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The problem with which this study is concerned was that of developing an understanding of teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining. The investigation was initiated so that members of school boards, administrators, and those associated with professional organizations could have the needed knowledge to permit them to deal realistically with employer-employee relations. Participating in the study were 374 teachers from three small suburban school districts in the North Texas area. These districts are similar in size, and they share common district boundary lines.

There were two purposes for conducting this study. First, an effort was made to determine the specific attitudes these teachers possess toward collective bargaining. This was done by employing the use of the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale. The second purpose was to analyze the teachers' background characteristics to determine whether classifications such as sex, academic degree, experience, assignment level, professional memberships, or age have an impact on these attitudes. The one-way analysis of variance was used to
discover instances of significant differences at the .05 level.

The Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale was developed by the researcher for use in this study. Initial development stages involved the formulation, compilation, and arrangement of pertinent questions. These questions were then submitted to a five-member panel of experts for verification; additions, deletions, and corrections were made. The result is a two-part, twenty-seven item questionnaire that deals with (a) the concept of collective bargaining, and (b) the role of the teacher organization in that process. An internal reliability check resulted in an alpha coefficient of .86882. Finally, the questionnaire was distributed and administered at individual faculty meetings in each of the sixteen schools involved in the study.

Five of the six null hypotheses in the study were rejected because significant differences were detected within the groups. Specifically, significant differences were found among teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining when respondents were classified by sex, experience, assignment level, professional memberships, and age. Only the hypothesis that pertains to the academic degree which teachers have attained was accepted.

Further results revealed that most attitudes on part one of the scale indicated only slight tendencies toward either extreme. This negated an opportunity to make definite statements relative to each question. However, the results from
two questions are of particular interest. Teachers showed only a slightly favorable attitude toward the need for collective bargaining legislation. Further, it is evident that teachers disagree with the premise that collective bargaining would probably result in a lower quality education for children.

Part two of the questionnaire resulted in more positive attitudes. In general, teachers definitely agree that salaries, fringe benefits, and class size should be bargained for if collective bargaining is legalized in Texas. Respondents are not in favor of requiring all teachers to be members of the representative teacher organization, nor are many of them in favor of the use of the strike.

A final analysis examined differences between each of the three school districts. It was determined that significant differences occurred between two of the districts. This is of particular interest due to the similarities of the districts as to size, location, and philosophy.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the approach to the financial and the management aspects of public elementary and secondary school education in the United States has been left in the hands of a small group of leaders, usually administrators and board members. However, the increased number of teacher unions and the advent of the collective bargaining process has caused the approach to change. More and more teachers are demanding a voice in the top-level decision-making areas. According to Shils and Whittier (10, p. 3), teacher militancy will continue to increase in the years to come.

Because of this increased militancy, collective bargaining is receiving an increased amount of attention in policy-making, educational, and scholarly circles. Currently, views on the subject range from those who believe collective bargaining is inevitable and desirable in the United States, to those who support no rights at all in this area. There are also those who take an intermediate view, who believe that collective bargaining should not be mandatory. They feel that the local school district needs a statutory right to meet and confer with representatives from local teacher organizations in order to discuss the relevant issues that face teachers.
and administrators daily. However, this middle-ground approach receives little support from teachers and administrators alike.

To a large extent, collective bargaining has arrived not as a result of enabling legislation, but as a result of efforts made on the part of educators across the country. In the absence of legislation such as the Wagner Act of 1935 and the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, which deal with unionism in the private sector, school personnel have sought enabling legislation at the state level. As of 1975, forty-two states have passed legislation that deals with some aspect of collective bargaining between local school boards and teacher organizations (9, p. 6).

Texas, for example, developed legislation in this area in the late 1960s. According to Marson and Vornberg (5, p. 3), since the sixtieth session of the Texas legislature passed a passive meet-and-confer bill in 1967, school boards across the state have been at liberty to decide if they want to accept or to reject a request for professional employee consultations. Since the passage of the bill, which exists today as Article 13.901 of the Texas Education Code, numerous attempts have been made either to amend the law or to secure the passage of a law making the consultation process mandatory.

A variety of attempts have been made in other states. Nebraska, for example, passed the "Nebraska Teachers' Professional Negotiations Act," also in 1967. This attempt is
very general in nature, but it is a step in the direction of mandatory public employee bargaining rights. The Washington Legislature also passed the "Public Employees Collective Bargaining Act" in 1967. Even though this act is not aimed at teachers specifically, it does affect them. A year later, in 1968, the New Jersey Legislature passed the "New Jersey Employer-Employee Relations Act." This act deals with the public sector, including teachers, and provides for the establishment of procedures for the formation of employees into a bargaining unit. In 1970, the state of Pennsylvania passed the "Public Employee Relations Act," which enables persons working in the public sector to organize and to negotiate through elected representatives. In California, there has been meet-and-confer legislation since 1965. Here, the Winton Act gives rights to teachers that include the right to join organizations of certified employees. Also, the Winton Act calls for a negotiating council, something a bit more specific in nature than some previously mentioned enactments (2, pp. 31-36).

The noticeable progression toward legislation in every state has led several authorities to assume that collective bargaining will steadily increase in significance. For example, some leading figures say that teachers and other school employees are no longer willing to be dominated by administrators and boards of education. McNew (4, p. 3) states that teachers now are demanding a much greater voice
in the policy-making and procedural areas. This increased demand will cause administrators to become increasingly competent in collective bargaining. Osburn and Toth (8, pp. 40-41) conclude that the idea of collective bargaining is one of the most important challenges to face administrators now and for years to come.

Statement of the Problem

Attitudes of teachers, and teachers' subsequent actions, will in large part determine the level of militancy of teachers' groups and the ultimate growth of collective bargaining in Texas. It is important to understand these attitudes so that school boards, administrators, and professional organizations will have the knowledge-base to permit them to deal realistically with employer-employee relations in Texas' schools.

Purpose of the Study

As one part of the process of ascertaining attitudes of teachers toward collective bargaining, the purposes of this study are

1. To determine attitudes of teachers in selected Texas public schools toward collective bargaining;

2. To analyze and to determine whether classifications such as sex, academic degree, age, experience, assignment level, or professional memberships have a bearing on teachers' attitudes toward collective bargaining.
Hypotheses

For the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were tested in the null form.

1. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to sex;

2. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the academic degree they have attained;

3. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the number of years they have taught;

4. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to their level of assignment;

5. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the professional organizations to which they belong;

6. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to age.
Definition of Terms

For the purposes of clarification, the following terms are defined as they relate to this research.

**Collective Bargaining**—Collective bargaining is the process of bilateral decision-making wherein two parties meet and through proposals and counter-proposals reach agreement on employment issues; such agreements are then ratified by the employee association or union and the school board or management to become binding on both parties for the period agreed upon (5, p. 4). The term collective bargaining is synonymous with the term collective negotiations.

**Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale**--This term is operationally defined as an instrument developed by the researcher to determine teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining.

**General Background Information Questionnaire**--This term is operationally defined as an instrument designed to gather vital and necessary background information on each respondent of the study.

**Teacher**--Any certified instructor who is teaching on a daily basis (excluding administrative, counseling, or support staff).

**Elementary Teacher**--Teachers with teaching assignments in grades kindergarten through six.

**Secondary Teacher**--Teachers with teaching assignments in grades seven through twelve.
Small Suburban Schools—This term is defined as any of three specific North Texas area schools consisting of student populations of 1,500 to 4,500 students.

Consultation—As opposed to bargaining, consultation is defined as the process that enables two groups to meet and confer with no binding decisions necessarily resulting.

Representation—Representation is the practice of an organization acting as an agent for a group of persons. This representation may be exclusive, wherein one teacher organization is the sole representative for all teachers.

Teacher organization—A teacher organization is a personnel association that could be called upon to represent teachers during the bargaining process.

Labor Union—A labor union is a confederation of individuals within the labor field that is designed to negotiate to improve conditions of employment.

Binding Arbitration—Binding arbitration is the process of involving the use of an impartial third party to settle disputes by making a decision that must be adhered to by both parties in conflict.

Non-binding Arbitration—Non-binding arbitration is the process of involving the use of an impartial third party to settle disputes by making a decision that is not necessarily mandatory.
Background and Significance of the Study

Only a little more than twenty years ago, in 1958, there was no legally permitted collective bargaining for teachers in the United States (6, p. 1). Previously, teachers relied on their administrations to deal with and solve all school problems. Since this method has obvious weaknesses, teachers demanded more of a voice in decision-making areas. Today, teachers and their representative organizations have a significant impact on school- and teacher-related decisions at the local, state, and national levels.

Wisconsin was the first state to pass legislation dealing with collective bargaining for teachers (3, p. 47). This 1959 legislation served as a motivator for other states to follow. Today, state involvement in collective bargaining falls along a continuum from no collective bargaining to highly formalized negotiation. For example, California has recently been introduced to the process, and Texas seems to be moving in the general direction of further bargaining legislation, yet progress is slow; Louisiana has no bargaining legislation at all. At the other end of the continuum, states such as New York and Pennsylvania have used collective bargaining for teachers for several years, and their schools are knowledgeable in dealing with its numerous implications (1, p. 2).

The noted trend toward bargaining legislation for teachers in public schools received great impetus when, in 1962, President John F. Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988.
This historically monumental order afforded bargaining rights to employees of the federal government. Although employees of state and local governments gained no actual rights in the area of bargaining, this order set a precedent for others to use as justification for bargaining measures (5, p. 5).

The first collectively bargained public school teachers contract between an independent teachers' organization and a school board occurred in 1946 when the Norwalk, Connecticut, Board of Education and the Norwalk Teachers' Association reached an agreement (12, p. 7). This contract was negotiated after a strike had occurred and several Norwalk teachers had been dismissed. After settlement of the dispute, the teachers' association filed suit against the board in order to have the teachers reinstated. Although the teacher dismissals were upheld, the court ruled on the legality of the negotiations. Nolte (7) reports the findings of the court ...

... that in the absence of enabling legislation, (1) public school teachers may organize; (2) a school board is permitted, but not legally obligated, to negotiate with a teachers' organization; (3) a school board may agree to arbitrate with teachers, but only on those issues that do not erode the board's legal prospective to have the last word; (4) a school board may not agree to a closed shop; and (5) public school teachers may not strike to enforce their demands (7, p. 4).

Further advancement in the area of bargaining rights for teachers was negligible until 1960. It was during this year that the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) initiated an effort to unify factions of New York City's teachers.
Through their efforts, the UFT gained exclusive bargaining rights for teachers and became a most important stimulus to the collective bargaining movement. In fact, Lieberman and Moscow (3, p. 35) say that this was the "single most important stimulus" to the advancement of bargaining rights for teachers.

The ensuing years brought about continued emphasis on bargaining rights for teachers. Particular reasons for this movement are numerous. According to Shreeve (11), there are at least six forces that contribute to this movement.

1. The continual change in employee-employer relationships within the educational setting;
2. The increase in school size and bureaucracy;
3. The assumed remoteness of the school board to the individual teacher;
4. The resistance of the public to pay additional taxes for school support;
5. The increase in the number of male teachers;
6. The drive of labor unions to recruit teachers as members (11, p. 4).

As evidenced by reported data, the collective bargaining movement in the United States is a relatively recent event, yet there is no indication that the movement will not continue to increase and gain significant influence on the nation's schools. More and more schools are being affected by teacher demands in the form of associational pressure. For administrators to ignore this trend could prove costly.
The significance of this study is fourfold. First, there is increased indication that collective bargaining supporters are branching out into the Texas suburban areas in order to gain additional teacher support. In the North Texas area alone, there have been at least two suburban school districts targeted for union emphasis (13), and one of these districts is included in this study. Therefore, a study of this nature could prove to be valuable in determining teacher receptivity to union action. Second, there is a need for research in small districts regarding collective bargaining. Most studies of this nature deal with larger school districts, and the attitudes of suburban teachers may be significantly different. Third, although results from this study cannot be generalized to all districts in Texas, there should be an opportunity to generalize with districts of similar size, geographical location, and philosophy. Finally, there was expressed interest from teachers and administrators in this study's target population toward attitudes relative to collective bargaining.

To study this growing movement is to more-accurately predict what lies ahead for employees and employers in the public schools. Thus, the aim of this study was to investigate the attitudes of Texas' teachers so that involved parties will have a needed knowledge base from which to deal effectively with employer-employee problems.
Limitation of the Study

One limitation should be noted in order to make the data interpretation accurate. This study is limited to three small suburban school districts in the North Texas area, and the results of this study cannot be generalized to all other school districts across the state of Texas.

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumptions of this study are

1. That the teachers surveyed in this study will accurately express their opinions on all segments of the questionnaire;

2. That the questionnaire will be administered at all locations in the same manner.

Procedures for Collection of Data

This study required the collection of data from three small suburban North Texas area school districts that are similar in size and geographical location. The collection of the data was divided into three steps.

Initially, the superintendents of each of the three districts were sent a letter introducing the study and securing their cooperation (Appendix D). Having received this permission, the second phase was initiated, which involved sending a letter to the principal of each school in each of the school districts included in this study (Appendix E). This letter introduced the study and asked for
permission to attend a regularly scheduled faculty meeting in order to administer the questionnaires.

Finally, the researcher went to each of the sixteen different schools and administered the instruments. This personal attention ensured the consistency of application measures and enabled the researcher to gain immediate and complete results. After a prepared statement was read to the respondents detailing the purpose and instructions for the study, the teachers were given ample time to complete the questionnaires (Appendix F). After all the instruments were collected, the data analyses began.

Procedures for Analysis of the Data

The Computing Center at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, was used to analyze data and make statistical calculations. The following statistical techniques were used in the study.

Descriptive Statistics--The calculation of means and standard deviations of teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining was measured by the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale;

Inferential Statistics--The one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if there were significant differences between teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining (as measured by the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale) when teachers were classified by sex, age, academic
degree, years of teaching experience, assignment level, or by professional memberships.

The .05 level of significance was used as an accepted standard, while all resulting statistical values were compared to the tabled values. If the calculated values equaled or exceeded the tabled values, the hypothesis was rejected. If the calculated values were smaller than the tabled values, the hypothesis was retained.

Summary

Chapter I has provided a summary of important segments that are included in this research study. A brief introduction opened the chapter, and other sections detailed areas that include the statement of the problem, the purposes of the study, the hypotheses, the definition of terms, the background and significance, limitations, basic assumptions, procedures for collection of the data, and procedures for analyses of the data.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature relevant to this study focuses on three major areas. Part one scrutinizes relevant research that deals specifically with teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining. Part two examines major conclusions that concern the positive aspects of collective bargaining. Part three deals with negative factors that are involved in the collective bargaining process.

Teacher Attitudes toward Collective Bargaining

There is a growing feeling today among teachers in the educational field that true "professionalism" is lost or is disappearing (6). Constituents at almost every level of education argue that the impact of classroom teachers on decisions made within a school district is relatively small; they insist that collective bargaining is the only effective manner to assure the needed balance between teachers and administrators. Whether this is fact or not, certainly teacher attitudes toward any subject could have a very significant impact on the jobs that teachers do each day (53, pp. 7-13).

According to Evans and Knox (17, pp. 1-2), teacher attitudes directly influence the direction in which the
collective bargaining movement will travel. Marson and Vornberg (34, p. 3) state that harmonious teacher attitudes yield a much greater benefit in the negotiating process than do diversified attitudes. Others, including Hennessey (22, p. 46) and Karlitz (26, p. 306), point out that role deprivation and adverse environmental factors lead to teacher militancy, which, in turn, results in teachers feeling a need for collective bargaining.

The move toward collective bargaining throughout the United States has as its source one real purpose--more teacher influence on the decisions that directly affect them. Adams (1, p. 1) states that before the advent of collective bargaining, teachers felt that they did not have a good method for influencing this decision-making process. Morrison (38, p. 2) says that teachers feel that they know best what is needed in education today, thus proliferating the need for worthwhile exchanges of ideas. Collective bargaining is a method by which this need has been somewhat satisfied. Although Reed (46, p. 6) states that some teachers are dissatisfied with the bargaining process itself, most of the surveyed teachers felt that it has had noteworthy results and has achieved its purposes, showing that it should be instituted elsewhere throughout the country. This feeling, along with the findings of Stefanic (51), which reveal that large numbers of registered voters favor collective bargaining for teachers, makes the need absolutely
mandatory for an understanding of how teachers view the collective bargaining process.

The supportive attitude among teachers toward collective bargaining seems to be universal in scope. Studies in many parts of the country reveal the general support for the process. O'Hare (40) surveyed 115 of the 455 school districts in Iowa; his findings reveal an unmistakable support for collective bargaining. Brelsford (5) obtained similar results in Indiana. Studies by Fris (19, p. 8) and Mikrut (36) reach the same conclusions in other states. An investigation by Olsen (41) shows support for collective bargaining in parochial schools. Even in Texas, where there is no enabling legislation for collective bargaining, there seems to be support for its institution. Stutz (52, p. 1A) states that a recent poll by the Texas State Teachers Association shows that 70 per cent of Texas' teachers support collective bargaining.

Almost all knowledgeable educators and analysts agree that support for collective bargaining is on the increase among classroom teachers. The trend toward bargaining legislation during the past twenty years is phenomenal. Studies by Birnbaum (4, p. 117) and by the editors of Today's Education (55, p. 27) acknowledge this increase, particularly since 1965. Forecasts generally point to a continued move toward the bargaining arena.
Questions concerning whether teachers in public schools should be allowed to strike continue to surface when collective bargaining is discussed. Hardcore supporters of the process seem to feel that strikes are absolutely a necessity if the purposes of collective bargaining are to be attained. Opponents argue that teachers have no constitutional right to strike. Although support for collective bargaining has been previously mentioned, studies reveal interesting results when teacher attitudes toward strikes are considered. A study by Johnson and Carlton (25, p. 3) yields the opinions of board members; they feel that the strike is a totally unacceptable tool for teachers to use. This attitude is certainly predictable for members at the management level. However, studies by Fris (19, p. 8), Elam (16, p. 410), and Brelsford (5) conclude that teachers are usually not in favor of striking, or that they are quite unsure of the use of their "ultimate weapon."

At the opposite end of the spectrum, two studies of significance result in different conclusions. First, a 1979 national survey of elementary teachers by the Instructor periodical reveals that most teachers favor the right to strike (24, p. 24). Second, a teacher opinion poll conducted by Today's Education (55, p. 27) found that 70 percent of the surveyed teachers would support strikes if certain conditions prevail. These conditions include unsafe working conditions, unfair salaries, large class size, poor
Much research has been initiated in order to determine which specific groups of teachers have favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward collective bargaining. Results have been somewhat varied. The data reveal conflicting results in some areas, agreement in others, and inconclusive evidence in others. A synthesis of the more noteworthy results follows.

Osburn (42, pp. 27-41) conducted a study of 266 randomly selected Missouri teachers. These teachers were in both the vocational and non-vocational realms. Conclusions show that teachers with favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining are usually members of teachers' unions, that they generally teach in large cities, and that they generally have less than the average number of years of experience. Osburn also found a great discrepancy in attitudes among all groups. Another significant finding was that most supporters in Missouri are graduates of out-of-state colleges and universities. Several other studies support Osburn's conclusions regarding the age of supporters of collective bargaining. These studies include those of Sinicropi (50), Tessier (54), and Brelsford (5).

Three significant studies indicate that men are more favorable toward collective bargaining than are women. These studies were conducted by *Today's Education* (55, p. 27), Fisher (18), and Carlton (7). Much speculation has occurred
concerning why men more than women are generally in favor of collective bargaining and the resulting unionism. Most experts feel that it is a result of the belief that men are the primary wage earners in most families, and that they feel bargaining will increase salaries. Regardless of the reasons, the data definitely indicate that a difference, indeed, exists.

Results from other studies dealing with bargaining show that teacher attitudes are affected but little when correlated with items such as the size of the school district, sex, years of experience, and age. These findings are supported by Marquardt (33) and Brelsford (5). O'Bare (40) further concurs and adds that conclusions from his study reveal that there is also no difference in attitudes of teachers from the elementary level as opposed to those of the teachers surveyed at the secondary level. Another investigation by Napolitano (39) shows a large difference in attitudes when respondents are classified according to the professional organizations to which they belong. Members of the American Federation of Teachers are more supportive of collective bargaining than are members of the National Education Association.

The question of why teachers possess favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining has been studied by several researchers. Schriesheim (47, p. 548) and Bigoness (2, p. 228) both conclude that there is a significant relationship between favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining
and the conditions of job dissatisfaction, low pay, little job security, and poor working environment. Corley (9) supports this view by his finding that a significant relationship exists between job satisfaction and attitudes toward collective bargaining. Hamner and Smith (21, p. 415) and Bigoness (2, p. 228) conclude that there is a relationship between collective bargaining attitudes and the quality of supervision under which teachers work. Teachers with highly organized, efficient supervisors are less likely to favor the bargaining process than are those with supervisors whom they consider poor. In one of the few attitudinal studies conducted in Texas, Segreto (48) surveyed 101 teachers in the Houston Independent School District. He found no relationship between attitudes toward collective bargaining and personal values. These personal values include practical-mindedness, achievement, variety, decisiveness, orderliness, and goal orientation. The Collective Action Scale developed by Patrick Carlton (7) was used by Segreto.

As expected, research reveals that there is a vast difference between the attitudes displayed by teachers and administrators and others. Researchers, including Evans (17, pp. 1-2), Sinicropi (50), Tynes (56), Hill (23), and Ziegel (61), support this finding. In a study by Wurster (60), which was done in New Mexico, the attitudes of school board presidents, superintendents, presidents of teachers'
associations, and teachers were studied. Wurster found that the four groups do not differ significantly either in their attitudes to most of the statements related to the need for collective negotiations provisions, or in their attitudes to most of the statements related to the collective negotiations provisions through state legislation. However, school board presidents and supervisors, when compared with teacher association presidents and teachers, are completely polarized in their attitudes on the two issues of teacher tenure and strikes by public school teachers. There is also polarization on provisions regarding establishment of collective bargaining provisions through state legislation and mandated bilateral determination of educational policy.

Teachers seem to have differing opinions about what items are proper for the negotiating arena. Wertz (59) found that teachers perceive items dealing with the negotiating process, salary, and fringe benefits as being resolved best through bargaining. Areas involving working conditions are settled best through teacher-administrator dialogue. Phelps (44), in his study involving Michigan teachers, found that teachers feel that items which should be included in the bargaining process are availability of instructional materials, facilities and conditions, class size, and personnel policies. He found that views indicate that teachers feel that there should be lesser emphasis on teacher involvement in decision making and union security. Shell (49) found that Oklahoma teachers
favor having a voice in curriculum development, evaluation, teacher work load, facilities, and class size. Tessier's (54) and O'Hare's (40) findings agree with many authorities as to the support for the view that salary and fringe benefits are the most important items to be bargained.

Finally, teachers must view collective bargaining in terms of what results occur and what benefits they receive. Although it is felt by many that teachers do not look objectively at the results and benefits of collective bargaining, their attitudes toward the process are shaped as a result of how they perceive it. In a study conducted by Wertz (59) in Indiana, results indicate that teachers feel collective bargaining is the most effective method to bring about increases in salaries and fringe benefits. Of course, these areas are of primary concern to all teachers. If they feel that these areas are benefitted by their support of collective bargaining, they will certainly express favorable attitudes toward it. Dexter (13) found that collective bargaining does not decrease teacher morale, thus offering support for the process, as does Marquardt (33) in his determination that collective bargaining increases the status of teachers.

Literature Supporting Collective Bargaining

Proponents of collective bargaining for teachers argue that some of the areas in which they are the strongest are those of working conditions, job security, salaries, and other such entities. These entities have long been a concern
for teachers, especially since teaching is traditionally a low-paying occupation.

Considering the area of salary benefits, Morgan (37, pp. 29-39) states that unions have very definitely caused teacher salaries to increase. In a study in which he compared forty-six union and non-union institutions, he found that collective bargaining has had a considerable impact on teacher salaries. Also, he found that these salary increases have resulted in the faculty having an important voice in the areas of job security and tenure. In a separate study, Reed (46) acknowledges that there is a definite trend for teachers to give up other things at the bargaining table in order to obtain increases in the salary level. His findings reveal that with each round of bargaining, higher teacher salaries are gradually traded off for a higher pupil-to-teacher ratio and a reduction in direct and indirect instructional support. In essence, Reed says that teachers will exchange intrinsic work satisfaction for monetary compensation. A further conclusion is that there will be an amplification of the current teacher push for higher wages.

Another important area seemingly influenced positively by teacher collective bargaining is that of working conditions and job security. According to Perry and Wildman (43, pp. 191-200), negotiations by teachers have been a great help to the profession in general. They state that the following
areas benefitted through the process in various parts of the country.

(1) Length of the school year;
(2) Length of the school day;
(3) Class teaching loads;
(4) Free time;
(5) Relief from non-teaching duties;
(6) Duty-free lunches.

All of the above are areas of concern for teachers that traditionally have been decided upon only by administrators. In relation to job security, Masters (35, pp. 455-458) says that teachers are quickly learning that collectively negotiated contracts often provide better job security than state legislation. At the same time, contracts enhance the power and prestige of teacher organizations in general. In making these statements, Masters expresses the feeling that the differences between public- and private-sector negotiations have not been as large as some believe. Teachers have developed their guiding principles for negotiation out of the problems they perceive, and each principle will be tested at the bargaining table. Originally, job security was not one of the major concerns. Teachers felt that legislation at the state level would take care of that concern. However, following the lead of private management, protection from undue interference by elected officials made negotiating for job security feasible. Finally, Masters feels that job security
will become increasingly a matter to be dealt with at the bargaining table.

Faculty power has been an issue of collective bargaining since its institution. DeMent (11, pp. 3-7) advocates that collective negotiation, in its truest sense, is actually a "myth" which is sweeping the country. Comparing it to the "old myth" of shared authority, DeMent says that old myths usually die and new ones take their place. He feels that the process of collective bargaining is a power struggle, but not necessarily an adversary one. Both sides of the bargaining table have something the other wants, and each side also holds some threat over the other. Thus, collective bargaining, to be successful, is the process of bringing the wants and the threats into a balance that is mutually acceptable. DeMent believes that if there is no willingness to use power, then there will be a loss of respect on the part of the involved parties. The strength of the faculty is its commitment to band together for the good of the group instead of for the individual. Further statements reveal that a new group of faculty leaders will be needed because of the changed relationship under the "myth" of collective negotiations.

Probably, there is nothing more fundamental to the running of a school system than that of making curriculum decisions. Again, these decisions have been made traditionally by a school's administration. However, collective bargaining has enabled teachers to have a stronger voice in this
area than in the past. According to the National Education Association (12, p. 82), there is increased concern in this area of curriculum decision-making at the bargaining table. Since this has not been true in the past, teachers now are looking upon this area as one that will enable them to have more freedom in policy making, one that will ultimately have a positive influence on the children in today's schools. Lutz and Azzarelli (31, p. 10) agree with these conclusions about curriculum decision-making. They conclude that teachers must have a joint responsibility for the maintenance of a successful educational system, and the only sure way to bring this about is at the bargaining table during the collective bargaining process. Walter (58, p. 8) feels that because of the efficiency of the bargaining table, curriculum is an acceptable and beneficial topic. Although he states that unions should be a conservative force which works within the democratic system, he understands that militancy has resulted. This does not have to be the case, however, because, in the long run, both sides are committed to the same end.

School-system organization is a concept that is rarely considered when collective bargaining is discussed. DiRocco (14, pp. 36-38) lists three basic factors that are vital in teacher bargaining. These factors are (1) that teachers are, by nature and training, planners, and they form their unions and bargaining positions as they would form a well-developed lesson plan, (2) that teachers tend to be verbal, adapting
the basic principles of teaching to fit the negotiating area, and (3) that teachers are self-righteous. DiRocco hints that because of these teacher characteristics, they should be involved more in the planning stages of school decision-making. This is needed because of the lack of management ability on the part of many current administrators.

Much has been written about the general feeling that the public sector (including the teaching field) and the private sector have vast differences and cannot be compared to each other regarding the right to assemble collectively and negotiate. According to Mannix (32, pp. 441-443), this is not necessarily the case. For example, he says that there is an almost endless list of parallels between collective bargaining in the private sector of the economy and the activity by teacher organizations. In both areas, the reasons for organizing include the desire for job security, better salaries, and improved working conditions. Further, experience in the private sector is complex enough to provide support for nearly anything a public school bargainer on either side of the table may wish to discuss. School boards, administrators, and teachers would be certainly foolish, in Mannix' opinion, if they did not study the process in the private sector with an open mind. Such study could certainly benefit both sides of the table.

Giandomenico (20, pp. 257-259) offers further consideration in favor of collective negotiations for teachers. In
this author's recent study, the results of the tests of his hypotheses suggest that restricting the scope of negotiations to the industrial model of bargaining for wages, fringe benefits, and conditions of employment may not be appropriate for teachers. This practice could indeed mitigate against the professional development of teachers by somewhat restricting their satisfaction through self-realization needs. He states that collective bargaining could certainly benefit teachers by being a tool by which obstacles are removed that prevent higher- and lower-order need fulfillment. It can foster the professional growth and development of teachers by modifying existing organizational structures in order to permit teachers to exercise discretion based upon expertise in their respective subject areas.

Literature Opposing Collective Bargaining

Opposition to the idea of collective bargaining comes from many different sources. It is probably safe to say, however, that administrators are at the forefront of this opposition (61). Arguments against negotiations range from those who say that it has no benefits at all, to those who say that although there are some benefits, these do not outweigh the negative aspects.

Many proponents of collective negotiations for teachers argue that increased salaries are obtained through the bargaining process. However, this statement has been disputed
by some educators. Birnbaum (3, pp. 29-33) argues that although salary is a legitimate topic for discussion at the bargaining table, there has been little research to support its positive effect on salary levels. He says that facts and figures from a comparison of faculty compensation at 176 unionized and nonunionized institutions reveal that most compensation increases occurred at institutions where salaries were already at the top level. The author conjectures that resistance by the administration to increased faculty influence in decision-making has been brought about through increased compensation. In a separate study, Birnbaum (4, pp. 116-118) concludes that the relationship between increased salaries and unionization is not as noteworthy as was once thought. Changes in compensation at specific institutions may be more reflective of such factors as unique histories or situations, regional locations, general economic conditions, or the changes of legislative attitudes toward the funding of education, than of whether or not collective bargaining was involved. Birnbaum's conclusions are supported by others including Morrison (38, p. 3), Zuelke and Frohreich (62, pp. 81-88), and Kasper (27, pp. 56-72).

When collective negotiations are discussed, a definite argument that creates more controversy than any other is teacher strikes. The effects of teacher strikes on school children cannot be accurately measured, but few would argue that the impact is positive. In a recent article, Elam
(16, p. 410) reports the results of the week-long strike by teachers in Tuscon, Arizona. He says that teachers are obviously quite ambivalent about collective bargaining, even after two decades of its use. According to him, teachers need to establish credibility and to recognize that even though much has been accomplished toward building a political base, professional status and political power are not to be considered synonymous. Strikes are often looked upon as merely a coverup of a large problem. It is noted that, usually, strikes are not followed up by a conscientious attempt at reconciliation, the reduction of tensions, and the ever-present problem of the rebuilding of communications.

As previously mentioned, the area of curriculum planning is growing as a topic for discussion at the bargaining table. However, according to Eiken (15, pp. 174-177) and Morrison (38, p. 3), this has not been to the benefit of the nation's schools. Both Eiken and Morrison state that the process of curriculum change is becoming increasingly constrained by collective negotiations, and they argue that a system's model of collective bargaining must be designed as a consensus-building process, integrating all the elements that are essential to the proper operation of a school district.

Comparison of the public and private domains regarding collective negotiations is always a controversial topic. Some say that there is little problem in seeing the similarities between the two. Opposition to this idea comes from Pisapia
(45, pp. 424-427), who says that the adoption of the private-sector bargaining model (with its assumptions of bilateral negotiations, consumer constraint, adversarial relations, costs to both employer and employee when impasse is reached, and freedom to withhold services) has an inherent weakness when used in the public sector. Such weakness involves the limited access to bargaining by groups that have legitimate interests in the bargaining results. Generally, four groups are thought to have legitimate interests—teachers, management (composed of those on the school board and the chief school administrator), school clients (students and parents), and the public (composed of those who elect school board members and pay taxes to support the schools). Nevertheless, usually only the interests of the teachers and management are represented at the bargaining table. For this reason, the author feels that there will be an increase in the number of other parties involved in the negotiating process. This will be done for the purpose of reducing the union's power, which is proving to be detrimental to the educational process in today's schools. The group most needed to join in the bargaining process is the citizens.

Walker (57, pp. 119-124) also agrees with the belief that there is little comparison between bargaining in the public and private sectors. He states that collective bargaining as it is used today in the organized business world is totally inappropriate for solving disputes in the academic
world. The industrial model emphasizes the differences between parties, whereas academia always has prided itself on the unity of collegiality and the pluralistic democracy by which most post-secondary institutions function. The examples cited in this article occurred at Southern Massachusetts University, where negotiations were built on a conscientious effort to dispel presumptions of conspiracy. In this model, a concerted effort to treat the resulting contract as a "constitution" resulted in agreements that proved to be beneficial to both sides of the bargaining table, which, in turn, benefited the students involved. The fact that the contracting parties willingly made efforts to bargain cooperatively is significant, and the author feels that this alternative to the concept of industrial-type bargaining had the greatest influence on the production of a positive result.

Parental involvement is discussed by Cheng (8, pp. 153-174), and he rejects the benefits of collective negotiations because of the lack of parental involvement. He says that there are existing ways to include parents and communities in educational decision-making without sacrificing some of the apparent gains on the part of teacher unions. Walker contends that unless there is this involvement, schools will operate without the full support of all involved. So-called experts have created the infrastructure that tends to take the decision-making power away from teachers, administrators, and parents. Cheng concludes with a challenge to teachers to take
a close look at their leaders' policies to determine if they lead in the direction that teachers really want to go.

Crossland (10, pp. 67-70) attacks unions because of the apparent differences in perception regarding the process and substance of collective bargaining that are held by the faculty members and the administrators. He states that there can be little result from any activity in which the participants have little or no agreement about the process itself. In contrast, Lieberman (29, pp. 415-419), one of the most notable authorities in this field, says that although he was at one time a strong advocate of bargaining rights for teachers, he has now changed his mind. Once a candidate for the presidency of the American Federation of Teachers, Lieberman now represents boards of education at bargaining tables; he believes that to compensate for the distinct advantages of public employment, teacher rights and representation at the bargaining table should be drastically reduced. Although he acknowledges the fact that it would be impossible to go back to pre-bargaining days, it is possible to approach bargaining in a more realistic way. Lieberman (30, pp. 19-21) also believes that board members do not have to "lie down like lambs" when teacher unionism becomes a reality in a particular geographic locality; school boards and superintendents can react much the same as does management in the private sector by launching a strong campaign to reduce representation on the part of teachers.
A further argument against teacher negotiating rights is offered by Larson (28, pp. 58-61); he states that there are ways to prevent the ever-increasing trend toward unionism. Larson points out that school boards need to take a firm stance against compulsory unionism by showing how this creates representation that does not fully parallel the ideas of the members. In other words, the wage-earner, often times, is forced to pay dues to support candidates and ideas that are contrary to their own.

Summary

Chapter II has focused on pertinent research that has been done in the area of collective bargaining. The chapter was divided into three sections. Part one involved a synthesis of attitudinal studies relating to collective bargaining. Part two covered literature dealing with the positive aspects of the bargaining process. The last section dealt with the negative factors within the process of collective bargaining.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter provides a detailed description of the methods and procedures involved in conducting this study. It includes an introduction, descriptions of the sources of data, the test population, and the instruments used. A short summary concludes the chapter.

Introduction

Statistical analyses of the data for this study were conducted in order to accomplish the two purposes of (1) to determine the attitudes of teachers in certain schools toward collective bargaining, and (2) to determine whether classifications such as sex, academic degree, experience, assignment level, professional memberships, or age have a bearing on these attitudes. These two purposes provide the framework on which this study is based, and they enabled the researcher to pinpoint the significant aspects of the data.

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized. The descriptive category includes the calculation of means and standard deviations of teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale. Inferential statistics were used when the one-way analysis of variance was employed in order to determine differences in attitudes based on sex, academic
degree, experience, assignment level, professional memberships, and age.

All hypotheses in this study were either accepted or rejected based on the .05 level of significance. The following six hypotheses were tested.

1. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to sex;

2. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the academic degree they have attained;

3. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the number of years they have taught;

4. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the level of assignment;

5. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the professional organizations to which they belong;

6. There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to their age.
Sources of Data

Data gathered for this study came from teachers who teach in three small suburban school districts. These districts, located close to the city of Dallas, Texas, lie within communities that have experienced tremendous growth during the past few years. The population of these districts is predominantly white, although the minority population is increasing. Teacher population is also predominantly white.

There are numerous similarities among the three districts. First, each district shares a common boundary line with one of the others. Second, the salary and fringe benefits offered to the teachers in the districts are comparable. Third, curriculum emphasis is similar in each district, with most differences resulting from campus-level administration. Finally, these districts share the political and cultural influence of the eighth largest metroplex in the United States (6).

Test Population

The three small suburban school districts are located in the North Texas area, and, for the purposes of this study, they are designated as districts I, II, and III. These districts were chosen for several reasons. First, they are similar in size; second, all are located in the same geographical area; third, all districts are easily accessible; finally, an expressed interest in the topic of this research was obtained from each of the three districts.
Five schools comprise district I. Three elementary and two secondary schools have a total teacher population of 104.

School I-1, with grades K-4, employs 20 teachers;
School I-2, with grades K-4, employs 22 teachers;
School I-3, with grades 5-6, employs 15 teachers;
School I-4, with grades 7-8, employs 17 teachers;
School I-5, with grades 9-12, employs 30 teachers.

School district II consists of six schools. The total teacher population is 211.

School II-1, with grades K-4, employs 26 teachers;
School II-2, with grades K-5, employs 26 teachers;
School II-3, with grades K-4, employs 22 teachers;
School II-4, with grades 5-6, employs 31 teachers;
School II-5, with grades 7-8, employs 31 teachers;
School II-6, with grades 9-12, employs 75 teachers.

In school district III, there are five schools. The total teacher population surveyed is 156.

School III-1, with grades K-5, employs 22 teachers;
School III-2, with grades K-5, employs 22 teachers;
School III-3, with grades K-5, employs 23 teachers;
School III-4, with grades 6-8, employs 33 teachers;
School III-5, with grades 9-12, employs 56 teachers.

The total number of teachers surveyed for this study is 471. These teachers represent a total of sixteen schools in the three districts. The grade-level breakdown of the schools is five schools with grades Kindergarten through four, three
with grades Kindergarten through five, two with grades five through six, two with grades seven through eight, one with grades six through eight, and three schools with grades nine through twelve.

Since all teachers in each district were surveyed, no random sampling techniques were used. At least a 50 per cent return of data from the teachers was required; however, a total of 379 teachers responded for a 79 per cent return of data.

Instruments

Two instruments were used in this study. First, the General Background Information Questionnaire was used to gather general background information on the respondents. Second, the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale was administered to determine teacher attitudes toward selected collective bargaining areas.

**General Background Information Questionnaire**

The following statements make up the General Background Information Questionnaire (GBIQ) (Appendix A). These variables are included because past educational research shows that these specific variables can have a significant impact on the results of educational studies (1; 2; 3; 4). The questions are as follows.
1. **Sex:**
   A. Male;
   B. Female.

2. **Educational Level:**
   A. Bachelor's;
   B. Master's;
   C. Doctorate;
   D. Other.

3. **Years of Teaching Experience:**
   A. 1 through 5 years;
   B. 6 through 10 years;
   C. 11 through 15 years;
   D. 16 years and over.

4. **Level of Assignment:**
   A. Elementary (grades K through 6);
   B. Secondary (grades 7 through 12).

5. **Professional Organizations to which Teachers Belong:**
   A. Texas Federation of Teachers (TFT);
   B. Texas Classroom Teachers Association (TCTA);
   C. Texas State Teachers Association (TSTA);
   D. Association of Texas Professional Educators (ATPE);
   E. None of the above.

6. **Age:**
   A. 20 through 29 years;
   B. 30 through 39 years;
C. 40 through 49 years;
D. 50 years and over.

Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale

The Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale was used for this study in order to determine accurately the attitudes of teachers toward collective bargaining. This scale was developed and constructed by the researcher for the sole purpose of providing a questionnaire for this study.

Part one of the questionnaire is designed to determine attitudes toward the concept of collective bargaining. The following statements comprise part one (Appendix B).

1. Enabling legislation should be passed in Texas so that teachers, through their representatives, will have the legal right to collectively bargain with boards of education;

2. Collective bargaining, or some other similar procedure, is necessary if teachers are to be heard and treated fairly by local boards of education;

3. Collective bargaining provides a needed power base for teachers so that they can have reasonable impact in their relationships with administration and the board;

4. Those who seek bargaining rights for Texas teachers are more concerned with improving the economic rewards of teachers than with improving the quality of classroom instruction;

5. Collective bargaining will reduce the professional status of teachers in the mind of the public;

6. If achieved, the advent of collective bargaining in Texas will
   A. Improve teacher salaries;
   B. Improve job security for teachers;
C. Cause an increase in student achievement test scores;
D. Improve community support for education;
E. Enhance the professional self-image of teachers;
F. Improve the accountability of educational administrators;
G. Give teachers more professional independence in performing their duties;
H. Enable teachers and administrators to work together more effectively;

7. Since many employees in the public and private sectors have the legal right to bargain collectively with their employers, teachers should have the same right;

8. Collective bargaining necessitates teacher strikes;

9. Binding arbitration (third-party decision making) should always occur before a strike is considered.

10. In the long run, collective bargaining will be generally beneficial for the profession of teaching.

11. In the long run, collective bargaining will probably result in lower quality of education for children.

The second part of the instrument evaluates the attitudes of respondents toward the role of the representative teacher organization. The statements in part two are as follows.

1. If collective bargaining becomes a legal right of teachers, the teachers' organization should have a legal right to negotiate with the local board in the following matters:
   A. Salaries;
   B. Fringe benefits;
   C. Standards and procedures for the hiring of new teachers;
   D. Standards and procedures for the regulation of teacher performance;
E. Acceptable class sizes;

F. All matters dealing with curriculum;

2. One teacher organization should represent all teachers in a local district;

3. All teachers should be required to pay dues to the representative teacher organization, regardless of whether they are members;

4. A representative teacher organization should be able to call a strike if the situation warrants it.

For scoring, the data were valued on a continuum from 1 through 5, wherein the value of 1 equals "strongly disagree," and the value of 5 equals "strongly agree." An X is used to designate that the surveyed individual feels that he has insufficient knowledge to judge the statement.

A thorough investigation of the literature pertaining to public school employee attitudes toward collective bargaining was used in constructing the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale. After identifying key elements and reviewing existing instruments, statements were developed by the researcher, which were submitted to various professors and other educators for determination of their appropriateness. Their suggestions were used in order to modify, expand, or eliminate items. A final draft was constructed and prepared for validation.

Validation of the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale was achieved through the use of a validation panel. The panel consisted of two college professors, one diagnostician, one public school principal, and one administrator at the mid-management level (Appendix C). Four of the members were
either active in the bargaining process or were considered to be knowledgeable in the area of collective bargaining. One member was chosen because of his knowledge and expertise with evaluative instrumentation. Members were asked to examine each item of the instrument and to offer comments if there were questions concerning format, content, or clarity. Suggested changes were incorporated into a final draft.

In order to determine the internal reliability of the instrument, factor analysis was used after results of the questionnaire were obtained. This analysis produced an alpha reliability coefficient of .86882; computations were made by the Computing Center at North Texas State University.

There were several reasons why the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale was developed for this study. Some of these reasons are as follows.

1. The instrument was designed for use only in Texas;
2. The instrument was developed recently, thus limiting the possibility of obsolete terminology;
3. Questions contained in the instrument are clear and concise;
4. Scoring of the instrument easily adapts to this study (5).

Summary

Chapter III described the methods and procedures involved in this study. After the introduction, the chapter was
divided into three major sections. Section one dealt with the sources of the data; section two covered the test population; section three describes the instruments used in the study.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES OF THE DATA

Major Findings

The results of the data relative to this study indicate that there are significant differences in five areas, or, five hypotheses were rejected while one was retained. Specifically, hypotheses one, three, four, five, and six were rejected; only hypothesis two was retained. A detailed examination of the data for the six hypotheses follows.

Hypothesis One

Significant differences occur in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to sex ($F = 3.976; p. .0469$). Hypothesis One, therefore, is rejected. Table I presents the results, and the data indicate that male respondents differ significantly from female respondents in their answers to the twenty-seven items on the questionnaire. It should be noted also that there were 65 male respondents and 309 female respondents for a total of 374 teachers who responded to this survey.

Particular attention was given to the individual items on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale that resulted in
significant F ratios. Table II gives these results when teachers were classified according to sex.

**TABLE I**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR TOTAL SCORES ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE WHEN CLASSIFIED BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.3453</td>
<td>0.4717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>3.1825</td>
<td>0.6213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3.2108</td>
<td>0.6006</td>
<td>3.976*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

**TABLE II**

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS INDICATING SIGNIFICANCE WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question #)</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0156</td>
<td>3.6340</td>
<td>4.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1094</td>
<td>3.6786</td>
<td>5.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0469</td>
<td>3.4739</td>
<td>10.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1719</td>
<td>2.5505</td>
<td>4.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8769</td>
<td>3.5752</td>
<td>4.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.9077</td>
<td>2.5311</td>
<td>6.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6923</td>
<td>3.2492</td>
<td>6.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7231</td>
<td>3.2336</td>
<td>7.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.1077</td>
<td>3.7475</td>
<td>4.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.9538</td>
<td>3.4444</td>
<td>8.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>3.9026</td>
<td>3.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.7538</td>
<td>2.3366</td>
<td>4.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.8615</td>
<td>2.1082</td>
<td>17.563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant results were found on questions 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 23. In part two, only questions 28, 31, and 33 indicate significant differences. The F ratios ranged from 4.113 to 17.563 on the variables; probabilities ranged from .0433 to .0001.

Question 7 is of notable interest. This question deals with whether or not Texas teachers favor enabling legislation for collective bargaining. On this variable, the men's attitude was more favorable. Men exhibited an attitude of support for the legislation; women also favored the legislation, but to a lesser degree. Also of interest is the indication that neither men nor women favor the use of the strike (as evidenced by mean scores of 2.8615 for men and 2.1082 for women).

**Hypothesis Two**

Significant differences did not occur in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when teachers were classified according to their attained academic degree (F = .425; p. .7352). As a result, hypothesis two was retained.

Table III indicates that of the total of 373 teachers responding to this category, most teachers hold bachelor's degrees. Since only one responding teacher holds a doctorate, no broad generalizations are made in this area. Neither are generalizations drawn from the seven "other" responses.
TABLE III

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR TOTAL SCORES ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE WHEN CLASSIFIED BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.2235</td>
<td>0.5837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.1970</td>
<td>0.6300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0317</td>
<td>0.6370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>3.2108</td>
<td>0.6014</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences occurred between any two pairs of groups in this category. As indicated on Table IV, F ratios range from 0.084 to 1.053. None is significant at the .05 level.

TABLE IV

F RATIO MATRIX FOR PAIRED GROUPS WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When individual questions were considered, only question 33, which dealt with whether or not to strike, produced a significant F ratio when teachers were classified by attained
degree. The data in Table V reveal that there is a mean difference of 2.000 to 3.6667 among the four groups. It should be noted, however, that there were only eight respondents in the doctorate and other categories.

**TABLE V**

**QUESTION INDICATING SIGNIFICANCE WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question #1)</th>
<th>Bachelor's Mean</th>
<th>Master's Mean</th>
<th>Doctorate Mean</th>
<th>Other Mean</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.3182</td>
<td>2.0704</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>3.320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis Three**

Significant differences occurred in teachers' scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents were classified according to the number of years they have taught (F = 6.141; p. 10004). Null hypothesis three was therefore rejected. Table VI presents these results.

Particular attention should be given to Table VI in regard to the distinct decline in the number of respondents in each group as the categories increase by experience. This indicates that the districts surveyed for this study have a high percentage of young teachers. In fact, there are almost equal numbers of respondents in the least-experienced category and the two most-experienced categories combined.
TABLE VI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR TOTAL SCORES ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE WHEN CLASSIFIED BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 5 years</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.3568</td>
<td>0.4248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.2367</td>
<td>0.5886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.0717</td>
<td>0.7038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and over</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.0123</td>
<td>0.7329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3.2108</td>
<td>0.6006</td>
<td>6.141*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table VII gives the results for each pair of groups within this analysis along with the resulting F ratios.

TABLE VII
F RATIO MATRIX FOR PAIRED GROUPS WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED BY EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11-15 Years</th>
<th>16+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 5 Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.888</td>
<td>12.303*</td>
<td>15.149*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>2.888</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>4.613*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>12.303*</td>
<td>3.111</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ Years</td>
<td>15.149*</td>
<td>4.613*</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Teacher attitudes differ significantly between the group with 1 to 5 years of experience and the group of teachers with 16 years or more. There are also significant differences between the youngest group and the 11 to 15 year group, and between the 6 to 10 year group and the 16 and over group. No
significant differences are found between teachers in the youngest category and those who have 6 to 10 years of experience.

When reviewing individual variables according to the experience classification, significant differences are found for seven questions on part one of the scale, while there are only three differences on part two of the instrument; differences are found for variables 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 19 in part one, and on variables 29, 31, and 33 on part two. As shown on Table VIII, the F ratios range from 3.005 to 5.995 on the significant variables, with probabilities ranging from .0304 to .0005.

### TABLE VIII

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS INDICATING SIGNIFICANCE WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question)</th>
<th>1-5 Year Mean</th>
<th>6-10 Year Mean</th>
<th>11-15 Year Mean</th>
<th>16 &amp; Over Mean</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9120</td>
<td>3.7241</td>
<td>3.6267</td>
<td>3.2593</td>
<td>3.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0238</td>
<td>3.7521</td>
<td>3.6133</td>
<td>3.3148</td>
<td>4.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3413</td>
<td>2.3846</td>
<td>2.8919</td>
<td>2.4815</td>
<td>3.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0238</td>
<td>3.8974</td>
<td>4.1486</td>
<td>3.5370</td>
<td>4.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7840</td>
<td>2.6496</td>
<td>2.4595</td>
<td>2.2407</td>
<td>3.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9127</td>
<td>2.6068</td>
<td>2.5270</td>
<td>2.3462</td>
<td>4.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6429</td>
<td>3.2931</td>
<td>2.9733</td>
<td>2.9630</td>
<td>5.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2480</td>
<td>4.2051</td>
<td>4.1892</td>
<td>3.7593</td>
<td>3.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.5242</td>
<td>2.5385</td>
<td>1.9474</td>
<td>2.5185</td>
<td>3.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.5238</td>
<td>2.1724</td>
<td>2.0400</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>3.136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of particular interest are the responses to question 7. It is evident that teachers, when asked whether Texas should have bargaining legislation, have differing opinions; teachers with little experience have a more favorable attitude than do more experienced teachers. A similar response was found for question 8, which is about the need for collective bargaining or some similar procedure. Again, the least experienced teachers have the most favorable attitude. Responses to questions 12, 29, 31, and 33 also were not clustered at the 3.0 level. Question 12 deals with the improvement of teacher salaries, and questions 29, 31, and 33 consider class size, exclusivity, and teacher strikes, respectively. In all cases, the teachers with the least experience have the most favorable attitude.

**Hypothesis Four**

Significant differences occurred in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents were classified according to level of assignment ($F = 4.447; p. .0356$). Therefore, null hypothesis four is rejected.

As indicated by Table IX, elementary teachers and secondary teachers have differing attitudes regarding collective bargaining. It should be noted, however, that mean scores were close in range and on a level just above neutral.

Analysis of the individual variables in this classification indicates significant differences on six questions.
TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR TOTAL SCORES ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE WHEN CLASSIFIED BY LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.1533</td>
<td>0.5990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3.2844</td>
<td>0.5956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>3.2127</td>
<td>0.6002</td>
<td>4.447*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table X, questions 8, 14, and 23 indicate significance in part one, and questions 31, 32, and 33 indicate significance in part two. F ratios range from 4.251 to 12.435, and probabilities range from .0399 to .0005. The largest differences appear for variable 14, on whether or not bargaining would result in increased student achievement test scores, and for variable 33, on teacher strikes.

TABLE X

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS INDICATING SIGNIFICANCE WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO THEIR LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question)</th>
<th>Elementary Mean</th>
<th>Secondary Mean</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6256</td>
<td>3.9053</td>
<td>4.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4208</td>
<td>2.8084</td>
<td>12.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.3812</td>
<td>3.7262</td>
<td>6.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.2475</td>
<td>2.5952</td>
<td>5.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.5792</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
<td>4.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.0198</td>
<td>2.5090</td>
<td>12.435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Five

Significant differences occur in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the professional organizations to which they belong (F = 7.746; p. .0001). Therefore, hypothesis five is rejected. Table XI presents these results.

The results indicate that many teachers in the study are not affiliated with any of the listed teacher organizations. This does not mean, however, that they are not members of some organization, merely that they are not members of those specified in this study. It is interesting to note that 132 teachers in the survey responded to this category.

There are significant results in this category when each pair of groups is compared. This analysis, as presented in Table XII, reveals that significant differences developed between the attitudes of teachers in the Texas State Teachers Association and the Association of Texas Professional Educators. Other significant differences were found among the Texas State Teachers Association and the Association of Texas Professional Educators when compared with the "none" group. Caution should be exercised in making any generalizations regarding the Texas Federation of Teachers and the Texas Classroom Teachers Association because, in each instance, only nine teachers responded.

Several interesting differences occurred when the individual variables were analyzed. In fact, sixteen questions
### TABLE XI

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR TOTAL SCORES ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE WHEN CLASSIFIED BY MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas Federation of Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1070</td>
<td>1.0827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Classroom Teachers Assn.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5185</td>
<td>0.3652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State Teachers Assn.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.3912</td>
<td>0.5245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. of Texas Professional Educators</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.9725</td>
<td>0.5576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.1849</td>
<td>0.6132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>3.2140</td>
<td>0.6005</td>
<td>7.746*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

### TABLE XII

**F RATIO MATRIX FOR PAIRED GROUPS WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED BY MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TFT 1</th>
<th>TCTA 2</th>
<th>TSTA 3</th>
<th>ATPE 4</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFT 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCTA 2</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>8.838*</td>
<td>2.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSTA 3</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.034*</td>
<td>9.263*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATPE 4</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>8.838*</td>
<td>33.034*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.578*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>9.263*</td>
<td>6.578*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Texas Federation of Teachers.
2. Texas Classroom Teachers Association.
4. Association of Texas Professional Educators.

*Significant at the .05 level.
on part one resulted in significant F ratios. These include questions 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 25. On part two, six questions resulted in significant F ratios; these questions include 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31. This category contains the highest number of total questions affected by any independent variable included in the study. In fact, almost all factors included on the questionnaire were affected by this variable. Table XIII shows these data.

A close look at Table XIII reveals that the F ratios range from 2.601 to 14.011, with probabilities ranging from .0359 to .0001. In most instances, the teachers who belong to the Texas State Teachers Association possess attitudes that are considered to be non-traditional in nature when compared with current methods. This was reflected in their attitudes regarding enabling legislation, the positive impacts of collective bargaining, and the overall good for the profession if bargaining is achieved. The members of the Association of Texas Educators, on the other hand, exhibited predictable, more traditional attitudes. Perhaps most interesting is the favorable attitude toward collective bargaining that was displayed by teachers who belong to none of the listed organizations; these teachers' views fell between the two organizations previously mentioned. Because of the small number of respondents to the Texas Federation of Teachers and to the Texas Classroom Teachers Association, no generalizations are made about these organizations.
### TABLE XIII

**INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS INDICATING SIGNIFICANCE WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question #)</th>
<th>TFT Mean</th>
<th>TCTA Mean</th>
<th>TSTA Mean</th>
<th>ATPE Mean</th>
<th>NONE Mean</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>3.9771</td>
<td>2.8864</td>
<td>3.5455</td>
<td>12.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>1.8889</td>
<td>2.1970</td>
<td>2.8523</td>
<td>2.5076</td>
<td>3.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1250</td>
<td>1.4444</td>
<td>2.2273</td>
<td>2.8068</td>
<td>2.5985</td>
<td>4.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>4.0153</td>
<td>3.6742</td>
<td>3.9697</td>
<td>2.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>3.6894</td>
<td>2.8202</td>
<td>3.2748</td>
<td>7.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>3.7328</td>
<td>2.9551</td>
<td>3.3385</td>
<td>5.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>3.5556</td>
<td>3.7154</td>
<td>2.8652</td>
<td>3.2290</td>
<td>6.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3750</td>
<td>3.5556</td>
<td>3.7348</td>
<td>2.9663</td>
<td>3.0840</td>
<td>6.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.2222</td>
<td>2.1111</td>
<td>1.9621</td>
<td>2.7471</td>
<td>2.5267</td>
<td>8.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>3.9470</td>
<td>2.9663</td>
<td>3.4615</td>
<td>8.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.7121</td>
<td>2.4494</td>
<td>2.0615</td>
<td>8.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>3.8594</td>
<td>3.4268</td>
<td>3.5968</td>
<td>3.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>4.0152</td>
<td>3.5843</td>
<td>3.8182</td>
<td>2.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
<td>4.3182</td>
<td>4.0112</td>
<td>4.0153</td>
<td>2.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.5556</td>
<td>4.4441</td>
<td>3.7481</td>
<td>3.5056</td>
<td>3.4122</td>
<td>2.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.1111</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>2.7481</td>
<td>1.9888</td>
<td>2.3435</td>
<td>4.272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis Six**

Significant differences occur in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to age ($F = 6.242; p. .0004$).
Hypothesis six is therefore rejected; the data for this hypothesis are found in Table XIV.

**TABLE XIV**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TOTAL SCORES ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE WHEN CLASSIFIED BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 Years</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.3644</td>
<td>0.4442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 Years</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3.2369</td>
<td>0.5798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.0342</td>
<td>0.7143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.9976</td>
<td>0.6372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>3.2194</td>
<td>0.5871</td>
<td>6.242*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

An analysis of Table XIV indicates that all age groups are represented, although the younger categories contain the largest number of respondents. The mean-score range in this group is 2.9976 to 3.3644.

There are some interesting results when F ratios are calculated for each pair of groups in this category. Table XV presents these results. Mean scores in the twenty to twenty-nine year group differ significantly from both the forty to forty-nine and the fifty and over age groups. Significant differences were also found among the thirty to thirty-nine year group and the two groups aged forty to forty-nine and fifty and over. It is evident (and interesting)
that the younger teachers differ significantly in their attitudes toward collective bargaining than do teachers in the two older categories.

**TABLE XV**

F RATIO MATRIX FOR PAIRED GROUPS WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20-29 Years</th>
<th>30-39 Years</th>
<th>40-49 Years</th>
<th>50+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.650</td>
<td>13.690*</td>
<td>12.766*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 Years</td>
<td>3.650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.792*</td>
<td>4.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
<td>13.690*</td>
<td>4.792*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ Years</td>
<td>12.766*</td>
<td>4.014*</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

When teachers are classified by age, the individual analysis of each question indicates significant differences in eleven of the variables. Questions 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 result in significant F ratios for part one of the questionnaire; questions 29, 30, and 33 from part two have significant results. Table XVI presents these results. The largest F ratios occur on questions 14 and 15. These questions deal with the results of student achievement test scores and with community support if bargaining is achieved.

**Additional Findings**

The means and the standard deviations of individual items on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale are of particular interest. The results from part one of the questionnaire,
### TABLE XVI

**INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS INDICATING SIGNIFICANCE WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question #)</th>
<th>20-29 Year Mean</th>
<th>30-39 Year Mean</th>
<th>40-49 Year Mean</th>
<th>50+ Year Mean</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0268</td>
<td>3.7055</td>
<td>3.6462</td>
<td>3.1935</td>
<td>3.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2411</td>
<td>2.4969</td>
<td>2.6154</td>
<td>3.0323</td>
<td>3.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8829</td>
<td>2.6296</td>
<td>2.2308</td>
<td>2.1613</td>
<td>7.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0089</td>
<td>2.5864</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>2.2667</td>
<td>7.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.5625</td>
<td>3.2393</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>2.8710</td>
<td>2.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.6250</td>
<td>3.4233</td>
<td>3.1803</td>
<td>2.9677</td>
<td>3.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5982</td>
<td>3.2531</td>
<td>3.1111</td>
<td>3.0645</td>
<td>2.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.7054</td>
<td>3.1718</td>
<td>3.0469</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>5.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.7232</td>
<td>3.6258</td>
<td>3.2154</td>
<td>3.4667</td>
<td>2.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.4911</td>
<td>2.2393</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
<td>2.932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XVII

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE: PART ONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question #)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6837</td>
<td>1.3684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7078</td>
<td>1.3290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5361</td>
<td>1.3312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4608</td>
<td>1.3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4819</td>
<td>1.3518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9096</td>
<td>0.9974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5994</td>
<td>1.1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6235</td>
<td>1.0714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.6807</td>
<td>1.0801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which deal with the concept of collective bargaining, are given in Table XVII.

As the data in Table XVII indicate, most means are clustered at the 3.0 level, thus negating an opportunity to make general statements pertaining to each question. Question 7, dealing with whether there should be enabling bargaining legislation in Texas, has a mean of 3.6837. This indicates that the attitudes are only slightly favorable among teachers within the sample. In addition, it should be noted that a number of respondents, fifty-six, marked question 22 with an "X" to indicate insufficient knowledge to answer the question dealing with arbitration; the "X" answers to other questions were negligible.

Question 24 received the most definite response on part one. The mean of 1.9970 indicates that the average teacher
disagrees with this statement, which deals with collective bargaining lowering the quality of education for children. The teachers included in this study believe that this is not the case.

Part two of the questionnaire deals with the role of the teachers' organizations in the collective bargaining process. Table XVIII presents these results.

**TABLE XVIII**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE: PART TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question #)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.2982</td>
<td>1.0097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.2470</td>
<td>1.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.6717</td>
<td>1.2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.8434</td>
<td>1.1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.1506</td>
<td>1.0142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.5693</td>
<td>1.2135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.3916</td>
<td>1.3873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.6867</td>
<td>1.1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.2199</td>
<td>1.3293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident that attitudes on this section are much more positive than they were on part one by mean scores of 4.2982 to 1.6867. However, this section deals with attitudes of teachers if collective bargaining becomes a reality in the state of Texas.

Questions 25, 26, 29, and 32 resulted in the most positive attitudes among teachers on part two. Teachers definitely
agree with statements 25, 26, and 29 dealing with the inclusion of salaries, fringe benefits, and class sizes in a bargaining agreement. They disagree on question 32, which states that all teachers should be required to pay union dues regardless of whether or not they are members.

When the data from the questionnaire are compared according to school districts, some significant results occurred ($F = 5.188; p. .0060$). Table XIX shows these results by total scores.

**TABLE XIX**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA FOR TOTAL SCORES ON THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE WHEN CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District I</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
<td>0.5452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District II</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3.2182</td>
<td>0.5790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District III</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.0990</td>
<td>0.6412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3.2108</td>
<td>0.6006</td>
<td>5.188*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

The mean range in this category is 3.0990 to 3.3810.

The largest range difference is between districts I and III.

When teachers are classified by district and the individual variables are considered, several significant $F$ ratios result. On part one of the questionnaire, six variables reveal significance. These include questions 8, 11, 16, 17, 18, and 19. Variables 31 and 32 result in significant
F ratios on part two of the questionnaire. Table XX gives the results.

**TABLE XX**

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS INDICATING SIGNIFICANCE WHEN TEACHERS WERE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SCHOOL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (Question #)</th>
<th>District I Mean</th>
<th>District II Mean</th>
<th>District III Mean</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1096</td>
<td>3.7571</td>
<td>3.5328</td>
<td>4.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1781</td>
<td>2.4716</td>
<td>2.6885</td>
<td>3.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7379</td>
<td>3.2938</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>5.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>3.3277</td>
<td>3.2773</td>
<td>4.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6250</td>
<td>3.3672</td>
<td>3.0667</td>
<td>4.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6986</td>
<td>3.4294</td>
<td>2.8678</td>
<td>11.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.8592</td>
<td>2.3107</td>
<td>2.2927</td>
<td>4.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.2083</td>
<td>1.6648</td>
<td>1.4634</td>
<td>10.289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XX also indicates that the largest F ratio is found for question 19, which deals with whether or not bargaining would enable administrators and teachers to work together more effectively. The data indicate that there are diverse opinions within the three districts regarding this subject.

**Teacher Descriptive Profiles**

The following teacher profiles were determined after data were collected and interpreted for this study. Caution should be exercised in making generalizations to other populations as a result of these interpretations.
Typical Teacher-Respondent

The typical teacher-respondent in this study is female. In fact, females outnumbered males by a count of 309 to 65. This teacher probably has a bachelor's degree, and she has between one and ten years of teaching experience (the one to five year category contained the most respondents). No generalization can be made about teaching level for the typical teacher-respondent because although elementary teachers outnumbered secondary teachers, it was by such a small number. This teacher is in the 30 to 39 year age range, and she is a member of the Texas State Teachers Association or a member of none of the listed organizations.

Pro-Bargaining Teachers

The data reveal that the teachers who are most in favor of collective bargaining are males who hold a bachelor's degree. These teachers are usually in the 20 to 29 year age category, and they have taught school for five years or less. Usually, these teachers are employed at the secondary level. The pro-bargaining teachers are also more likely to be members of the Texas State Teachers Association as opposed to the other categories.

Anti-Bargaining Teachers

The teachers in this study who are considered to be opposed to the bargaining process are usually female. They hold the bachelor's degree, and they are the more experienced
of the surveyed teachers. They teach at the elementary level, and they are generally members of the Association of Texas Professional Educators. These teachers also are in the 50 years and over age category.

Summary

Chapter IV began with a section dealing with the major findings of the study. This was approached by examining each hypothesis with its relevant tabular and narrative results. There are three types of tables in this section. First, there are tables that show the analysis of variance data for total scores when teachers are classified according to sex, educational level, experience, level of assignment, membership in professional organizations, and age. Second, there are tables that illustrate individual questions indicating significance when teachers are classified in each of the six categories. Finally, there are tables that provide the results of comparisons of each pair of groups within each of the four categories which contain more than two divisions each.

The next section considered the additional findings of the study. It included the means and standard deviations of each question on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale. Also included were analysis of variance data for teachers as classified by the district in which they teach.

Chapter IV concluded with a section that portrayed the typical teacher-respondent in this study, the pro-bargaining
teachers, and the anti-collective bargaining teachers. These profiles were developed by interpreting the data from the study and organizing various characteristics into the three profile categories.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

There are many varied attitudes regarding collective bargaining among classroom teachers. In Texas, these attitudes have not been examined intently. This study attempts to discover these attitudes among teachers in three small suburban school districts in North Texas. This study also seeks to determine the effect on teacher attitudes of such variables as sex, academic degree, years of experience, level of assignment, professional memberships, and age.

The related literature for this study was reported in three sections. Section one, on the significant research on specific teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining, determined that although opinions are diverse, there is a growing feeling among teachers throughout the country that collective bargaining is necessary. Section two, on the positive aspects of the bargaining process, covered monetary gain, job security and working conditions, faculty power, curriculum concerns, and school system organization. Section three dealt with the negative aspects of bargaining in the areas of salary, strikes, curriculum content, private- versus public-sector bargaining models, and parental involvement.
Before this research was undertaken, permission was secured from the authorized leadership of the three target school districts. These small suburban school districts in the North Texas area are similar in size and geographical location, and they share common district boundary lines. Also, a pronounced interest in the research topic was expressed by employees in each of the districts.

The instrument used, the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale, was developed by the researcher. Initial steps in its development involved compiling pertinent questions; these were reviewed by professors and others who are knowledgeable of the collective bargaining process. Additions, deletions, and suggestions were incorporated until a useable document was obtained. Finally, a panel of experts validated the instrument. An alpha coefficient of .86882 indicated a high internal reliability for the instrument after factor analysis was incorporated.

The one-way analysis of variance was used in order to determine whether differences existed among attitudes of teachers for each of the six categories described in the hypotheses. All statistical tests of the null hypotheses were conducted at the .05 level of significance.

**Findings**

**Major Findings**

**Hypothesis one**—Null hypothesis one is stated, "There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the
Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to sex."

Results indicate that there are significant differences in these total scores when teachers are classified by sex. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance because of the significant differences found between the respondents in the male and female categories. An F ratio of 3.976 and a probability of .0469 resulted.

Hypothesis two—Null hypothesis two is stated, "There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the academic degree they have attained."

Results indicate that there are no significant differences in these total scores when teachers are classified by the academic degree they have attained. The null hypothesis is retained because of the lack of significant differences found among the bachelor's, master's, doctorate, and other categories. The F ratio was .425 while the probability was .7352.

Significant differences appeared on only one individual variable, question 33, which deals with strikes. It should be noted that teachers in the doctorate and other categories represent a very small percentage of the target population; therefore, broad generalities concerning these categories will not be made.
Hypothesis three—Null hypothesis three is stated, "There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the number of years they have taught."

The results indicate that there are significant differences in these total scores when teachers are classified by experience. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected because of significant differences found among the four groups. The resulting F ratio was 6.141, while the probability was .0004.

Noted differences occur between those teachers with one to five years of experience and the two groups of teachers with eleven to fifteen years and sixteen years and over. There were also differences between the six to ten year group and the sixteen and over group. No significant differences were observed between the one to five year group and the six to ten year group.

Hypothesis four—Null hypothesis four is stated, "There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to their level of assignment."

Results reveal that there are significant differences in total scores when teachers are classified by assignment level. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected at the .05 level because of significant differences found in the attitudes of teachers at the elementary and secondary levels. An F ratio of 4.447, and a probability of .0469, resulted.
Hypothesis five—Null hypothesis five is stated, "There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to the professional organizations to which they belong."

The results indicate that there are significant differences in these total scores when teachers are classified by their professional organizations; therefore, the null hypothesis five is rejected. The $F$ ratio was 7.746, while the probability was .0001.

An analysis of the data reveals that significant differences result regarding attitudes of teachers in the Texas State Teachers Association and the Association of Texas Professional Educators. Significant differences were also found between the Texas State Teachers Association and the Association of Texas Professional Educators when compared with the none (no membership) category. Caution should be exercised in making generalizations regarding the Texas Federation of Teachers and the Texas Classroom Teachers Association memberships because only nine teachers responded in each of these categories.

There are twenty-two individual questions that resulted in significant $F$ ratios; sixteen are on part one and six are on part two of the questionnaire. This category has the highest number of individual questions with significant $F$ ratios. The range of the $F$ ratios was from 2.601 to 14.011; the probabilities range from .0359 to .0001.
Hypothesis six--Null hypothesis six is stated, "There will be no significant differences in teacher scores on the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale when respondents are classified according to their age."

The results indicate that there are significant differences in the total scores when teachers are classified by age. Null hypothesis six is therefore rejected because of the significant differences found among the four age groups. An F ratio of 6.242 and a probability of .0004 resulted.

The significant differences in this category occur between those teachers aged twenty to twenty-nine years and those in the forty to forty-nine and in the fifty and over groups. Significant differences were also found between the thirty to thirty-nine years group and the two groups of forty to forty-nine and fifty and over.

Additional Findings

Additional findings include the listing of all means and standard deviations for all questions on both parts one and two of the questionnaire. Part one deals with the collective bargaining concept itself; the second part considers the role of the local teacher organization if bargaining becomes a reality in the state of Texas.

The majority of the means on part one are clustered close to the 3.0 level, thus negating an opportunity to make definite statements in regard to each question. Two questions,
however, are of particular interest. Question 7 deals with whether or not teachers should be allowed to collectively bargain in Texas. A mean of 3.6837 resulted, which indicates a favorable attitude among teachers within the sample even though the mean is not high. The most extreme attitude score in part one resulted from question 24, which states that collective bargaining would probably result in a lower quality of education for children. Teachers definitely disagree with this statement; the mean on this variable was 1.9970.

It is quite evident that part two produced more extreme attitudes; the mean scores range from 1.6867 to 4.2982. Questions 25, 26, 29, and 32 produced the most extreme results. Teachers agree with questions 25, 26, and 29, which deal with the inclusion of salaries, fringe benefits, and class size in a bargaining agreement. The mean scores were 4.2982, 4.2470, and 4.1506, respectively. A mean of 1.6867 shows disagreement on question 32, which states that all teachers should be required to pay union dues whether or not they are members.

The results on question 33 are of notable interest. This considers the concept of a teacher strike if the individual situation warrants it. A mean of 2.2199 indicates that teachers within the sample are generally opposed to this concept. This seems to indicate that, although the respondents are in favor of collective bargaining, they are not willing to take this controversial step in the overall process.
A final analysis considered teacher attitudes when the respondents were classified according to the school district in which they work. The results indicate that there are significant differences between districts I and III; the F ratio was 5.188, while the probability was .0060.

Conclusions

Based on data interpretations of this study, the following conclusions are made.

Hypothesis One

1. It may be concluded that male teachers are more favorable than female teachers in their attitudes toward collective bargaining; thus, men seem to be more receptive to advanced union activities;

2. Men feel that collective bargaining is accomplishing its purposes, and that it is developing the power base needed to influence educational decisions; women are more likely to question its benefits and are less bold in advocating the process;

3. Men, more than women, feel that collective bargaining will enhance the image and professional status of teachers; men are less likely to be concerned with opposition from outside the educational realm because they feel that the benefits to be obtained from bargaining are more important;

4. Male teachers feel that collective bargaining will help to increase job security; females have a much less definite feeling regarding this subject;
5. In general, men tend to perceive collective bargaining as a process that benefits the teaching profession as a whole; men feel that benefits result from collective bargaining (such as higher salaries, smaller class size, and more teacher independence); women are less likely to accept the process, but they still favor its advocacy and enabling legislation in Texas.

**Hypothesis Two**

The academic degree held by a teacher has little bearing on the teacher's acceptance or rejection of the collective bargaining process or of its many implications.

**Hypothesis Three**

1. It is evident that the teachers included in this study who have one to five years of experience are much more supportive of the collective bargaining process than are the more experienced teachers; less-experienced teachers are more receptive to efforts for enabling bargaining legislation, and they would be primary targets for union leaders who are attempting to gain increased teacher support;

2. The least experienced teachers in this study are convinced that collective bargaining could and would improve their professional status;

3. Teachers who have five years or less experience believe, to a much greater degree than more experienced teachers, that collective bargaining causes teacher salaries to increase;
4. Teachers with little experience are idealistic in their belief that the bargaining process will cause the teacher-administrator relationship to improve; more experienced teachers do not feel this is necessarily the case;

5. The least experienced teachers are more non-traditional in nature; this is evidenced by the indication that they would be more likely to strike than would the more experienced teachers; this militancy causes administrators to face new and ever-increasing problems when additional staff members must be hired.

**Hypothesis Four**

1. Although there was little difference between the attitudes of elementary and secondary teachers, it is evident that secondary teachers feel more of a need for collective bargaining or some similar process; elementary teachers, as evidenced by lower mean scores on several questions, are more likely to respond to the traditional methods of problem-solving;

2. Secondary teachers feel that collective bargaining will strengthen and benefit the profession as a whole; elementary teachers show a sense of caution in their attitudes toward the process.

**Hypothesis Five**

1. There is overwhelming support for collective bargaining among the members of the Texas State Teachers Association
in the surveyed districts; mean scores indicate that its members feel positively about the following concepts:

A. Collective bargaining will provide a needed power base for teachers;

B. The bargaining process will cause teacher salaries to increase;

C. Collective bargaining will increase the accountability of educational administrators;

D. Bargaining will not cause a decrease in the educational quality of a school district;

E. Salaries, fringe benefits, duties, class size, etc., should be included in the bargaining agreement;

2. Teachers who belong to none of the listed organizations still favor collective bargaining; this is of notable interest because they have chosen to remain unrepresented (at least by the listed associations), yet they favor a process that is built around representation;

3. Members of the Association of Texas Professional Educators are least likely to favor collective bargaining; their attitudes, however, were not in the "strongly disagree" range on relevant questions; this seems to indicate a different attitude from the organization's leadership.

**Hypothesis Six**

1. Younger teachers within the surveyed districts seem to favor collective bargaining more than do the older teachers;
there is little support for the process itself among teachers in the fifty and over age group;

2. Older teachers seem more concerned about community support for education than the young teachers; older teachers feel that bargaining would not be publicly supported in Texas, and this causes them to be cautious in their support;

3. The younger teachers are more optimistic about collective bargaining increasing administrative accountability and improving teacher-administrator relations;

4. Younger teachers are more likely to strike than are older teachers.

**Teacher Comments**

The comment section of the questionnaire indicates some frustration on the part of teachers in the survey. Written comments indicate that teachers are searching for a new or better way to gain additional insight and information on educational matters. These teachers admit that they have little knowledge about the collective bargaining process itself, but they feel that it has benefited teachers in other states; therefore, blind support for the bargaining process was evidenced.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made as a result of this study.
1. Because of the evidence that suburban teachers are not knowledgeable about all aspects of collective bargaining, school personnel should be encouraged to become enlightened about the overall bargaining process;

2. Since teachers advocate the institution of the process, all school administrators should attend workshops and seminars on collective bargaining in order to enlarge their capacity to deal with its many implications;

3. Since teachers possess many differing opinions about collective bargaining, administrators should attempt to increase their understanding of how teachers feel about the process through interaction, reading, and research;

4. Colleges and universities should offer courses within the departments of education that deal with the major aspects of collective bargaining; if and when collective bargaining becomes a reality in Texas, some of these courses could be required, and this would help to provide a needed knowledge base for administrators and teachers alike;

5. If collective bargaining is instituted in Texas, school districts should exercise great care and caution in the initial phases; the hiring of competent consultants should be a primary consideration because of the differing opinions that teachers possess on the subject and because of the potentially explosive implications of collective bargaining.
Recommendations for Further Study

Based on the findings in this study, the following recommendations for further research are suggested.

1. This study could be replicated in the same districts at a later time in order to determine if changes in attitude have occurred;

2. This study should be replicated in other school districts across the state, which would help to determine if the differences in attitudes are the result of differences in location, size, or cultural make-up of school districts; another purpose would be to determine if attitudes are changing or remaining at a constant level;

3. A similar study should be conducted that utilizes administrators and board members as respondents from school districts of varying size;

4. A study should be instituted in order to determine what current action is being taken to prepare school districts in the event that enabling bargaining legislation is passed in Texas;

5. This study should be conducted in other states so that differences in teacher attitudes could be compared; one purpose of this would be to analyze results from respondents who are considered knowledgeable of the collective bargaining process.
APPENDIX A

GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle the number in parentheses beside the response which applies to you.

1. Sex
   (1) Male
   (2) Female

2. Educational level
   (1) Bachelor's
   (2) Master's
   (3) Doctorate
   (4) Other

3. Years of teaching experience
   (1) 1-5 years
   (2) 6-10 years
   (3) 11-15 years
   (4) 16 and over

4. Level of assignment
   (1) Elementary (grades K-6)
   (2) Secondary (grades 7-12)

5. Professional organizations to which you belong
   (1) Texas Federation of Teachers (TFT)
   (2) Texas Classroom Teachers Association (TCTA)
(3) Texas State Teachers Association (TSTA)
(4) Association of Texas Professional Educators (ATPE)
(5) None of the above

6. Age

(1) 20–29 years
(2) 30–39 years
(3) 40–49 years
(4) 50 years and up.
APPENDIX B

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE
APPENDIX B

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ATTITUDE SCALE

The following questionnaire is designed to measure the attitude of Texas' public school teachers toward collective bargaining. The instrument is divided into two sections. Section one deals with the collective bargaining concept. Section two deals with the role of the teacher organization.

The following definition of collective bargaining will apply to this questionnaire:

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING is a process of bilateral decision-making whereby two parties meet and through proposals and counter proposals reach agreement on certain issues; such agreements are then ratified by the employee association or union and the school board or management to become binding on both parties for the period agreed upon (Marson, 1978).

Directions

Please answer the following questions by circling one of the numbers beside each statement. A circle around a "5" indicates a "strongly agree" (SA) attitude, while a circle around a "1" indicates a "strongly disagree" (SD) reaction. The other numbers represent various degrees between the two points. Place an "X" in the blank provided if there is insufficient knowledge on the part of the responder to answer.

The Collective Bargaining Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Enabling legislation should be passed in Texas so that teachers, through their representatives, will have the legal right to collectively bargain with boards of education.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collective bargaining, or some other similar procedure, is necessary if teachers are to be heard and treated fairly by local boards of education.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Collective bargaining provides a needed power base for teachers so that they can have reasonable impact in their relationships with administration and the local board. 5 4 3 2 1

10. Those who seek bargaining rights for Texas teachers are more concerned with improving the economic rewards of teachers than with improving the quality of classroom instruction. 5 4 3 2 1

11. Collective bargaining will reduce the professional status of teachers in the minds of the public. 5 4 3 2 1

If achieved, the advent of collective bargaining in Texas will:

12. Improve teacher salaries 5 4 3 2 1

13. Improve job security for teachers 5 4 3 2 1

14. Cause an increase in student achievement test scores 5 4 3 2 1

15. Improve the community support for education 5 4 3 2 1

16. Enhance the professional self-image of teachers 5 4 3 2 1

17. Improve the accountability of educational administrators 5 4 3 2 1

18. Give teachers more professional independence in performing their duties 5 4 3 2 1

19. Enable teachers and administrators to work together more effectively 5 4 3 2 1

20. Since many employees in the public and private sectors have the legal right to bargain collectively with their employers, teachers should have the same right 5 4 3 2 1

21. Collective bargaining necessitates teacher strikes 5 4 3 2 1
22. Binding arbitration (third-party decision making) should always occur before a strike is considered  
   5  4  3  2  1  

23. In the long run, collective bargaining will generally be beneficial for the teaching profession  
   5  4  3  2  1  

24. In the long run, collective bargaining will probably result in lower quality education for children  
   5  4  3  2  1  

The Role of the Teacher Organization

If collective bargaining becomes a legal right of teachers, the teachers' organization should have the legal right to negotiate with the local board in the following matters:

25. Salaries  
   5  4  3  2  1  

26. Fringe benefits  
   5  4  3  2  1  

27. Standards and procedures for the hiring of new teachers  
   5  4  3  2  1  

28. Standards and procedures for the regulation of teacher performance  
   5  4  3  2  1  

29. Acceptable class sizes  
   5  4  3  2  1  

30. All matters dealing with curriculum  
   5  4  3  2  1  

31. One teacher organization should represent all teachers in a local school district  
   5  4  3  2  1  

32. All teachers should be required to pay dues to the representative teacher organization regardless of whether they are a member  
   5  4  3  2  1  

33. A representative teacher organization should be able to call a strike if the situation warrants it  
   5  4  3  2  1  

COMMENTS: (over)
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1. Dr. Charles Tilelrson, Professor of Education  
   Dallas Baptist College  
   Dallas, Texas

2. Dr. Alvin Marson, Professor of Education  
   Sul Ross State University  
   Alpine, Texas

3. Mr. Hollis Palmer, Principal  
   Balston Spa Central School District  
   Balston Spa, New York

4. Mr. Robby Collins, Mid-Management Administrator  
   Dallas Independent School District  
   Dallas, Texas
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LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

716 Terrace
De Soto, Texas  75115

Dear Superintendent of _____________ District:

I am a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. Under the supervision of Dr. Gary Anderson, I am initiating a study of teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining in selected school districts in the North Texas area.

Collective bargaining is an issue of great importance across the country. Here in Texas, the impact has not yet been felt to its fullest degree, but many experts seem to feel that it is only a matter of time before legislation will make the process mandatory.

I would like to survey the teachers in your district with your permission. Attached are copies of the questionnaire that would be used if your approval is granted. I would be administering the questionnaires personally during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting at each available campus.

Please contact me if you have further questions concerning the study. Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. Brian Nichols

Gary Anderson, Major Professor
APPENDIX E

LETTER TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

716 Terrace
De Soto, Texas  75115

Dear Principal:

I am a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. My dissertation study is attempting to determine teacher attitudes toward collective bargaining in selected area school districts.

Collective bargaining is a critical issue in education today. Administrators and teachers alike are in need of further enlightenment concerning the process and its implications. This study would provide some of this insight.

Permission has been received from your superintendent to conduct the study. However, your cooperation is greatly needed in order for me to setup a time to administer the questionnaires at one of your regularly scheduled faculty meetings. The process should take no more than fifteen minutes of your time.

Your approval and cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. Brian Nichols

Gary Anderson, Major Professor
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STATEMENT TO THE RESPONDENTS

I would like to express my thanks to each of you for your cooperation.

This investigation is designed to determine teacher attitudes toward the collective bargaining process. The questionnaire to be administered consists of a background information questionnaire and the Collective Bargaining Attitude Scale developed by the researcher.

Please read all instructions carefully before completing the instrument. Accuracy, of course, is a necessity in any research study.

Remember, this study does not require the identity of respondents and all information obtained will be kept confidential and will be used for research purposes only.

Are there any questions? (Pause) At this time, please begin completing the instrument. This should not require more than ten minutes of your time.
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