

PERCEIVED DIFFERENCES AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
ADMINISTRATORS, AND TEACHERS ON COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING AND SELECTED DIMENSIONS OF
INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY IN SCHOOL
DISTRICTS IN THE STATE
OF OKLAHOMA

By

MARSHA JEANNE EDMONDS

Bachelor of Arts
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1968

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
College of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1981

Thesis
1981D
Ed 4p
Cop 2



PERCEIVED DIFFERENCES AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS,
ADMINISTRATORS, AND TEACHERS ON COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING AND SELECTED DIMENSIONS OF
INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY IN SCHOOL
DISTRICTS IN THE STATE
OF OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Carl R. Anderson

Thesis Adviser

Thomas Smith

Ralph A. Brann

Shan D. Joubert

Norman D. Buchanan

Dean of the Graduate College

1099200

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her heartfelt appreciation to the members of her doctoral committee: Dr. Carl R. Anderson, the chairman, for his patience, guidance and counsel throughout the entire study; Dr. Ralph Brann for his early and continued interest in the study, and Dr. Thomas Smith and Dr. Tom Johnsten for their assistance and support.

Each of the committee members exemplified all the personal qualities of caring and concern that are so important and necessary to successfully complete a doctoral study. Their personal consideration and advice will always be remembered as the writer feels very fortunate to have had the opportunity to enjoy a close affiliation with these committee members.

Additional thanks is also given to the faculty and staff of Booker T. Washington High School in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and especially to its principal, Mr. H. J. Green, whose administrative philosophy served as a source of inspiration to the writer. Mr. Green personifies the ideal school administrator and his consideration and support were invaluable. A special thanks is given to Mrs. Hazel Jackson and Mrs. Stacy Darty who assisted as typists.

Final recognition goes to the writer's mother, Mrs. Grace Edmonds, and sister, Ms. Rhonda Edmonds, for their support and personal sacrifice. Without their assistance, this work would not have been possible. Thank you for your patience and I love you both.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Historical Background	6
Definition of Selected Terms	14
Assumptions	15
Limitations	15
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	17
Introduction	17
Movement Toward Collective Bargaining	17
Institutional Quality	23
Rationale	26
Hypotheses	27
Summary	27
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	29
Introduction	29
Description of the Population and Sampling Procedures	29
Design and Implementation of the Instrument	32
Data Collection and Statistical Procedures	35
Summary	37
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	38
Introduction	38
Analysis of the Hypotheses	39
Analysis of Additional Data	40
Summary	84
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	86
Introduction	86
Summary	86
Conclusions and Implications	89
Recommendations for Further Research	91
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	93

Chapter	Page
APPENDIXES	97
APPENDIX A - Correspondence	98
APPENDIX B - Pilot Study Statements	101
APPENDIX C - Rejected Pilot Study Statements	104
APPENDIX D - Final Instrument	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. State Public Employee Collective Bargaining Laws Affecting Education	11
II. Study Sample	30
III. OEA Negotiations Levels	31
IV. Returned Questionnaires	36
V. Analysis of Variance Among Teachers, Building Administrators, Superintendents and Board of Education Presidents	40
VI. Item 1 Analysis of Variance: Quality	41
VII. Item 1 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	42
VIII. Item 2 Analysis of Variance: Quality	43
IX. Item 2 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	44
X. Item 3 Analysis of Variance: Quality	45
XI. Item 3 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	46
XII. Item 4 Analysis of Variance: Quality	47
XIII. Item 4 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	48
XIV. Item 5 Analysis of Variance: Quality	49
XV. Item 5 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	50
XVI. Item 6 Analysis of Variance: Quality	51
XVII. Item 6 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	52
XVIII. Item 7 Analysis of Variance: Quality	53
XIX. Item 7 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	54
XX. Item 8 Analysis of Variance: Quality	55

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
XXI. Item 8 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	56
XXII. Item 9 Analysis of Variance: Quality	57
XXIII. Item 9 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining	58
XXIV. Item 10 Analysis of Variance: Quality	59
XXV. Item 10 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	60
XXVI. Item 11 Analysis of Variance: Quality	61
XXVII. Item 11 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	62
XXVIII. Item 12 Analysis of Variance: Quality	63
XXIX. Item 12 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	64
XXX. Item 13 Analysis of Variance: Quality	65
XXXI. Item 13 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	66
XXXII. Item 14 Analysis of Variance: Quality	67
XXXIII. Item 14 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	68
XXXIV. Item 15 Analysis of Variance: Quality	69
XXXV. Item 15 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	70
XXXVI. Item 16 Analysis of Variance: Quality	71
XXXVII. Item 16 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	72
XXXVIII. Item 17 Analysis of Variance: Quality	73
XXXIX. Item 17 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	74
XL. Item 18 Analysis of Variance: Quality	75
XLI. Item 18 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	76
XLII. Item 19 Analysis of Variance: Quality	77
XLIII. Item 19 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	78
XLIV. Item 20 Analysis of Variance: Quality	79

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
XLV. Item 20 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	80
XLVI. Item 21 Analysis of Variance: Quality	81
XLVII. Item 21 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	82
XLVIII. Item 22 Analysis of Variance: Quality	83
XLIX. Item 22 Analysis of Variance: Effect of Bargaining . . .	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The 1960's was a decade of political and social disorder. Major issues such as the impact of urbanization, the development and growth of science and technology, population and bureaucratic growth, and race relations were important factors in the social unrest of that period. Indeed, many of these issues remain unresolved some twenty years later. In addition to these issues of importance, in recent years society has increasingly demanded more democratic institutions. Myers (1973) states that the societal thrust toward more democratic institutions is evidenced by such factors as the reduced number of autocratic heads of nations, the lessening number of colonial possessions throughout the world, and the ecumenical movement. Teachers have been influenced by this movement. Rosenthal (1969) states seeing and experiencing the benefits of some democracy, teachers do not rest content. They aspire and work toward greater democracy in the public schools.

The increasing sense of awareness on the part of teachers that they shared in the stakes of a sound educational system and the realization that they heretofore had little say in the educational process made many teachers demand a wider role in the decision-making process. Oftentimes, these demands fell on deaf ears. Shils (1968) notes evidence mounts that public school teachers want to take a hand in decision-making as it affects their assignments, conditions of work and their

professional futures. There is a wave of militancy taking place among the nation's teachers. They are not asking to run the schools, but they want their views heard and heeded. Former NEA President Richard Batchelder, at an American Association of School Administrators meeting, February 15, 1966, states while teachers were not trying to seize control of the schools, they wanted to become full partners in the school enterprise.

Within education, as in other major social institutions, a complex form of administrative organization has developed. This form of administrative organization, known as bureaucracy, has as its goal the attainment of efficient operation through the rationalization of behavior within the organization. Bureaucracies have five major characteristics which are as follows:

1. Hierarchical Authority Structure
2. Fixed Rules and Regulations
3. Tasks Are Distributed as Official Duties
4. Impersonal Orientation
5. Employment Constitutes a Career

Thompson (1961) notes that within the bureaucracy, the hierarchical authority structure overemphasizes the veto and thus leads to favor of the status quo. Superiors have the right to expect obedience and loyalty from subordinates. In addition, they have the right to initiate activities, assign them and settle conflicts. Thompson continues by noting that bureaucracies limit the effectiveness of group processes for problem-solving and that the distribution of power within the bureaucracy is at the prerogative of the superior. The full exercise of hierarchical rights results in autocratic rule. Gibb (1954) points out

that autocratic supervision within larger societal situations where participants have been socialized toward democratic expectations has very detrimental effects on the satisfaction of the participants.

The bureaucratic organization emphasizes the employee status of individuals within the organization. However, there is another form of institutional organization. Organization along professional lines is an alternative form of organization. There are many definitions of the word profession. Corwin (1970) defines a mature profession as an organized work group that has a legal monopoly to establish procedures for recruiting and policing members and for maximizing control over a body of theoretical knowledge and applying it to the solution of social problems. Kornhauser (1962) identifies four criteria of a profession:

1. Specialized competence having an intellectual component
2. Extensive autonomy in exercising special competence
3. Strong commitment to a career based on a special competence
4. Influence and responsibility in the use of a special competence

The professional-bureaucratic schemes of organization are in conflict with one another. One of the critical problems for modern organizations is to establish ways to reconcile the growing professionalism of individuals who seek individual autonomy and the central control demands of bureaucratic hierarchies which demand conformity and uniformity (Anderson, 1967). Washburne (1957) anticipated the development of teacher militancy arising from the lack of machinery for resolving the conflict between bureaucratic and professional authority. In addition, Parsons (1962) observed that the articulation between managerial and technical levels in organizations suffers as the expertise of the technical personnel increases. The more expert

(that is, professional) the technical personnel become, the more restive they become about managerial decisions concerning technical activities and about the competence of the managerial personnel to supervise technical performance.

The bureaucratic demand for employee subordination is directly in conflict with the professionalization movement which has become increasingly apparent among America's teachers. As teachers have demanded more of a voice in the educational process, the power-holders within the system have been reluctant to relinquish authority for decision-making. The result of this situation is that teachers have adapted a more militant stance with regard to issues which have affected education in today's society.

To briefly summarize these developments, the 1960's witnessed a growing political and social unrest. The nation's schools were not excluded from this social drama. Indeed, many of the broad issues of our society's existence were re-enacted in our nation's classrooms. Teachers were not unaffected by rising societal demands for more democratic institutions. Within the area of organizational development, bureaucracy has become the major form of organization during this century. The increasing bureaucratization of major social institutions has been accompanied by a sense of power loss by employees within the organization. This is due to the fact that our bureaucracies demand centralization of authority accompanied by autocratic rule, and employees have little input into the decision-making process.

Statement of the Problem

Before 1960, collective bargaining was considered repugnant and unethical by professional educators. However, dramatic changes have occurred in attitudes toward collective bargaining. Since that time, teachers have organized to bring about a change in the decision-making structure in schools. This has led to many demands, some of which include better salaries, economic security, control over recruitment, selection, evaluation and tenure, and the right to participate in the decision-making process.

Although Oklahoma has had legal provisions for collective bargaining since 1971, there is a lack of research in the area of collective bargaining and the impact it has had on the quality of our educational institutions. Nighswander and Kahn (1977) report that in fact, since 1970, the apparent quantity of research into the effects of collective bargaining has diminished. However, collective bargaining continues to increase as a function of the desire of public employees. It appears that various groups within the school system perceive the effects of collective bargaining on institutional quality differently. The purpose of this study is to present data to establish the degree of these differences among school board members, school administrators and teachers.

Teachers profess that through the process of collective bargaining not only will their personal welfare be enhanced, but that negotiations will ultimately result in a better educational system for the community. Frymier (1968) aptly states that professional negotiations probably holds a greater potential for the improvement of education than any

series of events or activities which have occurred in the last fifty years. According to negotiations advocates, collective bargaining has as one of its goals the advancement of the educational program. This study will provide information on the perceptions of the impact of collective bargaining on institutional quality in school districts in Oklahoma by teachers, building administrators, superintendents, and school board members.

Historical Background

The nineteenth century witnessed a struggle for trade union organization in America. The view that combinations of workers were conspiracies in restraint of trade was the prevailing attitude in American society. This American legacy from England made it difficult for unions to organize as they often encountered court-ordered injunctions upon efforts to strike. In Commonwealth v. Hunt (1842) the state of Massachusetts held that combinations of workers were not illegal per se; only if the object of the combination was criminal could it be prohibited. This landmark case also declared that seeking a closed shop and striking were not illegal goals and that workers could organize for these purposes.

Despite this judicial decision, unions did not fare well among American workers, especially the unskilled workers, until some years later. Unlike his European counterpart, the American worker did not become radical or seek to establish his own political party. The American worker was paid well, compared to the European worker, worked about the same number of hours and benefitted from constantly improved tools and machinery. If he became disillusioned, the American West,

with vast amounts of land and opportunity, served as an escape valve for him.

As mentioned above, labor unions made very little progress among industrial workers; however, craft workers and railroad brotherhoods began to gain strength even in the light of relatively hostile public opinion. Meager gains made by such organizations as the Knights of Labor and the National Labor Union were supplanted by labor violence in the 1880's and 1890's which fueled the public's fear of labor unions. However, even under such adverse conditions the American Federation of Labor, organized in 1886 as a federation of craft unions, experienced moderate success. Under the astute leadership of Samuel Gompers, craft union membership steadily increased. The industrial worker had to wait for a more appropriate time when public opinion changed to succeed in attempts to organize.

Herring and Sarthory (1980) state that by 1900 craft unions numbered almost a million workers and the expansion produced by World War I brought the total membership to five million. These wartime gains were lost in the 1920's and by 1930 membership had fallen to 3.5 million, less than seven per cent of the total labor force. The Depression intensified the problems of labor and from that time on, labor began to look toward the government for intervention in labor management relations.

The Roosevelt years were characterized by a view of society from the bottom up. This era witnessed the use of federal power to change the prevailing relationship between government and business. The results were more encompassing than even the Populists and Progressives of an earlier time had envisioned. The New Deal saw the passage

of revolutionary legislation which greatly strengthened the position of labor.

The first significant piece of legislation was the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932. This act took away the power of the federal government to issue injunctions in cases growing out of labor disputes. In 1933, the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) was passed. Section 7(a) guaranteed that employees would have the right to organize and bargain collectively through their own representatives. It also guaranteed they would be free from interference, restraint and coercion. Although the NIRA was subsequently declared unconstitutional, the National Labor Relations Act (the Wagner Act) was substituted. This act was even better in the eyes of labor as it further delineated the labor/management relationship by guaranteeing employees' rights of self organization and collective bargaining. Additionally, the Wagner Act created the National Labor Relations Board which had the power to issue cease and desist orders against employers who violated these restrictions. The board also had the power to determine appropriate bargaining units and to conduct representation elections.

Thus, labor gained substantial power during the 1930's. New labor union memberships were added as a result of John L. Lewis' success in forming the Congress of Industrial Organizations in 1937. Other legislative accomplishments which benefitted the growing labor movement included the Social Security Act of 1935, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act in 1938.

World War II witnessed the co-operation of both labor and management in an all out effort to increase production for the war effort. Differences were temporarily laid aside; however, after the war, the

many strikes which ensued led the public to believe that labor had too much power. This resulted in the passage of the Labor-Management Relations Act (Taft-Hartley Act) in 1947. This act amended the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 which had set legal prohibitions almost entirely against the activities of employers, while at the same time benefitting and protecting union interests. The Taft-Hartley Act strengthened the power of employers against unfair labor practices. Section 14(b) gave workers, in states enacting permissive legislation, the right to work without having to belong to a union.

The development of collective bargaining in the public sector came about more slowly than in the private sector. The major reason for this was that public opinion was not favorable to collective action by government employees. Many Americans felt that this would be contrary to public welfare. Traditionally, public employee organizations attempted to further their interests by lobbying rather than demanding collective bargaining. Gitlow (1970) states that while union membership between 1956 and 1968 rose only a little in absolute terms in private manufacturing and non-manufacturing industries, public employee unionism exploded both absolutely and relatively. In absolute terms it grew from 915,000 to 2,155,000 and in relative terms it expanded from 5.1% of total union membership to 10.7%.

The movement toward unionization in the public sector moved slowly until recently for a number of reasons. One of these reasons was the public attitude toward strikes. The right to strike has generally been denied to public employees. This denial is based upon the reasoning that public employees are in the business of supplying essential public services, the discontinuance of which would result in damage to an

orderly system of governmental operation. An additional reason for the slow movement in the public sector was the belief that authority could not be shared in the public domain. This attitude is aptly expressed by Franklin D. Roosevelt (1937) in a letter to L. C. Stewart, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees. Roosevelt stated that the very nature and purpose of government make it impossible for administration officials to represent fully or to bind the employer in mutual discussions with government employee organizations. The employer is the whole people who speak by laws enacted by their representatives in Congress. Accordingly, administration officials and employees alike are governed and guided, and in many cases, restricted by laws which establish policies, procedures, or rules in personnel matters.

Collective bargaining in the public sector became more firmly established with Executive Order 10988, signed by President Kennedy in 1962. This order established rights to organize and consult, and assured a formal grievance process for public employees. However, the employee's right to strike was not recognized. Executive Order 11491, signed by President Nixon in 1968 continued this prohibition, although it improved upon the process of bargaining for public employees.

Teachers, as public employees, have not failed to take advantage of the collective bargaining process in order to improve their position in policy formulation in school districts throughout the United States. Table I indicates that 32 states (including the District of Columbia) have granted teachers the right to bargain (State Education Collective Bargaining Laws, 1980).

TABLE I
SUMMARY TABLE

State Public Employee Collective Bargaining Laws Affecting Education														
State	Number of Statutes ¹	Type of Laws			Professional Coverage ⁵			Classified Coverage ⁶			Supervisor Coverage ⁷			Union Security Provisions ⁹
		Local ²	State ³	Omnibus ⁴	K-12	CC ⁸	PS	K-12	CC ⁸	PS	K-12	CC ⁸	PS	
Alabama														AL
Alaska	2	x		x	x		x			x	x			AK
Arizona														AZ
Arkansas														AR
California	3	x	PS		x	x	x	x	x	x			x	CA
Colorado														CO
Connecticut	3	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	CT
Delaware	2	x			x		x	x		x			x	DE
Florida	1			x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	FL
Georgia														GA
Hawaii	1			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	HI
Idaho	1	x			x						x			ID
Illinois														IL
Indiana	1	x			x								x	IN
Iowa	1			x	x		x	x		x			x	IA
Kansas	2	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	KS
Kentucky														KY
Louisiana														LA
Maine	2	x	PS,CC		x	x	x	x	x	x			x	ME
Maryland	2	x			x			x			x		x	MD
Massachusetts	1			x	x		x	x		x	x		x	MA
Michigan	1			x	x		x	x		x	x		x	MI
Minnesota	1			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	MN

TABLE I (Continued)

State Public Employee Collective Bargaining Laws Affecting Education														
State	Number of Statutes ¹	Type of Laws			Professional Coverage ⁵			Classified Coverage ⁶			Supervisor Coverage ⁷			Union Security Provisions ⁹
		Local ²	State ³	Omnibus ⁴	K-12	CC ⁸	PS	K-12	CC ⁸	PS	K-12	CC ⁸	PS	
Mississippi														MS
Missouri	1			x				x			x			MO
Montana	1			x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	MT
Nebraska	2	x		x	x		x	x		x				NE
Nevada	1	x			x			x			x		x	NV
New Hampshire	1			x	x		x	x		x		x		NH
New Jersey	1			x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	NJ
New Mexico														NM
New York	1			x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	NY
North Carolina														NC
North Dakota	1	x			x						x			ND
Ohio														OH
Oklahoma	1	x			x			x			x		x	OK
Oregon	1			x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	OR
Pennsylvania	1			x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	PA
Rhode Island	3	x	x		x		x	x					x	RI
South Carolina														SC
South Dakota	1			x	x		x	x		x	x	x		SD
Tennessee	1	x			x									TN
Texas														TX
Utah														UT
Vermont	3	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	VT
Virginia														VA

TABLE I (Continued)

State Public Employee Collective Bargaining Laws Affecting Education															
State	Number of Statutes ¹	Type of Laws			Professional Coverage ⁵			Classified Coverage ⁶			Supervisor Coverage ⁷			Union Security Provisions ⁹	
		Local ²	State ³	Omnibus ⁴	K-12	CC ⁸	PS	K-12	CC ⁸	PS	K-12	CC ⁸	PS		
Washington	4	x	CC		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	WA
West Virginia															WV
Wisconsin	2	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	WI
Wyoming															WY
District of Columbia	1	x			x		x				x		x	x	DC
TOTALS		19	7	17	32	12 ⁸	24	27	12 ⁸	24	20 ⁸	5	13	26	

¹Represents the number of separate statutes summarized on the table for each state.

²Coverage for local-level employees only.

³Coverage for state-level employees only. California, Maine and Washington laws are specific for postsecondary and/or community colleges.

⁴Coverage for employees of more than one governmental level.

⁵Teachers or personnel with similar or higher status.

⁶Below the rank of teacher, non-administrative support personnel.

⁷Any or all levels of supervisors and administrators, in one or more laws in the state.

⁸This column is checked only if community colleges are noted specifically in law. State structures vary, and community colleges may be included in K-12 system, in the postsecondary system, or may be a separate system.

⁹This column is checked if union security provisions are present in one or more of the state laws.

Definition of Selected Terms

The following terms are collected and defined for the convenience of the reader. These terms are in accord with common educational usage and are used throughout the study. Other significant terms will be appropriately defined as they are introduced in the study.

Board of Education: An elected or appointed body of citizens responsible for the establishment and operation of the local public school system.

Building Administrator: The chief administrative manager of the school, usually referred to as the principal, who is responsible for the development and implementation of the instructional program at the school.

Collective Bargaining: The mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment.

Collective Negotiations: See Collective Bargaining.

Institutional Quality: A set of dimensions in a school district, the presence of which contributes to, but does not guarantee, the existence of an adequately acceptable educational program for the local school district. For the purposes of this study, institutional quality has been operationalized as the thirteen dimensions broadly identified by Nighswander and Kahn (1977) and further delineated and clarified by this researcher in the pilot study for this research (See Appendix B).

Professional Negotiations: See Collective Bargaining.

Superintendent: Chief executive officer of the school district, employed by the Board of Education as its advisor, guide and leader.

Teacher: A certificated employee of a school district charged with implementing instruction for the students of the school district.

Assumptions

In the preparation of this research study, several assumptions have been made. First, it must be assumed that the sociopolitical and socio-psychological situation of the questionnaire respondents was conducive to the honest disclosure of information. Secondly, it is assumed that local teachers represented in the bargaining units are concerned with personal welfare objectives as well as the improvement of the educational program within the school district. Thirdly, it is assumed that teachers today are still concerned with the subjects for professional negotiations as stated in the 1963 NEA guidelines (see p. 22 of this study). Finally, it is assumed that the population which was asked to respond is representative of superintendents, building administrators, teachers and board members throughout the state of Oklahoma.

Limitations

This research study is primarily concerned with the perceptions of superintendents, building administrators, teachers and board members in Oklahoma. The conclusions drawn from this study; therefore, should be limited to this population and not necessarily applicable to these

groups in other states. Additional limitations could result from the sampling technique fully described in Chapter III.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter consists of an examination of collective bargaining and its growing influence in education. The review of literature will focus on research in the area of collective bargaining and its relationship to institutional quality. Additional attention will be given to the reasons for the development of the bargaining model in public education. Chapter II will conclude with a rationale and a statement of the five research hypotheses.

Movement Toward Collective Bargaining

As collective bargaining gained impetus in the public sector of the economy, teachers began to make demands for an increasing role in the decision-making which affected schools. Areas of concern included, but were not limited to, such factors as how to group students for instruction, how to organize fellow colleagues for effective work (team-teaching, small group instruction, etc.) selection of department chairpersons and subject supervisors, selection and use of instructional materials, and colleague evaluation and tenure issues (Myers, 1973). Prior to this point in time, relatively few teachers were involved in decisions of this nature. The workday of the average teacher went

something like this: report to the assigned building, teach assigned students the prescribed curriculum using the assigned textbook and materials. The teacher was not consulted in this process.

The prevailing attitude of many power-holders in the decision-making process was aptly expressed in attitudes such as the following. Teachers cannot be trusted with responsibility for educational policies in curriculum or discipline or promotion standards; nor can they be trusted with professional controls, such as entry requirements or judgment of one another's competence; nor can they be trusted with a voice in terms of employment; nor most emphatically, can they be trusted with the power of independent and cohesive professional organization. No, teachers cannot be trusted--except in the classroom with our children. (Solomon, 1961).

Attitudes such as the one stated above led teachers to assume a more militant posture. At this point, it seems appropriate to assess additional conditions which have led to this development. Williams (1970) discusses three external factors which have affected teacher militancy. These are as follows:

1. Civil Disobedience: The lessons of civil disobedience and the success of those who have used it have not been ignored by teachers.
2. American Labor Movement: A mutual attraction has developed between the American labor movement and the teaching profession. The labor movement's success in improving the compensation and working conditions of its members has made unionism an attractive alternative for teachers who seek similar goals.

3. Dissatisfaction With Schools: The American public traditionally has believed that the quality of its life is directly related to the effectiveness of its public schools. Perhaps nothing so matches the public discontent with societal life today as its conviction that the schools are not living up to their potential. Teachers have been receiving the brunt of the public's condemnation of the schools.

Myers (1973) identifies four external factors affecting teacher militancy that are noteworthy. They are as follows:

1. Larger and More Bureaucratic Systems: As school districts have become larger and more bureaucratic, there has been a resultant loss of identity by teachers. One can view the rising power of teachers as a direct response to rising bureaucracy.
2. Societal Demands Toward More Democratic Institutions: This has been discussed in detail in the introduction.
3. Struggle Between the AFT and NEA: The emergence of the AFT and its resultant conflict with the NEA has greatly stimulated teacher militancy.
4. Countervailing Power: Countervailing power occurs when one section of the economy gains a disproportionate amount of control or power over a second section. In time, this second section tries to equalize that power. This is what is happening to teachers; they are gaining countervailing power in education in response to the monopoly held by boards of education.

The characteristics of bureaucracy were noted in the introduction, Chapter I. With regard to the power issue within the

bureaucracy, the literature reports mixed findings. While Boyan (1967) states that the collective militant action of teachers as employers in public bureaucracies represents their search to achieve power equalization; Mollers and Charters (1966) do not find support for their hypothesis that the extent of bureaucracy varies inversely with a teacher's sense of power. Griffiths (1969) reports that power is sought in order to control the decision-making process of the organization.

The definition of what constitutes a profession appeared in the introduction, Chapter I. The growth of knowledge in teaching and a strong sense of responsibility for student welfare supports claims to an exclusive monopoly over certain aspects of teaching (Corwin, 1970). Myers (1973) points out that it seems doubtful that teachers will become further professionalized if they do not acquire more of the characteristics of the established professions.

Whether teaching can be classified as a profession remains an unsettled question (Cheek, 1967). However, teachers are more and more inclined to view themselves as professionals. This trend toward professionalization has increased tension between teachers and school management, resulting in greater militancy (Williams, 1970).

The professional/bureaucratic question remains unsettled in our schools. Bureaucracy demands centralization of authority and employees have little input into the decision-making process. Teachers lack authority in part because of hierarchical authority patterns that exist in bureaucratically oriented school districts. Bureaucracies demand a vertical structure of authority, whereas professions tend to follow a horizontal structure (Myers, 1973).

During the turbulent period of the 1960's, teachers in many cities resorted to strikes, sanctions, boycotts, walkouts and other means of withdrawal of services. These are still methods which are in use today. The mounting anxiety and hostility of teachers toward educational systems that perpetuated inadequate salaries, large classes, and poor teaching materials was incorrectly assessed by many boards of education. Teachers were no longer willing to set by idly regardless of the educational policies instituted by the state legislature, the state board of education, and the local board of education. Teachers became a new breed that wanted their voices heard. Shanker (1966) stated that power is never given to anyone. Power is taken, and it is taken from someone. Teachers have started this process and it is causing a realignment of power relationships.

Within the bureaucratic structure of the schools, authority and power are vested in hierarchical positions above the teacher. As a result, teachers have traditionally had little autonomy. The formal and legal allocation of authority in school systems is monolithic, hierarchical and centralized; official powers are focused at the apex of the structure (Lortie, 1969). Individuals may fight back through union activity (Strauss, 1963).

Collective bargaining has become an alternative method for decision-making in which teachers have a voice in educational affairs. By its nature, collective bargaining reduces the power exercised by administrators and boards of education. Nolte (1970) reports that in the traditional approach to decisions the board could unilaterally, without consultation with its employees, allow only one-way communication, always have the last word, lack good faith, ignore

divergencies between policy and practice, and retain a power relationship that is unilateral, paternalistic, and authoritarian. Using collective bargaining; however, the board is required to consult with employees, communication is two-way, impasse procedures are provided, good-faith bargaining is mandated, constant dialogue requires the board to discuss divergencies between policy and practice, and the power relationship is bilateral, cooperative, and democratic. Through collective bargaining, teachers have sought to increase their power.

Shils (1968) states that historically negotiations between school boards and teachers organizations were generally limited to salaries and economic welfare benefits such as insurance and sick leave. However, the 1963 NEA Guidelines included the following:

Subjects for Professional Negotiation: The matters of joint concern to a local professional organization and a school board are included in the broad aim to achieve better schools and a better education for every child. This includes, but is not limited to, setting standards for employing professional personnel, community support for the school system, in-service training of personnel, class size, teacher turnover, personnel policies, salaries, working conditions and communications within the school system. All or any of these may be the subject of professional negotiations.

As the reader can see, teachers are desirous of establishing policy on subjects that not so long ago were considered to be outside their realm of concern. Myers (1973) has conceptualized teacher areas of concern into three major categories. They are teacher welfare objectives, service objectives, and professional objectives. These areas can sometimes overlap, such as the case involving the issue of class size, which can

be viewed as both a teacher welfare objective and a service objective. In addition to making the teacher's job easier, there is some evidence that class size may have some effect on learning.

The movement of American teachers toward participative models of decision-making which have included professional negotiations as an important aspect of the model has become the primary response made by teachers to ensure that teachers' views will be represented in the educational process. Schultz (1975) believes that social theory indicates that only through organized groups can the individual have an impact on policies and practices which will improve his self-identity and status. Collective bargaining; therefore, is an effective means by which the teacher, his goals and his professional expectations can be integrated with the institution. By its very nature, it creates dynamic interaction between administrator and teacher, each of whom is considered sovereign in his own sphere. Although this territoriality can lead to institutional fragmentation and loss of holistic perspective; negotiations brings the parties together, providing a matrix for promise and consensus. Seen as problem solving, negotiations tends to reduce rather than create conflicts.

Institutional Quality

As educators became more interested in collective bargaining as a means for achieving representation in the decision-making process, articles began to appear in educational literature with increasing regularity.

Early literature was primarily concerned with recognition and legitimation (Blanke, 1965; Stumpf, 1966; Lieberman, 1971; Ostrander,

1975). This early interest was followed by concern for governance of the schools (Williams, 1975; Cresswell and Murphy, 1976) and procedure (Rago, 1978). More recently there has been a developing interest in community participation models for negotiations (Cheng, 1976; Pisapia, 1979) and the role of administrators in the bargaining model (Cooper, 1976; Barea, 1977; Kowalski, 1978). Negotiations has been addressed from an additional perspective of impact on variables such as teachers morale (Davies, 1972) and salary considerations (Morgan, 1977). Thus, the researcher who wishes to study collective bargaining is confronted with a diversity of theoretical orientations that reflect important differences in the professional training, experience, and goals of those who work in this area. It is interesting to note that a substantial number of articles are descriptive rather than experimental in approach.

A limited amount of work that has been done in the area of collective bargaining relates to the relationship between bargaining and institutional quality. Davies (1972) conducted a study on the relationship between collective bargaining and teacher morale. The collective negotiations process was not found to be a vehicle for improved teacher morale, according to the results of this study. Teachers in unilateral (traditional) employment relationships exhibited higher morale in comparisons between unilateral and comprehensive collective negotiations groups.

The impact of collective bargaining on organizational climate was addressed by Woods (1979). The author reports no significant differences were observed in negotiating and non-negotiating districts on Openness Scores on the OCDQ (Organizational Climate Description

Questionnaire). The author found that organization climate was not affected by collective bargaining.

Zeiss (1978) in a study designed to determine the effect of professional negotiations on educational, institutional, and administrative variables, found that Nebraska school personnel gave high ratings to their schools on institutional quality variables. The author found that professional negotiations, while perceived as having negative effects on many facets of the educational enterprise, apparently had minimal impact on students or instructional programs. According to Zeiss, there were more perceived negative effects associated with negotiations than positive. Positive effects accrued to teachers in the form of staff salaries, fringe benefits, and working conditions. The most strongly felt negative effects were in the areas related to school finance, school community relations, and staff morale.

Jenkins (1970) assessed the impact of professional negotiations as perceived by superintendents, teacher organization presidents, and board of education presidents in Illinois. In addition, the study attempted to assess the differences in perception among these groups in negotiating school districts. Respondents in the study agreed that negotiations have had a marked impact on education. Teacher organization presidents perceive the impact of negotiations as more beneficial than do the superintendents or board presidents. Superintendents agreed more closely with board presidents than they did with teacher organization presidents.

In a survey of North Central Association principals, superintendents, and college presidents, Nighswander and Kahn (1977) assessed the perceived impact of collective bargaining on thirteen dimensions

related to institutional quality. Five of the thirteen dimensions were rated by a large portion of respondents as having been weakened by collective bargaining. Fiscal condition was reported as most weakened of these five. Other dimensions of institutional quality rated as weakened by collective bargaining were: community support of education, staff morale, intra-staff communications, and public relations. Two items, professional staff salaries and fringe benefits for professional staff were rated by the majority as strengthened by collective bargaining. The other six variables of institutional quality; instruction program, extra-curricular programs, inservice programs, student academic achievement, student morale, and physical facilities were perceived as largely unaffected by collective bargaining. Those considered least affected were student academic achievement, student morale, and physical facilities.

Rationale

Based on the findings of the above mentioned researchers, a rationale for the present study can be articulated as follows. From the Woods (1979) study it appears that negotiating and non-negotiating school districts share similar perceptions on organizational climate. The study presented by Zeiss (1978) indicates that school employees rate their schools high on institutional quality variables, although the effects of bargaining were viewed somewhat negatively by participants of this study. Further research by Jenkins (1970) seems to indicate that collective bargaining indeed has affected education and that different groups associated with the school district have differences in their perceptions of the effect of negotiations on education. The Nighswander

and Kahn (1977) study further indicates a relationship between collective bargaining and school quality.

Hypotheses

With significant attention given to the literature review, and from the research findings emphasized in the rationale, the following hypotheses were tested in this study.

1. There are no significant differences between negotiating and non-negotiating school districts on perceptions of institutional quality.
2. There are significant differences between teachers and principals on their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating districts.
3. There are significant differences between teachers and superintendents in their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating districts.
4. There are significant differences between teachers and board of education presidents in their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating districts.
5. Superintendents and board of education presidents are more likely to agree on the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality than superintendents and teachers in negotiating districts.

Summary

The literature suggests that collective bargaining has become an important phenomena in education. The rise of collective bargaining in public schools has caused educators to become interested in the role

that collective bargaining is assuming in employer/employee relationships. Additionally, educators have serious concerns about how collective bargaining is influencing the quality of education being offered in our schools.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology and procedures used in this study. Specifically, this chapter will consider the following areas: 1. description of the population and sampling procedures, 2. design and administration of the instrument, and 3. data collection and statistical procedures.

Description of the Population and Sampling Procedures

This study was designed to assess the differences in perceptions among school employees on collective bargaining and institutional quality. In order to accomplish this, two groups were identified. Group One consisted of K-12 school districts in Oklahoma that have been involved in collective bargaining. Group Two consisted of K-12 school districts in Oklahoma that have not been involved in collective bargaining. Each group included superintendents, board of education presidents, building principals, and teachers (See Table II). The two groups utilized in this study differed on the independent variable of collective bargaining.

TABLE II
STUDY SAMPLE

	Levels 5&6 Negotiating School Districts	Non-Negotiating School Districts
Board Presidents	44	10
Superintendents	44	10
Building Principals	69	14
Teachers	411	55

In order to determine which districts would be included in Group One and Group Two, the researcher obtained a list of school districts involved in Level Five or Level Six negotiations as described by the Oklahoma Education Association. School districts not involved in Level Five or Level Six negotiations were considered for inclusion in Group Two. The Oklahoma Education Association description of the various levels of negotiations can be found in Table III.

For the purposes of verification and in order to secure permission for the school district to be included in the study, the superintendent of each Level Five and Level Six district was contacted by telephone. Forty-six districts were verified and invited to be included in Group One. Through the above process, the total population of Level Five and Level Six school districts with the exception of one district, was contacted and invited to participate in the study. Of the forty-six districts whose superintendents were contacted, two declined to participate. The final sample for Group One was 44 school districts, or 95.6% of the total population.

TABLE III

 OEA NEGOTIATIONS LEVELS

- Level 1. Local has indicated an interest in bargaining, but has not organized for bargaining.
 - Level 2. Local is currently organizing for bargaining, but has not initiated the bargaining process.
 - Level 3. Local has a "meet and confer" process currently in effect for bargaining purposes.
 - Level 4. Local has an adversary relationship, but bargains only financial issues.
 - Level 5. Local has an adversary relationship, and negotiates issues on item-by-item basis.
 - Level 6. Local has an adversary relationship, and obtains ratification on all items in a package year (i.e. comprehensive agreement or master contract).
-

Group Two school districts were identified as any school district on the OEA list not negotiating on Level Five or Level Six. From this group of school districts, ten were randomly selected (using a table of random numbers) to be included in the study. These districts were contacted through the superintendent's office for verification and permission to be included in the study.

Within Group One and Group Two, every superintendent, every board of education president, twenty percent of the building principals, and twenty percent of his/her teachers were included in the study. The anonymity of each school district was guaranteed by the researcher. Utilizing this procedure, each district was ensured equal representation of superintendents and board presidents, and proportional representation

of building principals and teachers. The exception to proportional representation of building principals and teachers was that every district included at least one of the former and two of the latter.

Selection of the building principals was accomplished on a random basis within each district. A twenty percent sample was obtained by first determining the total number of building principals within each district. Following this determination, the names of the building principals within the district were obtained from the Oklahoma Educational Directory, 1980-1981. These names were put in a container and drawn by the researcher until the desired number had been obtained within each district.

The method for securing teacher subjects for the study was achieved differently. The number of teachers within each principal's building was obtained from the Oklahoma Educational Directory, 1980-1981. Still utilizing twenty percent proportional representation, the desirable number from each building was then identified and the principal was instructed in his/her cover letter to systematically select every nth teacher from a list of his/her faculty. (See Appendix A).

Design and Implementation of the Instrument

Nighswander and Kahn (1977) identified thirteen dimensions of institutional quality. Nighswander, in a letter to this researcher, reported that these dimensions were tested by a panel of experts for validity. He reports both content and face validity. Additionally, Nighswander reports that the instrument was pilot tested; however, no estimates of reliability were made.

From these dimensions of institutional quality taken from the Nighswander instrument, this researcher constructed thirty-nine items (three for each dimension) which attempted to further clarify the meaning and intent of each dimension. Each of the items included in the instrument in Part III relates to a dimension of quality as identified by Nighswander and Kahn (1977). For example, items one and two relate to the instructional program, a dimension which Nighswander and Kahn have identified as contributing to institutional quality. In the same manner, items 17 and 18 relate to the dimension of professional staff salaries, while items 14 and 15 relate to intra-staff communications. For further identification of the relationship of individual items to the various dimensions, see Appendix B. These items were included in a questionnaire constructed by the researcher (FORM CBIQ) in two distinct phases.

In the first developmental phase, FORM CBIQ was arranged in three parts. Part I consisted of background information, Part II consisted of items concerning general impressions and Part III contained the thirty-nine items mentioned above arranged in a Likert-like form. Each item in Part III had an additional component designed to measure perceptions of the impact of collective bargaining on that item.

Internal validity was established by a panel of eight experts. The panel was asked to review FORM CBIQ. Statements that the experts identified as lacking merit were omitted in the final form. For example, the panel recommended that answers to Part I questions might best be obtained in another fashion. Questions that the panel felt had merit but were lacking in clarity or intent were modified in the final construction of the instrument. Additionally, it was determined that

Part I could best be used to obtain demographic data which may have a bearing on this study. The instrument was photoelectronically reduced in size so that it would be less bulky.

Phase Two consisted of a pilot study conducted with two groups utilizing a method of opportunity sampling. The first group for the pilot study consisted of several classes of graduate students at Oklahoma State University. These classes were composed of practicing school administrators, counselors, and teachers, along with full time graduate students. Foreign students were eliminated from the pilot study. Group Two of the pilot study was the entire certificated staff at a school in a school district not included in the study. One hundred thirty instruments were returned to the researcher of which one hundred seventeen were of useable quality.

Statistical data were computed on Part III of FORM CBIQ using the technique of factor analysis with an oblique rotation. Only items loading in excess of .366 on the primary factor pertaining to the study were allowed to remain in the design of the final instrument. Responses to the selected questions were computed using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. On the twenty two items included in the study, a reliability of .83 was established using this method. The statements from the original questionnaire which were not considered in the calculation of the reliability coefficient because of low loading during factor analysis are shown in Appendix C.

The modified instrument (see Appendix D) which was a product of the decisions made by the panel of experts and statistical data of factor analysis and Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha, was reproduced and mailed to the individual school districts agreeing to participate in the study.

Additionally, each packet contained cover letters to the individual superintendents and building principals (Appendix A) expressing gratitude for their participation and outlining steps for the successful implementation of the study. The superintendent was asked to return all the questionnaires from his/her district in a postage paid self-addressed envelope included for his/her convenience.

The response rate at the stated deadline was 57.7%. At that time, follow-up activities were initiated. These activities included personal telephone conversations to remind each district that the questionnaires should be mailed. In some instances it was necessary to mail duplicate questionnaires along with another self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. Two weeks following this activity, the total survey response rate had increased to nearly 70%. By mid-May, 1981, the data collected for the study was considered complete. The rates of return are shown in Table IV.

Data Collection and Statistical Procedures

In order to facilitate a more timely and accurate interpretation of the statistical data, the data processing facilities at Oklahoma State University were utilized. The software package, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was the primary component in interpreting the data submitted by Fortran batch controlled cards.

The data collected in Part III of FORM CBIQ were scored in the following manner. As previously stated, each question in Part III contained two response options. The first response option consisted of a statement concerning institutional quality, with four options ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The second response option

asked respondents to indicate their perception of the effect of collective bargaining on the statement of institutional quality. (See Figure 1).

TABLE IV

RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES				
Teachers				
Responses:	310			
Percent:	67%			
Building Administrators				
Responses:	71			
Percent:	86%			
Superintendents				
Responses:	40			
Percent:	74%			
Board of Education Presidents				
Responses:	33			
Percent:	61%			
The teachers in this district are confident in the school program.				
	4	3	2	1
	SA	A	D	SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining	1	2	3	
	Improved	No Effect	Harmed	

Figure 1. Example of Procedure Used to Score Statements

Data were analyzed utilizing the following procedures. A t test was administered to determine at the .05 confidence level, significant differences, if any, between negotiating and non-negotiating school districts' perceptions of institutional quality. Data from the perceptions of board of education presidents, superintendents, building principals and teachers on the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality were analyzed using a One Way Analysis of Variance. These data were measured against the .05 level of confidence. Additionally, a Scheffe Multiple Comparison Procedure was used to analyze differences among these groups. Cronbach's Reliability Coefficient Alpha was computed for Part III of the questionnaire, to determine reliability in the study. The reliability was .85.

Summary

Chapter III has provided information concerning the research methodology and procedures utilized in data collection and interpretation. It has included a description of the population and sampling procedures, a description of the research design and instrumentation and statistical procedures used in data analysis.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis and discussion of the data collected as part of the study. Five hypotheses served as the focal point for the analysis of the data. The stated hypotheses are as follows:

H.1: There are no significant differences between negotiating and non-negotiating school districts on perceptions of institutional quality.

H.2: There are significant differences between teachers and principals on their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating school districts.

H.3: There are significant differences between teachers and superintendents in their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating school districts.

H.4: There are significant differences between teachers and board of education presidents in their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating school districts.

H.5: Superintendents and board of education presidents are more likely to agree on the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality than superintendents and teachers in negotiating school districts.

Results of the statistical treatment were accepted at or below the .05 level of significance.

Analysis of the Hypotheses

In the analysis of the statistical findings resulting from the treatment of the first hypothesis, it was found that there were no significant differences between negotiating and non-negotiating school districts on their perceptions of institutional quality. The t test, used as the statistical treatment for Hypothesis One, determined an F value of 1.15 with $p=.456$. The t test then, clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypotheses Two, Three, Four and Five were statistically analyzed with a One Way Analysis of Variance and a Scheffe Multiple Comparison Procedure. Data related to this test are summarized in Table V.

The Scheffe Multiple Comparison Procedure determined that:

1. Teachers differed significantly with building administrators, superintendents and board of education presidents on their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality. Teachers were more likely to view collective bargaining as having a more improving effect on institutional quality than building administrators, superintendents and board of education presidents.
2. Superintendents more closely agreed with board of education

presidents than with teachers on their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality.

TABLE V
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG TEACHERS, BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS,
SUPERINTENDENTS AND BOARD OF EDUCATION PRESIDENTS

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	1818.9491	606.3162	20.329	0.000
Within Groups	408	12168.6399	29.8251		
Total	411	13987.5859			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
36.1538	Teachers				
39.3279	Building Admin.	*			
42.0000	Superintendents	*			
42.1364	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

Analysis of Additional Data

Additional data were collected and analyzed for this study although this data is not considered as part of the central study. An individual item analysis utilizing a One Way Analysis of Variance and a Scheffe

Multiple Comparison Procedure was conducted to determine significant differences, if any, between teachers, principals, superintendents and board presidents on both parts of each item contained in Part III of Form CBIQ. This information is presented in the following manner. First, the statistical data will be presented, followed by a discussion of the data for each individual item. It should be noted that, in some cases, the Scheffe Procedure, which is a very strict test for significance does not identify differences among the groups, although the One Way Analysis of Variance does report significance at the .05 level.

TABLE VI
ITEM 1 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	2.5204	0.8401	1.183	0.3157
Within Groups	408	289.6590	0.7099		
Total	411	292.1792			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there is no statistical significance in the perceptions of the groups on the part of the item concerning school quality.

TABLE VII
ITEM 1 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	9.0917	3.0306	10.108	0.000
Within Groups	408	122.3241	0.2998		
Total	411	131.4158			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.7391	Teachers				
1.9672	Building Admin.	*			
2.1333	Superintendents	*			
2.1818	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates that there are significant differences in the way teachers, building administrators, superintendents and board presidents view the effect of bargaining on item one, with teachers viewing it as having a more improving effect than the other groups.

TABLE VIII
ITEM 2 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	1.4533	0.4844	1.314	0.2692
Within Groups	408	150.3604	0.3685		
Total	411	151.8137			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on the part of the item concerning quality.

TABLE IX
ITEM 2 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	7.3796	2.4599	8.824	0.000
Within Groups	408	113.7351	0.2788		
Total	411	121.1147			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.5184	Teachers				
1.7377	Building Admin.	*			
1.8667	Superintendents	*			
1.9091	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates that there are statistical differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item two, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on the item.

TABLE X
ITEM 3 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	2.3042	0.7681	1.064	0.3641
Within Groups	408	294.4418	0.7217		
Total	411	296.7458			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on the part of the item concerning school quality.

TABLE XI

ITEM 3 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	8.7505	2.9168	13.339	0.000
Within Groups	408	89.2160	0.2187		
Total	411	97.9665			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.7726	Teachers				
1.9508	Building Admin.				
2.1333	Superintendents	*			
2.2727	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates that there are significant differences among teachers, superintendents and board presidents with regard to the effect of bargaining on item three.

TABLE XII
ITEM 4 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	3.9458	1.3153	2.539	0.0561
Within Groups	408	211.3606	0.5180		
Total	411	215.3063			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on the part of item four concerning quality.

TABLE XIII
ITEM 4 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	2.7862	0.9287	4.326	0.0051
Within Groups	408	87.6002	0.2147		
Total	411	90.3864			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.8161	Teachers				
1.9508	Building Admin.				
2.0000	Superintendents	*			
2.0667	Board of Ed. Pres.				

The above table indicates that there are significant differences between teachers and superintendents with regard to the effect of bargaining on item four.

TABLE XIV
ITEM 5 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	4.8354	1.6118	2.865	0.0365
Within Groups	408	229.5501	0.5626		
Total	411	234.3856			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Although the Analysis of Variance indicates statistical significance among the group's perceptions of quality on item five, the Scheffe Procedure, due to the strict nature of the test, fails to denote where the differences are.

TABLE XV
ITEM 5 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	0.3646	0.1215	1.045	0.3725
Within Groups	408	47.4495	0.1163		
Total	411	47.8141			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates there are no significant differences among the groups on the perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item five.

TABLE XVI
ITEM 6 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	2.5679	0.8560	2.922	0.0338
Within Groups	408	119.5346	0.2930		
Total	411	122.1025			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that although there are statistical differences among the group's perceptions of school quality in item six, the Scheffe Procedure, due to its nature, was unable to denote where these differences are.

TABLE XVII

ITEM 6 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	20.5807	6.8602	17.151	0.000
Within Groups	408	263.1941	0.4000		
Total	411	183.7748			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.5351	Teachers				
1.8852	Building Admin.	*			
2.2000	Superintendents	*			
2.0909	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The table above indicates that there are statistical differences among the groups perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item six, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on quality as measured by item six.

TABLE XVIII
ITEM 7 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	1.2325	0.4108	1.095	0.3512
Within Groups	408	153.1244	0.3753		
Total	411	154.3569			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no statistical differences among the groups perceptions of quality as measured by item seven.

TABLE XIX

ITEM 7 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	19.4317	6.4772	18.109	0.000
Within Groups	408	145.9329	0.3577		
Total	411	165.3646			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.5284	Teachers				
1.8525	Building Admin.	*			
2.2000	Superintendents	*			
2.0455	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates there are statistical differences among the groups perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item seven, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect.

TABLE XX
ITEM 8 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	6.2543	2.0848	4.176	0.0063
Within Groups	408	203.6727	0.4992		
Total	411	209.9270			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that although there are statistical differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item eight, again, the Scheffe Procedure fails to denote where the differences are.

TABLE XXI
ITEM 8 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	6.0326	2.0109	5.831	0.0007
Within Groups	408	140.7107	0.3449		
Total	411	146.7433			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.5853	Teachers				
1.8197	Building Admin.	*			
1.8333	Superintendents				
1.9545	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates that there are significant differences among teachers, principals and board members with regard to the effect of bargaining on item eight, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on the item.

TABLE XXII
ITEM 9 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	5.9386	1.9795	4.577	0.0036
Within Groups	408	176.4478	0.4325		
Total	411	182.3864			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
2.1538	Teachers		*		
1.8852	Building Admin.				
2.3667	Superintendents		*		
2.2727	Board of Ed. Pres.				

The above table indicates there are statistical differences between building administrators and teachers and superintendents on perceptions of quality as measured by item nine. Building administrators view quality as measured by this item in a more favorable manner than do the other groups.

TABLE XXIII

ITEM 9 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	9.8829	3.2943	12.290	0.000
Within Groups	408	109.3649	0.2681		
Total	411	119.2479			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.6656	Teachers				
1.8525	Building Admin.				
2.0667	Superintendents	*			
2.1818	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates that there are differences between teachers, superintendents and board presidents on the effect of bargaining on item nine, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect.

TABLE XXIV
ITEM 10 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	7.2261	2.4087	5.080	0.0018
Within Groups	408	193.4387	0.4741		
Total	411	200.6648			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
2.8462	Teachers				
3.1148	Building Admin.				
3.2333	Superintendents	*			
3.0455	Board of Ed. Pres.				

The above table indicates that there are statistical differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item 10, with teachers viewing quality as measured by item 10 in a more unfavorable manner than other groups.

TABLE XXV

ITEM 10 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	3.2777	1.0926	4.077	0.0072
Within Groups	408	109.3299	0.2680		
Total	411	112.6076			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that although there are differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item 10, again, the Scheffe Procedure fails to denote where the differences are among the groups.

TABLE XXVI
ITEM 11 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	4.2521	1.4174	3.158	0.0247
Within Groups	408	183.0930	0.4488		
Total	411	187.3452			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
3.1672	Teachers				
3.3607	Building Admin.				*
3.2000	Superintendents				
2.8636	Board of Ed. Pres.				

The above table indicates that there are differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item 11, with board presidents viewing quality in a more unfavorable manner than other groups.

TABLE XXVII
ITEM 11 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	1.9317	0.6439	3.789	0.0106
Within Groups	408	69.3293	0.1699		
Total	411	71.2610			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that although there are significant differences on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item 11, the Scheffe Procedure fails to denote where the differences are among the groups.

TABLE XXVIII
ITEM 12 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	1.0466	0.3495	1.021	0.3830
Within Groups	408	139.6191	0.3422		
Total	411	140.6677			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups with regard to perceptions of quality as measured by item 12.

TABLE XXIX

ITEM 12 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	0.6386	0.2129	2.225	0.0847
Within Groups	408	39.0375	0.0957		
Total	411	39.6761			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on school quality as measured by item 12.

TABLE XXX
ITEM 13 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	1.6722	0.5577	1.393	0.2443
Within Groups	408	163.2067	0.4000		
Total	411	164.8789			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of school quality as measured by item 13.

TABLE XXXI
ITEM 13 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	1.5985	0.5328	4.233	0.000
Within Groups	408	51.3589	0.1259		
Total	411	52.9574			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item 13.

TABLE XXXII
ITEM 14 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	2.8404	0.9468	2.943	0.0329
Within Groups	408	131.2746	0.3218		
Total	411	134.1150			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that although there are significant differences among the groups with regard to perceptions of school quality as measured by item 14, the Scheffe Procedure fails to denote where these differences are.

TABLE XXXIII

ITEM 14 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	7.6820	2.5607	8.094	0.000
Within Groups	408	129.0729	0.3164		
Total	411	136.7549			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.4181	Teachers				
1.4590	Building Admin.				
1.7667	Superintendents	*			
1.9091	Board of Ed. Pres.	*	*		

The above table indicates that there are significant differences among the groups on the effect of bargaining on quality as measured by item 14, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on this item.

TABLE XXXIV
ITEM 15 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	3.5185	1.1728	3.432	0.0171
Within Groups	408	139.4381	0.3418		
Total	411	142.9566			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are significant differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item 15; however, the Scheffe Procedure fails to denote where these differences are.

TABLE XXXV

ITEM 15 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	4.8001	1.6000	5.217	0.0015
Within Groups	408	125.1277	0.3067		
Total	411	129.9278			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.4916	Teachers				
1.6230	Building Admin.				
1.8000	Superintendents	*			
1.8182	Board of Ed. Pres.				

The above table indicates that there are significant differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on quality than the other groups.

TABLE XXXVI
ITEM 16 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	1.8650	0.6217	1.708	0.1647
Within Groups	408	148.4904	0.3639		
Total	411	150.3554			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item 16.

TABLE XXXVII

ITEM 16 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	8.2502	2.7501	10.449	0.000
Within Groups	408	107.3867	0.2632		
Total	411	115.6369			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.8060	Teachers				
2.0000	Building Admin.				
2.2333	Superintendents	*			
2.1818	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates there are significant differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item 16, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on quality than the other groups.

TABLE XXXVIII
ITEM 17 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	0.8574	0.2858	0.657	0.5792
Within Groups	408	177.5941	0.4353		
Total	411	178.4515			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of school quality as measured by item 17.

TABLE XXXIX

ITEM 17 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	11.6727	3.8909	13.947	0.000
Within Groups	408	113.8207	0.2790		
Total	411	125.4934			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.3077	Teachers				
1.6066	Building Admin.	*			
1.7000	Superintendents	*			
1.8182	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates there are significant differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item 17, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on bargaining than the other groups.

TABLE XL
ITEM 18 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	0.8310	0.2770	0.780	0.5057
Within Groups	408	144.8944	0.3551		
Total	411	145.7253			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item 18.

TABLE XLI

ITEM 18 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	12.0678	4.0226	15.546	0.000
Within Groups	408	105.5692	0.2587		
Total	411	117.6370			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.2876	Teachers				
1.5574	Building Admin.	*			
1.6667	Superintendents	*			
1.8636	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates there are significant differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item 18, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on quality as measured by the item.

TABLE XLII
ITEM 19 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	2.0512	0.6837	0.852	0.4661
Within Groups	408	327.3904	0.8024		
Total	411	329.4414			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item 19.

TABLE XLIII

ITEM 19 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	3.2432	1.0811	3.517	0.0152
Within Groups	408	125.4057	0.3074		
Total	411	128.6488			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.4281	Teachers				
1.4918	Building Admin.				
1.7333	Superintendents	*			
1.6364	Board of Ed. Pres.				

The above table indicates there are significant differences among the groups on the effect of bargaining on item 19, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on quality.

TABLE XLIV
ITEM 20 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	2.3257	0.7752	1.990	0.1148
Within Groups	408	158.9049	0.3895		
Total	411	161.2306			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item 20.

TABLE XLV
ITEM 20 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	8.1451	2.7150	9.313	0.000
Within Groups	408	118.9501	0.2915		
Total	411	127.0952			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.4816	Teachers				
1.8033	Building Admin.	*			
1.8000	Superintendents	*			
1.7727	Board of Ed. Pres.				

The above table indicates there are significant differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on item 20, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect than the other groups.

TABLE XLVI
ITEM 21 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	20.5045	6.8348	12.576	0.000
Within Groups	408	221.7332	0.5435		
Total	411	242.2376			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
2.6221	Teachers				
3.0164	Building Admin.	*			
3.2667	Superintendents	*			
3.1364	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates there are significant differences among the groups on perceptions of quality as measured by item 21. The Scheffe Procedure indicates that teachers view quality as measured by this item in a more favorable manner than the other groups.

TABLE XLVII

ITEM 21 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	9.7510	3.2503	10.918	0.000
Within Groups	408	121.4580	0.2977		
Total	411	131.2090			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.6656	Teachers				
1.9836	Building Admin.	*			
2.0333	Superintendents	*			
2.0455	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates there are significant differences among the groups on the effect of bargaining on quality as measured by item 21, with teachers viewing bargaining as having a more improving effect on the item than the other groups.

TABLE XLVIII
ITEM 22 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	4.5065	1.5022	2.316	0.0752
Within Groups	408	264.5981	0.6485		
Total	411	269.1045			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
	Teachers				
	Building Admin.				
	Superintendents				
	Board of Ed. Pres.				

No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

The above table indicates there are no significant differences among the groups on perceptions of school quality as measured by item 22.

TABLE XLIX
ITEM 22 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: EFFECT OF BARGAINING

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3	6.0452	2.0151	7.953	0.000
Within Groups	408	103.3707	0.2534		
Total	411	109.4159			

Scheffe Multiple Range Test:

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Mean	Group	Teachers	Building Administrators	Superintendents	Bd Pres.
1.7559	Teachers				
1.9344	Building Admin.				
2.0667	Superintendents	*			
2.1364	Board of Ed. Pres.	*			

The above table indicates there are significant differences among the groups on perceptions of the effect of bargaining on quality as measured by item 22. The greatest differences are found between teachers and superintendents, and teachers and school board members.

Summary

Chapter IV has been devoted to the analysis of the data which were collected as part of the study. Hypothesis one predicted no significant differences between negotiating and non-negotiating school

districts on perceptions of institutional quality. This hypothesis was supported. The second, third, fourth and fifth hypotheses predicting significant differences between teachers and building administrators, superintendents and board of education presidents were supported at the .05 level of confidence. Chapter V will continue with a summary, conclusions and implications, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

The final chapter of the study contains a brief summary of the research findings. Following the summary, conclusions and implications made from the findings will be presented. The last section of Chapter V focuses on recommendations for further study.

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of teachers, building administrators, superintendents and board of education presidents concerning the effects of collective bargaining on the quality of schools. Additionally, the study assessed the perceptions of the above mentioned groups on school quality in negotiating and non-negotiating school districts. Additional analysis of each item in Part III of the instrument was conducted, although this was not the primary focus of the study. The research sample consisted of 95.6% of the entire population of Level V and Level VI negotiating school districts in Oklahoma. Within each of the school districts which participated in the study, the board of education president, the superintendent, twenty percent of the building administrators and twenty percent of his/her

faculty were mailed questionnaires to complete. The instrument contained three parts: Part I consisted of demographic data, Part II dealt with general impressions, and Part III contained twenty-two Likert-type statements. Each item in Part III had two response options. Acceptable reliability coefficients were established by conducting a pilot study. Validity was determined through the convention of a panel of experts.

The data gathered through the administration of the instrument were tested statistically to determine the degree of differences between groups. The first hypothesis was tested through the application of a t test. The second, third, fourth and fifth hypotheses were tested utilizing a One Way Analysis of Variance with a Scheffe Multiple Comparison Procedure. Results were accepted at or below the .05 confidence level.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis stated that there were no significant differences between negotiating and non-negotiating school districts on the perceptions of institutional quality. The hypothesis was accepted at the .05 confidence level.

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis stated that there were significant differences between teachers and principals on their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating school districts. The data determined that teachers perceived collective bargaining as having a more positive effect on institutional

quality than principals. The hypothesis was supported at the .05 confidence level.

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis stated that there were significant differences between teachers and superintendents in their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating school districts. The data determined that teachers perceived negotiations as having a more positive effect on institutional quality than superintendents. The hypothesis was accepted at the .05 confidence level.

Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis stated that there were significant differences between teachers and board of education presidents in their perceptions of the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality in negotiating school districts. The data determined that teachers perceived negotiations as having a more positive effect on institutional quality than presidents of boards of education. The hypothesis was accepted at the .05 level of confidence.

Hypothesis Five

The fifth hypothesis stated that superintendents and board of education presidents were more likely to agree on the effect of collective bargaining on institutional quality than superintendents and teachers in negotiating school districts. The hypothesis was accepted.

Conclusions and Implications

It is apparent that within recent years, collective bargaining has become an accepted modus operandi in the field of education. Increasingly, teachers have come to view collective bargaining as an acceptable technique for conflict resolution and for the achievement of occupational goals. Among these goals which teachers have stated as important is the improvement of the quality of education within school districts.

Sources of conflict within local school districts arise from the growing professionalism of teachers who, in many instances, have relinquished individual autonomy in conformance to the central control demands of the bureaucratic hierarchy. Teachers, as professionals, have participated in a growing school bureaucracy where the educational managers have become more and more removed from the technical aspects of the organization. This has evolved in part due to the increase in hierarchical levels within the school system. As teachers felt less and less a part of the system (bureaucratic alienation) they sought ways to increase their power within the organization. Teachers wanted to be a part of the decision-making process which affected their daily lives in the schools. Collective bargaining was hailed by teachers as a vehicle for increased participation in the decision-making structure. In developing a rationale for the acceptance of collective bargaining, many teachers looked at the potential that collective bargaining possessed as a means to achieve professional objectives. One such stated objective is the improvement of the quality of schools.

As collective bargaining provisions were established, the promise that the process held for shared decision-making and conflict resolution

was not readily recognized by administrators of the schools. District school managers, for the most part, viewed negotiations as an assault on traditional authority entrusted to them by the public. School administrators and school boards geared up to "hold the line" and protect themselves from the power seekers.

In view of these vastly different perceptions toward the effect of the collective bargaining process, it is apparent that administrators and teachers perceive negotiations and the subsequent outcome of the process in different ways. Differences in perceptions could be a source of conflict within a school system. Perhaps these different perceptions result from the relative newness of the model. As Carleton (1969) suggests, collective bargaining may pass through stages: stage one--nativity, stage two--adolescence, stage three--productive and cooperative.

It seems doubtful that many districts have been involved in the bargaining process long enough to assume the stage three model of operation which maximizes mutual benefits. Additionally, it is entirely possible that many teachers and administrators believe that stage two is the final stage. This stage is characterized by an adversarial relationship which promotes hostility and ill-feeling between the negotiating groups.

The presence of conflict within an organization can create disruption or displacement of organizational goals. The data seems to indicate that some conflict could exist regarding the perceptions of the effect of bargaining on school quality. If the present adversarial model for negotiations continues to be the primary mode of procedure, and teachers and administrators hold on to traditional role patterns

within this process, future implications could be serious and far-reaching.

As goal displacement resulting from continued conflict becomes more commonplace within the school organization, educators can expect increased hostility from a public which has historically relied on a free public system of education to prepare its youth for the challenges that face a complex, modern, democratic society. No other country in the world has embarked on such a monumental undertaking. Our citizenry looks to the schools as an avenue to success just as other nations of the world look to America as the educational leader of the twentieth century.

If the standards of excellence which have been characteristic of the American education experience are not maintained, the responsibility for the demise of public education will rest on the shoulders of all educators. The public schools are in the midst of attacks from all fronts. Instead of allowing conflict within the system to bring about deterioration of the schools, educators should strive to ameliorate the conditions giving rise to that conflict. The energy used in creating and maintaining hostile attitudes between teachers and administrators could be converted into more constructive channels for the betterment of the system.

Recommendations for Further Research

As a result of the present study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Due to the fact that the sample size was limited and the study was confined to Oklahoma, perhaps a study larger in scope would have a

higher degree of generalizability.

2. Further research on the instrument would be beneficial, even though reliability and validity were considered acceptable. This could be accomplished by utilizing the instrument in additional research and subjecting the instrument to more rigorous statistical procedures.

3. The perceptions and/or role of the building administrator in the negotiations process would be a fertile research ground. The Scheffe Multiple Comparison Procedure utilized in the statistical treatment of data indicated that building administrators differed almost equally as much with teachers as they did with superintendents and board of education presidents.

4. Further research with time and stages of collective bargaining as research variables along with attitudes and/or perceptions toward bargaining is much needed. This would help clarify whether or not attitudes and/or perceptions toward the effects of negotiations might change with the passage of time or as districts move through the various negotiations stages.

5. An additional research possibility is the examination of perceptions on the effect of collective bargaining as an independent variable and dependent variables such as student test scores, per pupil expenditures, or additional equipment and material obtained through the negotiations process.

The consideration of the recommendations listed above would perhaps lend more insight into the process of negotiations and the perceptions of various groups on the education outcomes. The success of the present study will be determined in part by the additional research it stimulates and the practicality and usefulness it hopefully offers.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, James G. "The Authority Structure of the School: System of Social Exchange." Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. III, Spring, 1967.
- Barea, Norman, "Separate Bargaining Units: A Must for Today's Principal", NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 61, May, 1977, pp. 43-51.
- Blanke, Virgil E. "Teachers in Search of Power", American School Board Journal, Vol. 151, November, 1965, pp. 7-9.
- Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher in the Authority Structure of the School." In Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. St. Louis: McGraw-Hill Book Company, St. Louis, 1969.
- Carleton, Patrick W. "Social and Attitudinal Correlates of Collective Negotiations in Education." ISR Journal, Vol. 1, Winter, 1969, pp. 8-14.
- Cheek, Neil H. Jr. "The Social Role of the Professional." In The Professional in the Organization, Mark Abrahamson, ed. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1967.
- Cheng, Charles W. "Community Participation in Teacher Collective Bargaining: Problems and Prospects." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 46, May, 1976, pp. 153-174.
- Cloninger, Carroll Alexander. "Differential Perceptions of School Board Chairmen, Superintendents, Principals, and Classroom Teachers Concerning Selected Aspects of Collective Negotiations." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1971.)
- Cooper, Bruce S. "Collective Bargaining Comes to School Middle Management." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 58, October, 1976, pp. 202-204.
- Corwin, Ronald C. Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organization Conflict in High Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Creswell, Anthony M. and Michael J. Murphy, eds. Education and Collective Bargaining. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1976.

- Davies, Paul Rowland. "The Relationship Between Collective Negotiations and Teacher Morale in Selected Indiana Secondary Schools." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1972.)
- Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership", In Handbook of Social Psychology, Lindzey Gardner, ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959.
- Jenkins, Donald Ray. "The Impact of Professional Negotiations on Illinois School Districts Having Level III Professional Negotiating Agreements: Perceptions of Superintendents, Board of Education Presidents, and Teacher Organization Presidents", (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1970.)
- Kornhauser, William. Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodations. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.
- Kowalski, Theodore J. "Are You Pushing Your Administrators into Collective Bargaining?" American School Board Journal, Vol. 165, July 1978, pp. 35-37.
- Labor Management Relations Act, Section 8(d), 1947.
- Lieberman, Myron. "Must You Bargain With Your Teachers?" American School Board Journal, Vol. 163, September, 1976, pp. 19-21.
- Lortie, Dan C. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching." In The Semi-Professions and Their Organizations: Teachers, Nurses, and Social Workers, Amatai Etzioni, ed. New York: Free Press, 1969.
- Moellers, Gerald H. and Charters, W. W. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 10, March, 1966, pp. 446-450.
- Morgan, David R. "Collective Bargaining and Faculty Compensation." Sociology of Education, Vol. 50, January 1977, pp. 28-39.
- Myers, Donald A. Teacher Power--Professionalization and Collective Bargaining. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1973).
- NEA Guidelines, Published by the National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1963.
- Nighswander, James K. and Richard P. Klahn. "Teacher Collective Bargaining--A Survey of Administrators", North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 51, Winter, 1977, pp. 337-343.

- Nolte, Chester M. Status and Scope of Collective Bargaining in Education. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration, 1970.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Professional and Bureaucratic Orientation." in Formal Organizations, Peter Blau and W. R. Scott, eds. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Pisapia, John Ralph. "Trilateral Practices and the Public Sector Bargaining Model." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 60, February, 1979, pp. 424-427.
- Rago, Anthony V. "How to Bargain in a Small School District." American School Board Journal, Vol. 165, August 1978, pp. 29-34.
- Rosenthal, Alan. Pedagogues and Power: Teacher Groups in School Politics. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1969.
- Schultz, Daniel F. "Why Faculties Bargain", New Directions for Community Colleges. Vol. 3, Autumn, 1975, pp. 19-23.
- Shanker, Albert. "Teacher--Supervisory Relationships: A Symposium." Changing Education, Vol. 1, Spring, 1966, pp. 12-14.
- Shils, Edward B. and C. Taylor Whittier. Teachers, Administrators, and Collective Bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.
- Solomon, Benjamin. "A Profession Taken For Granted." School Review, Vol. 169, August, 1961, pp. 20-23.
- Stumpf, W. A. "The New World of Educational Administration: Teacher Militancy." American School Board Journal, Vol. 152, February, 1966, pp. 10-13.
- Thompson, Victor A. "Hierarchy, Specialization, and Organization Conflict." In Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools, Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds., St. Louis: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Washburne, Chandler. "Teacher in the Authority System." Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 30, 1957, pp. 390-394.
- Williams, Richard C. "Teacher Militancy: Implications for the Schools." In Social and Technological Change, Terry L. Eidell, ed. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1970.
- Williams, Thomas E. "Governance is the Real Issue: A Management Manifesto." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 56, April 1975, pp. 561-562.

Woods, Shirley Ann. "The Influence of a Collective Negotiations Agreement on Teacher Perception of Organizational Climate in Selected Ohio Schools." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1979).

Zeiss, Donald Vernon. "The Impact of Professional Negotiations on Illinois School Districts Having Level III Professional Negotiating Agreements: Perceptions of Superintendents, Board of Education Presidents, and Teacher Organization Presidents." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1970).

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
CORRESPONDENCE

April 15, 1981

Dear Mr. Superintendent:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for agreeing to participate in our study concerning collective bargaining in Oklahoma. As I stated in our phone conversation, the Colleges of Education and Business Administration are working on a Presidential Challenge Grant, the purpose of which is to assess the impact of collective bargaining in schools, businesses and industries throughout the State of Oklahoma.

Enclosed please find copies of our questionnaire to be distributed to your board president, building principal(s) and teacher(s). The following steps need to be completed for the study to be correctly implemented. The anonymity of each respondent is ensured if each step is correctly followed.

- STEP ONE: Complete the questionnaire yourself and enclose in the attached envelope.
- STEP TWO: Ask your board president to complete the questionnaire, enclose in the attached envelope and return to you.
- STEP THREE: Distribute the remainder of the questionnaires to the building principal(s) whose name appears on the cover letter. Instructions to the building principal concerning distribution and collection of the questionnaire to teachers are included in this letter.
- STEP FOUR: Collect the questionnaires from the building principal(s).
- STEP FIVE: Enclose all of the completed questionnaires in the large brown self addressed, stamped envelope enclosed for your convenience in this packet. Mail to our office.

We would appreciate your earliest possible response before April 30, 1981. Again, thank you for your effort at such a busy time of the school year. Our gratitude goes out to you and your staff for your assistance in making this a successful study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Thomas J. Smith
Director, Education Extension

Marsha J. Edmonds
Research Associate

April 15, 1981

Dear Mr. Principal:

The Colleges of Education and Business Administration at Oklahoma State University are involved in a Presidential Challenge Grant, the purpose of which is to assess the impact of collective bargaining in schools, businesses and industries throughout the State of Oklahoma. Your superintendent has agreed for your district to participate in this study.

In order for this study to be a success, your cooperation is necessary. The following steps need to be completed for the study to be correctly implemented. The anonymity of each respondent is ensured if each step is correctly followed.

- STEP ONE: Complete one questionnaire yourself and enclose in the attached envelope.
- STEP TWO: Distribute a copy of the questionnaire to every nth name appearing on your faculty list. Ask each of these teachers to complete the questionnaire, enclose it in the attached envelope, and return to you promptly. Upon completion of this step, you should have identified _____ faculty members to complete the questionnaire.
- STEP THREE: Return all completed questionnaires to your superintendent. All questionnaires from your district will then be forwarded to our office on or before April 30, 1981.

Thank you for your effort at such a busy time of the school year. Our gratitude goes out to you and your faculty members who participated for your assistance in making this study a success.

Sincerely,

Dr. Thomas J. Smith
Director, Education Extension

Marsha J. Edmonds
Research Associate

APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY STATEMENTS

Instructional Program

1. The school district has an adequate amount of funds available for instructional materials.
2. The school district offers a variety of courses for the students.
3. Teachers are involved in the revision and improvement of the curriculum.

Student Activity Program

1. The student activity program offers a variety of activities for students.
2. The student activity program attempts to meet the social needs and interests of the students.
3. School funds are available for use in the student activity program.

Community Support of Education

1. The people in the community are willing to vote bond money for school district needs.
2. The people in the community are willing to vote the mill levies to support the schools.
3. The people in the community participate in school functions and activities.

Staff Morale

1. The educators in this district show enthusiasm for their work.
2. The educators in this district are confident in the school program.
3. Absenteeism among the educators in our district is a great problem.

Inservice Programs

1. The inservice program in our district is well planned by teachers and administrators.
2. Adequate funds are available to carry out the district inservice program.
3. The inservice program attempts to offer experiences which will help educators in their jobs.

Student Academic Achievement

1. The students' scores in standardized tests are equal to or better than national norms.
2. Many of the students continue their education beyond the 12th grade.
3. The school district has a serious drop-out problem.

Student Morale

1. The students are enthusiastic participators in school activities.
2. The students exhibit an "esprit de corps" in their schools.
3. Absenteeism is a major problem among the students.

Intra-Staff Communications

1. The school district has adequate provisions for communicating school policy and procedure to its employees.
2. The educational staff has the opportunity for input into the communication of organizational expectations.
3. The district uses appropriate and effective communications techniques.

Public Relations

1. The people in the district understand the role of the school in the community.
2. The people of the district have a feeling of goodwill toward the schools.
3. The district has a program designed to encourage good public relations.

Professional Staff Salaries

1. The salary schedule is based on academic preparation.
2. The salary schedule takes into account the amount of experience that an employee has.
3. The salary schedule is competitive with districts of the same size in the surrounding area.

Fringe Benefits

1. The district financially participates in a health insurance plan for its employees.
2. The district has an adequate sick leave policy.
3. The district makes adequate provisions for holidays and vacations.

Physical Facilities

1. The district's buildings and grounds are in good physical condition.
2. The district's buildings provide rooms for small as well as large group instruction.
3. The district's buildings have special areas designed for special instructional needs such as music, art and shop rooms.

Fiscal Condition

1. The district has adequate funds available to carry out the total program.
2. The district wisely allocates its monies to the various educational programs and services.
3. On the whole, the district's fiscal condition is good.

APPENDIX C

REJECTED PILOT STUDY STATEMENTS

ITEMS NOT INCLUDED IN FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The student activity program offers sports, cultural, entertainment and leisure activities for students.
2. The people in the district understand the role of the school in the community.
3. The district's buildings and grounds are in good physical condition.
4. The school district offers several electives within each department for the students.
5. The student activity program meets the social needs and interests of the students.
6. The students exhibit an "esprit de corps" in their schools.
7. The district has an adequate sick leave policy.
8. The district's buildings provide rooms for small as well as large group instruction.
9. Absenteeism among the teachers in our district is a great problem.
10. The school district has a serious drop-out problem.
11. Absenteeism is a major problem among the students.
12. The district uses appropriate and effective communication techniques.
13. The district has an organized program designed to encourage good public relations.
14. The salary schedule is competitive with districts of like size in the surrounding area.
15. The districts buildings have special areas designed for special instructional needs, such as music, art and shop rooms.
16. On the whole, the district's financial condition is good.
17. School funds are available for use in the student activity program.

APPENDIX D

FINAL INSTRUMENT

Dear Educator:

We need your assistance. The Colleges of Education and Business Administration at Oklahoma State University are working on a Presidential Challenge Grant, the purpose of which is to assess the impact of collective bargaining in schools, businesses and industries throughout the State of Oklahoma.

Your participation in this project would be very much appreciated. Please take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire. Be sure to follow the instructions carefully. Enclose the questionnaire in the attached envelope. This procedure will ensure your anonymity.

Again, we appreciate your effort at such a busy time of the school year. Thank you for helping to make this study a success!

Sincerely,

Dr. Thomas J. Smith
Director, Education Extension

Marsha J. Edmonds
Research Associate

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please respond by placing a check () on the appropriate line following each item. Do not write your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

1. What is your current position in the school district?
 Board Member Superintendent Building Principal
 Teacher
2. How many years have you been in your present position?
 1-3 years 4-6 years 7-10 years over 10 years
3. Indicate whether or not your school district is involved in negotiations.
 Yes No
4. If you are a principal or teacher, what is your present area?
 Elementary Middle School Secondary
5. What is your sex?
 Male Female
6. What is your age group?
 20-30 years 30-40 years 40-50 years 50-60 years
 over 60 years
7. If your assignment is in a school, what is the approximate size of the school?
 under 300 students 300-500 students 500-1000 students
 over 1000 students
8. Is your district urban, suburban, or rural?
 Urban Suburban Rural
9. What is your highest educational level?
 Bachelors Masters Masters + Doctorate

PART TWO: GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

Please indicate your reactions to the negotiations process in your school district. If your district does not presently negotiate, indicate your reactions to the negotiations process in general.

1. Please indicate your perceptions of the following group's reactions to the negotiations process.
 - A. Superintendent Generally Favorable Generally Unfavorable
 - B. Teachers Generally Favorable Generally Unfavorable
 - C. Building Administrators Generally Favorable Generally Unfavorable
 - D. Board Members Generally Favorable Generally Unfavorable
 - E. Community Generally Favorable Generally Unfavorable

2. What is your reaction to the negotiation process?

Generally Favorable Generally Unfavorable

3. Do you feel that through negotiations the communications process has been improved?

Yes No

4. Do you feel that the quality of education has been improved through negotiations?

Yes No

PART THREE: INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY

This section lists 22 statements which represent various dimensions of institutional quality. Please note that each item has two responses to complete. Evaluate each item and circle the appropriate response to the right of each statement. SA=STRONGLY AGREE A=AGREE D=DISAGREE SD=STRONGLY DISAGREE. Additionally, for each item respond to the effect you feel that collective bargaining has had on each item. Place a check () to the left of the appropriate response, improved, no effect, or harmed. If your district is not currently involved in negotiations, please respond to the general impressions that you have concerning collective bargaining.

EXAMPLE: The students exhibit an "esprit de corps" in their schools. SA A D SD

Effect of Collective Bargaining Improved No Effect
 Harmed

1. The school district has an adequate amount of funds available for instructional materials. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
2. Teachers are involved in the revision and improvement of the curriculum. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
3. During the past five years the community has voted bond money for school district needs. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
4. The people in the community have consistently voted mill levies to support the schools. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
5. The majority of the people in the community participate in some school functions and activities, such as athletic, cultural, informational and entertainment programs. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
6. The teachers in this district show enthusiasm for their work. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
7. The teachers in this district are confident in the school program. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
8. The inservice and staff development programs in our district are well planned by teachers and administrators. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed

9. Adequate funds are available to conduct the district inservice and staff development programs. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
10. The inservice and staff development programs offer experiences that will help teachers in their jobs. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
11. I believe that student's scores on standardized tests are equal to or better than the national norms. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
12. Many of the students continue their education beyond the 12th grade. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
13. The students are enthusiastic participators in school activities. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
14. The school district has provisions for communicating school policy and procedure to its employees. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
15. The educational staff has the opportunity for input into the communication of organizational expectations. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
16. The people of the district have a feeling of goodwill toward the schools. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed

17. The salary schedule is based on academic preparation. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
18. The salary schedule takes into account the amount of experience of the employee. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
19. The district financially participates in a health insurance plan for its employees. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
20. The district makes adequate provisions for holidays and vacations. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
21. The district wisely allocates its monies to the various educational programs and services. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed
22. The district has adequate funds available to conduct the total program. SA A D SD
Effect of Collective Bargaining ___Improved ___No Effect ___Harmed

Would you be interested in receiving a summary of the findings of this study?

___Yes ___No

VITA²

Marsha Jeanne Edmonds

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE PERCEIVED DIFFERENCES AMONG SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND SELECTED DIMENSIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Springfield, Illinois, September 10, 1946, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. B. L. Edmonds.

Education: Graduated from Springfield High School, Springfield, Illinois, in June, 1964; received Bachelor of Arts degree in History and Political Science from the University of Tulsa in 1968; enrolled in graduate school at Oklahoma State University in 1976; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in Educational Administration in May, 1978; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education Degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1981.

Professional Organizations: National Education Association, Oklahoma Education Association, Tulsa Classroom Teacher's Association, National Council for the Social Studies, Phi Delta Kappa.

Professional Experience: Teacher in the Tulsa Public School System at Roosevelt Junior High School, 1969-1972; Whitney Junior High School, 1972-1973; and Booker T. Washington High School, 1973-1980. Currently on leave of absence from Tulsa Public Schools. Member of Interdisciplinary Social Studies Project at Roosevelt Junior High School; Instructor and Participant in National Science Foundation Project "Man-Made-World", 1972. Teacher of Political Parties, Constitutional Law, Sociology and United States History.