

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9234898

**Principal decision-making and the teachers' use of the complaint
and grievance procedure**

Cano, Yvonne, Ph.D.

The University of Arizona, 1992

Copyright ©1992 by Cano, Yvonne. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PRINCIPAL DECISION MAKING AND THE TEACHERS' USE
OF THE COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

by

Yvonne Cano

Copyright © Yvonne Cano 1992

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND
HIGHER EDUCATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
WITH A MAJOR IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 9 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read
the dissertation prepared by Yvonne Cano
entitled Principal Decision Making and the Teachers' Use of the Complaint
and Grievance Procedure

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Sharon Conley
Sharon Conley

7-14-92
Date July 14, 1992

Robert T. Grant
Robert T. Grant

7-14-92
Date July 14, 1992

L.O. Nelson
L.O. Nelson

7/14/92
Date July 14, 1992

Date

Date

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the
candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate
College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my
direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation
requirement.

Sharon Conley
Dissertation Director

7-14-92
Date

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under the rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: 

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	8
ABSTRACT.....	9
1. INTRODUCTION.....	11
The Problem.....	16
Significance and Need for the Study.....	16
Theoretical Framework for the Study.....	18
Statement of the Problem.....	19
Research Questions.....	20
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study.....	20
Limitations.....	20
Delimitations.....	22
Definition of Terms.....	22
Summary.....	24
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	26
The Nature of Schools.....	29
Negotiated Orders.....	32
The Character of Principal- Teacher Relationships.....	37
The Effects of Collective Bargaining.....	41
Complaints and Grievances.....	43
Principal Decision Making.....	49
Summary and Implications for the Present Study.....	51
3. RESEARCH METHOD.....	54
General Method.....	54
Sample.....	54
Subjects.....	54
District Setting.....	55
School Settings.....	56
Procedure.....	56
Pilot Study.....	57
Data Collection.....	57
Selection of Subjects.....	58

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
3. <u>Continued</u>	
Access to Subjects.....	58
Confidentiality.....	58
Interviews.....	59
Interview Protocol.....	59
Data Analysis Procedures.....	60
Data Reduction Techniques.....	60
Analytic Strategies.....	61
Analytic Techniques.....	61
4. FINDINGS.....	65
Question One.....	65
Salary, Wages, Hours.....	66
Salaries.....	66
Curriculum Development.....	68
Evaluation.....	69
Fair, Professional.....	69
Teacher Improvement.....	69
Promotion.....	71
Working Conditions.....	72
Clean Rooms, Broken Chairs.....	72
Principal's Manner.....	72
Teacher-Teacher Relationships.....	73
Discipline.....	75
Bell System.....	76
Monitors.....	77
Refusing a Student.....	77
Teacher Workload.....	77
Summary.....	78
Grievances.....	79
Salary, Wages, Hours:	
Planning Period.....	79
Salary Adjustment.....	82
Seniority.....	83
Substitutes.....	83
Evaluation.....	84
Reprimand.....	84
Working Conditions.....	84
Cooling and Heating.....	84
Teacher's Equipment/Assignment.....	86

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
4 <u>Continued</u>	
Cockroaches.....	87
Safety.....	87
Class Size.....	88
Summary.....	90
Question Two.....	90
Evaluation.....	92
Career Ladder.....	92
Reprimand.....	92
Working Conditions.....	93
Planning: Inservice.....	93
Class Size.....	94
School Culture and Vision.....	97
Power and Authority.....	99
Implementing Change.....	101
Problem Solving.....	101
Summary.....	102
Question Three.....	103
Elementary School Principals.....	103
Middle School Principals.....	110
Secondary School Principals.....	114
Summary.....	118
Elementary School Principals.....	118
Middle School Principals.....	118
Secondary School Principals.....	119
Question Four.....	120
Complaints.....	120
Impact on Managerial.....	120
Impact on Leadership.....	121
Grievances.....	121
Impact on Managerial.....	121
Impact on Leadership.....	122
Summary.....	122
5. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	124
Conclusions.....	124
Question One.....	125
Question Two.....	125
Question Three.....	127
Question Four.....	128

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
5. <u>Continued</u>	
Recommendations.....	129
APPENDIX A: PRINCIPALS' EXPERIENCE.....	131
APPENDIX B: PRINCIPAL PROFILE.....	133
APPENDIX C: SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS.....	135
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW CONDITIONS.....	137
APPENDIX E: PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW.....	139
REFERENCES.....	143

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Structural, Negotiative, Negotiation Contexts.....	62
2	Complaint Issues Identified by Principals....	67
3	Grievance Issues Identified by Principals....	80
4	Grievance Issues Limiting Principals' Freedom of Action.....	91

ABSTRACT

Current research in collective bargaining suggests the need to investigate how contracts and agreements are interpreted at school sites. Speculation about the effects of collective bargaining describe comprehensive situations and neglect the individual settings which are most critically affected. Furthermore, a need persists to reveal those aspects of "life as a principal" that are affected by collective bargaining, teacher behaviors, and interpretations and decisions that occur within this working domain. This qualitative study addressed these issues. It investigated how 15 principals, kindergarten through grade 12, in a state that lacks a comprehensive statute which neither requires nor prohibits bargaining, interpret contracts and agreements. Analysis of protocols revealed that locally negotiated arrangements influence the course of complaints and grievances. The principals in this study provided evidence indicating that collective bargaining agreements limit principals' action in certain areas but some of these same limitations are locally negotiated between principals and teachers. This renegotiating process enabled both principals and teachers to continue in working relationships to meet the distinct needs of each school.

Further research on the daily settlement of disputes, arising during the life of an agreement, would be beneficial in understanding the effects of collective bargaining.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The educational debate has been characterized by a tension between administrative control on the one hand and teacher resistance to such control on the other (Rees & Carpenter, 1980; Raelin, 1985, 1989). Nowhere has this tension been more evident than in current developments in collective bargaining. As administrators seek to retain managerial prerogatives, teachers and their representatives are pushing for increased professional rights. Girded with the basic aim of involving teachers in decision making, collective bargaining has brought about changes not only in how schools are organized and governed but also in the relationships between administrators and teachers. While the administrative goal has been to retain power to control and direct the organization, the goal of teachers as professionals has been to seek broader participation and to gain greater authority for governing their work activities (Carlson, 1987; Retsinas, 1982). Clearly, a discrepancy exists between the interests articulated by administrators and teachers regarding the structuring of educational decision making.

Due to collective bargaining, schools have been found to operate in two competing but integrated social systems:

one requiring adherence to managerial decisions, and the other encouraging challenges to those decisions (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988). As the administrators most unfavorably affected by collective bargaining, principals are characterized as existing in an organizational world rife with paradox and ambiguity (Argyle, 1980; Webster, 1985). In this setting, principals are caught between managerial requirements and responsibilities and the demands of professionals who perceive themselves as knowing best what procedures and practices contribute to educational success (Doherty, 1980, 526).

As a result of these developments, the role of the principal has steadily become one best described as complex. Two recent, critical factors which have contributed to this complexity are: (1) reform agendas and (2) an imperative for work-force participation (Glasman, 1983; Rallis & Highsmith, 1986). Even though school principals are "accountable for delivering", principal autonomy, prerogative and overall "power" are reportedly curbed and abraded (English & Hill, 1990; Goldschmidt & Stuart, 1984; Mazzarella, 1985; Sarason, 1982).

This study investigates how principals act in the day-to-day administration of the school, within the aegis of a district negotiated agreement, and in response to teachers' utilization of complaints and grievances. Given that

collective bargaining "reallocates power" (Berg, 1973) and thus reduces the principal's decision making capacity, this context is salient because the collective bargaining relationship structures and creates conditions for individual efforts and local negotiative processes to occur. Examination of complaints and first-level grievances can be means to define and give meaning to principal and teacher behaviors. For example, because of the contract, some things are not grievable and may strongly influence how a principal interprets and responds to teachers' "resistance" activities. It is the principals' experience, as affected by collective bargaining, that captures and crystallizes the issue.

Previous research has examined those grievances advancing to arbitration to explain the extent to which collective bargaining has influenced organizational culture and changes (Sarason, 1982; Sarason & Klaber, 1985). Other research has focused on how grievances concerning negotiable issues affect individual behavior (Robson & Davis, 1983; Skratek, 1990; Smeenk, 1981). For example, researchers have investigated how grievances affect such individual outcomes as employee satisfaction and productivity (Glassman & Belasco, 1975; Lutz, Kleinman, & Evans, 1967).

The effect of complaints and first-level grievances on principals' decision making, however, has been a neglected

area of research. In general, the literature suggests that the principals' decision making is constrained by collective bargaining or that, flexibility in decision making has diminished since work agreements require more uniformity and centralization of decision making (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1988; Mitchell, Kerchner, Erck, & Pryor, 1981). In addition, complaints and grievances resulting from managerial practice have been addressed only secondarily (Johnson, 1984, 1988). This omission is surprising as complaints and grievances are an integral part of the organizational dynamics of a social system: social relations in the workplace are altered when managerial decisions are appealed. In particular, complaints and first level grievances on issues stemming from professional norms should be critical because they are likely to affect the enduring tension between managerial authority and teachers' professional interests (McDonnell & Pascal, 1988).

Although most labor relations research has focused on the district level (Johnson, 1984; Smith, 1985; Ubben & Fulmer, 1985), this study investigates decision making at the school site. Since few building administrators (e.g., principals) have direct involvement in the actual agreement negotiations and the drafting of an agreement, it is at the school site that conflict may be most apparent between administrative decisions and teachers' rights, whether

perceived or actual (Webster, 1985). It is in the day-to-day administration of an agreement between administrators and teachers that the impact of collective bargaining is most apparent.

Since complaints and grievances typically originate at the school level, this study focuses on the lowest levels of dispute (i.e., complaints and first-level grievances). This is in keeping with admonitions suggesting that the unit of analysis most suitable for investigating relations between principals and teachers operating within collectively bargained agreements is the individual school (Bascia, 1990; Kerchner, 1984). This study, thus, investigates principals' interpretations of the impact of collective bargaining on their decision making and what they report about teachers' use of complaints and grievances in response to managerial practice in schools.

The context for this study is five school districts in a Southwestern state. This state lacks a comprehensive statute which neither requires nor prohibits bargaining (Sacken, 1986). As such, school districts in this state can choose whether or not to enter into a bargaining arrangement with an organization representing their teachers. Similarly, the five school districts in this study differ in their bargaining relationships with teachers. They all, however, utilize similar complaint/grievance procedures.

The Problem

Significance and Need for the Study

The effects of collective bargaining in public education have been both maligned (Sykes & Elmore, 1988) and praised (Bacharach, Shedd, & Conley, 1988; Shedd, 1990). Critics suggest that collective bargaining engenders conflict, while advocates propose that it enhances cooperation. Seemingly, these speculations only provide caricatures of bargaining relationships since they describe comprehensive situations and neglect the individual settings which are most critically affected. It is through the investigation of labor relation practices (i.e., contract management), that critical insights about how collective bargaining is really working can be garnered.

Since the day-to-day administration of an agreement between administrators and teachers occurs at the school-site, this level is the most conducive research environment for clarifying the generalized characterizations of collective bargaining. It is in the daily settlement of disputes arising during the life of the agreement that the effects of collective bargaining are most apparent (Kagel, 1986). Investigating how contracts and agreements are interpreted at the school-site can contribute to an understanding of how order is created and maintained by administrators and teachers.

Some lines of inquiry suggest that principals serve more to interpret and enforce the contract (Kerchner, 1984), while others suggest that contractual agreements are frequently modified in practice (Jessup, 1985; Johnson, 1984; Lambert, 1988). However, a need persists to reveal those aspects of "life as a principal" that are affected by collective bargaining, teacher behaviors, and interpretations and decisions that occur within this working domain. This is so, particularly in light of the increasing demands placed on school leaders by decentralization reforms and the developing features of teachers-as-professionals which predispose them to resist managerial control (Raelin, 1985).

A primary duty of principals is to implement and administer the bargained agreement. Investigating how principals act in the day-to-day administration of the school, and how they respond to teachers' utilization of complaints and grievances, can add to an understanding of the principal's sense of limitations. These limitations may or may not impede his/her ability to create and guide effective schools.

Critical concepts such as negotiated order (Strauss, 1978) (e.g., working relationships between principals and teachers), and the content of complaints/grievances (e.g., types of issues), have the potential to add an understanding

of how principals respond to conflict situations and resolution processes created through collective bargaining, and to their anticipation and/or experience of teachers using them.

Theoretical Framework for the Study

A political perspective provides the underpinning for this study (Bacharach, 1988; Bacharach & Mitchell, 1987; Corwin, 1981). Further, a micropolitical focus allows the school-site to be viewed as: an organizational "subsystem" with ongoing administrator-teacher interactions (Iannaccone, 1975), replete with individuals utilizing strategies to achieve preferred outcomes (Ball, 1987), and a setting where organizational maintenance and control may collide with policy (Hoyle, 1986).

Framing this study is Kerchner and Mitchell's (1988) notion that schools operate in two competing but integrated social systems. While one system is dependent on compliance and adherence to directives, the other fosters questioning of decisions. To clarify how these two systems are integrated, the work of Kagel (1986), Lewin and Peterson (1988), and Flippo (1980) will be incorporated to understand how these two systems evolve, especially when complaints and grievances are viewed as a continuation of the collective bargaining process.

Also included will be Sarason's (1982) observation that the power of principals is "overstated" and Hoy and Brown's (1988) suggestion that conflict in schools is due in part to adversarial teacher-administrator relationships.

In addition, the "negotiated order" paradigm will provide an appropriate landscape for inquiring into the contextual properties which enable participants to "live" with the effects of a bargained agreement (Strauss, 1978). By focusing on the school-site and one of the key actors in this milieu, principals' interpretations regarding how they intuit their decision making is affected by teachers' willingness to use the complaint and grievance process in response to their managerial practices, should contribute toward a further understanding of how the role(s) of the principal "unfolds" (Denzin, 1983).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate how principals take action and plan for future action in collective bargaining environments. Specifically, inquiry centered on how principals make decisions to direct work under conditions which provide mechanisms for expressing dissatisfaction with any aspect of work.

Drawing on principals' accounts about complaints and grievances at his/her school, this study considered what issues engender conflict and if they were related to

professional norms among teachers (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1986; McDonnell & Pascal, 1988). For example, what goes to grievance? Additionally, what do principals report about how conflict is resolved in their individual schools? For example, how do different teachers respond to informal (complaint) and formal (grievance) options differently?

A further interest was whether principals are able to affect their style, preferences and leadership in the context of collective bargaining. For example, how does it impact the principals' sense of control and well-being in the building and the district?

Research Questions

1. Regarding what areas and issues do principals report teachers to present complaints or grievances?
2. Do principals report complaints or grievances as limiting their freedom of action within the school setting?
3. How do principals "manage" teachers and does this influence the use of complaints and grievances?
4. Do principals report that complaints and grievances impact their managerial and leadership roles?

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Limitations

1. As an exploratory case study (Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Yin, 1989), the effects of collective bargaining on decision making in public education will be examined solely

from accounts of 15 principals operating in public schools, grades K-12, in a Southwestern state.

2. Investigating how 15 principals make and implement decisions in the context of four different collective bargaining environments is a means for this study to address the larger issue of how principal decision making is affected by collective bargaining.

3. Collective bargaining is considered the culprit which limits the principal's decision making capacity. Other speculations suggest that principals manage to adjust and "push the limits" of agreements/contracts (Crowson & Morris, 1985). As a means to unravel such paradoxical conjectures, semi-structured, open-end interviews are used to elicit 15 principals' perceptions about how they develop and implement school/district goals and clarify problematic aspects of the work situation.

4. Complaints and grievances will be seen as a means for reconciling conflicting demands regarding decision making. Complaints and grievances were also viewed as mechanisms for teachers to voice the incompatibility of formalized practices to their specific work situations (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988; Redfern, 1969).

Delimitations

1. The unit of analysis in this study is the individual principal. The results will reflect only the interpretations and attitudes of the principal.

2. The non-random, selected group of principals in this study does not include all principals in each of the five school districts. The variance in grade-level representation (K-12) was minimized by including every grade-level configuration in two of the four different bargaining arrangements.

3. Qualitative research (case studies) utilizing "elite" interviews is dependent on two contingencies: Principal's schedule and availability, and his/her disposition regarding the time allowed for the interview. To the degree that these conditions varied, the interview questions and probes in this study proceeded differently in format but not in substance.

4. The integrity of responses was dependent on the individual's candor and frankness.

5. Interview data analysis requires reiterative categorizing and coding of lengthy transcriptions.

Definition of Terms

The following terms apply throughout this study:

Arbitration (in grievance procedure). When a grievance cannot be mutually resolved at the terminal step of the

process, the parties may agree to engage an arbitrator who will render a binding decision.

Agreement. A document containing the terms of a negotiated contract. These terms bind the parties to certain activities for a determined period of time. This term will be used interchangeably with contract (Gilroy, et al., 1969).

Collective Bargaining. A process whereby teachers and their representatives negotiate with the school board and/or its representatives, over salary, working conditions, and other issues of mutual interest. The format is generally that of labor-management (Webster, 1985). Collective bargaining and collective negotiations will be used interchangeably as will the terms union and teachers' association.

Decision Making. Choices and judgments made regarding sources of problems, resources available, and individual and group needs.

Complaint. A problem occurring at the operational level such as a local school. Involved may be a teacher and an administrator. This problem may or may not develop into a grievance (Flippo, 1980).

Conflict. Disagreement between people with different ideas or beliefs, or a situation in which individuals are in opposition or disagreement.

Grievance. A complaint which cannot be resolved at the operational level and must be submitted through the grievance procedure for resolution (Lewin & Peterson, 1988).

Grievance Procedure. A series of steps, progressing sequentially through the hierarchy of the organization, toward satisfactory resolution of a dispute (Lewin & Peterson, 1988).

Labor Relations. Everything that affects the individual worker or groups of workers as they relate to the employer (O'Reilly, 1978).

Scope of Negotiation. Either or both parties are limited to the type and number of issues and items that can be presented for negotiation (Carlton & Goodwin, 1969).

Teacher Demands. Teacher expectations which motivate the formulation of specific negotiation requests.

Summary

A critical responsibility ascribed to principals is to make and implement workplace decisions (Hoy & Miskel, 1982). This straightforward job requirement is deceptively simple, especially when one considers the complexity of the principal's role. For example, not only do principals function as managers in carrying out policy, they also direct a professional workforce (Restinas, 1982). Principals often find themselves interpreting and implementing policies and procedures that conflict with

teachers' demands for control over aspects of their work (Raelin, 1985). An additional factor in the principal's complex role is administering a negotiated contract or contracts. Since contracts/agreements cannot encompass every aspect of the school operation, fertile ground exists for challenging administrative decisions.

This study investigates how principals believe their decision making is affected by teachers' willingness to use the complaint and grievance process in response to their managerial practices. The information sources utilized in this research include semi-structured, open-ended interviews of 15 principals operating in districts which have a bargaining relationship with their teachers. Questions focus on principal perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining (contractual terms and conflict procedures) on decision making at the school site.

Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature for this study while the methodological structure is presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 reports the findings and Chapter 5 closes with conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The central office has its agenda, principals have their turf to protect, and teachers desire to protect their autonomy. . . (Corwin, 1979, p. 214).

Corwin's (1970, 1981) characterizations of schools as bureaucracies suggest that occurrences of conflict are inevitable in an organization where participants who are structurally differentiated yet dependent on one another, hold differing ideologies about how to implement organizational goals.

Kerchner and Mitchell (1988) propose that in practice, schools operate on two competing but integrated social systems: "the administrative organization [which] wants teachers to embrace and pursue district goals [and] the teacher organization [which] wants teachers to challenge the legitimacy of management directives" (p. 216). In this system, the principal is the "middle person" and the one most critically affected by the conflict generated by disagreement over decision making (Argyle, 1980; Rees & Carpenter, 1980; Webster, 1985). For example, school principals find themselves caught between managerial requirements and responsibilities and the demands of

professionals who perceive themselves "in a better position to know what procedures and practices constitute sound educational programs" (Doherty, 1980, p. 526). This predicament is further exacerbated by a commonly held concern for effective schools and the belief that effective administrators are leaders in their buildings.

Stager and Leithwood (1989) argue that little is known about how principals "come to act as they do . . . what shapes their practice . . . and what meaning they find in such practice" (p. 217). The literature is sparse regarding the problem of how principals calibrate work priorities when their decision making capacity is circumscribed by organizational demands and teachers' interests resonating a "professional" ethos (Berg, 1973; Blumberg, Brannigan, & Nason, 1981; Duke, 1987; Geisert, 1989; Glasman, 1983; Haller & Strike, 1986; Hoy & Brown, 1988; Rallis & Highsmith, 1986).

One perspective indicates that principals' decision making follows the application of rules (Robson & Davis, 1983), or proceeds rationally (Shapiro & Crowson, 1990). In contrast, others posit that principals often deviate from the rational model (Blumberg, 1987; Wolcott, 1973), regularly make decisions in the absence of clear guidelines (Duke, 1987), and manipulate and creatively circumvent boundaries (Crowson & Porter-Gehrie, 1980).

The literature generally indicates that principals' discretionary action is limited by contracts and a myriad of legal mandates (English & Hill, 1990; Goldschmidt & Stuart, 1984; Mazzearella, 1985; Sarason, 1982), or that creative manipulation is common practice (Crowson & Porter-Gehrie, 1980).

Few researchers have addressed the issue of how principals take action when specifically circumscribed by conditions created by negotiated agreements (Kessup, 1985; Johnson, 1984; Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988). Critically significant is the scant attention given to how principals perform the dual role of manager in carrying out district fiats while directing a professional workforce in the context of collective bargaining. Neglected is whether the possible use of sanctions by teachers (e.g., complaints, grievances), influence principals' decisions in how they implement the contract and carry out district policies and procedures.

As a means to unravel the paradoxical evidence which at once casts principal decision making as inevitably restricted, but also an activity which proceeds creatively through manipulation and "pushing the limits", three areas of relevant literature will be reviewed: the nature of schools, the character of principal-teacher relationships,

and the effects of collective bargaining on the principal's decision making process.

The Nature of Schools

The problem of how administrators and teachers accommodate or resist "street-level bureaucracies" (Lipsky, 1980) is placed in perspective by scholars and researchers who depict schools as complex, politicized organizations (Bacharach, 1988; Bacharach & Mitchell, 1987; Corwin, 1970), whose participants use strategies to further their interests (Ball, 1987; Blase, 1991; Hoyle, 1986; Iannaccone, 1975), and as "negotiated orders" (Hall & Spencer-Hall, 1982; Martin, 1976).

Bacharach (1988) casts organizational participants as "political actors with their own needs, objectives, and strategies to achieve those objectives" (p. 282). In these organizational contexts, individuals and groups constantly vie for power and influence and subsequently engage in power struggles over scarce resources and decision making authority. For example, teachers respond to organizational action by engaging, individually and collectively, in activities which resist or challenge managerial practice and decisions (Blase, 1989; Kanpol, 1988; Wolcott, 1975). Most notably, teachers alter organizational power relationships through resistance activities at the school-site and by

entering into negotiations (collective bargaining) at the district level to promote and protect their interests.

Shapiro and Crowson (1990) suggest that both leaders and followers can be seen as "preference-driven and opportunistic" (p. 298). For example, principals have been reported to engage in similar strategies as those of teachers by "maneuvering past and manipulating policies, procedures, and personnel issues" (Crowson & Morris, 1985).

These activities indicate that the dynamics between organizational demands and professional expectations in schools can appropriately be examined through the "cognition and actions of actors within the context of specific organizational structure(s) and environment(s)" (Bacharach, 1988, p. 281). Salient to this study are the "cognition and actions" reported by principals regarding how they make decisions, in their respective schools, which may or may not be in alignment with district requirements and within the boundaries of district negotiated agreements.

Central to the political perspective are factors which are amplified when seen through a micropolitical lens. This perspective addresses the issue of individual purposeful behavior for achieving ends to meet desired outcomes. To understand the dynamics between principals and teachers in the implementation of contracts and working agreements, the

micropolitical frame serves well to capture the daily nuances of school life for it:

highlights the fundamentals of human behavior and purpose . . . power and how people use it to influence others and to protect themselves . . . conflict and how people compete with each other to get what they want . . . cooperation and how people build support among themselves to achieve their ends . . . what people in all social settings think about and have strong feelings about, but what is so often unspoken and not easily observed (Blase, 1991, p. 1).

Iannaccone (1975), Hoyle (1986), and Ball (1987), have applied the micropolitical perspective to study schools. Iannaccone (1975), for example, conceptualized school composition as groups within groups (in the school and outside the school) which constantly interact to further ideological demands. Further, Ball (1987) described schools as "arenas of struggle . . . riven with actual or potential conflict between members . . . poorly coordinated . . . (and) ideologically diverse" (p. 227). Participants in these arenas strike trade-offs and engage in "individual bargaining", an activity "more micropolitical to the degree to which it is implicit rather than explicit, outside rather than inside formal structures and procedures, and draws on

informal resources of influence" (Hoyle, 1986, p. 127). In collective bargaining, this activity is conceptualized as "fractional bargaining" (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988; Kuhn, 1961; Lambert, 1988).

For an understanding of the day-to-day processes in schools, particularly when they operate in ways not necessarily stipulated by structural determination (Manning, 1977) and where "rules and legalistic authority . . . are best treated as resources in social interaction" (Blankenship, 1976, p. 165), the literature on "negotiated order" (Strauss, 1978) will be reviewed as it provides further underpinning for this study.

Negotiated Order

As a viable model for understanding how some professions function within organizational structures, researchers have applied this perspective to the study of schools (Hall & Spencer-Hall, 1982; Martin, 1976). For example, in their study of schools, Hall and Spencer-Hall (1982) found that much of school life was routine and non-negotiative, while the area of special education was replete with negotiation. Their goal was to determine, not whether schools were negotiated orders, but rather "when, how, and why, participants engage in negotiative activities" (p. 328).

Maines (1982) highlights Strauss' notion of negotiated order as:

the stable features of an organization, but those features, such as rules and policies, work groups, hierarchies and divisions of labor, ideologies, career lines, and organizational goals, [were] regarded as the organizational background through which and within which people interact on a daily basis and attempt to get their work done.

Ambiguities inherent in the organization require negotiation, either explicit or implicit, in order for organizational work to take place. It is through negotiation that the organizational structure is able to operate (p. 269).

With roots in symbolic interaction, and as a perspective challenging the traditional rational-bureaucratic concept of organizational authority (Stelling & Bucher, 1972), "negotiated order" is a term coined by Strauss (1963). He conceptualized negotiation as an activity whereby organizational members "come to terms with each other's actions, to work with one another, even if antagonistically, in order to get done whatever needs to be done 'for' or 'in' or 'through the organization'" (Strauss, 1978, p. 105). His concerns were the features that comprise the negotiation process, fin what "really" happens when

people come together in organizations. He acknowledged the fact that some organizational relationships involve standardization determined by rules or other structural elements, but others, involve "conflict, ambiguity or novelty" (p. 105).

Friedson (1976) summarizes it as:

a process of social interaction in the course of which the participants are continuously engaged in attempting to define, establish, maintain, and renew the tasks they perform and the relationships with each other which the tasks presuppose (p. 311).

Strauss' (1978, 1982) overarching goal in the "negotiated order" paradigm is to link negotiations and their contexts to social orders. This paradigm suggests that organizations exist because members engage in reconciliatory activities in dealing with one another's actions. As a result, relationships emerge which are sometimes guided by standardized rules or may involve conflict. In order to "get things done", organizational members develop ways to accomplish organizational goals either "for", "in", or "through" organizational structured (p. 105).

Founded on three central concepts, this paradigm aids in the examination and understanding of political processes

occurring in organizations. First, "negotiation" includes the types of interaction that participants engage in and the strategies and tactics they use. Second, "negotiation context" includes features which directly enter into negotiations and affect their course. Third, "structural context" includes the larger, transcending circumstance in which negotiation contexts exist (p. 270).

Within the negotiated order paradigm are "issues" which Strauss (1978) has determined to be essential for data analysis. These issues are: (1) continuous working relations, (2) interplay of legal and illegal negotiations in the political arena, (3) building cooperative structures, (4) negotiating compromises within social orders, (5) antagonistic negotiation within changing structural context, and (6) limits, silent bargains and implicit negotiation. And, within these issues, negotiatives features and subprocesses occur which provide the substance for descriptions and analysis of social orders. These issues, which are essential for accomplishing organizational "work", can be examined for special features (e.g., stakes, balance of power) and subprocesses such as trade-offs and renegotiation to yield a truer picture of negotiations than has been reported. The "negotiated order" paradigm provides the scheme for investigating how in "street-level bureaucracies" (Lipsky, 1980), replete with ambiguities,

tensions, and contradictions, participants resist and accommodate incompatible formalized practices to specific work situations.

Sarason (1985) proposes that documents such as collectively bargained contracts and decisions rendered by arbitrators illustrate how the social situation in schools has changed. However, it could be argued that the dynamics of challenging managerial decisions are more evident during the life of the agreement and thus provide a more accurate depiction of school change. An approach, such as Sarason's, which temporizes the bargaining process, fails to capture the ongoing, often informal negotiations principals and teachers engage in for expediting and coordinating the educational enterprise. Since collective bargaining creates a context for individual efforts and local negotiative processes to occur, it has the potential to explain and give meaning to behaviors occurring at the most essential level--the school site. For example, not all issues pertaining to the working situation that are covered by a contract can support a grievance. How a principal interprets and responds to "resistance" activities may be affected by collective bargaining. For this reason, the "negotiated order" paradigm is useful since it extends beyond assumptions that organizational members engage in political activity. By examining features of "what negotiation looks

like" a more vivid, realistic picture of the circumstances is possible.

The Character of Principal-Teacher Relationships

Analysis of the present social situation of schools and how participants enact their roles indicates that the allocation of decision making authority is under dispute and is the organizational action most likely to bring about conflict between administrators and teachers (Ball, 1987; Hoy & Brown, 1988). Rees and Carpenter (1980) attribute the changing power relationships of administrators and teachers to disagreement about "how decisions are made and who is going to make them" (p. 51). For example, the current reform strategies which advise a shift from unilateral to shared decision making can engender disagreement about how decision making is to be shared (California Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985; Carnegie Commission, 1986).

If these strategies are to be effectively implemented, researchers propose that the responsibilities and prerogatives of both administrators and teachers must be redefined. That is, in the management of schools, teachers should be seen as professionals and accorded critical roles which allow them to "identify problems and the resources needed to solve them" (Conley & Bacharach, 1990, p. 540). The redefinition of roles, however, is criticized among administrators because granting teachers a more active role

in decision making may in fact diminish administrative discretion even further (Geisert, 1989).

What work features predispose professionals to resist managerial control? Raelin (1985) found that the freedom to question management on decisions that affect professionals' work and work evaluation figure significantly. Along with higher wages, Retsinas (1982) found that teachers demanded "input into policy that they merit as professionals" (p. 356). Clearly, teachers deem traditional bargaining objectives dealing with wages, hours, and working conditions as important, but as professionals, in addition to "bread and butter" issues, they want more control over their work activities and seek inclusion in a more expanded decision making arena (Doherty, 1980).

As a result of the expanded roles that teachers are demanding, the role of the principal has steadily developed into one best described as complex. Two recent critical factors which have contributed to this complexity are: (a) recent reform agendas which call for the improvement of school productivity and (b) an imperative for work-force participation in the determination of how to achieve this increased productivity (Glasman, 1983; Rallis & Highsmith, 1986).

Even though secondary school principals are "accountable for delivering", English and Hill (19809) found

that their control was fragmented by collective bargaining agreements, legalities regarding how teachers are assigned and evaluated, and a myriad of school board policies and procedures. These developments have been reported to impact the tenor of principals' activities, especially as leaders, since administrative autonomy has been curbed. As the administrators most unfavorably affected by collective bargaining (Aregyle, 1980), principals describe their role as "schizophrenic" and "caught in a cross-fire" (Webster, 1985, p. 28).

In their study of administrators, Blumberg, Brannigan, and Nason (1981) focused on how contracts limited the power of superintendents and principals. They were interested whether--and the extent to which--"these constraints hampered their (superintendents' and principals') ability to do their job in a manner they thought best" (p. 328). They found that superintendents were concerned with constraints on larger school district issues such as school calendar decisions, policies about leaves, absences, and teacher discipline and transfer. Principals, on the other hand, cited issues which dealt with school building operation, teacher workload, class size, and teacher termination and transfer.

In general, principals perceive their jobs very differently as a result of collective bargaining

(Goldschmidt & Stuart, 1984; Mazzarella, 1985). Even though they seldom participate in the determination of educational policy, principals are nevertheless responsible for the implementation of policy. Critically hindering principals is the loss of prerogatives and the erosion of autonomy. This reflects Sarason's (1982) observation that the power of principals is overstated and should be thought of "in terms of what he or she cannot do or the numerous restrictions, formal and informal that limit (the principals') freedom of action" (pp. 147-148).

An additional responsibility of principals is to influence individuals to comply with directives. However, Hoy and Brown (1988) found that conflict in schools was largely due to "teachers in opposition to administrators" (p., 29). Suggesting that both teachers and administrators have given up some freedom and discretion, Muth (1984) found that relationships were most effectively transacted through "persuasion and incentives" (p. 32). Areas of limited control--often exercised by administrators--were found in the allocation of rewards and punishments (Pitner, 1986).

These limitations, or the principals' sense of them, must be viewed against heroic rhetoric such as principal as "visionary", "instructional leader", and "creator of effective schools". These images and the belief that effective administrators are leaders in their buildings,

increase the level of expectations while any sense of control paradoxically diminishes.

The Effects of Collective Bargaining

Included with desegregation and special compensatory programs, collective bargaining is considered to be one of the most influential forces in bringing about changes in public education (Mitchell, Kerchner, Erck, & Prior, 1981).

In 1962, the New York City teachers' strike bolstered and strengthened teachers' unions. By negotiating what is considered to be the most significant of teachers' contracts, teachers' unions were recognized as "formidable labor organizations" (Castallo, Fletcher, Rossetti & Sekowski, 1992, p. 196).

As a result of these events and ongoing teacher activism, there continue to be "changes in the roles of middle level administrators, in the relationships between teachers and administrators, and in the perceptions of teachers and teaching" (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1988, p. 157). Collective bargaining, as a major force in educational reform since the early 60's, has had an incontestable impact on the work lives of both administrators and teachers.

The basic aim of collective bargaining in public education has been to involve teachers in decision making (Rebore, 1991). This goal has served to provide the impetus for teachers to demand inclusion in the decisions affecting

their assignments, conditions of work, and continuing employment. "They are not asking to run the schools, but they want their views heard and heeded" (Shils & Whittier, 1968, p. 20). But, fundamentally, "the stakes of collective bargaining come to price and power" (Barbash, 1980, p. 554).

A great deal of tension and debate has been generated by teachers over the legal status of topics and issues brought to the negotiations table (i.e., scope of bargaining) (Ostrander, 1987). Teachers who identify themselves as professionals are straining against the limited number of topics and issues which can be negotiated. Particularly in the wake of school reform, teachers seek an expansion of negotiable topics even if they intrude into areas solely delegated to school boards. As teachers continue to gain control over working conditions, such as hours and class size, they are seen as gaining more control over educational policy--"the issues that most directly affect principals" (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1982, p. 29).

As a result of these gains, some have pronounced collective bargaining as having "run its course" (Sykes, 1989, p. 81). Cast as an element which engenders conflict and distrust between teachers and administrators, critics view collective bargaining as limiting the possibilities for cooperation (Sykes & Elmore, 1988). Others, however,

speculate that unionism is becoming a "scrappy new form" that is well-suited for enhancing cooperation between managers and teachers (Bacharach, Shedd, & Conley, 1988; Doherty & Lipsky, 1988; Shedd, 1988). This view is similar to those who advocate a balance of bargaining agendas enabling both teachers and administrators to jointly agree to disagree regarding decision making (Hatch, 1982; Moser & Randles, 1984; Walton & McKersie, 1965). In order to enhance working relationships between unions and school management, recent emphasis has been placed on collaborative forms of negotiation in order to involve staff in more decision making issues.

The literature is too insistent about the restrictive character of collective bargaining based on the labor model. It could be argued that investigation of idiosyncratic practices at individual schools can inspire a renewed confidence in the "scrappiness" (Shedd, 1990) of public education unionism. Negotiations occur in day-to-day practices and indicate that rules and limits are not restrictive. Perhaps "collegial and collective management" (Conley & Bacharach, 1990) is occurring more prevalently than is acknowledged.

Complaints and Grievances

After considering the wide-scope influence of collective bargaining, it is necessary to consider how

contracts affect those who "live" with them. The organizational impact of collective bargaining is most apparent in the day-to-day administration of an agreement between administrators and teachers. Castetter (1986) suggests that "how" the bargaining parties administer agreements largely determines the quality and continuity of "relationships between system and its personnel groups" (p. 176). Kagel (1986) notes that the "terms of the agreement itself provide only the skeleton, the bare bones of bargaining and it is the day-to-day settlement of disputes arising during the life of the agreement that provides the flesh and blood of bargaining" (p. vii). Since few building administrators (e.g., principals) have direct involvement in the actual agreement negotiations and the drafting of an agreement, this process, designed for the pursuit of collective interests, may become a system inherently conducive for conflict between administrative decisions and teachers' rights (whether perceived or actual).

After bargaining, the primary duty of managers is to implement and administer the negotiated agreement. Kerchner (1984) suggests that principals now serve more to interpret and enforce the contract. However, a growing line of inquiry suggests that contractual agreements are frequently modified in practice (Jessup, 1985; Johnson, 1984; Kerchner, 1984). This ad hoc modification (or localization) appears

to depend on the administrator/teacher relationships established at the school-site (Johnson, 1984; Lambert, 1988). For example, where relationships are estranged and formal, it is more likely--than in collegial environments--that teachers will use the grievance process to challenge managerial decisions that are perceived as inappropriate and in violation of the bargained agreement. Though grievances are expected to insure contractual or policy compliance, this use of complaints and grievances is clearly a mechanism for teachers to voice the incompatibility of formalized practices to their specific work situation or preferences.

The definitions of complaints and grievances are at best ambiguous (Kagel, 1986). Differences in definitions of grievances vary from work setting to work setting and from author to author (Castetter, 1986; Chamberlain, 1965; Flippo, 1980; Kagel, 1986; Lewin & Peterson, 1988; McBrearty, 1972; Steiber, 1968). A broad interpretation of grievance would be discontent or dissatisfaction which affects work performance. This definition includes almost every aspect of employment and has far-reaching implications since the breadth of definition takes into account both singular and general aspects of employment. Functional interpretation, however, is dependent on the bargaining context. Some broad categories under which grievances are often initiated may involve "the employees' perception that

their health or safety are threatened, working conditions and/or equipment are unreasonable, or that supervision is inconsistent or unfair" (Castallo et al., 1992, p. 210). Definitions and function become further entangled when distinctions are made between complaints and grievances. Webster (1985) notes that "all grievances are complaints but not all complaints are grievances" (p. 194). Kagel exacerbates the dilemma by speculating as to whether grievances are complaints, simply part and parcel of the agreement, or "just a complaint for which the agreement provides no relief. In practice, grievances are contract-related disputes and limit the parties' rights and duties to contract (agreement) language" (pp. 3-5). Further, as the basic method of conflict resolution, grievances are "often considered to be a continuation of the collective bargaining process which theoretically stopped with the signing of a new contract" (Flippo, 1980, p. 361).

Contracts (agreements) do not encompass every aspect of the school operation. Further, they cannot include a clause and/or phrase to capture all possible situations in day-to-day work activities. For this reason, complaints are often not contractually addressed, even though they are related to the content and substance of teachers' work, and thus, they fail to meet the criteria of a grievance. Complaints are often submitted informally and may address such things as

room temperature, inadequate lighting, job assignment, etc. In this vein, one would expect many more complaints than grievances. Though seemingly benign, complaints can potentially escalate to a grievance if they are ignored or if dissatisfactions with the work situation grow. "A complaint becomes a grievance when the employee feels that an injustice has been committed--it can be valid or ridiculous and must grow out of something connected with the work setting" (Flippo, 1980, p. 360). Commentators have indicated that complaint policies are as important as grievance procedures (Castallo et al., 1992; McBrearty, 1972). Since many complaints are not related to the contract and are not subject to control through the relationship between the teachers' organization and the school district, it is incumbent on site administrators to deal with complaints in order to reach adequate remedy "to what may be important to an individual but is a minor problem in the school district" (Castallo et al., 1992, p. 209). It would seem that attitudinal barriers which foster "do nothing" about such complaints are likely to create bigger risks, specifically, the escalation of a problem which could have been remediated. "Silenced" complaints have been found to result in poor morale and anti-organization behavior (Castetter, 1986).

The formal procedure (grievance), consisting of steps of appeal and method of resolution, encourages the informal procedure (complaint) as a means to resolve workplace dissatisfaction at the lowest level of origin. Only if satisfaction is not forthcoming, does the individual resort to the formal grievance procedure as provided by the contract (Webster, 1985). It is at this point that the grievance functions as an expression to management that "disagreement or dissatisfaction about conditions of employment" exist (Castetter, 1986, p. 524). As provided through negotiations between a district and the teachers' organization, teachers may generally challenge administrative decisions in four areas: (1) conditions of employment (e.g., extracurricular activities), (2) evaluation (e.g., procedures and subjectivity), (3) consistency in dealing with and assignment of teachers, and (4) work load (e.g., class size and preparations). Prime areas of conflict between principals and teachers at the school-site include: (1) class size, (2) the nature and use of contracted duty hours for teachers, (3) classroom discipline and management, and (4) inconsistencies in the administration of the school (Webster, 1985). Lewin and Peterson (1988) found that the predominant grievances in local schools were in the areas of working conditions, health and safety, and work assignments. In addition, from

their interviews with work supervisors and union officials, they found that most grievances were settled informally through discussion between supervisors and employees.

Many daily occurrences, in the work situation, may cause conflict between principals and teachers. Since contract implementation falls squarely on principals, and may limit decision making flexibility, principals are characterized as "interpreters", not "makers" of decisions (Webster, 1985, p. 188).

Principal Decision Making

A critical responsibility ascribed to principals is to make and implement decisions (Hoy & Miskel, 1982). The decision making environment surrounding principals involves decisions about sources of problems, resources available and individual and collective needs. Stager and Leithwood (1989) argue that little is known about how principals select and operationalize specific behaviors.

A prominent perspective guiding principal behavior in complex settings has been the rational system of decision making. The assumption inherent in this perspective holds that managerial decision making proceeds logically and orderly (Barnard, 1938; Gouldner, 1959; Simon, 1957; Thompson & Tuden, 1959). Decisions in the rational model are "made by the evaluation of alternatives in terms of their future consequences for prior preferences" (March &

Shapira, 1982, p. 92). Scott (1981) acknowledges the efficiency of this system, but characterizes it as centralizing decisions and precluding participants from exercising power and discretion. Shapiro and Crowson (1990) suggest in their study that site principals "act rationally . . . based on the benefits they perceive and their preferences for different outcomes" (p. 297). In recasting this perspective for the study of leader behavior in schools, they posit that both "leaders" and "followers" are "preference-driven and opportunistic" (p. 298).

Researchers have challenged the rational decision making model by suggesting that the day-to-day decisions made by all managers and leaders (Mintzberg, 1973), including principals (Blumberg, 1987; Wolcott, 1973) often deviate from the rational model. Principals regularly make decisions in the absence of clear guidelines and often without advance notice (Duke, 1987). In addition, principals report that their decision making behaviors result from factors both internal and external to their schools (e.g., collective bargaining, reform agendas). These principals' actions, as in Hunt and Osborn's (1982) categories of managerial behaviors, include activities resulting from the manager's initiative (discretionary) and in response to demands from people within the manager's organizational environment (lateral). For principals, the

complexity of such an environment results in role ambiguity and constraints on their actions (Berg, 1973; Peterson, 1978). Stager and Leithwood (1989) refer to instances of cognitive flexibility and inflexibility among school principals in their study which investigated how principals order preferences and actions in problem-solving. Bridges (1970) suggested that administrator's decisions were actually 'guided, shaped, and even controlled by subordinates' (p. 7).

Weick's (1978) image of managers and leaders goes beyond the stereotype and provides a bolder description from the standard: "leaders made do, let it pass, improvise, make inferences, and scramble" (p. 60). Similarly, principals in the large bureaucracies studied by Crowson and Morris (1985) survived the constraints imposed by a formal structure "maneuvering past and manipulating" policies, procedures and personnel issues (including grievances).

Summary and Implications for the Present Study

This chapter has suggested that: (1) schools function within two competing social systems, (2) two primary actors (principals and teachers) in these systems have needs and objectives and through continuous interaction, engage in strategies to achieve them, (3) collective bargaining is both a medium which engenders conflict and distrust and a forum which enhances cooperation between principals and

teachers, and (4) the actor most critically affected by collective bargaining is the principal.

These developments are expected to affect principal decision making in several ways. First, the working domain of principals is circumscribed by organizational demands and teachers' interests resonating a "professional" ethos. Therefore, policies, procedures and contract terms limit principals' decision making capacity. Second, the dual role of directing a professional workforce while also functioning as a manager in carrying out contract terms and policies and procedures is inherently ambiguous and necessitates discretionary action. As such, principals' interpretations and behaviors may create conflict at the school site. Third, the possible use of sanctions (e.g., complaints, grievances) may influence principals' decisions. Contract implementation and work direction may be influenced by locally negotiated, formal and informal processes created between principals and teachers.

This study adopts perspectives which cast schools as complex, politicized organizations (Bacharach, 1988; Ball, 1987; Corwin, 1970; Hoyle, 1985), which operate within two competing systems (Kerchkner & Mitchell, 1988), and whose actors are dependent on one another for the accomplishment of organizational goals (Strauss, 1978).

A case study design (Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Yin, 1989) effectuates the purpose of this study: to elicit and attempt to reveal certain aspects of "life as a principal" through the individual's lens/gestalt as it is affected by: (1) collective bargaining, (2) teacher's behaviors, and (3) interpretations and decisions that occur within this working domain. The actors' activities in this study occur in a dynamic system (Kagel, 1986; Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988), and their reported behaviors and perceptions are best investigated through a political perspective. For these reasons, the case study method is appropriate and is in keeping with Bacharach's (1988) observation that "the strength of the case study approach lies in its ability to explore how political processes unfold over time in a specific setting" (p. 286). Also, the principal's "working domain" is examined as a context within a larger social order and follows Strauss's (1982) assertion that case studies "help to elaborate and clarify . . . negotiative textures" (pp. 353-354).

Chapter 3 details the case study design selected for this study.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

General Method

A variety of methods are used to investigate principals' decision making in particular, and individual and group organizational action in general. Salient to this study is fieldwork utilizing qualitative research methods to derive descriptions based on participants' oral histories (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). As a means to capture what individuals interpret and believe (Denzin, 1983) about their organizational lives, case studies provide in-depth descriptions situating those beliefs and interpretations for explanations from particular to larger issues (Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Strauss, 1978; Yin, 1989).

This study follows a single-embedded-case study design (Yin, 1989). As such, each embedded unit (i.e., principal) was analyzed within the case (i.e., decision making in collective bargaining environments), and treated as one factor in building an aggregate explanation about the case.

Sample

Subjects

The 15 subjects in this study were principals, working in Kindergarten through grade 12 settings, from five school districts in a Southwestern state. The criteria for

inclusion in this study were: (1) a minimum of two years administrative experience as principal at the selected school site and (2) the school site be situated in a school district which has some type of bargaining relationship with its teachers. The study used principals with at least two years experience for two reasons. First, the principal is no longer a "rookie" (Greenfield, 1985). Second, the principal is "situationally adjusted" (Greenfield, 1977) and has developed the behaviors required to succeed in the situation (Becker, 1964) (see Appendices A and B).

District Setting

The study used public school districts in a state that lacks a comprehensive statute which requires or prohibits bargaining (Sacken, 1986). Schools in this state were selected for two reasons. First, the bargaining arrangements of school districts in this state are similar in structure and practice but vary in how they operate within state law. That is, they exhibited differences as to the school boards' voluntary recognition of a representative organization, and the process or product that resulted from such a relationship. Second, the school districts in this study utilized similar complaint/grievance procedures. Even though each district differed in what constitutes a complaint and/or grievance, all districts encouraged the informal process (i.e., complaint), as the first option

toward resolving conflict. If a mutually satisfactory resolution was not possible, the districts provided the formal procedure (i.e., grievance), as a tenable option. In this study, complaints were defined as informal and grievances as formal options.

School Settings

Represented are three suburban, one rural, and one urban school within a 35-mile radius of a large metropolitan area. The demographic characteristics of these districts differ. For example, some urban schools have predominantly minority populations whereas, one of the suburban school districts had an Anglo, upper middle-class population. The basic demographic data for each school is presented in Appendix C.

The principals in the study are referred to by an alpha code. These letters (i.e., A, B, C, etc.) were randomly assigned and used only to distinguish among the subjects. The school-site is referred to by grade level (e.g., secondary, middle, elementary). The school district is referred to by a two-letter code (i.e., CA, MA, MC, and NO). These were used to distinguish among the different district bargaining arrangements.

Procedure

The primary data for this study were semi-structured, open-ended interviews. Following Marshall and Rossman

(1989), the "elite interview", a specialized treatment of interviewing was utilized. This procedure was used because principals are well-informed people in the school and can comprehensively report about the school's operating norms, past and future goals. The researcher's role as the interviewer was modified because principals as "elites": (1) were busy people and not readily accessible, (2) they disdained narrow, stereotypical questions, (3) there was variation in the degree of control in the interview, and (4) the problem had to be projected through shrewd questions.

Pilot Study

General questions regarding principal decision making were developed for five principal interviews. These administrators were considered to represent the principals and their working environments of the present study. From their input and suggestions from committee members, questions for this study's interviews were refined in order to gain maximum information regarding the research topic. These principals were not used as subjects in the study.

Data Collection

The data collection process for this study was based on methods discussed by Yin (1989). Data collection proceeded by: (1) gaining access to principals, (2) developing an interview schedule specifying date, time, and place, (3) the use of tape recorder and field notes, and (4) planning for

"unanticipated events, including changes in the availability of principals" (p. 75).

Selection of Subjects

Initial contact in two of the four districts was made through central office. In district MC, four principals were recommended by the superintendent. Two of these four principals agreed to participate in the study. In district N, the assistant superintendent recommended five principals. Two of these five principals agreed to participate in the study. Selection of the remaining 11 principals was nonrandom and independent of central office recommendation.

Access to Subjects

Access to the 15 principals was gained by telephone and each principal readily agreed to participate in the study. Subsequently, an interview time and date, which was most convenient for the individual, was determined and scheduled. The time and date were contingent upon the principal's schedule and availability, and his/her willingness to participate in the study.

Confidentiality

Prior to the interview, each principal was assured that: (1) his/her participation was voluntary, (2) he/she could withdraw from the interview or decline to answer questions at any time, and (3) the interview was confidential. These stipulations were stated initially

(telephone) and before beginning the interview. In addition, they were provided with a written copy of these conditions (McCracken, 1988) (see Appendix D).

Interviews

All interviews were conducted and audiotaped in the principals' offices. Further, all of the principals were amenable to the use of a tape recorder. On one occasion, a principal addressing a sensitive issue, asked that the tape recorder be stopped. Once the discussion was completed, however, the interview was tape recorded. Each interview was a minimum of 45 minutes in length. However, some interviews consisted of a maximum of two hours. The length of the interview was contingent on the principal's schedule and his/her disposition. For example, as a result of unanticipated events, two principals rescheduled the interview due to simultaneous situations requiring immediate attention. Three other principals invited the researcher to accompany them as they observed activities within the school and/or "walk the campus". Three other principals allowed the researcher to observe the resolution of a problem situation dealing with students.

Interview Protocol

As a means to describe each principal's perspective, interview questions followed a semi-structured, open-ended format. Probes were included whenever an issue required

clarification or embellishment. Questions fundamentally focused on how principals interpret (1) the effects of collective bargaining on their life as a principal (e.g., contractual terms and conflict procedures), (2) teachers' behaviors, existing and anticipated, and (3) their decisions and actions in this working domain (see Appendix E).

Data Analysis Procedures

The study's analytic methods are based on a qualitative perspective. The data collection process for the study follows a case study as discussed by Yin (1989) and Marshall and Rossman (1989). The data reduction techniques follow those of Miles and Huberman (1984). Informants' reports about how work is accomplished in collective bargaining environments was the central concern in analyzing the data. This was done following the negotiated order paradigm (Strauss, 1978).

Data Reduction Techniques

The data reduction techniques used in this study were those discussed by Miles and Huberman (1984). Sorting and organizing the data was reiterative and proceeded in four steps. Step One was a general reading of each interview--15 in all. In Step Two, each interview was read to identify responses which matched the five categories in the interview protocol. In Step Three, patterns were identified from responses to categories which addressed the four research

questions. In Step Four, general themes emerged which indicated that ongoing negotiative processes were common occurrences at all the schools in the study. This observation thus became the basis for further analysis. Step Five was analysis of the themes following the negotiated order paradigm to describe the issues, features, and subprocesses of continuing negotiations (Strauss, 1978) (see Table 1).

Analytic Strategies

This study utilized the descriptive approach as a means to identify the idiosyncratic processes which occur at individual school sites. This approach was used to develop explanations about the effects of collective bargaining on principals' decision making as they implement agreements.

Analytic Techniques

This single-embedded-case study utilized techniques which first analyze each embedded unit in the case. The embedded units were 15 school-site principals operating in a collective bargaining environment. Second, patterns were investigated to explain the larger issue (Yin, 1989) of principal decision making in the context of collective bargaining. Analysis of data followed the negotiated order paradigm to describe local negotiations (Strauss, 1978).

An example of Step Four and the Step Five analysis is drawn from a portion of an interviewed in which the

Table 1

Structural, Negotiative, Negotiation Contexts

		Context
Properties	Structural	
	Dimensions	
	Intersectional Organizational Line-of-work Arena	
	Issues	
	Continuous working relationships Building cooperative structures Negotiating compromises Antagonistic negotiation Limits, Silent bargains	
	Negotiative	
	Features	
	Negotiators Frequency and character Balance of power Stakes Visibility Complexity , number of issues Clarity of legitimacy Options to avoid or continue	
	Negotiation	
	Subprocesses	
	Mediating Trade-offs Compromise to middle	

Note. Adapted from Strauss (1978, 1982)

principal describes the district's bargaining relationship with teachers and the impact on the school. Following Strauss' paradigm (1978), the issue of continuous working relations and features such as stakes, relative balance of power, and legitimacy boundaries for salient in this principal's characterization.

Principal A (Secondary, MC)

We meet and confer. Our association is a factor in the meet and confer but it is not a major factor in policy and/or decision making at the building level. They are involved in the meet and confer which are mainly financial issues and some other issues, and now we're into a win-win. But as far as my being constrained by union or association, I have very few constraints. There are a few involving right to representation when I meet with a teacher. In contrast to where I worked before, it's like night and day as far as constraints on decision making. We have policies and then the teacher gets a contract that says you make X amount. As far as labor relations, all the cards are in, we have all the cards, basically, administratively. But we also don't flaunt that and abuse it, the district has a commitment to listening and doing right by their employees. I

think there isn't a strong union because they haven't had a need for one. Their needs have been met. Every dime of the bond issue went to teachers' salaries. I think if there was need, if we were abusing employees, professionals, there would be a stronger union-type thing. If it wasn't in line with what it means to treat somebody like professionals, they'd be clamoring and I'd get lots of grievances.

The district bargaining relationship (structural context) and how it influences the school (negotiation context) are described by the principal as fair and providing for the needs of employees. Fundamentally, the administration "holds the cards" and working relations are maintained by a clearly defined balance of power even with the goal of a "win-win" approach in bargaining. Employee needs are equated with financial compensation and professional treatment. There are no complex issues to negotiate since the legitimacy boundaries are understood and adhered to. The stakes are ideological (teachers-as-professionals), equity (fair treatment), and needs (salaries). He further characterized it as not intrusive or constraining on his decision making capacity.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The findings are discussed first by revisiting the research questions which guided this study. The first question was (1) Regarding what areas and issues do principals report teachers to present complaints or grievances? Next was (2) Do principals report complaints or grievances as limiting their freedom of action within the school setting? This was followed by (3) How do principals "manage" teachers and does this influence the use of complaints and grievances? Last was (4) Do principals report that complaints and grievances impact their managerial and leadership roles?

Summaries recapitulate the general findings of each of the research questions.

Question One

Regarding what areas and issues do principals report teachers present complaints or grievances?

These issues were categorized according to the traditional scope of collective bargaining provisions (e.g., salaries, wages, hours, and working conditions). The categories are consistent with the literature which identifies the substantive issues of collective bargaining in public education (Doherty, 1980; Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988; Lewin & Peterson, 1988; McDonnell & Pascal, 1988;

Webster, 1985). Also included is teacher evaluation since certain aspects (e.g., procedures), are considered bargaining items by some school districts and teachers.

Table 2 shows the issues and numbers of complaints identified by principals. This is followed by selected excerpts from principals' interviews to provide detailed descriptions of the complaints.

Salary, Wages, Hours

Salaries

Two principals, elementary and middle school (L, H), in a district with no collective bargaining agreement, reported that complaints were surfacing about salaries. The middle school principal (H) described it as:

What we do have is a career-ladder committee and that's where salary decisions are made and they are made by that group which is comprised of teachers and administrators. So that's as close as we get to bargaining. Yeah, there are some definite decisions made in that group and there's some BIG issues and, talk about people's salaries! So, it's no less serious than it is anywhere else. People have no less strong feelings about their salaries and their paychecks and their benefits, but I think it's just that agreements are made, people usually consider them fair.

Table 2

Complaint Issues Identified by Principals

Issue	n ^a	Grade Level		
		Elementary	Middle	Secondary
Complaints				
Salary, Wages, Hours				
Salaries		1	1	
Curriculum Development				1
Extracurricular assignment				2
Absences				1
Evaluation				
Fair, professional				1
Improvement		1	1	1
Promotion			1	
Working Conditions				
Clean room		1		1
Broken chairs				1
Principal's manner				2
Teacher-Teacher relations		1		
Discipline		2		2
Bell system				1
Campus monitors			1	1
Aides			1	
Attendance office				2
Refusing a child		1		
Demographic changes		1		1
Teacher input			1	3
Parent involvement			1	
Custodian		1		
Class schedule				2
Teacher workload			1	

Note. Total = 39

^a Number of principals out of 15 who reported each issue.

Curriculum Development

A high school principal (B) related the resistance of a teacher and subsequent complaint from that teacher regarding curriculum development. The principal stated:

The curriculum emphasis is on other issues than what the teacher is doing in her class. This teacher isn't all that great on doing that. She said, 'I won't do that unless you pay me in the summer to develop curriculum'. What a probably do would be to drop the classes that she wanted to teach and she would no longer have a job because we no longer offer her classes. I've seen that happen, it isn't my favorite thing to do and I didn't have to do that. But it took some heavy leaning to get it done.

This same principal related two other complaints regarding pay for extracurricular duties:

They resented the assignment to do a dance, that we would just ask and they would volunteer. Every time we've had to put the squeeze on someone. They resent in the spring when it gets real busy with track, basketball, that we ask teachers to cover for another teacher's class. They want to be paid for it, or they want us to hire people to do it. And they talk to me about it, they ask the

superintendent to look at the period coverage, how many periods some people have to give up.

Evaluation

Fair, Professional

A secondary principal (A) reported:

Some faculty felt that a colleague was not being treated fairly. For example, we did a home visit on a faculty person who had a history of attendance, absences, a little pattern. Next time he was absent we were going to verify it, so we called and the phone was disconnected, so we said we're going to verify it so we went to the person's home. That got translated a lot of different ways. People were concerned that we were not treating people professionally, that we weren't being fair.

This same principal (A) received complaints from several of another teacher's colleagues.

A faculty member received quite a few I's on his evaluation form and they felt we weren't being fair with this person.

Teacher Improvement

An elementary principal (N) stated

There's a real tendency for people to want all to be superior. I give descriptors for what I look

for, for superior. We gauge where they're at. I give my viewpoint but they counter me. So I do some negotiation with evaluation.

A middle school principal (I) felt that:

A teacher should hear a complaint from a group of kids who came in to tell on him for swearing. And this teacher said 'I got this damn, hard class and they're, and there's First Amendment rights'. But I saw a teachable moment and said 'let's talk about 'hell' and 'damn' and what's appropriate'.

A secondary principal (C) related a complaint from teachers regarding students out of class. This complaint, however, spilled-over into evaluation. For example:

Teachers will complain that kids are out in the hallways all the time. So what it makes me do instead of being able to work with professionals who would maintain the classroom, I then have to monitor teachers, like a parent has to monitor a child, to say 'you can't do this'. Then I have to write them up and do all that which takes away from leadership. So I walk the halls like a police-person, trying to catch them and have little time to catch them doing good things.

Promotion

A middle school principal (I) reported a complaint related to a potential promotion. He said:

I needed another curriculum specialist. I knew who I wanted on this one. I wanted this certain individual because I owed him. Because he had been here and stayed all the extra hours and had done all those extra things. And I knew he wanted to be an administrator. And I was going to push him on the same little treadmill and put him in the beauty contest and push him out of the nest when he got ready. I felt a counselor here had really done a yeoman's job and really deserved the job. As well as I know the staff and faculty here, I didn't trust them enough that if I put the job out for an interview within the school, I knew it was 'bully' time, that I had to bully that one through. One of the site-based team members and others said to me, 'You know, I have a problem with your decision. My problem with your decision is what you did, you didn't even ask us if we were interested'. And I defended my decision by saying that the individual I wanted had spent his time, but other people said, 'but so did we. We've also spent time. We paid our dues. Why didn't you

give us the opportunity to look at us and talk about it?'

Working Conditions

Clean Rooms, Broken Chairs

Two principals (A and O) reported complaints about the physical condition of rooms. Principal A stated that "teachers complain about the physical, lighting, cooling, the chairs are broken, and the room hasn't been cleaned". Principal O reported:

We have a fairly new custodian here who's not cleaning adequately. And it's my job to supervise him and I don't always see what he doesn't do because I don't go inspect the corners of the classrooms, so teachers come and say 'he's not doing this, he's not doing that, he's only vacuuming three times a week, he's not cleaning the little bathroom properly, he's whatever'. And then I have to figure out how to encourage this custodian to increase his standards and then do a better job for the teachers. They and we as a school need to be clean.

Principal's Manner

Secondary principals A and B reported complaints that dealt with their manner and how teachers perceived them.

Principal A reported:

Some folks don't like to talk to me. They are intimidated by me or they think that I'm not going to listen to them, they're just not comfortable dealing with me. I don't think they are going to have retribution if they complain, although I joke a little bit about whining and sometimes a joke will become more than just the joke. And the old 'you got a minute', I joke a little bit about that. I'm one that I'm on the go all the time where I give the impression I'm on the go and I have a hard time focusing sometimes on somebody sitting down and telling me.

Principal B reported:

I think people were concerned I was upset from the tone of my voice and it had nothing to do, they didn't hear what I said, it was the tone of the voice that just sounded that way and so I keep trying to work on that, spend more time away and get my rest too, so that I'm more tolerant.

Teacher-Teacher Relationships

Two principals reported complaints regarding teachers' interpersonal relationships. For example, a middle school principal (I) reported:

One teacher came in telling another teacher that they're breaking the copyright law. One of the teachers felt it was necessary for her to tell another adult and the adult coming into me and saying 'if she tells me that again, I'll punch her in the face. It's my business and I'll use the aide and if I choose to have the aide copy stuff and not and she doesn't need to come and tell the aide she shouldn't do that because it's breaking the copyright law'. That's one I heard today.

An elementary principal (J) related that:

Because of the architecture of our building, we get people that work closely together. I mean it's like living, because their work area is close. Which is good yet at the same time it promotes challenges. Just recently, somebody had said something, kinda offended somebody else and they felt really badly about it. And they let me know about it. And it was one of these things that somebody said where somebody took it the wrong way. And they came to me because they were just so mad.

Discipline

Four principals reported complaints dealing with student discipline. One elementary principal (O) reported that:

Teachers had complaints that there is no follow-up with the discipline. A kid is misbehaving and they want me to go and pull the kid out of the room and keep him here the rest of the day. And I say a kid is going to have more time with me to convince me that the teacher did something to set him off. By the time the teacher gets tome,d I have a biased opinion. It's real important that teachers call me into the room and we can chat out in the hallway, the three of us, and work it out. I refused to set-up a suspension room in my office and have a bunch of kids there.

Another elementary principal (M) said:

The complaints right now are discipline problems in the classrooms and what teachers can do. The population has changed here. We've turned much more transient. People are on welfare, food stamps and everything else. The kids have been taken out of their neighborhoods and these children can be highly disruptive in the

classroom. Teachers want to know 'what do I do with these kids'?

A secondary principal (A) stated that:

Teachers write me a memo and say 'I've had this kid referred 12 times and nothing has been done. What are you going to do about it?'. I joke a bit about whining.

Another secondary principal (D) reported that:

Teachers want to know how we deal with discipline and if they are being addressed right now. If, if they are waiting forever on a referral to be done. We have teachers who are not completely pleased with the discipline process. They would like to see things happen much quicker. They know we have one less administrator but they would still like to have results sooner.

Bell System

A secondary principal (C) had complaints regarding the bell system. She reported that:

The bell system doesn't function right. It cannot be repaired so you don't always hear the bells from the room which makes it again exceedingly difficult for kids to be on time. There are a variety of problems. We have checked each room, done what we can to alleviate that, but I've

reached the limit of what can be done in the present circumstances.

Monitors

A middle school principal (E) had a complaint from teachers regarding how campus monitors were doing their work:

They were very instrumental in how monitors would be working and they came and said 'I don't see them doing this, I don't see them doing that'.

Refusing a Student

An elementary principal (O) related a complaint regarding students placed in teachers' classes:

I've wanted real direct contact when new kids come in, where they go, because of the language, high risk factors, coming from other schools. I make the decision on where the student will go. I've had people blow-up when a certain type of those kids are in their classroom. They come in and let me know 'I refuse to have this child in my room'.

Teacher Workload

A middle school principal (F) reported a complaint which he anticipates will become a class grievance:

I think this is going to be a grievable thing in the middle schools very quickly. We're going to change our way that we do progress reports for 8th

grade students because of a state revised statute that says 'no pass, no play'. If a student fails an 8th grade class they cannot participate in 9th grade extra-curricular activities as controlled by the interscholastic body. The teachers' organization fought for a long time to get away from the 6th week grading period. The argument is that the initial portion of the year we really don't know the students well enough to be doing that kind of grades. The teachers are saying 'Well, now we're grading every four and a half weeks'.

Summary

Complaints occur more often than grievances and deal with issues and situations which critically impact the teachers' daily work activities. Some complaints reported by principals were in the realm of "enabling conditions" (e.g., disruptive students and teachers' workload) (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1986). Other complaints dealt with issues identified by McDonnell and Pascal (1988) as "professional conditions" (e.g., evaluation, collective decision making). In this study, more than half of the complaints reported by principals dealt with working conditions, suggesting that the teaching environment is a critical area of concern for teachers.

Grievances

Twelve of the 15 principals interviewed reported grievances at their school sites. Each reported a minimum of one grievance and a maximum of five. For example, one elementary school principal (N) reported she had "five at the most", a middle school principal (I) said, "Nah, I don't keep track. I haven't had any this year", and a secondary principal (C) stated that "Last year we had quite a few, part of them not necessarily because of morale. Lots of Level I stuff". Table 3 shows the grievance issues reported by the 12 principals.

Salary, Wages, Hours: Planning Period

In keeping with the complaints categories, grievances are similarly discussed. The following are selected excerpts from principals' interviews.

The use of teachers' planning periods resulted in grievances at several schools. An elementary principal (N) reported:

At the beginning of my first year here, one was a class action. Lots of teachers didn't want know who they were. We wanted to start the planning time by dismissing kids at one o'clock and the teachers would spend one to five o'clock planning and would get extra contract pay. As a result, 13 teachers left, retired, were reassigned or

Table 3

Grievance Issues Identified by Principals

Issue	n ^a	Grade Level		
		Elementary	Middle	Secondary
Grievances				
Salary, Wages, Hours				
Salary Adjustment			1	2
Seniority			1	
Substitutes			1	
Evaluation				
Reprimand				1
Working Conditions				
Cooling			2	1
Heating				1
Non-smoking environment			1	
Teacher's equipment		1		
Out of area assignment		1		
Class size		3		
Window blinds			1	
Cockroaches		1		
Safety			1	1
Planning		1	1	1

Note. Total = 23

^a Number of principals out of 12 who reported each issue.

transferred to another district. It gave me the opportunity to hire a lot of people who wanted to be here.

A middle school principal (I) reported:

Everybody in middle school plans for 45 minutes in the morning. But I said 'the 45 period can be used as my time. I can do inservice, I can do whatever I want to in that time'. The teachers had traditionally had it as their time. I'd see them in the boiler room, they'd be real negative and I kept thinking it really is my time. If I had any backbone, I'd do something about it. So I said 'I'm taking three of those days a week as mine, we're gonna have inservice'. And they grieved it. And that was probably the most attacked I had on me. But I knew I was right. I just couldn't take away their planning time.

Another middle school principal (E) anticipated a complaint becoming a grievance regarding planning period:

If I feel that there might be something that could result in a misunderstanding, I contact the teachers' association building representative, off the record so they're not put in a situation. For example, we have an all-day activity schedule which includes every student in the school. I

heard some teachers complaining about losing their planning hour. So I said, 'what are you planning for, you're not doing anything'. It was an issue. So I said 'go and take your planning period, make sure that there's somebody with a team, we make sure that they have a variety of planning periods. A secondary school principal (C) reported a grievance

when:

The instructional council decided they wanted some kind of potluck during grading day. It would take place after verification of grades. So one of the administrators wrote up a memo and made an erroneous statement of Faculty Meeting instead of Potluck. We knew where it was, they knew where it was, so I said 'why don't we deal with it in this manner. There will be no potluck'.

Salary Adjustment

Three principals reported grievances related to salaries. A middle school principal (E) reported:

I have one lady that grieved because she felt she should get more pay. I asked for a reclassification but I don't control the money. I encouraged her to grieve. If there are some people paid and others not, hey, 'what's going on? Let's clarify this, let's either do it or not do

it'. See, it's for clarification, a misunderstanding.

One of the two secondary principals (C) reported that: The district cut the stipend for head librarian. Because we had one librarian, not a head librarian anymore, that was grieved. It went to arbitration and was decided in favor of the grievant. The district caused this in their consensus. There was no warning of those things. It was a cut in the budget that had to be absorbed and the district had to pay, regardless.

Seniority

A middle school principal (E) reported the following: I had a grievance on something that I just forgot to do. I said 'you're right. I just didn't'. I had a part-time clerk, white collar, so I was not as familiar, but that's no excuse. I really should have offered the substitute office manager to the one that was part-time before getting a substitute.

Substitutes

A middle school principal (F) reported a group of grievances regarding substitutes:

We had a lot of teachers at the end of the school year who had to cover for other teachers because

of the lack of subs. So there was a Level III filed by the organization directly to the superintendent indicating that the teachers were upset that the district was not providing the substitutes that we needed for their professional leave time.

Evaluation

Reprimand

A secondary principal (C) reported a grievance dealing with a teacher who was reprimanded for using profanity. It went to a Level III grievance and it also went to a board member who now seeks the majority of the board vote to overturn the reprimand. So the teacher can circumvent the whole procedure. What I'm looking at is loss of power of principals. While it's designated as a safeguard, it has become a constraint.

Working Conditions

Cooling and Heating

Three principals reported grievances dealing with heating and cooling. One middle school principal (E) stated:

One was on cooling which was awful. I was glad. I think we have some things that happen because of the contract that wouldn't have happened, especially in schools like this. They grieved and

we got our fooling fixed, you know, just like that.

Another middle school principal (I) encouraged a grievance:

It's too hot in the classrooms. 'Good. I've tried to get the fans, I've called them up. I've done all the things that I can do. Please, make it a grievance'.

A secondary principal (A) reported:

I've had in nine years two formal grievances and they both had to do with air conditioning and heating. I encouraged it in some sense because I had done everything I could do and it wasn't unexpected and it wasn't something that I felt I hadn't done everything under my power to resolve the problem.

Another middle school principal (F) averted a grievance related to hearing. He states the reasons:

Any kind of complaint should be handled right up front and do something about it or tell them that you can or cannot and why you can or cannot. I had a boiler blow up in this school. And we were without heat for three days in December. I received not one grievance or even mention of a grievance. And that's a grievable item, working

conditions. And nobody said anything. We got space heaters for them and put them in. They knew that we were doing everything we possibly could. So you make the genuine effort and it has to be genuine and the staff has to realize that you are doing your darndest to be able to provide the best possible conditions under a grievable situation. I think most reasonable human beings will go along with it. There's always going to be a few grouches who are going to file a grievance every time they go between two classrooms.

Teacher's Equipment/Assignment

An elementary school principal (K) reported having had two grievances. She felt that both grievances were different and extreme:

Years ago, I had a teacher, the first grievance, a formal grievance because of playground balls outside her door. She was mad because the kids in other classes would go by and take and I didn't do anything about it. It didn't seem logical to me but she wanted me to be able to enforce that nobody touches her box of balls. Well, that would have been ideal, I would have loved to have had everybody's respect, but, ideally yes, you'd want people to be able to leave things and not have

somebody else bother them. Another grievance was that I assigned a teacher to take an unfair assignment and it was outside her area.

Cockroaches

An elementary school principal (O) reported three grievances. Two were related to class size and one to cockroaches. She stated:

They grieved when there were too many cockroaches and the district wouldn't send out an exterminator. We got the exterminator as soon as the grievance was filed. So it does show that there is some useful power there for the union. It got taken care of and since it was something that central office district had to deal with in order to remedy. I made calls to the maintenance department but was given various institutional excuses for why they couldn't send anybody for weeks.

Safety

Two principals reported grievances regarding safety. A secondary school principal (D) reported a class grievance related to the hazardous conditions of sports fields and middle school principal (I) reported:

They had a light post that was sitting out in the middle of an athletic field. I was looking for

anything that I could do that would be successful, to show the teachers I was powerful. And that I made things happen. The district came back and said 'that really belongs to the city' and the city said, 'no it really belongs to the district'. I told a teacher, 'you grieve this and say it's safety for your safety and the kids, let's do that'. Well, they thought I was a hero. You know, here I am, I'm taking the system on and I'm saying 'screw you' to the system and I'm getting something done. And the light pole went away.

Class Size

Three elementary school principals reported grievances related to class size. One principal (O) reported:

The only grievances that have been filed here were related to class size which was not a building issue, it was nothing over which I had control.

Two on class size that were very appropriate. The class had gone over cap. The teachers very nicely came in and said 'I think we need to consider this a grievance, because it will help get teachers here and once it was filed we got the teacher sent out that we needed in order to alleviate the situation.

Another elementary principal reported:

Being a new school and such a nice place, we had a lot of requests and our enrollment went up by 150 kids. The teachers were not there so we had crowded classrooms. One of my teams did a grievance to get more teachers. I supported the grievance and said 'I'll sign my name to it, because if they're going to put the power stuff and make us take kids, that I'm saying don't belong in the district, then they better match it with teachers. There were 39 kids in one room. They encountered with one teacher. We needed three. Then they said 'we'll give you two'. Finally, it was after the grievance that they gave us the third.

The third elementary principal (M) reported that the grievance related to the class size was ill-timed:

A teacher came to me and said 'I've got the magic number. I want you to hire another teacher. I sat the teacher down and explained the complications that would be created because of the grievance. I said 'is it worth all of this to hire a part-time teacher'? And her answer to me was 'Yes',. She knew my feelings and she also knew that according to the agreement she had every

right to say 'I am one child over and therefore this is what I want'.

Summary

Grievances were reported as both positive and negative events. The distinction turned on the benefits accrued from such action. When working conditions were improved (e.g., heating and cooling, cockroaches, light posts), they were considered problem-solvers and a means for expeditious action.

None of the 15 principals reported that grievances were utilized to remedy arbitrary or capricious administrative action. Grievances were reported to circumvent "the process" and to resolve issues related to class size. Further, they were a means to "clarify" and assure consistency in matters of wages and hours.

Question Two

Do principals report complaints or grievances as limiting their freedom of action within the school setting?

Table 4 shows the grievance issues that principals reported as limiting their freedom of action.

Four principals reported that grievances limited their freedom of action. The following are excerpts from the principals' interviews.

Table 4

Grievance Issues Limiting Principals' Freedom of Action

Issue	n ^a	Grade Level		
		Elementary	Middle	Secondary
Grievances				
Evaluation				
Career Ladder		1		
Reprimand				1
Working Conditions				
Planning: Inservice			1	
Class Size		1		

Note. Total = 4

^aNumber of principals out of 15 who reported each issue.

Evaluation

Career Ladder

One elementary principal (K) reported limitations as a result of the career ladder and the evaluation process.

Grievances came out of it because teachers were unhappy about it too. For me, I think it is real important to evaluate other than in the formal sense. I think that's one thing, but there are lots of informal kinds of things even though I'm always looking for a balance. I look to see what is better than last year, what has improved, what things I can suggest. Informally, you are always looking and listening.

Reprimand

A secondary principal (C) was "looking at loss of power of principals" particularly as related to reprimands.

When you deal with a reprimand, you have some considerable problems making that stick. And in trying to dismiss an employee, it's almost an impossibility. There's a loophole in this whole thing, in that particular process. One of our employees was reprimanded. It went to a Level III and also to a board member who now seeks the majority of the board vote to overturn the reprimand. He can circumvent the whole procedure.

these are constraints and they don't need me as a leader here, trying to get the school moving. I could easily just be in the stands. I have to get the procedures in place that we all can live with so the place functions. Since there has been so much power negotiated away, I have to cut through some of this BS and say 'look folks, this is the way it's done'. I have to be able to deal with this recalcitrant outfit I have.

Working Conditions

Planning: Inservice

Two middle school principals (E and I) and an elementary school principal (O) reported that inservice meetings limited their freedom of action. Principal E reported:

I make sure my meetings are over by the time teachers have to leave. They complained about too many inservices in addition to home visits and calling parents. So for two months we didn't plan meetings. I also provided extra phones so they could make parent contacts during that time.

An elementary principal (O), on the other hand, reported "making honest mistakes in terms of overstepping things about the contract":

Principals who just simply forgot that something was supposed to be three and a half hours instead of three and three-quarters were slapped with grievances. Here, when I make a mistake like that nobody even noticed it. Nobody said 'did you know that the contract says?'. And I say 'no I forgot, I'm sorry'. And we've changed that so no people have the option of doing what the contract says or doing what is better for kids (e.g., how long a teacher supervises kids on early dismissal days). We bend the contract but make it clear that everything is voluntary. The complaints are when I screw up and do things wrong. Fortunately, the communication is such that people usually come and tell me. I don't think people are too timid to do that.

Class Size

An elementary principal (M) stated that she was "extremely constrained" regarding class size:

I will disregard the agreement and take a chance. I mean it's just part of the risk-taking which is part of this job. But, I also am aware, if push comes to shove and I'm grieved, then I have to say 'you're absolutely right' and we'll go back and reverse that decision. It was just like the

teacher that came to me with the child that was over. Technically, I should have just said 'ok'. The teacher didn't need to hear my opinion, the teacher didn't need all of the background information. I felt it was important, only because I wanted to make sure with two and a half months left of school that the teacher realized the impact this was going to have on the big picture. And what she told me in her words were "I don't care". I could have bought her more aide time. She said, 'I don't need any more aide time. I want the class size reduced'. And there was no argument. I don't think she was right, but she pointed out clearly 'the district has rules to follow. You are representing the district'. She was absolutely correct and I followed them. I was trying to renegotiate with her. I don't intentionally violate the contract, and to be really candid, I would more intentionally violate some district directive knowing I could have my hand slapped for it. So be it, I do what is in the best interest of the child. I need a unique kind of individual that is willing to put in overtime without grieving. Our population is changing and it's changing drastically, much more

transient. And I need teachers with a lot more energy who are willing to go the home, willing to reach out a little bit more than they could do during the typical seven and a half-hour day. And yet I don't have any right to ask them to do that because of the agreement.

Two principals reported taking grievances "seriously".

An elementary principal (N) stated:

I take the agreement seriously and I think you save a lot of adversarial roles when you take it as something that has been agreed upon, it is important to follow the guidelines. Then even grievances don't become such a major battleground. Some administrators thought the agreement was a joke and didn't focus on it as a working document of work relationships. They would violate all these crazy things that there was no need to do. It is paying attention to the stuff that is there.

A middle school principal (F) reported that he took "all complaints seriously, even to the too hot or too cold":

If the teacher is too hot or too cold in the classroom, the teacher is less than efficient even if to me it is not too cold or too hot. That doesn't make a difference. I'm not in the classroom. Therefore, I have to address the

issue. I stay to the agreement as much as possible. The other times, I talk to the individual and say 'it is out of consensus. I know that I'm asking you to do something that is out of consensus. Are you willing to do it? You have a right to file a grievance if you wish to. This is the way it is'. Then we sit and negotiate an individual item.

School Culture and Vision

Three principals did not feel limited in their freedom of action and attributed it to decisions firmly anchored in the culture or vision of the school. An elementary principal (J) reported:

Generally, if I make a decision, it is important that my decisions are congruent with the vision. And if I make a decision, I have to tell the reasons why I'm making this decision. Now if that's not congruent with our vision, they probably have a real legitimate complaint and they should tell. If it is and they just don't like it, well, they can let me know and I'll certainly listen. But when it comes right down to it, the principal is the responsible party of the school. If something goes wrong, everybody else will walk but the principal is there. I have to just say

'I've got to make this decision because I'm comfortable with it'. Since I am responsible and I'm the one who has to live with the decision, then that's the one I'm gonna make.

Another elementary principal (L) stated:

There are many times when there are conflicts. There aren't too many times when I'm on one side and the staff is on the other. If I had been listening when they've been talking and if they had been listening when I've been talking, that doesn't happen. One of the things that we've come to as a staff in terms of our vision, our beliefs, is that we should agree to disagree respectfully. I can take some minor grumbling but if it was big grumbling then I wouldn't have been listening.

A middle school principal (H) reported:

Teachers feel r-e-a-l comfortable coming with complaints. They know why I made a certain decision. I will provide them with an explanation, they trust me. We just don't think about things being spelled out, like number of students, duty and all that. It goes back to the culture, that every single person's opinions are respected, that people express their opinion on a regular basis. We are a support system for each

other. It's not a system in which people see me as the fixer of everything or the person who should know all of their complaints. Ideally we would all just see one another as peers. There is a point where it's on my shoulders, that's all there is to it. If it's something bad, I'm the one who's gonna hang for it, and if it's something good, I probably get credit for a lot of things I really didn't do either. I accept that because that goes with my job.

Power and Authority

A middle school principal (G) reported that "I can do anything I want to do". He said that:

I get complaints but most of the time they are jovial complaints. We have a mutual understanding. I can accommodate, for example, one class was large but the teacher agreed to take it if he could choose the students. I'm out on a limb all the time. I gave two teachers off to work at home on accreditation. If the superintendent finds out, I'm in trouble because of the substitute monies. I ask teachers to do more, put in more time. This may become an issue for the association.

Two secondary principals reported no limitations regarding complaints or grievances. Principal A stated:

I have very few constraints. It's like night and day as far as constraints on decision making from where I came from. I feel pretty good about not having any grievances dealing with policy. The complaints about too much work and too many programs are related to my concept about client-centeredness. I haven't totally communicated and gotten through that culture. Teachers can grieve anything but it has to relate to policy or health and safety. I emphasize the policy but I use it primarily when I need to deal with a teacher on a formal basis. The other policies I manipulate. Some are not by the book, but you gotta know the book. You gotta know what you can do.

Another secondary principal (B) stated:

I feel that we have all the power and authority that is necessary to conduct business. We're small enough. My decisions haven't been questioned. My restrictions are on not setting up the superintendent. The grievance is against me but he's the next person in the pipeline. If I make a lot of bluff and bluster, I come off looking pretty stupid.

Implementing Change

A secondary principal (D) reported limitations from complaints and grievances resulting from attempts to implement "changes in a conservative school with an old guard":

We have to make changes slowly because I inherited a pretty stable culture. This was a conservative school, in a time warp. I have to deal with a powerful faculty council. They bring forth complaints but we try to cut them off at the pass. Complaints are piece-mealed off. That reduces the group grievances. The individual grievances we try to resolve them if we can right here.

Teachers feel comfortable coming and saying pay is not correct. There are contractual issues which really don't affect this school, only indirectly because we are the host school and the grievance originates here.

Problem Solving

A middle school principal (I) reported:

Most of the grievances I've asked for, usually if you can't get stuff, you manipulate the system. I don't like to do it. I've never had a grievance about me because I'm a jerk. I have grievances over situations. I don't want grievances for

things I can fix. I take care of complaints right away and if you can solve the problem using the grievance, it is a back-way door to it. I'm proud of that fact, except the inservice grievance. But even if I could do it, people would come with their arms folded and I might as well pack up my tent and go home. My only limitation is common sense. The previous superintendent valued people getting things done no matter how you did it. He wanted those things to happen. I don't know right now if that's valued. Hand-spanking just makes you be real careful.

Summary

Four principals out of 15 reported that grievances limited their freedom of action. These constraints were in evaluation: reprimands, career ladder, and working conditions (e.g., class size teacher planning time, i.e., inservice).

Three principals reported no limitations because their decisions were congruent with the vision and culture of their schools. They all cited accountability and a diligent effort to provide teachers with a rationale for their actions.

Two principals took complaints seriously and addressed any issue no matter how trivial. While both principals

respected the agreement, one avoided violations, whereas, the other was cognizant of the violations but proceeded to renegotiate with teachers in order to meet the needs of both students and teachers.

Three principals heeded complaints from teachers regarding the frequency and length of inservice meetings during teachers' planning time. One principal resolved the complaint by making changes to reduce the number of inservices while, the other provided teachers with options (e.g., "voluntary and in the interest of the children"). The third principal used grievances to solve problems but in the instance of inservice during planning time, he reported the grievance was a limitation.

Three principals reported no limitations because of their overall power and authority to conduct the business of administering their schools. They, however, reported more limitations regarding policies and procedures.

Question Three

How do principals manage teachers and does this influence the use of complaints and grievances?

Elementary School Principals

Principal J (MC) reported that:

I am very directive. I encourage but more important, I am directive, I tell them what to do. Those people are already encouraged. They're just

glad they've got a job! They'll do anything. I give support and a lot of direction too. I listen to input from them but ultimately I still make decisions for them in a lot of areas. I help people improve as best they can and also document for non-renewal. This is a real issue for probationary teachers. 'Do we want to confirm the marriage with this person?'. With continuing you're already married. Probationary is like you're engaged. But continuing, you're married. And so breaking the engagement is a lot less intense and easier to do than getting a divorce. This is my decision. That's what I get paid to do. Complaints come to me. I haven't had a grievance. Teachers can voice a complaint. I'm very approachable. I have monthly grade-level meetings, lunch meetings. Part of our vision is to establish an environment of trust. I try to promote that vision and I think they trust me. They come to me with legitimate concerns. I'm not gonna get angry with them or blow them off or become extremely defensive. That system which may not be terribly formalized is in place. I see this as informal. We don't have very many complaints that aren't resolved with me. It might

happen that they would go to the association or a staff representative who lets the superintendent know.

Principal K (MA) stated that:

I let others get involved in the decision making. It's part of the association's process in this district. Our process is anybody that is gonna be affected by a decision has to be involved. Those affected can come to a consensus. We have grade level teams who meet with me once a month. Any complaints or concerns from teachers come from the team leaders. I try to work things out with grievances. I don't know if it's successful. It's hard to gauge. Maybe because of a particular teacher. Most teachers feel comfortable telling me about a complaint. I would be dishonest to say that all of them do. In degrees. They let me know through their grade level leader.

Principal N (MA):

The only way you find out, managing is through lots of visits. You have to know what they're doing and that means getting in that classroom every single day. If I don't have formal observations scheduled, I make a round of the whole building and stop in every single classroom

for at least two or three minutes. I monitor and supervise people to make sure they show up for recess duty. I thank them for showing up or remind them to let me know if they aren't going to be there. I'm a good principal but I terrorize people. I think you don't get that respect from people if you don't do what you need to do. I'm a little authoritarian and task driven, but also do a lot of influencing. People respond real well to that. Teachers challenge my decisions and disagree with me. We try to do a complaint system, a weekly communicator meeting and each team has a rep. That's the forum for complaints. I have a handful of people who come right up to me and say 'Look, I have a real problem with this'. I always tell my staff, I appreciate those people because they are up front. It's the ones that complain but never tell me, that complain in other forums. They need to do that. I do it with my bosses!

Principal L (NO) reported that:

I spend a lot of time in the classrooms. We have a fairly intensive evaluation process. But I not only evaluate, it's also a supervisory process where I have an opportunity to give feedback for

the teacher to reflect on teaching. I treat people respectfully and professionally. I work on interpersonal skills because my job is to build relationships with people. There are times when I need to push a little for something that I believe in and I really have to balance how hard I push because these are real hard working people that are already pretty maxed out. I spur people on with real high standards and high expectations. I'm not here to make people feel good. I'm here to help kids have the best school experience they can so there are certain instances where we need to push to hold people accountable. There's a difference between consensus and sorta grudging agreement. That's when I need to be the force. Teachers have a lot of autonomy here, but the bottom line is they know kids all need to get the same outcomes and there's a lot of ways to get there. When I can, I try to solve problems or handle situations face-to-face, one-on-one, lots of face-to-face. As few memos as possible. There's not a lot of conflict between teachers and me. Very little conflict, we're all in sync, my beliefs tie in with the teacher's beliefs. One of my jobs is always trying to lower the level of

concern with most people (e.g., money, report cards).

Principal M (CA):

I rarely am not in the classroom observing. I also observe teacher's behaviors. If a teacher comes and snaps at the secretary or is in the copy room, the tone of voice, I can tell the teacher has a real short fuse and chances are I'm going to be receiving a lot of discipline problems that day and I know that these kids I will keep. I wouldn't dream of trying to work anything out with her in taking the kids back in the afternoon. I will go out of my way to say to the teacher at the end of the day 'why don't you leave early?'. Teachers should go above and beyond. Teachers shouldn't view this school as a place to come to retire. Doing in the classroom for the children while the children are here is not enough, I want to see above and beyond putting in the time. Teachers grieve evaluations when I put them on a plan for improvement based on the fact that 'all my evaluations have been good and you suddenly come along and say this needs to be worked on'. Teachers just come in with a complaint or grievance. Some don't feel comfortable with

confrontation. That's the reason there are spokespeople on the staff. People are hesitant, but I tell them to make me aware of it or I'm going to continue doing it. I've got two teachers that other teachers will talk to and say 'I'm unhappy with this and this'. And they come and are teacher advocates. It's an informal thing that happens here. One will say, 'rumor is'. I just drive myself real hard. If I don't address them, I better get out of here.

Principal O (CA):

I help people refocus because I feel I should be facilitative rather than authoritative. I'm accountable but it simply doesn't work in life to make someone do something. I ask and suggest. I give suggestions but I leave it up to them to carry them out or not. I don't have negative consequences for the people who don't carry it out. People do things. People come to me with complaints. There are kinda some informal spokespeople. Some people are shy and I don't like that. I like the person who has the concern to come with it. It doesn't always work, I'm viewed as an authority figure no matter how hard I try to have it be a different way.

Middle School Principals

Principal E (CA):

I dictated the parameters of the curriculum and the guidelines for how to deal with people. Even if we're rushing or whatever, we are the servants of whomever walks in here. I ask teachers to be involved in decision making and about what they want to do. Through their complaints and suggestions we improve things. People feel they can disagree with me. I've had to reinforce that. Early in the year, I heard some things, but they seem to run out. What I do when I hear that, I ask them to be in charge of something. For the most part, it's because they feel they haven't been recognized. I just go to the source and say "I've heard these things, do you want to talk about them?".

Principal E (CA):

I manage by consensus. I go to planning period meetings that are set-up on a regular basis. I don't always run them. I require my teachers to turn in lesson plan books every fourth week, on a routine basis. That's all part of their evaluation. That's part of the program, everybody does it. I am constantly in the classrooms. I

team-teach with teachers and I know what is going on instructionally. I mandate faculty meetings. It's my decision 'you will be at the faculty meeting. We will not call meetings unless we have issues that need to be discussed, we will not waste your time. But we will have a faculty meeting'. These meetings are open to public airing of complaints. Teachers are not afraid of me. Most feel very free to challenge my decisions. That depends on their personality. There are some who are much more reticent to do that than others. Mine is open door. I constantly stress 'You got a problem come in and see me'. The reticent ones have mouthpieces that they will use. They've got somebody else to do it for them. Yeah, I have mouthpieces on my staff and I know who they are. I just go to them sometimes and say 'What's the problem out there?'. Because I am an administrator, they won't talk to me and when I walk into the lounge the conversation changes. Two teachers came and said 'We were really upset that we did not have input at the staff meeting'.

Principal G (MC):

I encourage teacher participation but I also delegate. I walk around a lot but don't do much with evaluating teachers, there isn't enough time. How they deal with students is very important since discipline is a major problem here. I can get a real quick feel by observing classes and teachers' personalities. I help them first, but after two years, I know.

Principal H (NO):

Participation is very important. I surround myself with very competent people and then get out of their way. I don't like the word empowerment because I think it insinuates that somehow I give power to people. I let them exercise the power they have. I spend a lot of time in classrooms because of our evaluation system. I'm always looking for ways for their professional and personal growth and to see if they fit in this school. My job is to help individuals and groups perform in the most productive way possible. I spend a lot of time helping people with personal interrelationships because I ask people to interact in decision making. They may be talented

teachers but they have to be able to work with colleagues.

Principal I (CA):

I used to hate to do room observation. I never go into make observations without teachers knowing I'm coming. The agreement says I can come in there when I want, I just don't. I don't like people to come in and drop in on me unexpected. I'm trying to make those things go real smooth for teachers. If I'm telling the teachers they need to focus on the positive, my evaluations have to focus on the positive. Beating them upon an evaluation is not the place to do it. I want teachers to improve but I have to be patient. I watch people and grow and trust me. We have knock-down fights. But we respect each other. I tell teachers 'I cannot live with this' when kids get caught in the squeeze between two teachers. I've disagreed with teachers openly. Like with one teacher I said 'You can't do that to kids and you can't do that stuff to me. You're an excellent teacher but you're making me crazy and I'm making you crazy. We need a divorce'. We have teams, site-based. I don't advertise it but my idea is to empower teachers. I work with

people that are smarter than I am. They appreciate that I've got some savvy about how to get along with people. This is real consensus. I've always felt like I was real good about complaints. I have teams who say, 'Did you hear this or that?'. My groups always have better ideas than me.

Secondary School Principals

Principal D (CA):

I like input. The buck stops here but I feel more comfortable with getting input from people. I have a tendency to want to prompt them for change. I consider myself an enabler. I consider that I'm a teacher enabler if it's going to make things better for the teacher. I have a tendency to go further with some but my track record is that I discipline faculty members. I reprimand for not following a board or school policy like inappropriate behavior, dealing with students, or inappropriate language. I have a real thing about teachers touching and grabbing kids. We do progressive discipline. What I'm saying to the teacher is 'my expectation is that this is how it should be dealt with'. That's how I operate, how the district operates basically. And mine is,

it's not heavy, it's just 'that's the way it is'. I talk to teachers, feeling, listening listening, sharing, and having something like an open door policy. Mine is a 'swing-door'. Some walk in, some will not. But I move around the campus and get a flavor of what's happening and word comes in. Kids will report. You gotta listen to the trees, walls and hear what they're saying. Teachers challenge. If they feel uncomfortable, the faculty council is their sounding board. Some share with a friend and the friend makes sure the word gets back some one way or another. I have people out there that will keep me posted because they are concerned about this school. They say, 'You may want to be aware that this is a faculty concern'.

Principal C (CA):

I have to monitor to get this place streamlined so that it functions as a school. I have been fighting with people to do things. I have teachers who have stopped in their development. They have encapsulated themselves from reality and they go into their rooms and close the doors, form cliques in which they reinforce their own negativism. I like to work collaboratively.

However when I'm confronted with non-compliance, with that kind of behavior that has been displayed, I am autocratic and say 'this is the way it's gonna be done, cut out the nonsense! You need to get in gear'. When there is a resistance to work with certain populations, I say 'you will work with'. We put teachers in alpha order, invited them for afternoon meetings and said 'vent'. They use the newspaper to infuse their views through cartoons. People want to communicate through the curriculum council. Since the faculty is divided I support those who want to work.

Principal A (MC):

We've done a real good job of hiring a certain type of person here that is student oriented and not angry about life in general or their job. I think we give teachers a lot of freedom to make decisions and we trust them. I do an observation, but I don't ask for lesson plans, we don't have teachers check in or check out, we have a lot of trust in what they do and how they do it. I put out a half sheet for feedback to the principal. I route it to whoever can address the problem. I say it's open door, but there are barriers. Some

don't like to talk to me. I hire assistants who have contrasting styles and personalities. Eventually, complaints get to me. We have formalized the informal. They don't use grievances to tell me there is a problem.

Principal B (MC):

I wander around and I operate with an open door policy. I never ask people to do anything I won't do. I prefer to be a facilitator, to provide what teachers need and leave them free to teach.

That's what I see my job as. I'd rather be an enabler, they are professional, give them the time if possible to develop programs. I provide information, I ask questions, I prod and there are times when I say 'yes, you will do this'. There's a time when it's a necessity. I've said 'you will or we'll get somebody else to do it'. I feel an obligation to the kids, not the teachers.

Teachers aren't going to say who they are going to teach and what they will teach. I allow them to do that, when it comes time for the master schedule.

Summary

Elementary School Principals

All elementary principals report they spend time in classrooms to observe, monitor, evaluate, and supervise teachers. They characterize their management behavior as "directive but encouraging" (J), "involving teachers in decision making" (K), "authoritarian but influential toward implementing tasks" (N), "supervisory but treating teachers with respect and as professionals" (L), and "facilitative rather than authoritarian" (O).

They deal with complaints and grievances either directly with the individual(s), or through formal/informal means. For example, two principals (M and O) have "spokespeople" who relate teachers' concerns. Two principals (K and N) have formal "complaint systems" but also have direct contact with teachers. One principal (J) considers himself "approachable" and utilizes this as an informal means for teachers to present complaints. Another principal (L) engages in face-to-face and interpersonal encounters.

Middle School Principals

Middle school principals "dictate parameters and guidelines", "delegate" and "require" (i.e., "'that's part of the program"). All principals evaluate by visiting

classrooms and walking around. They focus on the positive personal growth of teachers.

They characterize their management behaviors as "by consensus" (F, I), "involving teachers in decision making" (E), and "participatory" (G,H). They deal with complaints and grievances in a utilitarian fashion. Complaints are viewed as suggestions for improvement. Principals have face-to-face interactions, "mouthpieces", "hear things", "have an understanding" and "disagree openly". Three principals (E, H, I) surround themselves with "competent" and "smarter than me" people.

Secondary School Principals

Secondary principals characterize their management behaviors as "enabling" (D, B), "monitoring" (C), and "trusting, allowing freedom" (A). Two principals (D, C) view themselves as teacher disciplinarians, a role which requires them to monitor teacher compliance with policy, but also like input and collaboration. Two principals (A, B) have an "open door" with some personality barriers. Three principals "prompt change" (D), "promote a vision" (C), and "prod" (B).

Three principals (D, C, B) utilize faculty councils as a means for teachers to present complaints. Another principal (A) formalized the "informal half-sheet" to

address complaints. Complaints eventually get to all secondary principals.

Question Four

Do principals report that complaints and grievances impact their managerial and leadership roles?

The principals in this study made distinctions between managerial and leadership roles. For example, one principal referred to time consuming activities as "managerial kinds of things--paperwork and trivia". Leadership, on the other hand was "providing students with success" and "promoting a vision or culture".

Complaints

Impact on Managerial

Principal F stated that:

Complaints should be handled up front and you must do something about it or tell why you can or cannot.

Principal M reported:

When I hear 'rumor is', I better address it. I drive myself real hard. If I don't address it, then I better get out of here. They make you aware of situations and you change.

Principal O stated:

It takes a lot of time to have good working relationships and avenues for complaints,

disagreement, and conflict. But you have to, to take care of it internally.

Principal I reported:

I spend my time communicating, I mean really listening and sharing. I spend a lot of time processing with people.

Impact on Leadership

Principal L stated:

Complaints make me more than a manager. I have to become involved in problem solving and planning for the future.

Principal E reported:

Complaints are instrumental in change. That's why we decided on a flexible schedule. There was just no time to meet with them for longer periods of time.

Grievances

Impact on Managerial

Principal N reported:

I conform to the contract about 90% of the time. The practical aspects of applying it sometimes doesn't mesh with everyday working.

Principal E stated:

The contract limits me in the hiring process. I have other things to concentrate on like school

climate and student and teacher self-esteem.

Principal O:

I hardly ever think of bending the contract. It's the teachers' call as to whether we are going to bend it.

Impact on Leadership

Principal F:

I interpret the contract. When I'm out of consensus, I attempt to make deals.

Principal N:

10% of the time, the contract contradicts the daily life of the school.

Principal M:

If it is in the best interest of the student, I will disregard the contract and take a chance. It's just part of risk-taking which is part of this job.

Summary

Principals reported that complaints needed to be addressed in order to build cooperative structures and to maintain continuous work relationships. The stakes for both principals and teachers were a common goal of getting things done. Complaints addressed the discrepancy between what was done and how it should be done differently. Complaints had

the potential for more joint decision making since teachers identified problems and suggested better solutions.

Grievances were reported to require too much procedural activity. Principals very often did not have the time nor inclination to worry about staying in compliance.

Grievances critically impacted their leadership role since they restricted hiring (e.g., principals needed unique individuals). Modifying and bending the agreement was considered risk-taking, a characteristic they felt was part of leadership. Principals were aware of the legitimate boundaries, but they questioned if these were the boundaries that "should" be.

The conclusions of these findings are discussed in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Conclusions

This chapter reconsiders the findings in Chapter 4 to provide answers to the four questions that guided this study. These conclusions will be followed by recommendations for further study.

Question One

The first question investigated in this study was "Regarding what areas and issues do principals report teachers present complaints or grievances?".

All but one of the 15 principals reported that teacher frequently presented complaints. All 15 principals, however, stated that complaints covered a wide range of issues. Some of the complaints were related to issues not covered by the negotiated agreement. For example, campus monitors and custodians not meeting teachers' expectations, teacher-teacher relationships, and too many school activities.

Grievances, on the other hand, were reported by principals to be less frequent and limited to the provisions of the agreement. Principals reported grievances dealing with violations of teacher safety, unreasonable working conditions (e.g., class size, heating and cooling,

cockroaches, infringement on planning time [e.g., inservice meetings], and unfair supervision and evaluation [e.g., reprimand]). These findings are not surprising when one considers that the issues are consistent with what is traditionally held to be within the scope of bargaining (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988; McDonnell & Pascal, 1988).

Question Two

The second question was "Do principals report complaints or grievances as limiting their freedom of action within the school setting?". The answer to this question provides evidence for a basic finding of this study: collective bargaining agreements limited principals' action in certain areas such as, teachers' planning time and class size, but some of these same limitations were locally renegotiated between principals and teachers.

An issue provided for in two agreements was teacher planning time. The provision stipulated that this time would not be encumbered with inservices and meetings. Conflict resulted when both teachers and principals claimed the right to discretionary use of planning time. Two principals reported renegotiating the terms and conditions of how planning periods were to be used. For example, in one school, the teachers' complaint was related to the frequency of inservice meetings and how these meetings were taking time away from making home visits and parent calls.

The principal agreed not to schedule inservice meetings for two months and further, she provided the teachers with two additional phones. Another principal provided teachers with the option to attend additional meetings on a "voluntary" basis. The negotiation process for these principals and teachers was a compromise toward the middle, a compromise which ensured continuous working relationships.

Another agreement provision limited class size. One principal was unable to renegotiate with a teacher who was one student over "cap". In exchange for waiting out the remaining two months of school, the principal offered the teacher more aide time. The teacher, however, was adamant about complying with the agreement and filing a grievance. As a result, the principal interpreted the teacher's behavior as insensitive and uncaring. The principal reported she was "very constrained by the agreement". Several principals reported they "renegotiated" with teachers and blatantly disregarded the agreement. However, for them the guiding principle was knowing "who" would be amenable to such a process. One principal thought that is what the teachers' call as to whether "we bend the agreement".

Two other principals encouraged grievances to remediate classes that had gone over cap. Both principals reported the situation was out of their control and supported the

grievances. Through mutual agreement, both principals and teachers utilized the grievance to get more teachers. As soon as the grievances were filed, the teachers that were needed were sent out to the schools. In one situation, the district tried to negotiate a compromise by first offering one extra teacher then two. When the grievance was filed, the school received the three teachers it had requested. Not only did renegotiation occur at the school, schools also engaged in renegotiation at the district level.

Four principals in this study found themselves incapable of improving the physical conditions of their buildings. When they exhausted every means available to them, they encouraged teachers to file grievances to expedite the repair of cooling and heating problems as well as for exterminating cockroaches. Grievances were seen as a means to solve problems and speed up centralized services. For example, repeated requests for cooling, heating, and an exterminator resulted in institutional excuses for the delay. However, these conditions were summarily attended to when a grievance was filed.

Question Three

Question three "How do principals 'manage' teachers and does this influence the use of complaints and grievances?". Significant were the principals' interpretations of the purpose and utility of complaints and grievances. For

example, all principals reported that complaints were inevitable, but most importantly, required immediate attention. Consideration of complaints was given priority over concern with grievances. Half of the principals reported that complaints had the potential to effect changes in how school work was accomplished. These principals reported that in managing teachers, they continually tried to respond to changing situations and the needs of teachers. These principals reported that they provided opportunities for teachers to challenge their decisions and indecision without negative consequences. Further, principals reported that complaints provided the basis for change in the work place.

Question Four

The fourth question was "Do principals report that complaints and grievances impact their managerial and leadership roles?".

Principals in this study were able to effect their managerial and leadership roles, most often through renegotiation and ad hoc solutions to conflict. Complaints that were mutually resolved between principal and teachers seldom proceeded to becoming formal grievances. Most often, principals and teachers mutually agreed that a complaint would become a grievance in order to address problems directly and explicitly and with the expectation that other

problems would be solved. Most principals reported that they consistently managed teachers in ways that would result in cooperative working relationships. Grievances did not deter principals from actualizing their goals, visions, and purposes. All but one principal reported that they and teachers were able to develop and come to hold common definitions of working situations through jointly created "working rules". This finding is not consistent with the perspective that principals' decision making capacity is limited as a result of collective bargaining. All but two principals were "rule-bound", that is, limited to rules for defining the boundaries of others' discretion. Twelve principals acknowledged rules, but treated them peripherally--through accommodation, adjustment, and by influencing beforehand.

Recommendations

Further research is needed on how principals interpret and administer bargaining agreements, and how they maintain relationships to further needs of the district, their respective schools, and personnel.

The finding of this study suggests that administrative training should include development of skills in how to manage networks of people. The support and effort of these individuals are necessary for principals to do their job effectively. In addition to job-centered training which

focuses on directing and monitoring, principals need skills which emphasize building effective work groups with high performance goals.

Further, principals are critically affected by the district's bargaining relationship with its teachers. Therefore, principal participation in the bargaining process is essential for planning and solving personnel problems growing out of this relationship. The role of principals should not be viewed as merely implementing agreements.

APPENDIX A
PRINCIPALS' EXPERIENCE

PRINCIPALS' EXPERIENCE

PRINCIPAL	TEACHING EXPERIENCE	ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE	PRESENT SCHOOL
A	7 yrs	3 yrs assistant principal middle and secondary	7 yrs
B	3 yrs	6 yrs assistant principal middle and secondary	8 yrs
C	16 yrs	3 yrs assistant principal secondary school	2 yrs
D	13 yrs	8 yrs assistant principal secondary school	4 yrs
E	8 yrs	12 yrs special programs director	2 yrs
F	9 yrs	3 yrs assistant principal present school	3 yrs
G	6 yrs	none	16 yrs
H	6 yrs	5 yrs assistant principal middle school	4 yrs
I	8 yrs	4 yrs assistant principal, principal elementary school	5 yrs
J	4 yrs	2 yrs assistant principal elementary school	4 yrs
K	16 yrs	8 yrs assistant principal middle school	5 yrs
L	10 yrs	1 yrs administrative assistant elementary school	5 yrs
M	10 yrs	11 yrs Central Office, middle school principal	4 yrs
N	10 yrs	3 yrs Program Director	6 yrs
O	3 yrs	2 yrs Special Projects Director	6 yrs

APPENDIX B
PRINCIPAL PROFILE

PRINCIPAL PROFILE

PRINCIPAL	AGE	GENDER	ETHNICITY	EDUCATION
A	38	Male	Anglo	Masters
B	53	Male	Anglo	Masters
C	51	Female	Anglo	Ph.D.
D	50	Male	Black	Masters
E	47	Female	Hispanic	Ed Spec
F	52	Male	Anglo	Masters
G	50	Male	Anglo	Masters
H	43	Female	Anglo	Masters
I	45	Male	Anglo	Masters
J	36	Male	Anglo	Masters
K	55	Female	Hispanic	Masters
L	36	Female	Anglo	Bachelors
M	47	Female	Anglo	Ph.D.
N	44	Female	Hispanic	Ph.D.
O	44	Female	Anglo	Ph.D.

APPENDIX C
SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

PRINCIPAL	BARGAINING RELATIONSHIP	SCHOOL TYPE	ENROLLMENT	FACULTY/ STAFF	ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS
A	MC	Suburban/Sec	1720	111	3
B	MC	Rural/Sec	650	50	1
C	CA	Urban/Sec	1200	150	2
D	CA	Urban/Sec	1400	138	2
E	CA	Urban/Middle	440	29	1
F	CA	Urban/Middle	561	36	1
G	MC	Rural/Middle	375	30	-
H	ND	Suburban/Middle	460	57	1
I	CA	Urban/Middle	680	50	1
J	MC	Suburban/Elem	610	52	-
K	MA	Suburban/Elem	600	55	-
L	ND	Suburban/Elem	635	50	-
M	CA	Urban/Elem	400	51	-
N	MA	Suburban/Elem	800	60	Part-time
O	CA	Urban/Elem	450	20	-

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW CONDITIONS

Interview Conditions

This study is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation in Educational Administration at the University of Arizona. Yvonne Cano is the principal investigator and may be contacted at --- .

Dr. Sharon Conley, Associate Professor, is the dissertation director and can be reached at ---.

Since your participation is voluntary, you can refuse to answer any question at any time and are free to withdraw from the interview at any time.

Even though this interview will be confidential, portions from it will be incorporated in the dissertation. Under no circumstances, however, will your name, school, or school district be identified.

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this study.

(Adapted from McCracken, 1988).

APPENDIX E
PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

Principal Profile

- 1) Male or female/age
- 2) Race or ethnic group
- 3) How long have you been a principal?
- 4) How long have you been a principal in this school district?
- 5) How long have you been a principal at this school?
- 6) Will you tell me about this school? (Staff, enrollment, size, etc.)

Conditions and impact of collective bargaining: district and school site

1. How would you characterize labor-management relations in the district/school?
2. What is the history of this relationship? In the district? In this school?

Principal managerial action and decision making

3. Can you describe any situations, formal or informal that limit your freedom of action?
4. How do you 'manage' teachers in a manner consistent with district objectives?
Probe: Contract implementation? District policies and procedures?
5. Can you describe any daily occurrences in the school operation which cause conflict between your decisions and teachers?
6. What are the prime areas which teachers may challenge your decisions?
Probe: Why is this? How do they do it?
7. What recourse do teachers (in this school, district) have if they disagree with your decisions?
Probe: Complaint procedure? Grievance procedure?

Complaints and Grievances

8. What types of complaints do you get?
9. Are there informal "processes" for handling them?
Probe: how are they created? communicated? used?
10. Do you envision any of these ultimately being referred to a grievance procedure?
Probe: what goes to grievance? is that avoidable? are grievances both positive and negative events? on what might such a distinction turn? What doesn't go to grievance? How are they handled?
11. Do different teachers respond to formal/informal "options" differently?
12. Can you influence whether conflict is formal (grievance) or informal (complaint)?
Probe: How?
13. What difference is there between a complaint and grievance?
14. Does the contract language influence whether a complaint is a grievance in the offing?
Probe: In what areas?

Teachers' Use of Complaints and Grievances

15. Why do teachers use complaints?
16. Why do teachers use grievances?
Probes: Are grievances used for procedural purposes? For sameness of treatment? Are they used out of envy or spite? Do grievances make "contingent" responses complicated? Do they make personnel matters uncomfortable or intolerable?
17. Is there contract language that is problem-attracting?
Probe: Do grievances eradicate ambiguities? In the district? At the school?
18. Are there policies and procedures that are problem-attracting?
Probe: Such as? Are they compatible with the contract?

Principal Role

19. How would you describe your 'style'?

Probe: Can you effect your 'style'?

Because or despite formal/informal processes?

20. Does this influence how you project your effectiveness in the district?

Probe: Is there 'principal' disobedience? What are the consequences?

REFERENCES

- Argyle, N. J. (1980). The impact of collective bargaining on public-school governance. Public Policy, 28(1), 117-141.
- Bacharach, S. B., & Mitchell, S. M. (1987). The generation of practical theory: Schools as political organizations. In J. W. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior (pp. 405-418). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Bacharach, S. B., Shedd, J. B., & Conley, S. C. (1988, December 28-30). School management and teacher unions: The capacity for cooperation in an age of reform. Paper presented at the 41st annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, New York.
- Bacharach, S. B. (1988). Notes on a political theory of educational organizations. In A. Westoby (Ed.), Culture and power in educational organizations (pp. 277-288). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Ball, T. (1987). The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization. London: Methuen/Routledge.
- Barbash, J. (1980). In G. G. Somers (Ed.), Collective bargaining: Contemporary American experience. Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association, 553-588.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. London: Harvard University Press.
- Bascia, N. (1990). Teachers' evaluations of unions. Journal of Education Policy, 5(4), 301-313.
- Becker, H. S. (1964). Personal change in adult life. Sociometry, 27, 49--53.
- Berg, P. (1973). The impact of collective bargaining upon the principal. Administrators Notebook, XXI(9).
- Blankenship, R. (1976). Collective behavior in organizational settings. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 3, 151-168.

- Blase, J. (1989). The teachers' political orientation vis-a-vis the principal: The micropolitics of the school. In J. Hannaway & R. Crowson (Eds.), The politics of reforming school administration. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.
- Blase, J. (1991). The micropolitical perspective. In J. Blase (Ed.), The politics of life in schools. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Blumberg, A. (1987). The work of principals: A touch of craft. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Blumberg, A., Brannigan, M., & Nason, D. (1981). Administrative power and collective bargaining in the schools. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 10(4), 329-335.
- Bridges, E. M. (1970). Administrative man: Origin or pawn in decision making? Educational Administration Quarterly, VI(1), 7-25.
- California Commission on the Teaching Profession. (1985). Who will teach our children?: A strategy for improving California schools. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- Carlson, D. (1987). Teachers as political actors: From reproductive theory to the crisis of schooling. Harvard Educational Review, 57(3), 283-307.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: The Carnegie Corporation.
- Castallo, R. T., Fletcher, M. R., Rossetti, A. D., & Sekowski, R. W. (1992). School personnel administration: A practitioner's guide. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Castetter, W. B. (1986). The personnel function in educational administration. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Conley, S. C., & Bacharach, S. B. (1990, March). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 539-544.

- Corwin, R. G. (1981). Patterns of organizational control and teacher militancy. Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, 2, 261-291.
- Corwin, R. G. (1970). Militant professionalism: A study of bureaucratic conflict in high schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Crowson, R. L., & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1980). The discretionary behavior of principals in large-city schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 10(4), 327-335.
- Denzin, N. K. (1983). Interpretive interactionism. In G. Morgan (Ed.), Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Doherty, R. E. (1980). Public education. In G. G. Somers (Ed.), Collective bargaining: Contemporary American experience. Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association.
- Doherty, R. E., & Lipsky, D. B. (1988, December 28-30). The education reform movement and the realities of collective bargaining. A paper presented at the 41st annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, New York.
- Duke, D. L. (1987). School leadership and instructional improvement. New York: Random House.
- English, F. W., & Hill, J. C. (1990). Restructuring the principal and curriculum change. A report of the NASSP Curriculum Council. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Flippo, E. B. (1980). Personnel management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Friedson, E. (1976). The division of labor as social interaction. Social Problems, 23, 304-313.
- Geisert, G. (1989). The new union juggernaut is disguised as a bandwagon. The Executive Educator, 11(8), 14-20.
- Glasman, N. S. (1983). Increased centrality of evaluation and the school principal. Administrators Notebook, 30(7).

- Glassman, A. M., & Belasco, J. A. (1975). The chapter chairman and school grievances. Industrial Relations, 14(2), 233-241.
- Goldschmidt, S. M., & Stuart, K. E. (1984). The extent of educational policy bargaining and its impact on school system adaptability. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1977). Administrative candidacy: A process of new-role learning. Journal of Educational Administration, 15, 30-48.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1985). The moral socialization of school administrators: Informal role learning outcomes. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21, 99-119.
- Hall, P. M., & Spencer-Hall, D. A. (1982). The social conditions of the negotiated order. Urban Life, 11(3), 328-349.
- Haller, E. J., & Strike, K. A. (1986). Educational administration: Social, legal, and ethical perspectives. New York: Longman Press.
- Hatch, J. A. (1982). Antagonistic cooperation as a policy for approaching management-labor relationships in education. Planning & Changing, 13(2), 124-128.
- Hoy, W. K., & Brown, B. L. (1988). Leadership behavior of principals and the zone of acceptance of elementary teachers. The Journal of Educational Administration, 26(1), 23-38.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Random House.
- Hoyle, E. (1986). The politics of school management. Great Britain: Hodder and Stoughton Educational.
- Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (1982). Toward a macro-oriented model of leadership: An odyssey. In J. B. Hunt, V. Selcaraan, & C. Schriesheim (Eds.), Leadership: Beyond establishment views. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Iannaccone, L. (1975). Educational policy systems: A study guide for educational administrators. Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova University.
- Jessup, D. K. (1985). Teachers, unions and change: A comparative study. New York: Praeger.
- Johnson, S. M. (1984). Teachers unions in schools. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Johnson, S. M. (1988). Unionism and collective bargaining in the public schools. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration: American Educational Research Association. New York: Longman Press.
- Kagel, S. (1986). Anatomy of a labor arbitration. Washington, DC: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
- Kanpol, B. (1988). Teacher work tasks and forms of resistance and accommodation to structural factors of schooling. Urban Education, 23(2), 173-187.
- Kerchner, C. T. (1984). The impact of labor relations on teaching. Center for Educational Policy and Management. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.
- Kerchkner, C. T., & Mitchell, D. E. (1986). Teaching reform and union reform. The Elementary School Journal, 86(4), 1-22.
- Kerchner, C. T., & Mitchell, D. E. (1988). The changing idea of a teachers' union. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.
- Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. (1988). Educational administration: An introduction. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Kuhn, J. (1961). Bargaining in grievance settlement: The power of industrial work groups. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lambert, V. (1988). Examples of fractional bargaining in public schools. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah. Dissertation Abstracts International 49,04A.
- Lewin, D., & Peterson, R. B. (1988). The modern grievance procedure in the United States. New York: Quorum Books.

- Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy. New York: Russell Sage.
- Lutz, F. W., Kleinman, L., & Evans, S. (1967). Grievances and their resolution. Danville, IL: Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.
- Maines, D. R. (1982). In search of mesostructure: Studies in the negotiated order. Urban Life, 11(3), 267-279).
- Manning, P. (1977). Rules in organizational context. Sociology Quarterly, 18, 44-61.
- March, J. G., & Shapira, Z. (1982). Behavioral decision theory and organizational decision theory. In G. R. Ungson & D. N. Braunstein (Eds.), Decision making: An interdisciplinary inquiry. Boston: Kent Publishing.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Martin, W. (1976). The negotiated order of the school. Macmillan of Canada: MacLean-Hunter Press.
- Mazzarella, J. A. (1985). Collective bargaining: How does it change the principals' role? NASSP Bulletin, 69(481), 75-81.
- McBrearty, J. C. (1972). Handling grievances: A positive approach for management and labor representatives. Tucson, AZ: College of Business and Public Administration, The University of Arizona.
- McCracken, G. D. (1988). The long interview. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- McDonnell, L. M., & Pascal, A. (1988). Teacher unions and education reform. JRE-02. Rand Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row.

- Mitchell, D. E., Kerchkner, C. T., Erck, W., & Pryor, G. (1981, February). The impact of collective bargaining on school management and policy. American Journal of Education, 147-188.
- Moser, C., & Randles, H. E. (1984). Options within the educational bargaining process. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 13(1), 39-53.
- Muth, R. (1984, Spring). Toward an integrative theory of power and educational organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(2), 25-42.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1982). Negotiating and administering contracts. School Management Handbook. Arlington, VA: Author.
- O'Reilly, R. C. (1978). Understanding collective bargaining in education: Negotiations, contracts, and disputes between teachers and boards. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Peterson, K. D. (1977-78). The principal's tasks. Administrators Notebook, XXVI(8).
- Pitner, N. J. (1986). Substitutes for principal leader behavior: An exploratory study. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(2), 23-42.
- Raelin, J. A. (1985). The basis for the professionals' resistance to managerial control. Human Resource Management, 24(2), 147-175.
- Raelin, J. A. (1989). Unionization and deprofessionalization: Which comes first? Journal of organization behavior, 10(2), 101-115.
- Rallis, S. F., & Highsmith, M. C. (1986). The myth of the "great principal": Questions of school management and instructional leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(1), 300-304.
- Rebore, R. W. (1991). Personnel administration in education, Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Redfern, G. B. (1969). Negotiation changes principal-teacher relationships. Professional negotiation and the principalship. Washington, DC: Department of Elementary School Principals.

- Rees, R. T., & Carpenter, R. (1980, Summer). A decision-making mode for collective bargaining. Planning and Changing, 11(2), 51-58.
- Retsinas, J. (1982). Teachers: Bargaining for control. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 353-372.
- Robson, D. L., & Davis, M. E. (1983). Administrative authority, leadership style, and the master contract. Journal of Educational Administration, 21(1), 5-13.
- Sacken, D. M. (1986). Collective negotiations in Arizona's public schools: The anomaly of tolerated illegal activities. Arizona Law Review, 28(1), 15-28.
- Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school the problem of change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sarason, S. B., & Klaber, M. (1985). The school as a social situation. Annual Review of Psychology, 36, 115-140.
- Scott, W. R. (1981). Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Shapiro, J. Z., & Crowson, R. L. (1990). Rational choice theory and administrative decision making: Implications for research in educational administration. In S. Bacharach (Ed.), Advances in research and theories of school management and educational policy, 1. Greenwich, CO: JAI Press.
- Shedd, J. B. (1988). Collective bargaining, school reform and the management of school systems. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24(4), 405-415.
- Shils, E. B., & Whittier, C. T. (1968). Teachers, administrators, and collective bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Simon, H. A. (1957). Administrative behavior. New York: MacMillan.
- Skratek, S. (1990, July). Grievance meditation: Does it really work? Negotiation Journal, 269-280.
- Smeenk, B. (1981). Contract administration and enforcement at the London, Ontario Board of education. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 10(1), 33-54.

- Smith, S. K. (1985). The union contract: A constraint on the evaluation of teacher performance? Journal of Collective Negotiations, 14(2), 151-159.
- Stager, M., & Leithwood, K. A. (1989). Cognitive flexibility and inflexibility in principals' problem solving. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 35(3), 217-236.
- Stelling, J., & Bucher, R. (1972). Autonomy and monitoring on hospital wards. Sociology Quarterly, 13, 431-446.
- Strauss, A. (1978). Negotiations: Varieties, contexts, processes, and social order. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Strauss, A. (1982). Interorganizational negotiation. Urban Life, 11(2), 350-367.
- Strauss, A. (1963). The hospital and its negotiated order. In E. Friedson (Ed.), The hospital in modern society. New York: Free Press.
- Sykes, G. (1985, March). Prospects for the reform of teaching through policy. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association annual meeting, Chicago, IL.
- Sykes, G. (1989). Teaching and professionalism: A cautionary perspective. In L. Weiss, P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, H. G. Petrie, & S. Slaughter (Eds.), Crisis in Teaching. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sykes, G., & Elmore, R. F. (1988). Making schools manageable: Policy and administration for tomorrow's schools. In J. Hannaway & R. Carowson (Eds.), The politics of reforming school administration: Yearbook of the politics of education association. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Thompson, J. D., & Tuden, A. (1959). Strategies, structures, and processes of organization decision. In J. D. Thompson (Ed.), Comparative studies in administration. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Ubeben, G., & Fulmer, B. (1985). The relationship of collective bargaining to the decision-making power of the public school principal. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 14(2), 141-149.
- Webster, W. (1985). Effective collective bargaining in public education. Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Weick, K. (1978). The spines of leaders. In M. W. McCall & M. M. Lombardo (Eds.), Leadership: Where else can we go? Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1973). The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.