective bargaining issues is a rational one but it does show that the principals feel that neither the superintendent nor the teachers invariably act in the best interests of all the educational staff.

Principals indicated in question ten the need for their own bargaining group but were split on the need for helping teachers obtain raises in salary.

Principals recognize gratefully that in many cases where higher salaries were negotiated by teachers, principals were often the beneficiaries. Principals, however, are directly concerned with many other items that are considered during negotiations.⁶²

This interest in other negotiable items is reflected in the growing trend toward independence of action. The following quotation summarizes the concept.

Principals must remain fiercely independent. Administration no longer has a place for errand boys. Nor is there any need for men and women who simply wish to conform to the desires of the boss. Today principals must be independent of such psychological ties to a father image. They must have their own programs, their own ideas, and their own strategies for doing what needs to be done. Their decision-making cannot be controlled by the thinking of the superintendent or the possibilities of promotion. Independence of thoughts, actions, and purpose is their basic and most important asset for success.⁶³

| By-pass? Alignment? | No Sup. | No Teachers | Yes Sup. | Yes Teachers | No Neither | |
|------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Ques. 2 (ESL) | 9 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 1 | =24 |
| (Jol) | 2 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4 | =19 |
| Ques. 10 (ESL) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | = 9 |
| (Jol) | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | = 7 |
| Ques. 16 (ESL) | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | = 9 |
| (Jol) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | = 3 |

East Saint Louis Total responses for items weighted three and four are 42 or 53%.

Joliet Total responses for items weighted three and four are 29 or 44%.

Percentages are based upon 78 possible choices for East Saint Louis (26 questionnaires x 3 questions) and upon 66 possible choices for Joliet (22 questionnaires x 3 questions).

⁶² Epstein, loc. cit., p. 10.

⁶³ Donald Thomas, "End Not in Sight," Chicago Principals Club Reporter, LVII (Winter, 1967), p. 6.

There seems to be substantial agreement among the principals except upon the issue of teacher motivation. The principals in Joliet tend to be more liberal.

Question 2

In issues leading to collective bargaining, the principal:

- +2 (A) Should align with the teachers.
- +1 (B) Should align with the superintendent.
- +4 (C) Should remain withdrawn from the situation because he is not involved in the negotiations.
- +3 (D) Should be active within a principal's organization to support whatever position seems to be appropriate on a particular issue.

| | | | | | |
|--------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| E.S.L. | <u>0</u> | <u>(1) 3.84%</u> | <u>(1) 3.84%</u> | <u>(23) 88.48%</u> | <u>(1) 3.84%</u> |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | <u>(1) 4.53%</u> | <u>(1) 4.54%</u> | <u>(1) 4.53%</u> | <u>(16) 72.73%</u> | <u>(3) 13.64%</u> |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

Traditionally, the principals have been aligned with the superintendent. In the instance of question two, the principals appear to be following a definite trend toward an independence of action. A preponderant number of choices fell into position three on the progression line, indicating a willingness to take whatever stand seems appropriate on a particular issue. The principals apparently do not feel the need to follow the superintendent's example or line of thought and are prepared to oppose his collective bargaining policies if they consider that such an action is warranted. The interviews in both cities

demonstrated that the principals regard their own organizations to be strong enough to afford this freedom of action.

Question 10

In many areas the principals' salary schedule is linked to the teachers' salary schedule. In places where this is true, the principals:

+1 (A) Should belong to the same bargaining organization that the teachers do and should actively work for the teachers' salary increases.

+3 (B) Should belong to the same bargaining organization that the teachers do but should refrain from working for the teachers' salary increases.

+2 (C) Should have their own bargaining organization but should aid the teachers in obtaining salary increases.

+4 (D) Should have their own bargaining organization and should work for their own salary increases only.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----|-------|-----|-------|------|--------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
| E.S.L. | (1) | 3.84% | (1) | 3.84% | (15) | 57.69% | (1) | 3.84% | (8) | 30.77% |
| | | 0 | | +1 | | +2 | | +3 | | +4 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----|-------|-----|--------|------|-----|-----|-------|-----|--------|
| Jol. | (1) | 4.55% | (4) | 18.18% | (11) | 50% | (1) | 4.55% | (6) | 27.27% |
| | | 0 | | +1 | | +2 | | +3 | | +4 |

In both cities the principals affirm that they should have their own bargaining organization. Many indicate definite moral but not active support for teacher salary increases. It is pertinent to note that some of the principals committed themselves in principle to supporting the teachers even though the administrators would benefit materially without expending any effort. This altruistic motivation should be appreciated by their staffs.

Question 16

In many school districts teacher representatives on the building level committees seem to be:

- +1 (A) Primarily working toward improving the teaching profession and the educational climate of the school.
- +2 (B) Primarily working toward amending the working conditions of the teachers.
- +3 (C) Primarily seeking status in the faculty.
- +4 (D) Primarily aspiring toward administrative and supervisory positions in the school system.

| | | | | | |
|--------|---|------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| E.S.L. | 0 | (9) 34.63% | (8) 30.77% | (2) 7.69% | (7) 26.92% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | 0 | (7) 31.82% | (12) 54.54% | 0 | (3) 13.64% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

Contrary to current literature, the principals in East Saint Louis and especially those in Joliet apparently think that the teachers composing the building grievance groups are not primarily concerned about personal gain. Sixty-five per cent of the respondents in East Saint Louis signified that their teacher representatives are working mainly toward the amelioration of (1) the teaching profession, (2) the working conditions of the teachers, and (3) the educational climate of the school. In Joliet, the choices are even more emphatic for the same answers. Eighty-six percent of the principals selected A and B.

Hypothesis IV

The principals are employing bargaining techniques in dealing with their teachers and the teachers' demands.

Questions three, nine, and sixteen pertain to hypothesis four. These questions explore the principal's attitude toward, (1) grievance sessions, (2) his ability to resolve problems on the school level, and (3) the professionalism of his staff during periods of collective negotiations.

| By-pass? | | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | |
|------------|-------|------|----------|------|----------|---------|-----|
| Alignment? | | Sup. | Teachers | Sup. | Teachers | Neither | |
| Ques. 3 | (ESL) | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | =11 |
| | (Jol) | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | = 8 |
| Ques. 9 | (ESL) | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | = 5 |
| | (Jol) | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | = 6 |
| Ques. 15 | (ESL) | 4 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | =13 |
| | (Jol) | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | =13 |

East Saint Louis Total responses for items weighted three and four are 29 or 38%.

Joliet Total responses for items weighted three and four are 27 or 41%.

Percentages are based upon 78 possible choices for East Saint Louis (26 questionnaires x 3 questions) and upon 66 possible choices for Joliet (22 questionnaires x 3 questions).

The responses to the questions for hypothesis four which deal with approach, illustrate that less than fifty per cent of the principals anticipate supervisory difficulties with their teachers under the terms of the collective bargaining contracts. This proportion may rise in the future. According to the findings of Luvern Cunningham, the Director of the Midwest

Administration Center at the University of Chicago, the trend seems to be in the direction of frustration for the principals who must implement the agreements reached at the bargaining table.

He writes:

Principals stated that it would be more difficult for them to supervise the instructional process in individual buildings, and that the search for power among teachers was an attempt to usurp the prerogatives of the building principal, the individual who is legally responsible for the educational program.⁶⁴

Wesley Wildman further states that the failure of some principals to properly administrate their schools is due in part to their lack of knowledge in how to do so under the contract.

Do we find in education, as we have frequently found elsewhere, that in suddenly having to meet the "crisis" of collective bargaining, top administrative personnel ignore the needs and interests of middle and lower level supervision? Yes. We already have mentioned that the initial practical impact of a negotiated agreement in a school system falls most heavily on the local school principal. If representatives of this group have not had a voice in the drafting and bargaining of the contract, resentment and disaffection often follow. Problems also have arisen from the failure, when bargaining has been concluded, to train all of those with supervisory responsibility in the interpretation and principles of proper administration of the negotiated agreement.⁶⁵

In summary, the principals are not employing bargaining techniques in dealing with their teachers' demands but there

⁶⁴Cunningham, loc. cit., p.2.

⁶⁵wildman, loc. cit., p. 32.

are indications that the administrators are being cautious in their approach to grievance handling.

Question 3

When a principal enters a grievance session with a teachers' committee at the building level:

+1 (A) The best approach is to be perfectly frank about his side of the problems and to state why he is recommending a certain course of action.

+4 (B) The best approach is to listen to the committee but make no statement of his own, other than the fact that he will take the problems under consideration.

+3 (C) The best approach is to listen to the committee and make minimal concessions so that he has bargaining power in future sessions.

(D) Other

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|-------------|----|------------|------------|
| E.S.L. | (1) 3.84% | (14) 53.85% | 0 | (3) 11.54% | (8) 30.77% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (1) 4.53% | (13) 59.09% | 0 | (5) 22.73% | (3) 13.64% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

In question three, the principals were offered the opportunity to supply an original alternative to the three choices listed, but none decided to do so. Since only one person from East Saint Louis and one in Joliet did not answer the question, apparently the other three choices were considered adequate.

Approximately half of the respondents chose answer A, indicating that they regarded the frank approach as the best when dealing with teacher groups. Considering the fact that recently the teachers in both areas have engaged in intensive

collective bargaining action, one would tend to conclude that the principals still believe that the teachers are being reasonable.

Of the principals who chose the road of non-commitment, there were more than twice as many in East Saint Louis as in Joliet. This result demonstrates either the cautious approach exhibited by disillusioned administrators or the strategy most easily defended, as judged by mature men. The latter observation seems more likely because in an ensuing question, when principals are asked whether, in their opinion, their authority is being diminished and whether the teachers are better or worse now that collective bargaining has been instituted, the principals in East Saint Louis reported that, if anything, teachers were better now.

It has been mentioned previously that having the teachers participate in problem-solving is a good approach to building staff unity. If, upon these occasions, a precedent is set for thoughtful, unhurried consideration of issues, the teachers will not be adverse to giving the principal time to answer their grievances when they occur. It will not appear to be an avoidance of the issue and the principal will have the time he needs to weight the various aspects of the problem before coming to a decision.

Frankness may be the approach that the principals prefer to use in working with their teachers but indications are that

more devious approaches are now being used in collective negotiations between the boards of education and teacher groups.

Are school boards and administrations "playing the bargaining game" as management does in private industry? Are they attempting at least to make it appear in negotiations that the teachers were successful in "getting more" than they would have in the absence of negotiations and collective pressure? Are they allowing the organization to have a function at the bargaining table, so that organization leadership will not be threatened, so that teacher group expectations will be fulfilled, and strikes or serious impasse problems avoided?

A few boards have accommodated to the bargaining facts of life and learned to employ appropriate tactics; more are learning rapidly. Some administrators in particular often find it distasteful and disingenuous to "fool" the teacher bargaining team by holding something back until late in the negotiations that otherwise would have been given freely at the outset. A few boards, particularly those whose members may have had private sector industrial relations experience are proving amazingly adept in hiding even relatively large sums of money to be released for salary purposes at the "11th hour," so that the additional amount may be claimed by the teacher organization as a victory for the exercise of teacher power and the efficacy of the negotiating process.

...the necessity for boards to bargain over money matters has been handled in terms of tactics, in a variety of ways, depending upon the fiscal structure of the district, the power of the teacher organization, the board's sophistication, and numerous other factors.⁶⁶

This recent survey tends to indicate a new bargaining consciousness on the part of the boards of education. A new awareness of the ramifications of power tactics seems manifest in the

⁶⁶ Wildman, loc. cit., p. 31.

boards' actions. Perhaps this trend from frankness to circum-spection will spread to the principals in time. It will be one of the movements which should be closely observed by principals.

Question 9

School District X has a collective bargaining agreement which specifies that preferential treatment in the assignment of subjects and grades should be accorded to teachers on the basis of teaching seniority in a school. Although this provision in the contract is not mandatory, the teachers in School A feel that their principal has not given it any consideration when he made some recent assignments. They protest to him strongly through a committee of teachers.

Perhaps the best approach to the solution of this problem would be for the principal to do the following:

- +1 (A) Have a conference with the teachers and try to resolve the problem with a minimum of attention from collective bargaining officials and higher administrative school personnel.
- +4 (B) Realize that, since he has used his best judgment in setting up the assignments, it is now the function of the superintendent to reinforce his decisions.
- +3 (C) Ask for a higher administrative official to be present when he meets with the teachers' committee to resolve the issue.
- +2 (D) Contact the principals' organization for professional advice before proceeding.

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| E.S.L. | 0 | (21) 80.78% | 0 | (1) 3.84% | (4) 15.38% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (1) 4.54% | (13) 59.09% | (2) 9.09% | (2) 9.09% | (4) 18.18% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

Overshwhelmingly, the principals in East Saint Louis stated that they should solve their own problems in their schools with a minimum of attention from other officials. The principals in Joliet are not so emphatic, but they do concur.

Interviews in East Saint Louis tended to indicate strong dissatisfaction with the new contract because it gives too much power to the teachers' union. Perhaps this is the reason those principals selected choice A, showing that they wish to avoid asking for outside help.

Question 15

During intensive bargaining between the board of education and the teachers' organization, the following is most likely to occur:

+2 (A) The teachers accept administrative direction better than they usually do and their level of teaching performance is higher.

+3 (B) The teachers accept administrative direction but their level of cooperation and the quality of their teaching performance declines.

+1 (C) The teachers accept administrative direction as they usually do and their level of teaching performance is the same.

+4 (D) The teachers seem primarily concerned about the bargaining outcomes and everything else suffers as a result.

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| E.S.L. | (1) 3.85% | (8) 30.77% | (4) 15.38% | (4) 15.38% | (9) 34.62% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (1) 4.54% | (5) 22.73% | (3) 13.64% | (5) 22.73% | (8) 36.36% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

On question fifteen, the answers seem to be thoroughly scattered and no one choice seemed to have drawn a large percentage of respondents.

While interviewing a principal in Joliet, the remark was made that the reason he had chosen a certain set of responses

was because he had a group of young, militant teachers on his staff who created problems which had not existed previously. He could only judge by their examples. If the scattering of answers is taken with this comment in mind, apparently each school presents a unique picture, and therefore a consensus of opinion is difficult to obtain.

Hypothesis V

The principals will indicate a need for specialized training in bargaining techniques as a background for themselves and for future administrators.

Questions seven, eleven, and seventeen pertain to this hypothesis. These three questions explore the principals' attitudes toward, (1) time-consuming grievance sessions, (2) specialized training for principals, and (3) teacher spokesmen.

Both groups of principals agree that much of the leadership in the teachers' groups is supplied by young men. It is indicated that an understanding of psychology and group dynamics is more valuable in working with these men than bargaining techniques would be. A planned, firm approach is indicated as desirable when working in grievance sessions with these teachers.

| By-pass? Alignment? | No Sup. | No Teachers | Yes Sup. | Yes Teachers | No Neither | |
|------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Ques. 7 (ESL) | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | =13 |
| (Jol) | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | =10 |
| Ques. 11 (ESL) | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | = 7 |
| (Jol) | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | = 6 |
| Ques. 17 (ESL) | 8 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 1 | =22 |
| (Jol) | 2 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | =17 |

East Saint Louis Total responses for items weighted three and four are 42 or 54%.

Joliet Total responses for items weighted three and four are 44 or 68%.

Percentages are based upon 78 possible choices for East Saint Louis (26 questionnaires x 3 questions) and upon 66 possible choices for Joliet (22 questionnaires x 3 questions).

Question 7

Principal X just emerged from a session with the grievance committee on the subject of student discipline. The chairman of the building level grievance committee feels that the rights of the teachers are not being considered and that further sessions are in order.

At this point Principal X probably feels:

+1 (A) Satisfied with the outcome because it is what he expected. He had plans for further meetings which will be more productive.

+2 (B) Uneasy about the outcome because too many concessions will be required.

+4 (C) Frustrated by the outcome because the teachers are being unreasonable. Their demands will reduce the principal to little more than a bookkeeper.

+3 (D) Certain that he has done everything to settle the situation reasonably and that the next step is to involve other officials in solving the problem.

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| E.S.L. | (1) 3.85% | (11) 42.31% | (1) 3.84% | (11) 42.31% | (2) 7.69% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (1) 4.55% | (10) 45.45% | (1) 4.55% | (10) 45.45% | 0 |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

This hypothetical question was presented to the principals to ascertain their emotional set to a frustrating situation. From the results it may be assumed that the principals do not hope to accomplish their aims too easily. Building administrators expect to hold a series of meetings to resolve problems but once they have made every effort to do so, they are not adverse to involving other officials in the situation.

Question 11

A principal who is about to enter a building level grievance session with a committee of teachers would find a background of one of these subject areas the most important. Which one?

- +4 (A) Labor relations courses.
- +1 (B) Group dynamics courses.
- +3 (C) Administration and supervision courses.
- +2 (D) Psychology courses.

| | | | | | |
|--------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| E.S.L. | (4) 15.38% | (11) 42.31% | (4) 15.38% | (3) 11.54% | (4) 15.38% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (1) 4.54% | (13) 59.09% | (2) 9.09% | (1) 4.54% | (5) 22.73% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

While a few of the principals in both groups thought that labor relations courses would be of some worth in the training background of principals, a greater number of them seem to consider group dynamics courses to be most invaluable. When the responses for both groups are totaled, the results show that the majority of principals believe that the most important assets are the knowledge and understanding of how people act as individuals and as members of a group. Principals think they can best work with teachers in grievance committee sessions with such training.

Question 17

A principal just assigned to a school is likely to find one of these groups most aware of the trends in collective bargaining and most active in them. Which?

- +2 (A) Young single women (20-35).
 +3 (B) Young single men (20-35).
 +4 (C) Young married men and women (20-35).
 +1 (D) Middle-aged men and women.

E.S.L. (1) 3.86% (2) 7.69% (1) 3.84% (5) 19.23% (17) 65.38%
 0 +1 +2 +3 +4

Jol. 0 (4) 18.18% (4) 4.55% (3) 13.64% (14) 63.63%
 0 +1 +2 +3 +4

One of the suppositions of this study is that it is the young married men and women who have been the moving force behind the greater push of the teaching force to obtain

increased salary and working conditions benefits. The percentage of responses in the weight four category seems to confirm that while they are not the only ones working strongly for these things, they do constitute a large group of individuals who do so.

Hypothesis VI

Principals feel that their role is most likely to diminish greatly in the future due to collective bargaining and the increased militancy of their teachers.

Questions six, twelve, and eighteen pertain to this hypothesis. These three questions explore the principals' attitudes toward, (1) the changing role of the building administrator, (2) the authority of the building administrator, and (3) the future importance of the building administrator.

Examination of the responses of the principals leaves little doubt that they feel it is their role which is being diminished through the teachers' search for power. While some of this is unavoidable, the loss of authority can be kept to a minimum. Two possible methods for doing so are mentioned in the article by Donald Thomas.

Problems occur at the building level and are usually solved there. The principal must insist that problems brought to the attention of the superintendent be referred back to the building. It is there that the problems must be solved. The authority of the principal should not be undermined at any time. It is better to fire a principal than to solve his problems at Central. Central usually has more problems than it can effectively handle anyway. The solution of

problems at the building level strengthens the position of the principal. Each problem solved by the building principal saves the superintendent's time, so that he can carry out his own duties more effectively.

Principals must project themselves into the decision-making process. Principals cannot wait to be consulted or communicated with. They must initiate communications themselves, and they must become knowledgeable about what is happening, so that they will be in a position to influence decision-making. Principals must become aggressive in making their ideas known and in projecting their influence prior to decisions being made. Second-guessing is of little value to any organization.⁶⁷

| By-pass? Alignment? | No Sup. | No Teachers | Yes Sup. | Yes Teachers | No Neither | |
|------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|------|
| Ques. 6 (ESL) | 7 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | = 16 |
| (Jol) | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | = 15 |
| Ques. 12 (ESL) | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | = 8 |
| (Jol) | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | = 10 |
| Ques. 18 (ESL) | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | = 5 |
| (Jol) | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | = 6 |

East Saint Louis Total responses for items weighted three and four are 29 or 37%.

Joliet Total responses for items weighted three and four are 31 or 47%.

Percentages are based upon 78 possible choices for East Saint Louis (26 questionnaires 2 3 questions) and upon 66 possible choices for Joliet (22 questionnaires x 3 questions).

There is much agreement between the two groups that the future importance of principals rests in their own hands, even

⁶⁷Thomas, loc. cit., p. 5.

though their duties may be redefined through collective bargaining. The principal who withstands the realignment of power will be the one who has won the respect of his teachers through skillful group dynamics and cooperation. It will not be the one who draws his authority from his office alone.

Question 6

Generally speaking, the role most likely to be diminished in the future through the process of collective bargaining is that of the:

- +2 (A) General Superintendent.
- +3 (B) Board of Education.
- +4 (C) School Building Administrator.
- +1 (D) Classroom Teacher

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| E.S.L. | (1) 3.84% | (3) 11.54% | (6) 23.08% | (5) 19.23% | (11) 42.31% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | (1) 4.53% | 0 | (6) 27.27% | (3) 13.64% | (12) 54.54% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

Approximately half of the principals in both cities indicated that if any role is being diminished, their role is the most likely one. This corresponds with the situation in industry where the authority of middle-management personnel is being reduced.

Exactly six principals in each group felt that the superintendent is losing ground. Possibly this response indicates that they feel sufficiently secure about remaining in a position

of authority, even after the superintendent's role is redefined.

The majority of the principals in both cases has indicated that they expect the role of the teacher to be a more powerful one in the future. Three of the group in East Saint Louis imply that teachers lose the respect of the community when they resort to pressure tactics, and this loss of prestige offsets some of the fiscal gains the teachers make.

Question 12

In most areas where collective bargaining occurs:

- +2 (A) Principals retain the necessary authority as well as the responsibility of administering a school.
- +3 (B) Principals retain the responsibility of administering a school but lose some of the authority.
- +4 (C) Principals retain the responsibility of administering a school but have their authority diminished to the point of not being able to administer the school properly.
- +1 (D) Principals retain the necessary authority and responsibility in administering a school and, in addition, find their staff doing a better job because they are now more aware of the problems the principal faces.

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| E.S.L. | (1) 3.86% | (13) 50% | (4) 15.38% | (7) 26.92% | (1) 3.86% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| <hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/> | | | | | |
| Jol. | 0 | (9) 40.90% | (3) 13.65% | (9) 40.90% | (1) 4.55% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

Forty percent of the principals in Joliet feel that they have lost no authority and that their teachers are working

better than ever since collective bargaining. Another forty per cent indicate that they have lost some authority but that this minor loss is not a serious problem. Only one individual feels that his role is so diminished that he cannot administer his school properly. Similarly, one principal in East Saint Louis points out that he, too, incurs a substantial loss in standing. Half of the other principals think that conditions are better when collective bargaining is introduced.

Question 18

If a principal is to be an important part of the educational staff of the future, which of the following courses of action is most important?

- +4 (A) The principals' authority in collective bargaining agreements must not be signed away by the board of education.
- +3 (B) The principals must organize their own organization to insure that their interests are protected.
- +1 (C) The principal must be more an originator and stimulator of educational progress and less a mere signer of papers.
- +2 (D) The principal should keep abreast of teachers' demands and, by judicious planning, prevent major eruptions from occurring.

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| E.S.L. | (1) 3.86% | (13) 50% | (7) 26.92% | (4) 15.38% | (1) 3.84% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Jol. | 0 | (11) 50% | (5) 22.73% | (5) 22.73% | (1) 4.54% |
| | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |

Envisioning the future, one may regard question eighteen as one of the most important queries in the study. From the

results obtained through the questionnaire, it appears that they must be progressive and inventive in meeting the educational needs in their schools. They also must be aware of the teachers' needs so as to meet them whenever possible. It is significant that both these responses place the responsibility primarily upon the principals themselves.

Question 19

Should teachers have the prerogative of by-passing the principal in disputes and going to the central staff in the principal is not directly involved in the issue?

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| A. Yes | East Saint Louis | 15.38% | Joliet | 31.82% |
| B. No | East Saint Louis | 80.76% | Joliet | 68.18% |
| Undecided | East Saint Louis | 3.86% | Joliet | 0.00% |

It is obvious that the majority of the principals in both areas agree that teachers should not by-pass their principals and appeal to the central staff. As one principal wrote in his questionnaire, "Everything which occurs in the school directly involves the principal."

Question 20

A principal should be more closely aligned in most issues with the:

| | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| A. Superintendent | East Saint Louis | 53.85% | Joliet | 15.38% |
| B. Teachers | East Saint Louis | 42.32% | Joliet | 50.00% |
| Undecided | East Saint Louis | 3.83% | Joliet | 34.62% |

In this matter--with whom should the principals align themselves on most issues--the principals in East Saint Louis seem almost equally divided. A little over half favored the superintendent, although this majority is more theoretical than real, as has been pointed out earlier.

In Joliet, only 15% decided in favor of the superintendent, 50% favored the teachers, and a large 34% are uncommitted. These percentages may indicate that Joliet is in a greater state of flux about alignment than is East Saint Louis. A subsequent study would be significant to indicate in which category this uncommitted group would align.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Tentative conclusions can be drawn upon the basis of information drawn from professional literature and the results obtained through the responses of the principals to the questionnaire. These conclusions can indicate only the possible trends in professional thinking and, because of several factors, cannot be treated as discrete data.

The first limitation is that, since collective bargaining is such a new facet in the field of education, the amount of experience that educators have had with it has been minimal compared to their experience with financial and staffing problems. The areas most experienced with collective bargaining are the larger cities and their surrounding suburbs. Even in these locales aggressive action by teachers has, at the most, been a decade in duration. The city of Chicago, despite its size and advantages for unionizing activities, has experienced a negotiations contract with the Chicago Teachers Union only since 1966.

The second limitation has been the size of the study sampling. The total responses of forty-eight principals cannot be considered extensive and indicative of the feelings of

administrators across the nation but they can suggest the trends of such thinking. East Saint Louis and Joliet have both experienced the process of collective negotiations as long as, or longer than, the average city so both groups of principals know the problems which can arise.

Hypothesis I

The role of the principalship is now being diminished because this middle level of administration is not represented at the bargaining table when agreements are reached between the teacher groups and the board of education.

In the light of the accumulated data this hypothesis can be accepted. It assumes that principals feel their authority is being threatened because of concessions by the board of education and/or the superintendent on the one hand and by the increased militancy of the teachers on the other. The results of the questionnaire and the contents of professional literature tend to support this hypothesis.

The greatest concern was about voicing objections to concessions before the higher administrative authorities make them. The difficulty here lies in the fact that principals are neither informed about what issues are discussed and accepted.

At the forty-ninth Annual Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, it was affirmed:

Because state laws, court decisions, state board of education regulations...and local board rules all assign special and unique duties to principals and because almost every item which may be

reviewed at negotiations may and will touch upon the responsibilities of the principal and his authority to fulfill his responsibilities, representatives delegated by principals' organizations must be integral participants in the negotiation process at all times...it means active and full membership at the discussions...it involves the right to agree, to disagree, and to offer substitute proposals.⁶⁸

According to all the literature previously cited, this ideal situation for principals is obviously nonexistent. The questionnaire shows that principals want at least to be able to attend some stage of the negotiative process.

Another author states:

In small school districts where principals are few in number, they should be active members of the administrative team involved in negotiations. In larger communities, principals may find it both necessary and effective to organize strong negotiating units of their own or, cooperatively, with other administrators and supervisors. In every case of negotiations between a school board and its teachers, every group whose basic duties and status may be affected by the outcomes of the negotiations has an inherent right to participate in the process.⁶⁹

It should be noted at this point that not only the role of the principal but also that of the superintendent⁷⁰ and the board of education are changing.⁷¹ The relative autonomy that

⁶⁸ NASSP Bulletin-49th Annual Convention, II (March, 1965),
p. 255.

⁶⁹ Epstein, loc. cit., p. 10.

⁷⁰ Turnbough, loc. cit., p. 134.

⁷¹ Becker, loc. cit., p. 57.

they possessed has been definitely circumscribed through the process of collective bargaining. As a result, they must adjust to their altered roles.⁷²

Gene Geisert, superintendent of schools in Alpena, Michigan writes:

The traditional associations among the superintendent, teachers, and boards no longer have meaning in those states where collective negotiations have legal sanction. New associations are developing. Traditional roles tend to become tinged with emotional appeals. What is needed is less emotionalism and more rational, logically reasoned approaches to these changing times.⁷³

As has been reiterated, everyone's role in education is changing; however, the principal's role is still unique. Although he has no voice in the changes, he is still faced with the necessity of carrying out the practical aspects of the agreements between teachers and higher officials.

Hypothesis II

The principals feel that their administrative prerogatives are being divested from them and this situation is leading to a deterioration in rapport between them and their teachers.

The data tends to disprove this hypothesis. Strong antipathy between the principals and the teachers was not manifest. There was a wide scattering of opinions about what principals

⁷²Robert Doherty, "Letter to a School Board," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (February, 1967), 272.

⁷³Gene Geisert, "Mr. Nobody," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (December, 1966), 159.

thought the teachers wanted most beyond adequate salaries. Class size, discipline, and representation on decision-making bodies were thought to be very important items. On a smaller scale, making teachers a part of the total effort in planning and executing the educational program could form a sound basis for providing a closer interchange of ideas and in averting conditions which might lead to strikes. The ability to work with teachers in such a manner should be a vital consideration in the appointment of future principals.

The most encouraging response was that of the degree of cooperation that principals found with their teaching staffs. Fully three-quarters of the respondents admitted that, despite their other troubles, their teachers were still accepting professional instructional supervision as well as or better than they had before collective bargaining action had been instituted.

This friendly attitude toward the teaching staff is not what the professional literature would lead one to suspect. From an interview with an anonymous board member who had just undergone rigorous negotiations sessions, the following statement was quoted in a professional periodical:

On balance, until this year, I'd say our administrators really leaned toward the teachers' point of view. But we've had a big change during the last year. Once the teachers got money and salary schedules, they were chopping away directly at the administrators' prerogatives.⁷⁴

⁷⁴"Negotiating with Teachers," School Management, X (June, 1966), 80.

John H. Langer, currently an assistant professor at Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan, and formerly a principal of the Masonic Heights Elementary School, Saint Clair Shores, Michigan, expresses many of the same reservations about teacher militancy in an article written for Phi Delta Kappan. He says:

The principals themselves appear to be confused and concerned about the role allotted them. In their publications and meetings, at least in Michigan, there is a recurring concern about how the new negotiation procedures affect the principal. Most legal rulings and interpretations place the principal with management; they allow him to organize but do not require the board to recognize his organization or to bargain with it. The real problem is the same one it has always been: which side to choose. In the past, the wise principal antagonized no one intentionally; he worked with his staff on a democratic basis, knowing that he was incapable of getting the best work from them by decree. Now he is placed in the position of having to enforce contract provisions while attempting to evoke enthusiasm for free and creative teaching.⁷⁵

Hypothesis III

The principals are abandoning their traditional role of alignment with the superintendent for an independent course of action.

The third hypothesis involves representation and on the basis of the data, it is being accepted. Almost unanimously, the principals want their representatives to attend collective bargaining sessions between the board and the teachers' group, or they, themselves, want to be able to voice some opinions

⁷⁵Langer, loc. cit.

about the possible outcomes of the issues being negotiated. Almost half of the principals feel that their negotiating representatives should be free from an independent principals' organization. Its function would be to protect the interests of the principals and also to help the teachers obtain justifiable requests, such as reasonable salary increases.

In negotiations over such issues as those discussed currently over collective bargaining tables, the views of teachers as to what is right and just have conflicted with the administration's desire to exercise its traditional unilateral responsibility to staff and assign, and, in general, to administer the educational enterprise. We have found that in schools, just as in industry, bargaining on these matters has in some instances on the management side substituted centralized decision making for decentralized. It is school principals who have lost significant discretion in the process; as a result, in some systems they are undertaking to organize themselves in order to secure a stronger voice in the new decision-making processes of collective bargaining.⁷⁶

It has repeatedly been pointed out from a variety of sources that it is best for administrators to organize their own groups and not depend upon the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers for support. This point is brought out again and again from diverse groups. On Friday, September 23, 1966, the Michigan Labor Mediation Board ordered that the Board of Education and all administrative officials cease and desist from:

⁷⁶Wildman, loc. cit., p. 29.

Interfering with the administration of the Grand Rapids Education Association by participating through their superiors and executives in such Grand Rapids Education Association activities as elections, holding office, attending internal business and/or labor relations meetings of the Grand Rapids Education Association and engaging in any other activity on behalf of the Association.⁷⁷

The effect of this order is to nullify the memberships of administrators in the Association.

From another source the same point of view is accepted.

The Michigan Association of School Administrators has recognized the impossibility of attempting to sit on both sides of the bargaining table at the same time and has taken appropriate action at the Association level. At their annual fall meeting, the organization voted to eliminate membership in the Michigan Education Association as a prerequisite for membership in the Michigan Association of School Administrators. Thus, they have taken the first step toward the establishment of a completely independent organization.

Although the preceding action affects superintendents, rather than principals, the same trend is occurring on the principal's level, as has been previously noted. It appears that the future trend is that of separate groups representing different levels of administrative interests.

77

Geisert, loc. cit.

Hypothesis IV

The principals are employing bargaining techniques in dealing with their teachers and the teachers' demands.

This hypothesis deals with approach. The results do not support the original statement that the best approach in dealing with teachers is that of circumspection. Despite the cardinal principle of negotiations which says that it is unwise to take a definite suggestion the first time an issue is to be discussed, half of the principals chose to be frank about their position when working with a teachers' grievance group on the building level. Perhaps these principals feel that, because of their closer association with the personnel in their building, this approach is more likely to result in settling an issue in a quick and sensible manner. The fact that the other half of the principals did not agree with this procedure would lead one to suspect that they do not have a sense of security in their positions either because of their personal relationship with the teachers or because of the type of teachers with whom they must deal. Only an in-depth study of one school at a time would reveal which of the two theories is correct. A follow-up technique would be to have the principals fill out the same questionnaire in a year's time to see whether there is an increase in the responses of one group or the other. From professional literature thus far reviewed, the tendency seems to

be away from frank conferences with the teachers toward a more restrictive bargaining atmosphere.

There was a wide scattering of responses in regard to the teachers' attitudes toward administrative direction. At this time, the principals agree that they should solve the school problems with a minimum of attention from their supervisors. This is probably a wise course of action, since their ability as principals will be judged mainly on the basis of their ability to organize, supervise, and maintain harmonious schools. This harmony, in turn, can be achieved only through good communication.

It will be possible for the elementary principal to be an effective agent for change and progress only if effective communication between administration and teachers is maintained. Communication breakdown, it would seem, is the greatest danger in the new developments in teacher-board-administration relationships. The best administrators have always tried to develop a rapport with teachers based not upon authority and regulation but upon cooperation and mutual concern for the objectives toward which they both work, the education of children.⁷⁸

Hypothesis V

The principals will indicate a need for specialized training in bargaining techniques as a background for themselves and for future administrators.

The fifth hypothesis involved the competencies which principals thought they had or should have in dealing with teachers.

⁷⁸ John H. Langer, "The Emerging Elementary Principalship in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan, (December, 1966), p. 161.

It was assumed that they would not consider themselves properly prepared unless they had had courses in labor management. While there were some principals who agreed, most did not and so the hypothesis is being rejected. Although the principals admitted that some of the militant young men on their staffs were difficult to handle at times, the use of formal bargaining tactics was inappropriate. Further elaboration upon this hypothesis did bear out that it was necessary to use discretion and to be firm when working in a grievance session with teachers. It may be that in the future the principals may have to resort to formalized procedures but at this point they do not wish to do so.

Principals strongly agree that the most militant of the teachers are the young married men and women who have the least to lose and the most to gain by expressing their opinions and demands but point out that they are people who can be reached through the use of reason. This conclusion is the basis for the principals choosing courses in group dynamics and psychology as important tools rather than labor management courses.

Hypothesis VI

Principals feel that their role is most likely to diminish greatly in the future due to collective bargaining and the increased militancy of their teachers.

The sixth hypothesis involved a look into the future. The assumption was that the principals would consider their role to be deteriorating. The results point in this direction. Over

half of the principals in both cities indicated this to be true. At this time the administrators feel that they have adequate authority to manage their schools properly and they still feel that they can work with their teachers on a professional level. From the few principals who indicated otherwise, it may be that this situation could change sharply in the future.

For the principal who tries to cope with the problem of teacher militancy by placating the leaders, Doherty says:

There is nothing in the grievance process that by itself threatens the right of a principal to run his school as the law, the board, and his own good judgment says it should be run. When it comes down to actual cases, however, the authority of the principal can be threatened. The reasons for this are not difficult to understand. Principals do not like formal grievances; they reflect upon his ability as an administrator and they take up a great deal of his time, particularly when they are appealed to higher steps. If he loses the grievance he must worry about the reaction from board headquarters and how to save face before his teachers; if he wins he stands the chance of alienating a large number of his faculty, thereby reducing his chance of getting their cooperation on other educational ventures. There is a strong tendency, then, for the principal to knuckle under a complaint that becomes a grievance--to give that plum of a non-teaching assignment to the outspoken union or association bigwig who has all the paper qualifications but no talent for the job. That way he saves time, the people down at headquarters won't hear about it, the teacher organization won't get upset with him, and maybe he thinks he has built up a little capital that he can spend later.⁷⁹

Such rationalizations can diminish the future role of the more effectively than can the process of collective bargaining by itself.

⁷⁹Doherty, loc. cit., p. 274.

Recommendations

An analysis of the results of the questionnaire tends to show definite concern by the principals about various aspects of the issue of collective bargaining. The degree of concern varies with the specific ramifications of the problem and with the geographical area tested. When there were striking differences of opinion, the group from East Saint Louis tended to be more unsure of the future and to lean toward changes in the traditional pattern of responses. On the whole, however, the two groups showed definite concurrence of opinion on major issues.

Suggestion I

The lines of communication between the principals and their administrative superiors must not only be kept open but must be strengthened. Principals must be made to feel that their opinions and experiences are invaluable to the superintendent before, during, and after teacher negotiations.

Higher supervisory personnel must reconsider their relationships with the principals under their direction. The deterioration of these relationships can be halted and reversed, if the principals are accorded respect for their opinions on policies affecting their schools. This resource pool of enlightened opinion cannot forever be ignored, not if principal morale is to remain high.

As Arnold Wolpert, Director of Urban Services, National Education Association says:

The day when the superintendent was the oracle has long since passed. Today the wisest decisions will be made on the basis of the involvement of the maximum number of the professional staff in a due process situation with the responsible representatives of the public.⁸⁰

Wesley Wildman, directing the University of Chicago's Study of Collective Action by Public School Teachers writes:

If a person of authority in an organization sees a dilution of that authority imminent as the inevitable result of a process...his effectiveness and leadership potential within the organization are likely to be diminished; if, on the other hand, the administrator, despite the necessity to share through bargaining some measure of previously unilaterally exercised authority, is ultimately responsible for representing his and the organization's interests and plays an indispensable role with the negotiating mechanism...his status and functional potential within the organization are more likely to be enhanced than eroded.⁸¹

Suggestion II

In the appointment of principals, their ability to work with others is becoming a crucial factor, more so now than ever before. It is recommended that this role concept be stressed with future administrators during their period of training and given high priority when evaluating the administrative potential of a candidate.

Lavern Cunningham, formerly director of the Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago, says:

⁸⁰ "Collective Bargaining vs. Professional Negotiations," School Management, IX (November, 1965), 75.

⁸¹ Wesley Wildman, "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (December, 1964), 155.

Since genuine participation of the principal in teacher negotiations themselves seems an unlikely prospect, it will be the individual building principal who has kept his fences mended in the important area of principal-staff interaction and thus has won the respect of his teachers who will ultimately prevail. The administrator, who has drawn his authority from the nature of his office rather than from personal and professional sources, will not survive the change in the authority structure.⁸²

Suggestion III

Courses dealing with the successful handling of groups and individuals should be part of every administrator's background.

While administrative detail and clerical work are increasing astronomically, especially since the influence of the federal government in the field of education, the need for closer communication between the principal and his teachers becomes more imperative. It would seem reasonable, therefore, to assume that aides should be available in each school building. The aides could help teachers with non-teaching duties. They could also relieve the principal of some of his repetitive clerical duties so that he could spend his time with the teachers and the educational program. For this is where he belongs and where he can utilize the skills acquired in the group dynamics and psychology courses.

Dr. Bernard Donovan, Superintendent of New York City schools, says:

⁸²Cunningham, loc. cit., p. 9.

I firmly believe, on the side of management that educational leadership is necessary. Good supervisors and good administrators, who once were classroom teachers, are needed in the schools. I don't think that we can just ignore them and make them clerks in the organization.⁸³

If principals are to be more than just clerks, they must have the managerial techniques in their educational and experiential backgrounds that will enable them to work with people effectively. Courses such as those mentioned could be of immeasurable value.

Suggestion IV

It is recommended that principals join their own group to protect their interests and to endow the educational policies of their schools through informed public opinion.

In the National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin of the Forty-ninth Convention it was suggested:

Perhaps principals and administrators may find it a more effective procedure to provide for their own welfare in their respective school districts if they speak on their own behalf rather than relying for representation on organizations which concentrate primarily on solving the problems of primary concern to teachers. Moreover as important as their welfare is, even more important is the possibility that, in speaking as a distinct group, they can be more effective in advancing the educational growth of the young people in their charge, in maintaining the respect of the teachers whom they supervise, and in protecting their schools from practices which may produce substantial harm.⁸⁴

⁸³"Collective Bargaining vs. Professional Negotiations," School Management, XI (November, 1965), 71.

⁸⁴NASSP Bulletin, loc. cit., p. 250.

Suggestion V

It is recommended that there be an inclusion of the principals' representatives in some pre-negotiation work committees if not at the bargaining table itself to help prepare the counter-proposals to the teachers' demands.

The representation on such a committee would solve many problems currently troubling administrators. It would satisfy the teachers' organization because no principal would actually be a part of the negotiating team. It would satisfy the principals because they would have had a voice in the final decisions, and, if communication lines were kept open between the superintendent's office and the principals, they would know that their interests were being considered. It would be an accepted fact that concessions would have to be made which would deviate from the pre-negotiations goals, but the deviations would not be so extreme that they would cause anxiety.

Suggestion VI

It is recommended that the principal's organization consider forming a problems committee which could be available to offer counsel to a perplexed principal. It could also serve an inservice function by pooling the resources and skills of the group for the benefit of a member.

People can learn very effectively through each others' successes and failures, and such information would be a great asset to the profession as a whole. A committee within the organization would be in a valuable position to render this service.

Suggestions for Further Study

Because the field of collective bargaining in education is only beginning to develop, many questions remain unanswered. These questions suggest possibilities for further research.

What prerogatives do principals hold most dear? Since concessions must be made at the bargaining table, which are most likely to alienate principals from the rest of the educational staff? This is one area in which the principals must be vocal and make their needs and professional opinions known. It does little good to wait for developments to occur and then bemoan the outcomes.

How profound has the movement been in the National Education Association to push administrators into separate categories instead of recognizing general membership in the organization? To what extent is the organization willing to compete with the American Federation of Teachers for members in the teaching profession. Indications are that competition is fierce now and will continue to be so in the future. There is even an indication that some members of both organizations are considering a merger to eliminate the fierce competition for membership. How strong this movement might become is a matter for conjecture.

Occasionally hints were dropped at the collective negotiations institutes by leaders of both factions indicating that some kind of National Education Association-American Federation of Teacher rapprochement is in the offing. At one point, Myron Lieberman

(institute co-director at Berkeley and Cambridge) remarked, "Every day that the National Education Association postpones a merger deal the price goes up." We are not so sure. In the forty states that do not yet have statutes regulating collective negotiations for public employees, National Education Association affiliates are likely to dominate. As in California, where the powerful California Teachers Association guided the essentially anti-union Winton bill into law, the state association will use their better organization to good effect.⁸⁵

As more and more cities are confronted with teacher strikes, will the public, through their legislators, demand legislation to restrict the actions of the teachers? Will the increased educational budgets lead to better teaching and more pupil progress? Will the citizens vote for larger educational budgets?

The solution to the problem of militant teacher demands does not lie solely, or even primarily, with the superintendent's agility or the board's magnanimity. It is directly related to an even more basic and frustrating issue faced by school administrators--school financing and the increasingly reluctant, often angry, taxpayer.

The action (or reaction) of voters in Southern California during the past year (1967) to fiscal elections is only a slight exaggeration of what is happening in many parts of the nation. There, taxpayers turned down 29 out of 54 tax increase proposals, 30 out of 59 bond issues and half of all state loan proposals (some of these would not have required additional taxes).⁸⁶

⁸⁵"Four Phi Delta Kappan Institutes," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (October, 1967), 65.

⁸⁶"Negotiation," School Management, 11 (June, 1967), 81.

One fact stands out among all these questions. There are those in education who profess a diminishing role for principals. It is true that the confrontations with modern issues have exposed the weaknesses and inability to deal with large problems of some administrators. This, however, is a reduction of particular principals in a particular situation, it is not a reduction of the principalship. The issues, the challenges have created a need for a new type of principal. He must be a more capable person, a man who can stand up for what is right, a man who can influence those around him for the good of education and a man who can exhibit true leadership. This sort of professional administrator can not only survive militant teachers and collective negotiations but can make the principalship a more indispensable position than ever.

APPENDIX I

East Saint Louis Public Schools

East Saint Louis Teachers' Local 1220 won exclusive bargaining rights in May, 1957. A strike was executed May 18, 1964 and lasted four days. The major issue was wages but there was much disagreement because of the teacher demands for pay for strike days. A pay raise was granted but a taxpayer successfully fought, through the circuit court, the issue to extend the school calendar four days for the purpose of paying striking teachers.

Another strike, now called work stoppage, occurred August 30, 1967 and lasted eight working days until September 12, 1967. The issues were wage increases and working demands. No wage increase was granted, the issue was put into a non-binding fact finding committee, and the issue became finally a preservation of the existing contract. The teachers were also granted a concession of making up working days lost and thus being paid.

A strikethreat was narrowly averted in September of 1966 by the granting of a large increase in salary and the adoption of a very controversial contract. In March of 1967, Local 1220 voted again to remain off the job if any attempt was made to pay them in scrip. The issue was resolved when a working cash fund loan was floated.

Joliet Public Schools
School District No. 86
Will County

The original agreement with the Teachers Coordinating Committee of the Joliet Education Association and the Joliet Federation of Teachers, Local 604, was August, 1956. This was not a formal contract. (No formal contract is in effect as of August, 1967). The agreement was instead the official establishment of a teacher coordinating committee as the recognized professional group with status and procedures spelled out in the Rules and Regulations of the District. There have been no subsequent "contracts" but there is, of necessity, annual negotiation relative to all matters pertaining to the professional staff which result in the rules, regulations, policies and practices of the District.

There have been no strikes by the employees of the Joliet Public Schools, District 86. The Joliet Township High Schools and Junior College, District 204, had a strike in 1966.

FROM THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF
THE JOLIET PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ARTICLE XLV--Co-ordination Committee

A committee consisting of the Board of School Inspectors as a whole, and representatives of School Administration, the Joliet Teachers' Association, and the Joliet Teachers' Union shall be maintained to expedite communications, and act as co-ordinator in matters concerning board-administration-teacher relations.

At the request of the representatives of either the Joliet Teachers' Association or the Joliet Teachers' Union a meeting of the Co-ordination Committee shall be held. This request shall be made through the School Administration, and the meeting shall be held within a reasonable length of time (not to exceed 14 calendar days) after the request is made.

As a matter of policy, a mid-year meeting of the Co-ordination Committee shall be held, irrespective of other meetings. In advance of all meetings including the mid-year meeting, each group shall submit to all parties a list of topics to be discussed.

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the answer which best answers the situation.

1. It seems likely that if an agreement is reached in a collective bargaining session and there are portions which seem unreasonable to the school building administrator:

A. The Superintendent or the Board of Education will eliminate these portions in time. The advisable reaction is to remain calm and intrust negotiations to them.

B. The Superintendent or the Board of Education will manage to eliminate these portions in time. The best policy is to make them aware of the problems the agreement might cause so they may better understand the situation.

C. The Superintendent or the Board of Education will probably not be able to retract concessions once they are made. Therefore, it is wise for principals to make their concern known before any agreements are reached.

D. The Superintendent or the Board of Education know what is reasonable and will not permit unreasonable concessions to be made.

2. In issues leading to collective bargaining, the principal:

A. Should align with the teachers.

B. Should align with the superintendent.

C. Should remain withdrawn from the situation because he is not involved in the negotiations.

D. Should be active within a principals' organization to support whatever position seems to be appropriate on a particular issue.

3. When a principal enters a grievance session with a teachers' committee at the building level:

A. The best approach is to be perfectly frank about his side of the problems and to state why he is recommending a certain course of action.

B. The best approach is to listen to the committee but make no statement of his own other than the fact that he will take the problems under consideration.

C. The best approach is to listen to the committee and make minimal concessions so that he has bargaining power in future sessions.

D. Other _____

4. Principals: (when negotiations are being conducted with a teachers' group)

A. Should have a representative at the collective bargaining table.

B. Probably don't have the training to be included in the collective bargaining procedure but should be asked for suggestions on the issues to be decided.

C. Should be notified of what transpires at the bargaining table as it occurs and the final results.

D. Should be notified of the final results of a collective bargaining session only.

5. In most areas where collective bargaining occurs:

A. The principal is informed of what is occurring at the bargaining session and is assured that his interests and authority are being fully considered along with those of the teachers.

B. The principal is fully informed of what is occurring at the bargaining session but feels that his interests and authority are not being fully considered when agreements are being made.

C. The principal is neither informed of what is occurring at the bargaining session nor is his authority or interests being fully considered when agreements are being reached.

D. The principal is represented at a bargaining session and so is not only fully informed of what is occurring but is also taking part actively in forming the agreements.

6. Generally speaking, the role most likely to be diminished in the future through the process of collective bargaining is that of the:

- A. General Superintendent.
 - B. Board of Education.
 - C. School Building Administrator.
 - D. Classroom Teacher.
-

7. Principal X has just emerged from a session with the grievance committee on the subject of student discipline. The chairman of the building level grievance committee feels that the rights of the teachers are not being considered and that further sessions are in order.

At this point Principal X probably feels:

- A. Satisfied with the outcome because it is what he expected. He has plans for further meetings which will make them more productive.
 - B. Uneasy about the outcome because too many concessions will be required.
 - C. Frustrated about the outcome because the teachers are being unreasonable. Their demands will reduce the principal to little more than a bookkeeper.
 - D. Certain that he has done everything to settle the situation reasonably and that the next step is to involve other officials in solving the problem.
-

8. In which of the following areas are teacher grievances most frequently found:

- A. Class size and student discipline.
- B. Evaluation of teacher performance and teaching methods.
- C. Use of teachers for other duties during their free periods.
- D. Room and subject assignments in a building.

9. School District X has a collective bargaining agreement which specifies that preferential treatment in the assignment of subjects and grades should be accorded to teachers on the basis of teaching seniority in a school. Although this provision in the contract is not mandatory, the teachers in School A feel that their principal has not given it any consideration when he made some recent assignments. They protest to him strongly through a committee of teachers.

Perhaps the best approach to solving this problem would be for the principal to do the following:

- A. Have a conference with the teachers and try to resolve the problem with a minimum of attention from collective bargaining officials and from higher administrative school officials.
- B. Realize that since he has used his best judgment in setting up the assignments, it is now the function of the superintendent to reinforce his decisions.
- C. Ask for a higher administrative official to be present when he meets with the teachers' committee to resolve the issue.
- D. Contact the principals' organization for professional advice before proceeding.

10. In many areas the principals' salary schedule is linked to the teachers' salary schedule. In places where this is true, the principals:

- A. Should belong to the same bargaining organization that the teachers do and should actively work for the teachers' salary increases.
- B. Should belong to the same bargaining organization that the teachers do but should refrain from working for the teachers' salary increases.
- C. Should have their own bargaining organization but should aid the teachers in obtaining salary increases.
- D. Should have their own bargaining organization and should work for their own salary increases only.

11. A principal who is about to enter a building level grievance session with a committee of teachers would find a background of one of these subject areas the most important. Which one?

- A. Labor relations courses.
 - B. Administration and supervision courses.
 - C. Group dynamics courses.
 - D. Psychology courses.
-

12. In most areas where collective bargaining occurs:

- A. Principals retain the necessary authority as well as the responsibility of administering a school.
 - B. Principals retain the responsibility of administering a school but lose some of the authority.
 - C. Principals retain the responsibility of administering a school but have their authority diminished to the point of not being able to administer a school properly.
 - D. Principals retain the necessary authority and responsibility in administering a school and in addition find their staff doing a better job because they are now aware of the problems the principal faces.
-

13. With the increase of teacher groups assuming the role of making decisions, principals typically find that, in supervising their teachers, there is:

- A. Greater cooperation than formerly.
 - B. More difficulty than formerly.
 - C. Considerably more difficulty than formerly.
 - D. No appreciable difference than formerly.
-

14. Following the trend in current years in collective bargaining, teachers will most likely go out on strike about: (assuming salary schedules are satisfactory)

- A. Physical facilities and educational equipment.
- B. Administrative assignment of teachers.
- C. Representation on decision-making groups.
- D. Principal's supervision of teachers.

15. During intensive bargaining between the Board of Education and the teachers' organization, the following is most likely to occur:

- A. Teachers accept administrative direction better than they usually do and their level of teaching performance is higher.
 - B. The teachers accept administrative direction but their level of cooperation and the quality of their teaching performance declines.
 - C. The teachers accept administrative direction as they usually do and their level of teaching performance is the same.
 - D. The teachers seem primarily concerned about the bargaining outcome and everything else suffers as a result.
-

16. In many school districts teacher representatives on the building level committee seem to be:

- A. Primarily working toward bettering the teaching profession and improving the educational climate of the school.
 - B. Primarily working toward improving the working conditions of the teachers.
 - C. Primarily seeking status in the faculty.
 - D. Primarily aspiring toward administrative and supervisory positions in the school system.
-

17. A principal just assigned to a school is likely to find one of these groups most aware of the trends in collective bargaining and most active in them. Which group?

- A. Young single women (20-35).
 - B. Young single men (20-35).
 - C. Young married men and women (20-35).
 - D. Middle-aged men and women.
-

18. If a principal is to be an important part of the educational staff of the future, which of the following courses of action is most important?

- A. The principals' authority in collective bargaining agreements must not be signed away by the board of education.
 - B. The principals must organize their own organizations to insure that their interests are protected.
 - C. The principal must be more an originator and stimulator of educational progress and less a mere signer of papers.
 - D. The principal should keep abreast of teachers' demands and by judicious planning, prevent major flareups from occurring.
-

19. Should teachers have the prerogative of by-passing the principal in disputes and going to the central staff if the principal is not involved directly in the issue?

- A. Yes.
 - B. No.
-

20. A principal should be more closely aligned in most issues with the:

- A. Superintendent.
 - B. Teachers.
-

If you would care to comment upon some significant collective bargaining trend which directly affects the principal's role as administrator of his school and which has been overlooked in this questionnaire, space has been provided on the next page for your convenience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agreement Between the Board of Education School District 189, East Saint Louis, Illinois, and the East Saint Louis Federation of Teachers, Local 1220 (August 28, 1966).
- A Layman's Guide to Basic Law Under the National Labor Relations Act. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.
- Becker, Harry A. "Collective Bargaining May Force School Boards to Organize," The American School Board Journal, CLIII, No. 4 (October, 1966), 57-58.
- Beirne, Joseph A. Collective Bargaining and Public Employees. AFT.
- Blanke, Virgil E. "Teachers in Search of Power," The Educational Forum, XXX, No. 2 (January, 1966), 231-238.
- Blankenship, Alden H. "The Role of the Superintendent in Teacher Negotiations," Theory Into Practice, IV, No. 2 (April, 1965), 70-74.
- Brief History of the American Labor Movement. United States Department of Labor Bulletin 1000. 1964 edition.
- Browder, Leslie Hughes. "Teacher Unionism in America: A Descriptive Analysis of the Structure, Force, and Membership of the American Federation of Teachers," (Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Dept. of Education, Cornell University, 1965), 1-320.
- Brown, George W. "Teacher Power Techniques," The American School Board Journal, CLII, No. 2 (February, 1966), 11-13.
- Cantor, Arnold. "Election and Negotiation in Rochester," NEA Journal, LIV, No. 6 (September, 1965), 22-24.
- Carr, William G. "The Principal's Role in Professional Negotiations," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, The 50th Annual Convention, L, No. 309 (April, 1966), 45-56.

Collective Bargaining Contracts Negotiated by Locals of the AFL-CIO, 1962. AFL.

"Collective Bargaining vs. Professional Negotiations," School Management, LX, No. 11 (November, 1965), 68-75.

Compulsory Arbitration--An American Federation of Teachers Leadership Paper, AFT

Cunningham, Luvern. "Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal," Paper read at a Seminar on Professional Negotiation in Public Education, co-sponsored by the NEA and the Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago, August 3, 1966.

Doherty, Robert E. "Letter to a School Board," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII, No. 6 (February, 1967), 272-277.

_____. "The Law and Collective Bargaining for Teachers," Teachers College Record, CXVIII, No. 1 (October, 1966), 1-12.

Epstein, Benjamin. The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations Between Teachers and School Boards, NASSP Bulletin, 1965.

_____. "What Status and Voice for Principals and Administrators in Collective Bargaining and Professional Negotiation by Teacher Organizations?," NASSP Bulletin, IL, No. 299 (March, 1965), 226-259.

"Four Phi Delta Kappan Institutes," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, No. 2 (October, 1967), 65.

Geisert, Gene. "Mr. Nobody," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII, No. 4 (December, 1966), 159-160.

Garber, Lee O. "These Ten Legal Principles Control Collective Bargaining," Nation's Schools, LXXVI, No. 3 (September, 1965), 67.

Grieder, Calvin. "Superintendents Can't Face Union Bargaining Teams Alone," Nation's Schools, LXXVII, No. 1 (July, 1966), 6.

Gross, Calvin. "Ways to Deal with the New Teacher Militancy," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI, No. 4 (December, 1964), 147-151.

- Hopkins, John. "A Review of Events in Professional Negotiations," Theory Into Practice, IV, No. 2 (April, 1965), 51-54.
- "How to Negotiate with Your Teachers--Without Surrendering," School Management, X, No. 9 (September, 1966), 110-114.
- Interview with Peter Schnauffer, American Federation of Teachers Director of Research, August 13, 1966.
- Kaplan, Joel. "Can a Teachers' Union Be Professional?," Changing Education, I, No. 2 (Summer, 1966), 36-42.
- Kratzmann, Arthur. "The Alberta Teachers' Association and Collective Bargaining," Theory Into Practice, IV, No. 2 (April, 1965), 75-78.
- "Labor-Management Relations: Analysis and Interpretation," Ed. Charley Leistner, The Forensic Quarterly of the Committee on Discussion and Debate--The National University Extension Association, XXXIX, No. 1 (April, 1965).
- Langer, John. "The Emerging Elementary Principalship in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan (December, 1966), 160-161.
- Lieberman, Myron. "Teachers' Strikes: Acceptable Strategy?," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI, No. 5 (January, 1965), 237-240.
- Manning, William R. "Negotiations: The Process in Collective Bargaining," The American School Board Journal, CLIII, No. 2 (August, 1966), 14-16.
- McGinnis, Lowell. "Another Look at Teacher Militancy," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII, No. 2 (February, 1967), 77-81.
- Mosier, Richard H. "Survey of Collective Bargaining Issues," School Management, X, No. 9 (September, 1966), 163.
- Mundy, James. Collective Bargaining and Public Employees, AFL-CIO.
- NASSP Bulletin--49th Annual Convention, IL (March, 1965), 255.
- "Negotiating with Teachers," School Management, IX, No. 5 (May, 1965), 81-87.
- "Negotiation," School Management, II, No. 6 (June, 1967), 76+.

Nolte, Chester. "Is the Board an 'Employer' Under a State's Labor Relations Law?," The American School Board Journal, CLI, No. 3 (September, 1965), 9-10.

_____. "Teachers Face Boards of Education Across the Bargaining Table--Legally," The American School Board Journal, CL, No. 6 (June, 1965), 10-12.

_____. "Teachers Seek Greater Independence Through Legislative Channels," The American School Board Journal, CLII, No. 3 (March, 1966), 7-9.

Rice, Arthur H. "Mediation Boards Will Move Where Schools Fear to Tread," Nation's Schools, LXXVIII, No. 5 (November, 1966), 14+.

_____. "Why Teachers Do Not Accept the Superintendent as Spokesman," Nation's Schools, LXXV, No. 4 (April, 1965), 36+.

Schnauffer, Pete. The Uses of Teacher Power. AFL-CIO (March, 1966).

Seitz, Reynolds. "Collective Bargaining Can Help Achieve Reasonable Agreements," The American School Board Journal, CLIII, No. 5 (November, 1966), 52-55.

_____. "Good Faith Required--Not Capitulation," The American School Board Journal, CLV, No. 1 (July, 1967), 7-9.

Selden, David. "Needed, More Teacher Strikes," (flyer reprinted from the Saturday Review, May 15, 1965), AFT.

"Should Labor Unions Be Subject to Anti-Trust Laws, Pro and Con," Congressional Digest, XL, No. 10 (October, 1961), 225-251.

Smith, James H. "Seventy-Fifth Anniversary Address to George Howland Club," Chicago Principals Club Reporter, LVII, No. 2 (Winter, 1967), 9-16+.

Story, Harold W. "Collective Bargaining with Teachers under Wisconsin Law," Theory Into Practice, IV, No. 2 (April, 1965), 61-65.

"Strike Fever and the Public," Life, LXI, No. 9 (August 26, 1966), 24-36.

- Stumpf, W. A. "The New world of Educational Administration," The American School Board Journal, CLII, No. 2 (February, 1966), 9-13.
- Taylor, George W. "The Public Interest in Collective Negotiations in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII, No. 1 (September, 1966), 16-22.
- Thomas, Donald. "End Not in Sight," Chicago Principals Club Reporter, LVII, No. 2 (Winter, 1967), 5-7.
- Townsend, Edward T. "Is There a Crisis in the American Trade Union Movement?," The Annals, CCCL (November, 1965), 1-10.
- Turnbaugh, Roy C. "How to Set Teacher Negotiation Policy," Nation's Schools, LXXVII, No. 3 (March, 1966), 134+.
- Wildman, Wesley A. and Perry, Charles R. "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII, No. 5 (January, 1966), 244-251.
- Wildman, Wesley A. "Collective Action by Public School Teachers," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, XVIII, No. 3 (October, 1964), 8.
- _____. "Legal Aspects of Teacher Collective Action," Theory Into Practice, IV, No. 2 (April, 1965), 55-60.
- _____. "Implications of Teacher Bargaining for School Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI, No. 4 (December, 1964), 152-158.
- _____. "What Prompts Greater Teacher Militancy?," American School Board Journal, CLIV, No. 3 (March, 1967), 27-31.
- Wilson, Charles F. "Whose Man Is the Superintendent?," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII, No. 4 (December, 1966), 156-157.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Olga Kaszubowski has been read and approved by members of the Department of Education.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Date

Signature of Adviser