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The problem investigated by this study was that of understanding types of behaviors exhibited by participants in negotiations processes and impact of behaviors on collective bargaining in Nigeria. The study's three purposes were to describe the nature and extent of interpersonal conflict that occurs in collective bargaining, to determine the consequences that stem from such conflict, and to suggest the behaviors and performances during the face-to-face negotiations that should exist to enhance labor-management relations in Nigerian public education. This study examined behavior in negotiations by using simulation, i.e., a quasi-experimental method. Four outcomes of negotiations--time required to reach agreement, terms of agreements, verbal behavior exhibited during negotiations, and satisfaction derived by negotiators in negotiations--were examined.

A Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire was used to measure attitude orientations of the subjects. Sixty-nine subjects were selected for the simulations. Thirty-four
subjects represented management while thirty-five
represented teachers in negotiations. There were four to
five subjects in each session, two to three subjects made
up teams representing various polarizations of
labor-management attitude orientations. Fifteen groups
participated in negotiations. Seven issues were presented
for negotiations in a ninety minute time period. The
results of the sessions were analyzed by the use of
post-session questionnaires, the final terms of agreements
on issues, and Bales' method for analysis of verbal
behavior.

Findings from the study indicated that highly
polarized groups used more time resolving issues, exhibited
more social emotional behavior, performed fewer tasks, and
showed less satisfaction than the less highly polarized
groups that used less time resolving issues, exhibited less
social emotional behavior, performed more tasks, and
derived more satisfaction. Negotiating teams with moderate
attitude polarization showed more success than teams with
highly polarized attitude orientations. Negotiating teams
with highly polarized attitudes toward opposing teams ended
in impasse in face-to-face negotiations and were
unsuccessful in attaining compromises.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The Nigerian Union of Teachers (NUT) is the largest trade union in Nigeria (2, p. 258). The NUT membership is comprised of teachers in the primary and secondary schools, in the teacher training colleges, and in the technical colleges in the Federation of Nigeria (11, p. 12). Coleman pointed out that the teachers' union was inclined to participate in demanding wage and salary increases prior to the Second World War. Falade states that after the Second World War, the purposes of the NUT concentrated on:

1. studying, promoting, and improving conditions affecting the teaching profession in Nigeria;
2. creating better understanding among teachers;
3. submitting to the government the opinions of teachers on matters directly affecting the teaching profession in Nigeria;
4. establishing a central working body for, and to unite, all the unions of teachers in Nigeria; and
5. cooperating with the Ministry of Education and the various missionary bodies on matters of educational reform (4, p. 3).

In 1945, when the Richards Constitution was proposed (3, p. 242), the NUT took advantage of the constitutional
reform as it affected education and developed a solid and united front which would encourage members in the future to be very active in the profession.

The Foot Commission was appointed in 1948 and recommended national modifications such as democratizing of local government in the East of Nigeria and recruitment and training of Nigerians for the government senior service level. It also went further to make it explicit that no foreigner should be employed in a teaching or government position where a suitable Nigerian was available (3, pp. 245-246). Therefore, the Foot Commission constitutional reform encouraged significant political development that promoted benefits for the educational advancement of Nigeria. First, it encouraged the provision of scholarships to Nigerian students for advanced study. Second, since many foreigners left the country after Nigeria gained her independence, it encouraged in-service training to meet the manpower demand created by their vacated positions. Third, it proposed an organizational structure and process more adequate to enhance the development of education and administration in Nigeria (12, p. 17).

In 1964, a general strike of Nigerian workers was precipitated by the fall in real wages, the lack of cheap housing, the bad conditions of service such as inadequate fringe benefits, and the disparity in wages
between Nigerians and foreigners, though they both possessed the same qualifications (15, p. 24). Foreigners enjoyed a wage advantage because they were on contracts, and the Nigerian government did everything possible to attract and retain foreigners until sufficient training of Nigerian manpower could be accomplished. Teachers were among the lowest paid workers in Nigeria so it was not surprising that the general strike was supported by the teachers' union.

In order to attempt to avert future strikes, the government established a procedure for resolving conflicts which included the following steps: (1) the government mandated that the ministries of labor and education actively negotiate with the NUT; (2) the government required that employers and employees must hold joint talks within a certain number of days to address their differences; (3) in cases where the talks led to an impasse, it required that a mediator must be appointed within seven days by common agreement of the teachers and the civil servants representing the government; (4) if there were still a deadlock within fourteen days, it demanded that the matter be referred to the Minister of Employment, Labor, and Productivity who appointed an arbitrator to reconcile the differences of both the NUT and the civil servants within fourteen days; and (5) where a
compromise could not be reached, it required the matter to be referred to an Industrial Arbitration Board which had up to forty days to hear appeals from either labor or management. In cases where forty days is not sufficient, the time frame can be extended at the discretion of the Minister of Employment, Labor, and Productivity (8, pp. 145-146). If all the procedures described above fail, the case is resolved by the National Industrial Court and its ruling is normally regarded as final. The federal government appoints a judge of the Federal Supreme Court, and both the NUT and the management in this case are required to present their cases to the court. Based on what is presented by both the NUT and management civil servants, the judge makes a ruling. However, when a ruling is considered biased by either the NUT or the civil servants, it is referred to the Board of Inquiry set up by the Minister of Employment, Labor, and Productivity.

The Board of Inquiry consists of full-time elected representatives of the NUT and the career civil servants who are expected to work with good will and full understanding to enable the parties to arrive at viable decisions to help resolve their differences. If all procedures fail to achieve or resolve the differences between the NUT and civil servants, the Nigerian Trade Dispute Decree of 1976 forbids any union to resort to strike or lockouts to
settle any differences between the union and management (8, p. 145). As a result of this prohibition, the NUT has resorted to tactics such as "work-to-rule" and absenteeism. Work-to-rule means the employee reports to work on schedule, obeys all rules, but is not productive.

Coleman states that there are several issues that united the NUT members. These issues include salary and status inequality among mission teachers with the same certification as Nigerian natives, severe discipline practices invoked by foreign employers on Nigerian teachers, lack of opportunity for advancement, and the awarding of top school positions to Europeans. Other program thrusts or issues of the NUT include (a) improving the working conditions of teachers, (b) keeping an independent status from the government and concentrating on essential issues affecting education, and (c) attracting and retaining capable and willing people for the teaching profession (4, p. 3). Currently, the NUT still works to resolve these issues and is working to achieve improvement of the pay structure of teachers.

Uvieghara noted that a NUT member made a motion at the NUT's annual convention "that concern for better pay should not be the primary aim of the teachers' body because it argued that it did not at this time assume the role of union" (18, p. 18). However, the idea of
improving the pay structure of teachers has been important in the NUT since union status was granted to the teachers in the late 1940s. The arguments presented by the NUT in support of improving pay for teachers include the fact that their counterparts in the civil service earn more and that the cost of living has increased dramatically. While the federal government has tried to establish a national pay scale for teachers, some state governments have deliberately blocked their efforts. An example of this was when the federal government determined the salary structure of teachers by using the civil service grading scale. State governments refused to implement the decisions of the federal government to grant special bonuses to teachers or to review teachers' pay by contending that states had no money to implement such awards (4, pp. 32-33). In Kano State, members of the NUT threatened to boycott the general election if the money channelled by the federal government through the Kano State government for the purpose of paying teachers was mishandled (13, p. 1688). Teachers continue to push for higher earnings nationally even though their efforts have not been highly successful.

In the Nigerian negotiation process, the bargaining parties are government and teachers: government, the employer, and teachers representing the NUT, the employees. The government is represented by Federal
Ministry of Education officials. The Ministry of Labor is also a government agency and acts as a third party to observe, to facilitate discussion to ensure that all have an opportunity to speak, and to make sure that ground rules are enforced (6, p. 35). The third party is seen as helping to resolve differences and enhancing the whole process of negotiations.

The national executives (president, vice-president, and secretary) of the NUT negotiate at the federal level while the state executives negotiate with the state officials. At the local level, zonal representatives of the NUT confer with either the inspector of education or a local government officer who represents the states (10, 1982). Actual negotiations are not conducted at the local level but only at the state and federal levels. The federal or state civil servants who represent the government in negotiations are appointed by the Federal Minister of Education or the State Commissioner of Education. The NUT executives at the federal, state, and local levels are elected by the teachers and they are charged with the responsibility of negotiating for the union with the civil servants (1, 1964).

The negotiation process takes the following pattern. First, teachers' representatives are consulted about the interests of the teachers. Second, the NUT teachers submit
a memorandum based on the interests of the teachers' union to the government representatives. Third, the Ministry of Education appoints a committee of civil servants which considers the facts of the memorandum. Fourth, after the committee has studied the facts, the committee meets with the NUT executive members to discuss any differences.

Fashoyin states that "government, labor and management all accept collective bargaining and have, at one time or another, expressed their belief in it as the most appropriate method for determining wages and conditions of employment" (5, p. 124). This process is mandated by the federal government of Nigeria. Prior to 1976, teachers addressed their grievances by going on strike. The mandate demanded that negotiations take place and that illegal strikes not be permitted to resolve wage and conditions of employment disputes (8, p. 145). However, illegal strikes do occur when the teachers believe that all possible remedies have been exhausted.

The NUT has negotiated on issues that include salary, fringe benefits, class size, the relevance of courses, curriculum designs, and the need for school facilities and equipment that can help professionals carry out their responsibilities (4, p. 39). Of all the issues stated above, the NUT considers salary and fringe benefits
the prime issues to be resolved by collective bargaining before the other issues are negotiated.

The NUT is faced with the problem of being viewed by government as a subordinate part of the government. This gives the government the right to base its bargaining upon the economic conditions of the country. Teachers see the privilege to bargain with the government to mean nothing since the government has the final say on issues such as salary and fringe benefits. To the teachers, bargaining appears not to be a two-way process but rather a process of unilateral government decision-making. In effect, salaries and fringe benefits are not negotiated but are determined solely by the government. As Falade notes, "This governmental control is obviously a disadvantage to the teachers since salaries are structured in line with but below salaries other civil servants earn" (14, p. 5).

Therefore, teachers find it difficult to argue that they should have a raise and other civil servants should not have a raise.

Unlike the private sector, the NUT is not permitted to bargain on car loans, car basic and accommodation allowances. This is because these factors are granted according to the different pay scales of the teachers. Each teacher is assigned to a particular grade scale, and it is the scale level that determines if a teacher is entitled to get
the benefits (4, pp. 9-13). Other factors such as hours of work, overtime pay, and holidays are solely determined by government regulations. Salaries and fringe benefits are fixed by the State Assembly or National Assembly. In summary, the pretense of bargaining, that is bargaining without real substance, prevails in the Nigerian negotiation process.

Smyke notes that during professional negotiations in the African context, there is a communication gap between the civil servants (administrators) and the teachers (labor). He states that civil servants need to develop a degree of understanding, the ability to be able to explore the issues at hand, and the capacity to know when to listen (16, p. 418). In actual practice the civil servants follow the approach of meeting teachers' delegations with prepared answers which show unwillingness to bargain. The appointed civil servants appear largely unwilling to address the sticky and delicate issues that bring both the union and management to the negotiating table. A case in point is the demand made by teachers for a housing allowance and car loans in Lagos State. In 1970, teachers specifically demanded car loans which were a fringe benefit enjoyed by their counterparts in the civil service, but each time the demand was made it was either turned down flatly or discussed with no serious intention
of making any change. The teachers became frustrated with this attitude, and the teachers' union resorted to a strike in 1972. It was only after this strike action that the Lagos State Ministry of Education approved both housing allowances and a revolving plan for teachers to purchase cars (4, p. 12). The above point illustrates an unwillingness to bargain in the absence of the pressure of a strike.

The civil servants have further widened the communication gap between the teachers and management. In 1977, the NUT was a member of the World Conference of Delegates of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession but was refused permission to host the conference. It was embarrassing to the NUT that a professional union of its caliber should be denied this permission. After several consultations and a series of letters between the government officials and the NUT elected officials, the approval was granted to host the world conference (9, 1977).

The situation in Nigeria suggests that civil servants can win teachers' confidence only if they can appreciate and work more seriously with the demands made by the teachers' union. It is only when there is appreciation and concern for teachers that negotiations can be achieved. Therefore, if civil servants avoid "stonewall" positions and demonstrate the willingness to bargain, the serious
communication gap between union and management may be reduced. The avoidance of intransigence will permit addressing the differences of both parties concerned in the negotiation process. It is necessary to establish a true negotiation process to resolve conflicts and to enable the teachers' union, management, and public education to benefit from the discussions held.

In the Nigerian setting, negotiations have been unsuccessful and strikes (prior to 1976) have damaged the teacher-management relationship. The Ministries of Education and Labor admit that there is a lack of dialogue between management and workers, poor organization of the national bodies representing both sides, and a lack of clear policy on handling industrial relations by the new government (16, p. 418). Honest negotiations are possible, as has been demonstrated by the negotiations in the industrial sector which ensured the setting of a national minimum wage.

To avoid poor communication by both the union and management, it is essential that the two bodies are well informed of the problems at hand. To this end, Tamoush points out that during a bargaining process, certain improvements are needed "to maintain a balance between the appropriate right of labor and management to bargain their own arrangements, yet to permit sufficient 'windows'
in the process to satisfy an ever more knowledgeable, concerned and financially squeezed public and consumer" (17, p. 79).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is that of understanding the types of behaviors exhibited by participants in the process of professional negotiations and the impact of those behaviors on the collective bargaining process in Nigeria.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study include the following:

1. To describe the nature and extent of interpersonal conflict in the professional negotiation process in Nigerian public education.

2. To determine the consequences that stem from interpersonal conflict in the professional negotiation process in Nigerian public education.

3. To suggest the behaviors and performances during the face-to-face professional negotiation process that would serve to enhance labor-management relations in Nigerian public education.
Hypotheses and Research Questions

The stated purposes have been investigated by testing the following hypotheses and answering the research questions. The hypotheses are stated in the null form.

1. There will be no significant differences in the social-emotional and task-oriented verbal behaviors of more highly polarized negotiating groups when compared with less highly polarized negotiating groups.

2. There will be no significant differences in the satisfaction (measured in numerical terms by the Post-Session Questionnaire) perceived by more highly polarized negotiating groups as a result of the negotiations when these are compared to less highly polarized negotiating groups.

The following research questions have been considered.

A. Do more highly polarized negotiating groups require more time to settle or reach agreement on a given number of specific issues than less highly polarized negotiating groups?

B. Do more highly polarized negotiating groups reach a settlement position or agreement which favors one side over the other on the issues for negotiation than do less highly polarized negotiating groups?
C. Which of the seven issues that were presented for the simulated negotiations were seen as most, and least, important by the negotiators?

D. Do management and union negotiating teams in the highly pro management and union attitude orientation gain agreements on the issues which are consistently more favorable to the management and union "sides" than the agreements negotiated by the other combinations of management and union negotiating teams?

Definition of Terms

Collective bargaining/professional negotiation. These terms refer to the process whereby management (employer) and labor (employee) engage in a collective or professional bilateral determination of resolving matters that are within the scope of negotiations. It is, however, not necessary that either of the parties involved is required to concede to any of the individual proposals.

Impasse. This term means that both parties involved in the negotiations process have reached a point on matters within the scope of bargaining where it may be futile for future meetings.
Polarization. This term, as used in this study, means a degree of attitude orientation whereby the negotiating groups view their positions in a positive manner as against the negative attitude developed against an opposite team during the process of bargaining.

**Car loan.** This is money granted to the employees by the government through the employer and a commercial bank following the standards and guidelines set by the Central Bank of Nigeria. This money is directly deducted from the employee's paycheck by the employer.

**Car basic.** This is money given to employees for the maintenance of the car purchased and it is non-refundable.

**Accommodation allowance.** The employee's rent is subsidized by the employer at a specified amount according to the rank or level of the employee.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study is quasi-experimental. It, therefore, utilizes the concept of role-playing in simulated bargaining situations confined to students. Students play the role of management negotiators as civil servants (that is, Chief Inspector of Schools and Assistant Inspector for
Business Management), while on the union side, students play the roles of the NUT president and secretary-treasurer. The function simulated is that of active negotiations; however, it is impossible for the researcher to conduct the experiment in actual real world negotiation settings. To make this study possible, the researcher must apply the quasi-experimental method which entails the use of simulation techniques, but it must be recognized that role playing with students is not necessarily the same as the "live" negotiating of union members.

However, in the context of the instrument used in the study, there have been several careful modifications to enable the different terms and personalities to fit the cultural, political, and economic set-up of Nigeria. The ideas of the original simulation instruments and stem from research in the U.S.A. as designed, tested to be both reliable and valid, and standardized by Horvat (7, pp. 168-216). Finally, because of obvious time limitations, the scope of negotiations in the simulation sessions is limited to seven issues only rather than to the entire range of issues which might occur in conducted negotiations.

Need and Significance

The study concentrates on how professionals behave during the process of negotiation and attempts to determine
the impact of the relationship between the attitudes of negotiators toward management (civil servants) and labor (teacher's union) and the outcomes of negotiations. This relationship is being examined because of the rampant strikes that prevailed in the Nigerian School System especially in the 1970s and 1980s in the hope that better understanding of interpersonal behaviors at the bargaining table might reduce the number of strikes and improve the relationship between the parties to negotiations.

The study is significant because no empirical studies of educational negotiations in Nigeria have been done. Analytical studies have been conducted in the industrial sector. While information from these studies does not directly apply to education, the information provides insight into situations that may crop up during this study's focus on the educational negotiating process. There is no information presently available on the impact of behaviors exhibited by the personalities involved during the negotiations that tend to make the process either a failure or a success. The writer believes that this study contributes to human knowledge in terms of how professionals behave during the professional negotiation processes and how their behavior affects outcomes of the process in Nigeria.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature is subdivided into three sections. The first section focuses on the review of the literature that relates to collective/professional negotiations in Nigeria. The second section focuses on the review of the literature that deals with negotiator behaviors and consequences of that behavior. The final section focuses on the relevant literature in the area of simulation as a research technique.

Review of the Literature Relating to Professional/Collective Negotiations in Nigeria

An annotated bibliography of literature on Nigerian labor relations compiled by Waterman cites a total of 299 items. Of the 299, only 77 had to do with collective bargaining in Nigeria; these sources included twenty government publications and documents, five periodicals, forty-two articles, and ten books (35, pp. 1-22). All of these publications were relevant to collective/professional bargaining, but none directly focused on the area of public education in Nigeria. Instead, the bulk of the publications concentrated on structural descriptions of union organization and unrest and conflicts in the
industrial setting of the Nigerian economy. It also should be recognized that none of the Nigerian literature on collective bargaining focused on the behaviors of face to face negotiators. The only analytical study that was conducted had to do with industrialization and patterns of conflicts was done in the business administration area.

Aire examined industrial conflict in Nigeria and explored ways of reducing it to a level acceptable to the country. However, he stated that Nigerian labor in the 1960s still had to deal with a powerful and foreign dominated private sector employer group. Aire used interviews and recorded data to show that the basic principles of collective bargaining were largely unobserved. The findings from the study are:

1. Most employers refused to recognize trade unions voluntarily and strike action was the most popular method of gaining union recognition.

2. Less that 12 percent of the registered trade unions in Nigeria had any collective bargaining agreements with their employers. Most employers had no consultation or negotiation machinery for such purposes.

3. Breach of agreements by both labor and management accounted for about 10 percent of strikes and
disputes each year. Labor contracts were not enforceable by law in Nigeria.

4. Organized labor, except for the very large unions, depends on the government to set wages or wage patterns for employees in the public and private sectors. This reliance on third party intervention rather than on collective bargaining caused conflict as many employers in the private sector opposed the use of government standards as patterns for wage settlement in their establishments.

The general finding from Aire's study indicated that in a situation of rising unemployment and a weak structure of "company unionism" organized labor is not an equal bargaining partner with the better organized, more powerful employers many of whom openly exploit the weak union position by imposing unilateral conditions of employment, irregular dismissals and deductions from wages and breaches of agreement. Aire also noted that organized labor increasingly relied more on government and less on collective bargaining as a means of achieving its demands.

Aire concluded that conflict which limited Nigeria's development efforts could be minimized through legislation providing for mandatory union recognition, legal enforcement of contracts, a mandatory national minimum wage
and a binding court of last resort, i.e., an industrial court. Finally, Aire emphasized that free collective bargaining cannot be effective if both the parties are decidedly unequal, especially in a situation such as exists in Nigeria (2, 1970).

An early work done by Narayanan concentrates on union attitudes toward wage policy as it reflects the developing world to which Nigeria belongs. Narayanan examined the conflicts between politicians and trade unions especially when there was need to determine Nigerian wage policy. These conflicts were found to be:

1. Trade unionists insist upon periodic increases in wages and fringe benefits such as better housing, medical facilities, and others, while the politicians look upon union members as people who want to erode capital accumulation because of demands for wage increases.

2. Unionists are ready to cooperate with the government to ensure that the national aspirations are carried out, but the unions are not ready to depart from pressing their demands for better wages and working conditions.

3. The freedom and rights of the union members to exert pressure on the authority vested in the legislators and to engage in strikes are regarded
as dangerous elements to democracy. Politicians hold the view that since strikes can retard production, it is better to control unions through party machinery which can curtail all liberties now enjoyed by unions (17, p. 384).

Iornem studied the concept of an active voice of the workers in the affairs of their place of work. He stated this concept as

In the context of the labor movement, industrial democracy has become popularly defined as a sharing of power by the majority of workers in decisions which affect them and which previously were regarded as the prerogative of a minority interest, that is, management (12, p. 38).

Iornem's concept has two possible interpretations:

1. It may suggest that workers (union) should engage in an economic and social revolution over ownership and management.

2. It may be regarded as a very mild means of encouraging that the needs of workers be met (12, pp. 38-39).

In a recent article, Okomilo writes that "traditionally, Nigeria's labor unions have been generally seen as the responsible and moderate type" (19, p. 26).

Okomilo states that the present downturn of the Nigerian economy is caused by the current irresponsible and recalcitrant behavior exhibited by the country's labor force. However, he states that the present military
government needs to handle the situation with caution not by expressing threats. For example, there have been stern and tough words voiced by top military personnel toward union's attitudes in the country. This line of action taken by military personnel is not only to be seen as a sign of firmness and reaction to opposition generally but as a total rebuff of the unions per se (19, p. 27).

Okomilo states that the approach by the government to peoples' problems and specifically to those of unions is not to be found in confrontations, threats, and encroaching on people's fundamental rights but in an open government. He urges that government "rely on or at least listen to inputs from the public" (19, p. 27).

Adeogun states that "if collective bargaining is to take firm root in Nigeria, the government must restrict its intervention in the field of industrial relations to one of laying down broad policy guidelines" (1, pp. 1-23).

Ubeku noted that even if the Nigerian government believed in the principles of collective bargaining, there was a question as to whether Nigeria really had fulfilled these principles. He suggests that behavior by the government has affected both the growth of unionism and the failure to encourage certain procedures in joint negotiations. Ubeku contends that the following are the results of such behavior.
1. In spite of the Nigerian Employers Consultative Association's efforts in encouraging the collective bargaining process, many employers refused to recognize the development of unionism in the organizations and this, in turn, discouraged the development of collective bargaining as a process of regulating the employment relationship.

2. It is because there were no avenues with which the civil service unions could pursue their grievances in respect of conditions of service, that they resorted to political agitation each time which resulted in the setting of commissions of inquiry such as Mbanefo and Morgan... The government appeared content to operate the labor laws it inherited from the colonial administration (32, p. 7).

Ubeku, concluded that for peace to exist, the government must actively be involved in industrial relations but only as a negotiator not as a dictator. The government can take a further step by allowing and ensuring that employers and unions are associated with the growth and development of the nation (32, pp. 18-19). Also, Ubeku emphasized that Nigeria should be aware of her independence and make thorough modifications of any previous existing systems. He states:

It will, thus, be seen that the military regime succeeded in sweeping aside the voluntary system of industrial relations which the country inherited from the British and established a system which has elements of both state control and voluntarism, i.e., a hybrid system which is not working (32, p. 20).

The Nigerian Labor Decree Number 21 of 1974 clearly bound the employer and the employees to situations such as
settlement of disputes. It includes jurisdiction, labor complaints and powers of the court (18 pp. A100-110).

The following elements are considered to be essential in order to enable collective negotiations to take place:

1. The right of employers and unions to bargain collectively over the terms and conditions of employment must exist.

2. There must be representative organizations of employees, which must be independent of the employer with whom they are negotiating on behalf of their members.

3. A method of determining the terms and conditions of employment which is based upon the consent of the interested parties and which takes account of the factors that are peculiar to each branch of production must be developed (22, p. 46).

These elements indicate that viable union-management relationships require both legal structures and voluntary interpersonal persuasion to make collective professional bargaining an effective vehicle for communication. Decree Number 21, 1976 of the Nigerian Labor Law provides a legal structure (see Appendix A) which compels union and management to negotiate. However, it also limits interpersonal persuasion by establishing the following:

1. Procedure for Settling Trade Disputes,

2. The National Industrial Court,

3. Arbitration Tribunals, and

4. Board of Inquiry.
Review of the Literature on Negotiator Behaviors and Consequences of That Behavior

During the negotiations process, it is common that certain kinds of situations such as formality and zero-sum games exist, thereby forcing the two opposing groups to adopt either cooperative or competitive methods to outplay one another. Where the players in a group try to benefit themselves at the expense of the other players in the opposing group, negotiations becomes a competitive win-lose game. This means that the total benefits occurring to the players will be less because of the competitive nature of the environment in which both groups were engaged in negotiations. Schmitt states that

the choice is between cooperation where everyone receives a similar reward when a performance standard has been met and competition where only the best performers are rewarded. In a variety of settings, most often academic classrooms or laboratory problem-solving groups, these conditions have been compared in an experimental research tradition which extends over half a century (27, p. 649).

It is further stated that

Cooperative and competitive contingencies differ in whether they motivate the behaviors needed for successful task performance when means interdependence is high. Under cooperative contingencies all persons gain when task activities are organized objectively and executed efficiently. There should thus be a willingness to divide responsibilities and accept assistance, processes which Deutsch has termed substitutability and inductibility, respectively (27, p. 652).
It is also stated that

Under competitive contingencies the only reason to collaborate with others is to gain advantage over them. Competitors should thus respond to offers of collaboration or assistance with suspiciousness and mistrust, because opponents may sabotage activities providing misleading information, or gain more from any collaboration. Hence, competitors should prefer to work singly even if their responses are inefficient or redundant (27, p. 652).

Schmitt concludes that

In light of these contingency effects, cooperation but not competition should lead to effective performance when task means interdependence is high. When means interdependence is low, performance will depend on the motivation level induced by the contingencies themselves. Competition may have the advantage in this respect. In short run, competition provides the opportunity for relative gain--difference between own and opponent's rewards--which may function as a reinforcer along with the reward itself. In addition, competition might elicit fear of defeat and failure which could produce increased drive (27, pp. 652-653).

In Nigeria when there is an impasse between union and management, the contract immediately goes to the binding arbitration (in this case, the Nigerian Industrial Arbitration Board) where a decision is reached to resolve the conflict. During the process of bargaining, the different participants' behaviors are determined basically through the exhibited level of aspiration and their alternative outcomes (33, pp. 157-180). Impasses frequently involve face saving and behaviors and usually require the forced lowering of the level of aspiration of the bargainers as suggested by a mediator (8, p. 5). By so doing, either the management (employer) or labor (employee) or both have been
forced to avoid prolonging the problem and continuing a 
confrontation which can last for an undetermined period of 
time.

Peterson and Tracy have identified four distinct 
bargaining processes or models as follows:

1. Distributive bargaining was directed toward 
   maximizing one side's share of the fixed bene-
   fits.

2. Integrative bargaining attempted to solve 
   problems and increase mutual benefits.

3. Attitudinal structuring was oriented toward 
   obtaining a desired working relationship with the 
   other party.

4. Intraorganizational bargaining attempted to 
   influence teammates and constituents to accept 
   the compromises necessary for successful negotia-
   tions (20, p. 35).

Because of the competitiveness and cooperativeness 
involved in negotiations, the attitudes exhibited by the 
participants are important. It is considered that change 
in attitude is a major factor when there is room for 
compromise during the negotiations process. The 
inTEGRATIVE bargaining model requires that both parties 
hold off on making firm commitments until discussions on 
possible causes of a problem and possible solutions are 
determined. Therefore, the main goal of integrative 
bargaining is to identify common interests and find 
solutions to problems facing both parties. Walton and
Mckersie have been credited for developing the model of integrative bargaining in which they state that

1. ... the parties do not have attitudes which prevent them from fully exploiting the integrative possibilities, but

2. which does not make them lose sight of their primary responsibilities to the separate and distinct interests of their respective principals and the need to preserve the strength of these principal organizations (34, p. 206).

It is posited in this model that, "the participants' attitudes and beliefs toward each other determine the entire spirit of the collective bargaining relationship."

Despite the fact that the significance of attitudes and beliefs in negotiations has been documented, the process of attitude change itself in the process of negotiations and its consequences has not. Only one study of the process of attitude change in negotiations was found, and it failed to achieve its purposes. This is the study by Douglas in 1962 (24, p. 381). The findings from this study include:

1. The study only begins at mediation but did not measure attitudes and communication pattern in negotiations prior to an intervention of a mediator.

2. The study did not measure attitude change in negotiations except at the beginning and the end of negotiations.
3. The attitudes and behaviors of the sample were inadequate because of inappropriate representation of the attitudes and behaviors of typical union or corporate representatives (24, p. 382).

In a nationwide survey conducted by Peterson and Tracy, questionnaires were administered to union and management negotiators prior to and after negotiating sessions. The study focused on problem-solving in bargaining and found that it is virtually impossible to study problem solving behaviors in negotiation outside of the negotiations sessions. The questionnaires were distributed to negotiators (fifty-one labor, ninety-seven management). The questionnaires were designed to measure the bargaining behaviors which occur within each of Walton and McKersie models. Their findings included the following.

First, it is virtually impossible to obtain objective information on most of the dimensions, for example success in distributive bargaining.

Second, as a decision making process collective bargaining is dependent on the perceptions of the negotiators. Attitudinal structuring is specifically aimed at perceptions.

Third, in contract negotiations objective knowledge virtually never becomes complete in the sense that the true nature of all factors is accurately understood by both sides. Thus, it is only necessary to change the other’s perceptions in order to alter his bargaining position. This is not to say that parties do not influence each other through more basic changes in the conditions in the underlying utilities and probabilities. The point is that the purpose of changing the actual conditions will be to influence opponent’s perception. If the latter does not occur, then the
tactical operation has not been successful (20, p. 60).

Peterson and Tracy state that it is only when there is an acceptable utility payoff to both players in negotiations that there is no conflict of interest and disagreement can be eliminated, but if the opposite is the case, it means that problems remain to be resolved.

The situation faced by bargainers can be better understood when the concepts of zones of acceptance and disagreement are explained. The zone of disagreement in a bargaining situation is when the conflict of interest arises in which a set of feasible expected utility payoffs to both players is unacceptable. When this point is reached by the negotiators, it is called either a zone of disagreement or a disagreement point. Zone of acceptance or point of agreement is defined as when the set of feasible expected utility payoffs overlap so that any one of the points can in time be accepted by both players (16, p. 331).

It appears to be established that

The degree of personal pro-labor and/or pro-management attitude orientation of a negotiator is directly related to his tendency or need to negotiate in a competitive, win-lose manner (10, p. 22).

It also appears that

Competitive, win-lose behaviors in negotiation situations tend to produce less desirable outputs or products than do less competitive negotiating behaviors (10, p. 22).
It seems clear that there are both positive and negative outcomes which can occur in negotiation sessions. Such outcomes are both behavioral and substantive in collective bargaining. Outputs which can be either negative or positive include areas such as agreements attained, time required to reach agreements, terms of agreement, verbal behavior shown during negotiation sessions, satisfaction attained and the focus of the sessions. These outputs are described as follows:

1. The attainment of agreement through negotiation is more desirable than is failure to attain agreement.

2. Agreement which is attained within a reasonable length of time especially the time formally set aside for negotiation is more desirable than agreement which requires an extended time period to attain. The logic here is that negotiations are costly in terms of money, emotional stress, and time spent away from other duties.

3. Substantive outcomes of negotiation which are fair to both parties are more desirable than outcomes which favor one party over the other.

4. Negotiations which create a feeling of satisfaction within the participants representing both parties are more desirable than are negotiations
which do not produce such feelings or which only create satisfaction with the negotiations for one of the parties. "Satisfaction" in this context refers to both the substantive outcomes of, and the interpersonal interactions within, the negotiation sessions.

5. Objective or focused, problem-solving, task oriented behaviors in negotiations are more desirable than are subjective emotional, self-oriented-need satisfying behaviors (10, p. 23).

Whether such outcomes are positive or negative in any particular bargaining situation depends upon a variety of factors, but it seems clear that the one most important factor is the attitude of the negotiators toward each other. However, collective bargaining by its very nature, sets up a competitive, us-them, situation as described in the following literature.

A. Collective bargaining introduced a process of joint determination of the rules under which the employer-employee relationship would be governed. The bargainer under this circumstance ought to be faithful only to the camp to which the bargainer belongs. The bargainer is faced with a situation that negotiation is done conscientiously through a communicating vehicle to settle differences over terms that may arise in the process of problem-solving. Therefore, each bargainer has a high orientation toward the side to which the bargainer is allied, thus making it impossible for a positive mutual identification (22, p. 159).
B. The bargaining process in which the participant is involved "requires a sense of feel for what is going on. The sense of feel is acquired through involvement in the process of collective bargaining, not in just reading about it" (21, p. 297). In the process of getting allied with one's side, the high orientation of the participant to the side the bargainer supports makes him impregnable to ideas and beliefs from the "enemy's camp" (10, p. 25).

C. Persons in the negotiating groups can be put into two different camps--cooperators and competitors. Competitors consider others to be competitive and act competitively themselves. Cooperators allow for both competitors and cooperators in the population. They will cooperate with someone they perceive to be acting cooperatively, but they will be competitive when the competitive actions of the other demand it in order to avoid exploitation. Thus, two competitors will produce bilateral competition, but the interaction of a cooperator and a competitor will also produce bilateral competition--the actions of the former being "assimilated" to the actions of the latter. Two cooperators interacting will perceive each other's actions as cooperative and each will cooperate (14, p. 521).

D. It is very rare that in group situations that a participant will change positions. It becomes almost impossible for an individual to defect from one group to another because of two reasons: a) lack of thrust and support from his colleagues and b) having to start a new base of thought and analysis of new information in a totally new way (10, p. 25).

Sherif and Sherif describe the impact of competition versus cooperation in groups as follows.

1. Within the Competing Group
   a. Each group becomes closely knit and elicits greater loyalty from its members; members close ranks and bury some of their internal differences.
   b. Group climate changes from informal, casual, playful to work- and
task-oriented; concern for members' psychological needs declines while concern for task accomplishment increases.

c. Leadership patterns tend to change from more democratic toward more autocratic; the group becomes more willing to tolerate autocratic leadership.

d. Each group becomes more highly structured and organized.

e. Each group demands more loyalty and conformity from its members in order to be able to present a 'solid front' (26, p. 97).

2. Between the Competing Groups

a. Each group begins to see the other group as the enemy, rather than merely a neutral object.

b. Each group begins to experience distortions of perception--it tends to perceive only the best parts of itself, denying its weaknesses, and tends to perceive only the worst parts of the other group, denying its strengths, each group is likely to develop a negative stereotype of the other. ("They don't play fair like we do.")

c. Hostility toward the other group increases while interaction and communication with the other group decrease; thus it becomes easier to maintain negative stereotypes and more difficult to correct perceptual distortions.

d. If the groups are forced into interaction--for example, if they are forced to listen to representatives plead its own and the others' cause in reference to some task, each group is likely to listen more closely to their own representative and not to listen to the representative of the other group, except to find fault with his presentation; in other words, group members tend to listen only for that which
supports their own position and stereotypes (26, p. 97).

The literature supports the negative outcomes likely to result from competitive behaviors in bargaining. It also supports the positive outcomes likely to occur as a result of cooperative behaviors. There are many advantages that accrue within a group or between groups when the idea of cooperation is applied instead of the competitive approach during either problem solving or decision making. There were very early studies done in this area such as Deutsch, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Cooperation and Competition upon Group Process." Thibaut and Kelley also noted in their studies the significance of within and between group cooperation.

Deutsch conducted one of the early studies which supports cooperative behavior as against those who exhibit competitive behavior. The results of his findings include:

a. More coordination of efforts,
b. More diversity in amount of contribution per member,
c. More sub-division of activity,
d. More achievement pressure,
e. More communication to another,
f. More attentiveness to fellow members
g. More mutual comprehension of communication,
h. Greater orientation and orderliness,
i. Greater productivity per unit time,

j. Better quality of product and discussion,

k. More friendliness during discussions,

l. More favorable evaluation of the group and its products,

m. More behavior directed toward helping the group improve its functioning,

n. Greater feeling of being liked by fellow members, and

o. Greater feeling of obligation and desire to win the respect of others (5, pp. 231-232).

Thibaut and Kelly assumed that the existence of the group is based upon the participation and satisfaction of individuals in the group. The authors' findings (30, pp. 283-292) indicate:

1. The two persons act in an agreed-on, coordinated manner, in the interest of providing each one with better outcomes than are available by individual action. (Value transformations serve the important purpose of facilitating such agreements, obviating the need for extensive analysis and negotiations. Thus the agreement may be tacit rather than explicit.) (30, p. 283)

2. Each person through interaction emits behavior in each other's presence.

3. Products are created for each other.

4. Communication with each other is present.

5. Actions exhibited by each person affect the other.

6. There are outcomes of interaction in form of reward or costs. Reward acts as a drive that
either reduces or fulfills the interaction while costs can be anything that inhibits the performance of a behavior sequence (30, pp. 283-292).

Schein identified the following as forces that tend to make group members cooperative instead of competitive. He stated (25, p. 152) that group cooperation can provide:

1. An outlet for affiliation needs, that is, needs for friendship, support, and love.

2. A means of developing, enhancing or confirming a sense of identity and maintaining self-esteem. Through group membership a person can develop or confirm some feelings or who he is, can gain some status, and thereby enhance his sense of self-esteem.

3. A means of establishing and testing reality. Through developing consensus among group members, uncertain parts of the social environment can be made "real" and stable, as when several workers agree that their boss is a slave-driver or when, by mutual agreement, they establish the reality that if they work harder, management will cut the piece of whatever they are making. Each person can validate his own perceptions and feelings best by checking them with others.

4. A means of increasing security and a sense of power in coping with a common and powerful enemy or threat. Through banding together into bargaining units such as unions or through agreeing to restrict output, groups can offset some of the power that management has over members individually.

5. A means of getting some job done that members need to have done, such as gathering information or helping out when some are sick or tired, or avoiding boredom and providing stimulation to one another, or bringing new members of the organization quickly into the informal structure.
Lindskold, Walters, and Koutsourais concluded that "competitors are interested in their absolute as well as relative standing in a relationship and that, when they can safely do so, they will join in mutually beneficial cooperation" (14, p. 530). It seems that once a person identifies with one side his orientation, beliefs, and opinions reflect that particular group and may not be subject to change. However, Kelley and Stahelski may have overstated the problem when they contend that 'competitors are ordinarily inflexible--remaining competitive even in interaction with cooperator' (14, p. 530). A fact that must not be overlooked during conflict management is the effect of the flow of information through an open exchange communication between competitors which can lead to cooperation.

In discussing group behavior Steiner points out that "group productivity depends upon three classes of variables: task demands, resources, and process" (28, p. 6). The three variables are described as follows.

First, task demands are when certain requirements are forced upon the group either through the task itself or by the rules under which the performance of the task is being carried out. Similarly, the group task normally has particular demands that can be identified and described even if the demands are not always practicable.
Second, resources include the task relevant abilities, knowledge, skills, and all the tools possessed by the members of the group. It is, therefore, possible to include in a group these resources that may be possessed by either a single group member or by different members.

Third, process variables can be regarded as the actions which are taken specifically by the group. Steiner stated that the process includes not only all actions that are regarded as directly relevant to the task but also all those intrapersonal and interpersonal actions by which people transform their resources into a product, and all those nonproductive actions that are promoted by frustration, competing motivations, or inadequate understanding. In short, process consists of the individual or collective actions of the people who have been assigned a task (28, p. 8).

In sum, each side in bargaining, that is union and management, holds views and opinions that quite naturally make them negotiate in favor of their own side. Consequently, the attachment of bargainers to views and opinions of their side makes communication difficult and each side finds it extremely difficult to accept and appreciate the views of the other side. This situation is well described by Deutsch’s original distinction between cooperation and competition:

Cooperative social situation was defined as one in which the goal regions of individual group members are such that if a goal region is entered by any given individual, all other group members are facilitated in reaching their respective regions. In other words, in competitive situations, goal achievement by one group
member to some extent hinders the goal achievement of other members, whereas in a cooperative situation, goal achievement by one member facilitates goal achievement by all others. A competitive situation clearly cannot exist if group goals are homogeneous; it is theoretically possible for a cooperative situation to exist without homogeneous group goals, but this situation is relatively rare (5, p. 324).

Review of the Literature Relating to Simulation Methodology

The use of simulation was necessary in this study because of the complexity and closed nature of interaction between the parties during collective negotiations. The use of simulation permitted the complex analysis of the real world negotiations sessions. The following literature citations describe and justify the use of simulation as a research technique in the arena of collective bargaining.

Where the variables in the study are many, it is almost practically impossible to have thorough control of all the variables. Campbell and Stanley express the difficulty in controlling extraneous variables in experimental research but also state that it is possible to eliminate these difficulties under quasi-experimental conditions (4, p. 50). They add that there are the systematic selection factors involved in the natural assemblage of the group. These factors can be expected both to have main effects and to interact with history, maturation, practice effects, etc. Were a fully controlled experiment to have been organized in this way, each person would have been assigned to each group independently and at random, and this source of both main and interaction effects would have been removed, at least to the extent of
sampling error. It is characteristic of the quasi-experiment that the counterbalancing was introduced to provide a kind of equation just because such random assignment was not possible. A second possible source of effects confounded with groups is that associated with specific sequences of treatments. Were all replications in a true experiment to have followed the same Latin square, this source of main and interaction effects would also have been present (4, p. 51).

Stanley and Campbell conclude that in quasi-experiments there is a strong consistency through the internal replications of the experiment (4, p. 52).

There are other reasons that suggest the application of simulation techniques in research. The reasons advanced by Johnson (13, pp. 5-10) include the reflection of the same pattern all through the experiment, the nature of showing accurately what it tends to represent in reality with minimal control, and the allowance of the measurements of many variables.

Geist (7, p. 3) supports the use of simulation because it is a productive "educational tool" useful in introductory organizational courses, the productivity of the tool is reflected in students applying it in the areas of decision-making authority and communication, and the productivity is also reflected in providing skills for analyzing, enacting, and discussing bargaining situations.
Lloyd describes the advantages of instructional simulation techniques.

1. Insights into industrial relations were better developed by role playing in collective bargaining than by the more traditional lecture-discussion or case-study classroom approach to the subject.

2. Role playing contributed to the development of a more perceptive level of critical thinking about industrial relations.

3. Role playing can be defined as an action-spontaneity procedure which takes place under contrived circumstances. It has three general classes of purpose:

   a. Diagnostic—to provide better understanding of the role players by seeing and hearing them in action,

   b. Informative—to inform the auditors and spectators how certain roles should be filled, and

   c. To provide the role players with knowledge and skills by permitting them to experience a near-vertical situation and to understand themselves and their behavior better through feed-back information (15, p. 104).

A number of specific studies also support the use of simulation as a research technique. In a study conducted by Sandver, students from two adult education classes were used as subjects. The fifty-six subjects were selected so that sixteen represented management while in the second group forty local union officers represented labor. Each group used a revised version of Kornhauser's Union-Management Attitudinal Scale to enable an assessment of prenegotiation attitudes toward both labor and management.
The groups were randomly assigned to four-person teams and were required to have engaged in eight hours of labor-management simulated negotiation. The findings from the research indicated that any attitudinal change tended to be small and probably short term (24, pp. 381-389). Sandver states, that in actual simulation negotiations, collecting attitudinal data from the parties are important both at the beginning and conclusion of the bargaining sessions.

Stoddard used simulation as an experimental method and states that

Milfort is a simulation that is designed to provide an opportunity to practice economic decision making and to examine the elements of opportunity costs and tradeoffs involved in labor negotiations. It also allows students, through interaction, to become aware of some dynamics of negotiations between labor and management (29, p. 212).

Gearon's use of simulation was done by providing students with information about labor-management relations. The author used mainly students to play the roles of citizens of Mount Van Buren in the capacity either of leaders or members of one of four groups or as one of four television reporters. The four groups were set up around the room in a session making a joint attempt to find a solution to labor problems which were threatening the economic security of Mount Van Buren. He does not report the outcome of the negotiations but indicates that neither side was willing to communicate (6, pp. 514-515).
A simulation study by Geist was carried out as follows. Four to five class period units were devoted to it. It had six different procedures. The students first read and discussed a chapter on negotiating groups. Later, the students read the bargaining case and chose from a list of eight, three best options for handling the case. Based on their choices, students were then divided into the labor or management group. The two groups, therefore, participated in preliminary caucuses to arrive at one option as a whole. Also, the two groups presented and negotiated their positions in a bargaining session. Finally, students discussed the bargaining experience during a debriefing class period. Geist concluded that simulation can be useful because of the application and integration of Barnard's concepts as they relate to organizational communication. This simulation approach is seen as not only an emphasis on theory alone but also stressing the need for practice of skills (7, p. 8).

Trifon and Landau used another simulation approach which is bargaining between an employer and an employee through "comparing a claim and offer at fixed intervals" (31, p. 960). The article by the two authors (31, pp. 960-970) reflects essentially that parties involved in negotiation should understand reaction functions that make provisions for both the past and the future. The parties concerned also need to be familiar with the reaction
functions change from one step to the other. The authors further explained that simulation relating to the bargaining process creates better understanding and allows accurate prediction to guide in policy involving decisions. Their research also focused on numerical simulation of wage conflicts and sensitivity test of behavioral parameters (31, p. 962).

Ross focused on the format of game theory to see if the format is applicable to collective bargaining in educational institutions. He examined Horvat's "Feedback in the Negotiation Game" (9, 1967) and Allen's proposed application of game theory to collective bargaining (3, 1956) through a hypothetical model that was not tested. The procedure used by Ross was to involve eighty-four prominent school administrators, school board members, and teachers to take part in an experiment at two workshops and one seminar at the University of Iowa. The subjects were randomly assigned to the various teams, and the teams were engaged in collective bargaining through simulation. The results of the simulation and the optimum solution of game theory were scored by using the guidelines as provided by the UCEA Negotiations Game (11, 1965). It was established that Horvat's simulation as used by Ross in this study is authentic and practical to the real world (23, pp. 1-4).
Therefore, the use of simulation in this study has stood repeated testing by other researchers and it has been found relevant to collective bargaining research.
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CHAPTER III
THE PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, the design of the study and the conceptual model used in the study are presented. The research instruments are described. The procedures for selection of the subjects involved in the simulated negotiation are described.

Design of the Study

Generally, professional negotiation is a means of letting the employer and employees resolve employment problems through open dialogue and communications. However, conducting direct experimental research in actual face-to-face bargaining situations is very difficult, if not impossible. It is only through simulation that all the relevant variables can be controlled. It is believed that simulation of face-to-face bargaining gets as close to true experimentation as real world conditions allow. It is important to describe carefully the advantages and limitations of the quasi-experimental research method. The quasi-experimental method through simulation creates a model of the real world system. The model should portray vividly and closely the real or actual world which it represents. Clearly, the more thoroughly the model
represents reality, the more accurate and valid will be the research findings.

The model used in this study to simulate the negotiations process is presented in Figure 1. This model permits the writer to deal with the basic question of the study: "What is the relationship, if any, between the pro-labor and/or pro-management attitude orientations of participants in collective bargaining and the behavioral and substantive outputs form negotiations in which they are involved?" To explicate further the design of the study detailed information on the instruments, methods, and the procedures of the study are described.

The Negotiation System Model

In an attempt to make explicit the complex study, it is described in three areas (Figure 1). The areas are:

A. System Inputs—Subjects Matching-Manipulation of Inputs in Terms of the Independent Variable,

B. Interaction in a Controlled and Standardized Experimental Setting, and

C. Measurable System Outputs--The Dependent Variables.

Experimental System Inputs: Step A

A total of sixty-nine subjects was used for this study. Thirty-four of the subjects represented management
A. System Inputs
Subjects Matching-Manipulation of Inputs in Terms of the Independent Variable

B. Interaction in a Controlled and Standardized Experimental Setting (The Negotiations Game)

C. Measurable System Outputs--The Dependent Variables

Union Negotiators, drawn from final year undergraduate students in education (with the exception of students of educational administration). The labor-management attitude orientation of 15 groups, 2-3 man teams is varied by the use of the results of an attitude questionnaire--thus, the independent variable is manipulated.

Management Negotiators, drawn from final year undergraduate students from the field of educational administration only. The labor-management orientation of 15 groups, 2-3 man teams is varied by the use of an attitude questionnaire--thus, the independent variable is manipulated.

The negotiating teams are matched in terms of polarity of their labor-management attitude orientations. Such matched teams (or groups) participate in a simulated negotiation situation (game).

The selected, matched teams meet and negotiate in a standardized controlled situation (the negotiations game) in which dynamic interpersonal and intergroup behaviors occur. Seven issues for active negotiation are presented for resolution with a 90-minute time period.

1. Time required to reach agreement on the 7 issues.
2. The "terms" of the agreement on the 7 issues.
3. Verbal behaviors exhibited during the negotiations, e.g., task-oriented, problem-solving, behaviors as opposed to emotional self-oriented need satisfying behaviors.
4. Satisfaction of the negotiators with both the processes within the negotiation sessions and the substantive outcomes from the sessions.

Fig. 1--The negotiation system model

(administrators) and thirty-five represented labor union (teachers) in the simulation sessions. All the subjects for this study were final year undergraduates of education in the University of Benin, the College of Education, Abraka campus. All subjects have had negotiations experience.

The subjects in this study were required to have had experience in negotiations. The subjects of this study consisted of a clear-cut cross-cultural reflection of Nigeria. The location of the institution, the University of Benin, the College of Education, Abraka campus, from which the sample of the study was drawn, evenly depicts the different parts of the country. As a result, Yorubas in the Western States (Ogun, Ondo, Oyo) and Lagos State are linked with the Edos and Owans of Bendel State. The Northern States such as Kwara, Niger, Benue, Plateau, and Gongola represent the Hausas who are linked with the Igbirras and Estakos of Bendel State. Ibos are represented by the ties of Ika Ibos and the Anioma area to the people of the Eastern States (Anambra and Imo) while the Rivers link with the Ijaws in the Delta part of Bendel State. Finally, there were also subjects who reflected Cross River whose cultural and social traditions are in close relationship with Itsekiris and other minorities in Bendel State. This cultural and ethnic ties explanation has been relevant
because students who are subjects in this study have a true reflection of Nigeria since almost all ethnic groups are represented in Bendel State where the University of Benin, the College of Education, Abraka campus is located.

The screening and matching of negotiations teams were accomplished through the use of the background information questionnaire (Appendix B) and the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire (LMAQ) (Appendix C). Subjects of the same years of experience in their fields and exposure to negotiations as reflected in their responses to the questionnaire were matched for the simulation in the experimental negotiation sessions. Both the background information questionnaire and the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire were administered to 251 students to enable the screening and selection of the sixty-nine subjects required for the quasi-experiment.

The Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire measures the labor-management attitude orientations of the negotiators which in this study is the independent variable. The scores by the subjects on the attitude questionnaire ranged from 169 (which is regarded as a very high labor orientation) to seventy-six (which is regarded as a very high orientation toward management). The directions for scoring the questionnaire are found in Appendix C. The following scale, developed by Hepler (5)
and modified by Campbell (3), was used to convert the numerical scores into verbal descriptions of attitude orientation. The first three scales reflect the attitude orientation of management.

76 - 124 indicates high identification with management (HiM)
125 - 136 indicates moderate identification with management (MoM)
137 - 155 indicates neutrality in identification with either management or labor (LoM)

The next scale reflects the attitude of labor.

112 - 134 indicates low identification with labor (LoL)
135 - 150 indicates moderate identification with labor (MoL)
152 - 169 indicates high identification with labor (HiL)

These symbols, HiM, MoM, LoM, LoL, MoL, and HiL, are used in this study when reference is to be made to attitude orientations.

The main purpose of the study is to measure the different outcomes and consequences that stem from varying degrees of attitude orientation polarity that may exist in the professional negotiation process in Nigerian public education. Thus, the independent variable was manipulated to establish bargaining teams with varying degrees of polarity in attitude orientations.
Six combinations of attitude orientation polarity are used in this study.

**Input Combination #1** establishes a very high polarization of labor-management attitude orientations. All members of management teams possess highly pro-management attitude orientation (HiM). All the members of the teachers' union (labor) negotiation team possess highly pro-labor attitude orientations (HiL).

**Input Combination #2** establishes high polarization of labor-management attitude orientations. One member of the management negotiation team possesses a high pro-management attitude orientation (HiM), while the other member possesses a moderately pro-management attitude orientation (MoM). One member of the teachers' union (labor) negotiation team possesses a high pro-labor attitude orientation (HiL), while the other member possesses a moderately pro-labor attitude orientation (MoL).

**Input Combination #3** establishes a moderate polarization of labor-management attitude orientations. Members of the management negotiating team possess a moderate pro-management attitude orientation (MoM) while members of the teachers' union...
(labor) negotiation team possess a moderate pro-labor attitude orientation (MoL).

**Input Combination #4** establishes a low polarization of labor-management attitude orientations. This combination reflects that both members of the management negotiating team possess low pro-management attitude orientations (LoM). The members of the teachers' union negotiating team possess low pro-labor attitude orientations (LoL).

**Input Combination #5** establishes a "management favorable" polarization of labor-management attitude orientations. This combination reflects that members of the management negotiating team possess high pro-management attitude orientations (HiM). Members of the teachers' union (labor) negotiating team possess a low pro-labor attitude orientations (LoL).

**Input Combination #6** establishes a "Union Favorable" polarization of labor-management attitude orientations. This combination reflects that members of the management negotiating team possess a low pro-management attitude orientation (LoM). The members of the teachers' union negotiating team possess high pro-labor attitude orientation (HiL).
A summary of these descriptions dealing with negotiating group input combinations is presented in Figure 2 as the input variations of independent variables for the study.

Fifteen groups were involved in this study. In each of the fifteen groups, each subject acted as one member of a two or three man negotiating team. Each group consisted of four or five negotiators and each actively negotiated for ninety minutes.

Instrumentation for Selection of Subjects and Manipulation of the Independent Variable

According to Al-Jafary, one of the most difficult tasks which researchers face generally in social sciences is the selection of an instrument which is both valid and reliable (1, p. 72). The instruments used for this study were originally designed, tested, and standardized by Horvat (6, 1968) at the time he was a research assistant with the University Council for Educational Administration at the Ohio State University, Columbus, in 1966. The instruments are both valid and reliable. Validity is how well the contents of the test measure what it purports to measure. In establishing content validity for the Horvat study, the instruments were used in seventy universities across the United States.

A final question which must be considered in this section is that of the validity and reliability of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination number</th>
<th>Member 1</th>
<th>Member 2</th>
<th>Member 1</th>
<th>Member 2</th>
<th>Degree of Polarization of Attitude Orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HiM</td>
<td>HiM</td>
<td>HiL</td>
<td>HiL</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HiM</td>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>HiL</td>
<td>MoL</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>MoM</td>
<td>HiL</td>
<td>MoL</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LoM</td>
<td>LoM</td>
<td>LoL</td>
<td>LoL</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HiM</td>
<td>HiM</td>
<td>LoL</td>
<td>LoL</td>
<td>Management Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LoM</td>
<td>LoM</td>
<td>HiL</td>
<td>HiL</td>
<td>Union Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2--The variations of the independent variable: The input combinations
"Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire." The following extract is taken directly from Horvat's (6, pp. 65-67) dissertation.

This questionnaire was developed, and first used, by Hepler (5) in order to measure the deep-seated, long-range, attitudes and beliefs of individuals toward labor and management. In designing the questionnaire, 118 statements of issues upon which labor oriented and management oriented individuals might disagree were suggested by a labor-management arbitrator, a professor of labor economics, a professor of industrial management, a plant superintendent, the owner of a small industrial concern, the president of a local affiliate of the CIO, and the director of education for a district CIO headquarters. Answers to these question were limited to those on a 5 point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The answers to the 118 questions were keyed and then administered to 120 students of freshman psychology at The Ohio State University. The scores from this test formed a normal distribution and the median score was, coincidentally, the same score that a middle-of-the-road answer on each item would produce.

The above distribution was subjected to an item analysis to determine the items which discriminated between high orientation toward labor or management and more moderate orientations. The 36 items showing the greatest values of discrimination were chosen to be the final form of the questionnaire in Hepler's (5) study.

This form was then administered to 2 groups which were assumed to hold positions on the opposite ends of the labor-management attitude orientation continuum. One group was comprised of business and professional men who were members of a local Junior Chamber of Commerce. The other group was made up of union leaders and union shop stewards. Out of a possible scoring range of 36 to 180, the "Jay Cees" had an average score of 91.46 with a standard deviation of 20.3. The union people had an average score of 138.42 with a standard deviation of 26.84. Using the procedure described by Edwards (4, pp. 167-168) for computing t groups of different N's, the t was found to be 6.41 which is significant beyond the .01 level.
The reliability of the questionnaire was determined by the test-retest method. The questionnaire was re-administered to 50 persons 10 weeks after the first administration. The reliability was found to be .86.

The questionnaire developed by Hepler (5) was revised slightly by Campbell (3) in his 1960 study. Campbell used 39 of Hepler's (5) original items and added 18 new items. He administered his revised scale to 114 students enrolled in university introductory sociology courses. Discrimination indices were computed for each of his items following the technique used by Sisson (11, pp. 365-382). Forty-two of Campbell's (3) items showed adequate discrimination and are included in his final form of the questionnaire. All but 3 of the 42 items correlated .30 or higher with total scores when the questionnaire was administered to another sample. The internal consistency of Campbell's (3) questionnaire was computed using the Kuder-Richardson (10, pp. 151-160) formula, and the coefficient of reliability was found to be .89.

With the exception that 2 of the 3 items found to correlate less than .30 with the total sample score were eliminated, the questionnaire used in the present study is identical to that used by Campbell (3).

The questionnaire is presented in Appendix C.

The instruments of the Horvat study were used in the present study, but the writer was forced to make changes in this study to suit the cultural environment of this study. Terms reflecting the economic and the labor market were basically similar, but some slight changes were made. For example, question 8 of the questionnaire, "Would you, under any circumstances, voluntarily become a member of a teachers' union? ( ) Yes, ( ) No," was deleted because it did not reflect or apply to Nigeria since NUT is the only recognized and known organization representing
teachers at the level on which this study is focused. Also, automatically once a teacher is employed in the Nigerian school system, he automatically belongs to the union.

Additionally, in the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire, the name of John L. Lewis was struck and replaced by Michael Imoudu, a prominent and important personality in the Nigerian Labor Congress. The words AFL-CIO were changed to NUTC which is the Nigerian Union of Trade Congress.

In an attempt to verify both the face and content validity of the modified instrument (LMAQ) for Nigeria, a preliminary study utilized two professionals—one from the University of Benin and another from the Ministry of Labor. These professionals were given the copies of the instrument with specific instructions which gave them the latitude to offer suggestions concerning the design and the validity of the instrument. The respondees offered no major changes; as a result there were no further modifications made.

After the face validity of the instrument had been established, the next step was to ascertain if the instrument was reliable. By reliability, Isaac and Michael meant "the accuracy (consistency and stability) of the
measurement by a test. Any direct measurement of such consistency obviously calls for a comparison between at least two measurements" (9, p. 125). The type of reliability required for this instrument is called a test-retest reliability. The pre-session and post-session questionnaires were administered to five professionals and after five days, the same questionnaires were re-administered to the same group of professionals. The scores obtained from the two administrations of the test or questionnaires were correlated to enable the writer to get the coefficient of reliability of .86.

The Negotiations Game: Step B

The negotiation simulation materials used in the study were designed to follow the pattern used in Horvat's study. Horvat's simulations materials have been published by Charles Merrill Company (8, 1968) and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) (7, 1974).

The simulation materials (Appendix D) include (1) letters of appointment to management and labor union negotiation teams, (2) background information setting the stage for the negotiations, (3) school system statistics, (4) seven issues for bargaining, and (5) confidential letters to negotiators which were specially designed for management and labor, respectively. All names, issues
addressed, and localities mentioned were changed to reflect the Nigerian environment.

The materials were modified to reflect the cultural setting of Nigeria where this study was conducted. The materials were carefully reviewed by the panel of five consisting of three labor professionals and two university professors and were found to be appropriate for conditions experienced by labor and management in Nigeria.

The writer has included a complete sample of the materials provided the subjects during the experimental simulation (Appendix D). The simulation materials included:

I. Letters of appointment to negotiation teams
   A. A letter from the Ministry of Education appointing the subject as a negotiator for the management. The letter was only given to and seen by subjects representing management.
   B. A letter from the president of the Nigerian Union of Teachers appointing the subject as a negotiator for labor union--teachers. The letter was only given to and seen by subjects representing the labor union.

II. Twenty-five pages of background information
   A. The general demographic information about the city in the simulation
   B. History of the growth of the teachers' union and a summary of an election held
   C. School system statistics including data on enrollments, professional staff, salaries, and other financial data
   D. A survey of practices in other similar schools in other local government areas
   E. A copy of the Nigerian Labor Law regarding teacher (labor union)--management negotiation relationships (Appendix A)
III. Formal statements of the seven issues simulated
   A. The nature of the issue
   B. The history of past practices with regard to the issue
   C. Naira cost of the issue if it is agreed to and incorporated into the school system.

IV. Confidential memoranda provided negotiators
   A. To management negotiators the Ministry's "general position" on the issues is given as a short statement regarding "good faith" in negotiating.
   B. To labor union negotiators the union's "general position" on the issues is given as a short statement regarding "good faith" bargaining.

V. Seven "form" sheets upon which the negotiated agreements are to be recorded

The writer granted enough time to the negotiators to read and understand the materials mentioned before a standardized procedure of instructions about the negotiations was presented to the negotiators. The time limit for the subjects to negotiate was ninety minutes. Each of the fifteen negotiation sessions was tape-recorded in its entirety and used for the analysis.

**Measurable Outputs--The Dependent Variables: Step C**

From the negotiation sessions, four dependent variables (outputs) were measured:

1. Time required to reach agreement.

The time required during the negotiation process was considered a key element because the time required to complete negotiations is usually a critical factor in real
world negotiations. It was assumed that it would not be an easy task to resolve all seven issues during the negotiation sessions, and that not all problems would be resolved in the ninety-minute negotiation simulation sessions. The time element was, therefore, measured in terms of average time per issue. It was anticipated that it would require more time per issue to resolve issues for highly polarized groups than for less highly polarized groups.

2. The terms of the agreement on the issue.

In an attempt to measure "who won" in the negotiations, a reasonable "going rate" was established so that it could be seen how far the agreements deviated from this position. Positive and negative deviation values were respectively assigned to favor union and management. The negative values were shown as the magnitude of deviation values which were assigned to positions that favored management while positive values were assigned to positions that favored the union (NUT) (Appendix E).

3. Verbal behavior exhibited during negotiation sessions.

The Bales Verbal Technique (Appendix F) has been used to analyze the verbal interactions of the negotiators. It is divided into twelve categories and four main problem areas. Essentially, the problem areas are categorized into
social-emotional verbal behaviors that are either positive or negative, and task oriented verbal behaviors that are either positive or negative.

It was hypothesized that the more highly polarized negotiating groups would tend to exhibit more social-emotional oriented behaviors and less task-oriented behaviors than less highly polarized negotiating groups. To enable this hypothesis to be tested, each of the fifteen negotiation sessions was tape-recorded in its entirety. The verbal interactions shown in the negotiations were analyzed by using a modified version of the Bales interaction process analysis (2, 1950) (Appendix F). The Bales method "is a way of classifying direct face-to-face interaction as it takes place, act by act, and series of ways of summarizing and analyzing the resulting data so that they will yield useful information." The modified version as presented by the writer scores the interactions every five seconds.

Data that were collected from the negotiation sessions by means of tapes were categorized following Bales' format in order to determine the nature of verbal behaviors of the negotiators. The writer was involved in a self-training program for six months to enable a thorough grasp of the interaction analysis system. In learning the system the writer focused on the methods provided in Bales' book.
entitled *Interaction Process Analysis* (2, 1950) and through practice in scoring the negotiations sessions used in this study. The tapes were analyzed two times, November 23 and December 28, 1985. After an interval of a month, the tapes were rescored. There were no major differences in scoring of the tapes.

Though it was not necessary to measure interscorer reliability, the writer accepted a suggestion of a consultant in the Computing Center at North Texas State University to have two independent scorers run a reliability test on the scores obtained by the writer in analyzing two tapes. The writer provided the format used by Bales as indicated in Appendix E and the tapes to one colleague at North Texas State University in the Department of Adult Education and another at Texas Woman's University in Educational Administration. Neither scorer has had previous training in interaction analysis but they carefully followed the instructions provided. In averaging their interscores and the writer's, reliability was established at .86 in the tests. According to Bales' laboratory reports, interscorer reliability can be as low as .75 and be considered as satisfactory for research purposes.

4. Satisfaction of the negotiators with the negotiations.
The level of satisfaction which an individual negotiator derived from the negotiations was a product of both the specific outcomes, i.e., "Did we win or lose?" and the process itself. Knowledge of the satisfaction of negotiators with the negotiations was important, of course, because satisfaction, or lack of it, will influence behaviors in and conditions of subsequent bargaining contacts. Dissatisfaction with the negotiations can occur as a result of failure to "win" on the issues bargained. Dissatisfaction can also occur as a result of intrateam and interteam behaviors such as intransigence, bitterness, antagonism, argumentativeness, condescension, etc. (6, pp. 77-79).

In this study, the negotiators' satisfaction with the negotiation sessions was measured by means of administration of the Post-Session Questionnaire (Appendix G). This instrument was administered to each negotiator as soon as the simulated negotiation sessions were concluded. Each negotiator was asked to indicate his or her degree of satisfaction with the negotiations in terms of the following factors:

1. Gains earned or won.
2. Feeling of success in terms of team behavior.
3. Success in dealing with intergroup problems.
4. Achievement of expectations.
The items of this questionnaire were scaled so that the negotiators' level of satisfaction could be presented in numerical terms. The questionnaire, a scoring method, and explanatory comments pertaining to the questionnaire are presented in Appendix G. Lastly, there were forms labelled as "Final Terms of Agreement" to be used to record each issue which was resolved by the negotiators.

In summary, this study utilized the following experimental procedures.

A. A standardized professional negotiations situation was created.

B. The negotiators who were participants were assigned roles according to their various premeasured attitudes with regard to labor and management.

C. The participants who were involved in the role playing actively negotiated with each other.

D. The collection of data was based on how the participants behaved in the negotiation process and the outcomes of simulated negotiation sessions.

Procedure for Data Collection

In conducting this study, the writer sought permission from the Provost to contact the students in the Department of Education and the Department of Educational
Administration at the University of Benin, the College of Education, Abraka Campus. The sample consisted of final year undergraduate students who have undergone formal training and who have been through a teachers' institute. This group of students has had exposure to real world professional negotiations which enabled the subjects to respond more specifically and adequately to the questions raised.

The writer left for Nigeria on October 19, 1984, to begin data collection at the University of Benin, College of Education, Abraka Campus. Between October 24 and December 10, 1984, the writer conducted the simulations.

The writer met with the provost and faculty members to explain the intent of the visit to the campus. On November 1, 1984, the Dean of the College of Education and the writer met with the final year undergraduate students to introduce the visiting writer and to explain the purpose of the visit. A total of 251 students voluntarily took the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire.

The writer administered the instrument in person to the prospective students. Of the 251 students, sixty-nine were selected as subjects for the experiment. The Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire (Appendix C) was administered which enabled the writer to select the subjects with the various attitude polarizations that were
necessary to set up the experiment. This screening procedure was necessary to complete replications of the six input conditions which comprised the manipulation of the independent variable.

The administration of the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire was preceded by standard verbal directions which simply explained the fact that the questionnaire was only a preamble for a larger future study. The participants completing the questionnaire were asked to answer all items and to indicate if they were willing to take part in the study. All questionnaires were returned and scored by the writer. At this point, subjects who (a) met the "teacher" experience and "administration" specialization requirements, (b) met the experimental manipulation requirements in terms of attitude orientation, and (c) were willing and able to participate were contacted in person to arrange for their participation in one of the fifteen sessions.

When the subject-negotiators were identified and matched to fit the independent variable manipulation categories, the writer supervised each of the simulated negotiation sessions. This process required visits to the University of Benin, College of Education, Abraka Campus, and it took exactly one month and three weeks to complete.
The writer explained to the selected and matched subjects the purpose of the study as soon as they arrived at the place of the negotiation session. At the completion of the process of explanation, the materials for the simulation (Appendix D) were distributed to the members of the management team and teachers' union team. Enough time was given for the subjects to study the material and to plan their strategies for the negotiation session. During the time the subjects were studying the materials, the two teams were placed in two separate rooms. The writer visited each team to provide a standard set of verbal instructions that prevailed over the negotiation session.

1. The total time allotted for the negotiations is ninety minutes.

2. No spokesman will be directing the negotiations. Any negotiator is permitted to speak at any time.

3. The information given to you in the background materials is to be accepted as fact, but, since "total information" is never available to negotiators in real world situations, contrived facts, figures and ideas are permitted and, indeed, expected.

4. There is no prescribed order in which to deal with the seven issues for negotiation; the order of dealing with issues is negotiable.

5. Either team can request and take a short break at any time so that teammates can confer privately.

6. The group that you represent expects you to reach agreement on as many issues as possible. However, you are not to feel compelled, because of the time constraint, to reach agreement on all issues. You need not feel compelled to agreement on any
issues. Negotiate as you feel you would if you were a negotiator in a real world negotiation.

7. Read your "Confidential Memorandum" carefully. Note especially the section on "good faith" bargaining. Also note that the guidelines given here are just that; they are not to be taken as final positions on the issues. You are free to negotiate any agreements that seem satisfactory to you and your teammates, remembering that all agreements are subject to final ratification by both the teachers' union membership and the Ministry of Education.

8. Roles have been assigned to negotiators. One member of the management team will assume the role of the Chief Inspector of Schools; the other member of this team will assume the role of the Inspector of School for Business Management. One member of the teacher's union team will assume the role of union president; the other member will assume the role of the union secretary. The role of the treasurer will alternate between management and union depending on the situation.

9. The substance of your agreements should be indicated on the "Final Terms of the Agreement" forms and these forms should be initialed by each negotiator. Compromises on issues are allowed and should be described briefly on the "Final Terms" forms.

10. The writer will not remain in the room during your deliberations. However, a recorder will record the session. The writer will step into the room from time to time to apprise the subjects of the amount of time remaining for negotiations.

After these instructions had been given to the negotiators, additional time was given to the participants to study the materials and plan their strategies for the simulation. Any questions asked by the subjects with regard to the materials or procedural rules were answered, but no suggestions for negotiation strategies were given.
After approximately forty-five to sixty minutes, the negotiating teams were brought together at the bargaining table and were introduced. The tape recorder was turned on and the writer asked the negotiators to state their names and positions to enable the writer to get an indication of the sound of the voices on the tape. As soon as this procedure was completed, the writer left the room and allowed the negotiations to continue. The negotiators were informed when there were thirty minutes and when there were fifteen minutes of negotiating time left.

All questionnaires and recorded tapes were returned to the writer at the completion of each negotiation session. The writer left Nigeria on December 14, 1984, for Denton to analyze and record the findings of the study.

The writer had to make another visit to Nigeria in December, 1985, to conduct additional simulations in order to fulfill input conditions which were not fulfilled in the first trip. The process of data collection was basically the same as previously described in this chapter.

Procedure for Analysis of Data

Data collected from the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire for the sixty-nine subjects were nominal in nature, and, therefore, rearranged according to the highest to the lowest scores. The subjects were matched to suit
the "teacher background" and "administrator background" and from the very high to the very low levels of polarization.

Tables, analyses of the findings of the data, and a general summary of all the findings were prepared. Data collected by means of the tape recorder were analyzed with the basic method developed by Bales. Further analyses were conducted in response to the research questions of the study and these analyses enabled the writer to categorize the responses for further statistical analyses leading to recommendations for future improvement of professional negotiations in the Nigerian School System.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter provides information regarding the data collected by the writer during the study. The statistical analyses employed include frequencies, averages, analysis of variance, and description of the interval data. In this chapter, the hypotheses and research questions are considered.

The data are reported in the following categories:

1. Results of the pre-test "Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire," i.e., manipulation of the independent variable.

2. Findings related to hypothesis 1 which reflect the social-emotional and task-oriented verbal behavior of more highly polarized negotiating groups when compared to less highly polarized negotiating groups.

3. Findings related to hypothesis 2 which reflect on the satisfaction (measured in numerical terms by the Post-Session Questionnaire) perceived by more highly polarized negotiating groups as a result of the negotiations when these are compared to less highly polarized negotiating groups.
4. Findings related to research question A which deals with the amount of time required to settle or reach agreement on a given number of specific issues by both the highly polarized and less highly polarized negotiating groups on the specific issues for negotiation.

5. Findings related to research question B which deals with the agreements made by the highly polarized negotiating groups on the specific issues for negotiation.

6. Findings related to research question C which deals with the relative importance of the issues as seen by the negotiators.

7. Findings related to research question D which deals with the effect of the "union and management favorable" polarization of negotiators on the outcome of the negotiations.

Data Concerning the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire¹

Table I indicates the scores obtained from the administration of the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire (LMAQ) to 122 individuals with "teacher" backgrounds,

¹These data might more properly be included in Chapter III since they deal with the manipulation of the independent variable, but for purposes of continuity they are presented here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and also to 129 individuals whose backgrounds reflect "administrator." The scores obtained from the individuals whose background reflects "teacher" and "administrator," respectively, were collected during the screening stage to enable the researcher to obtain the required number of subjects for the simulation.

After the completion of the screening of the 251 individuals represented in Table I, sixty-nine subjects were selected to participate in the study. The selections were made to suit the manipulation of the independent variable of labor-management in the attitude orientation. The scores shown in Table II reflect the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire scores for the sixty-nine subjects who were selected for the study. Table III shows the composition of the fifteen different negotiation groups in terms of their labor-management orientations.

The Findings Relative to Hypothesis One Which Reflect the Verbal Behavior Exhibited During Negotiation Sessions

It is hypothesized that the more highly polarized negotiating groups tend to exhibit more social-emotional oriented behaviors and less task-oriented behavior than less highly polarized negotiating groups. However, the hypothesis is stated in the following null form:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HiM</th>
<th>MoM</th>
<th>LoM</th>
<th>HiL</th>
<th>MoL</th>
<th>LoL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Combination Group</td>
<td>Management (Administrator) Team Scores</td>
<td>Labor (Nigerian Union of Teachers) Team Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Very High Polarization HIL vs. HIL</td>
<td>1 98 108 115 160 165 156</td>
<td>1 116 130 127 152 139 147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 High Polarization HIL-MON vs. HIL-MOL</td>
<td>2 112 118</td>
<td>2 133 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Moderate Polarization MON vs. MOL</td>
<td>3 116 118</td>
<td>3 133 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>5 133 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>6 133 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td>7 142 141 140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE III**

COMPOSITION OF NEGOTIATION GROUPS IN TERMS OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE SCORES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Combination</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#4 Low Polarization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoM vs. LoL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Management Favorable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiM vs. LoL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Union Favorable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoM vs. HiL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III--Continued
There will be no significant differences in the social-emotional and task-oriented verbal behaviors of more highly polarized negotiating groups when compared with less highly polarized negotiating groups.

To test this hypothesis, each of the fifteen negotiation sessions was tape-recorded in its entirety. The researcher analyzed the verbal interactions by using a modified version of the Bales' method as described earlier in the study. In essence, the Bales' method is "a way of classifying direct face-to-face interaction as it takes place, act by act, and series of ways of summarizing and analyzing the resulting data so that they will yield useful information."

Data from the analyses are presented in the four tables following which present the following information:

a. The total sum of statements made by each of the negotiating groups.

b. The total sum of statements expressed in percentages that were made by each of the negotiating groups as categorized according to the twelve distinct categories of analysis provided by Bales' method (Appendix F).

c. The total sum of statements made by each of the negotiating groups expressed in percentages that
deals with the four problem areas for analysis as presented by Bales (Appendix F).

Each of the input combinations are presented on separate but continuing tables to show the data for each of the input combinations to be analyzed.

For groups 1 through 7, the data demonstrate that the higher the polarization, the less task-oriented and the more social emotional behaviors the negotiators exhibited. Consequently, this finding rejects hypothesis 1.

Groups 8 and 9 which were low management and low labor oriented show no consistent behavioral pattern. This is probably due to the minimal level of attachment to either labor or management perspectives possessed by these negotiating teams. Groups 10 through 15 are not considered in testing this hypothesis since they are special groups designed to determine outcomes in highly management or highly union favorable polarizations.

The data presented in Table IV are further summarized in Table V which presents behaviors classified in the four major behavioral areas from the six input combinations. The highly polarized negotiating groups, as compared with less highly polarized negotiating groups, engage in less "task-oriented reactions" and more "social emotional reactions."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Very Highly Polarized</th>
<th>Average of Groups 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, etc.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, etc.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, etc.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 1, 2, and 3)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, etc.</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, etc.</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, ANSWERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 4, 5, and 6)</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, etc.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, etc.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, QUESTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 7, 8, and 9)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, etc.</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, etc.</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, etc.</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 10, 11, and 12)</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV—Continued

Percentage of the Total Statements Made by Groups in Each Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>High Polarization</th>
<th>Average of Groups 3 and 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Group 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, etc.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, etc.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, etc.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 1, 2, and 3)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, etc.</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, etc.</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, ANSWERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 4, 5, and 6)</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, etc.</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, etc.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, QUESTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 7, 8, and 9)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, etc.</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, etc.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, etc.</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 10, 11, and 12)</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Moderate Polarization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>Group 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, etc.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, etc.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, etc.</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 1, 2, and 3)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, etc.</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, etc.</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, ANSWERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 4, 5, and 6)</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, etc.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, etc.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, QUESTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 7, 8, and 9)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, etc.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, etc.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, etc.</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 10, 11, and 12)</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Low Polarization</td>
<td>Average of Groups 8 and 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 8</td>
<td>Group 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, etc.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, etc.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, etc.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSITIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 1, 2, and 3)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, etc.</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, etc.</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, ANSWERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 4, 5, and 6)</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, etc.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, etc.</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, QUESTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 7, 8, and 9)</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, etc.</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, etc.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, etc.</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEGATIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 10, 11, and 12)</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE</strong></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Polarization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 10</td>
<td>Group 11</td>
<td>Group 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, etc.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, etc.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, etc.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 1, 2, and 3)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, etc.</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, etc.</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, ANSWERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 4, 5, and 6)</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, etc.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, etc.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, QUESTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 7, 8, and 9)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, etc.</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, etc.</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, etc.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 10, 11, and 12)</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV--Continued

Percentage of the Total Statements Made by Groups in Each Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Union Favorable Polarization</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 13</td>
<td>Group 14</td>
<td>Group 15</td>
<td>Average of Groups 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, etc.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, etc.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, etc.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td>(Sum of categories 1, 2, and 3)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, etc.</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, etc.</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, ANSWERS</td>
<td>(Sum of categories 4, 5, and 6)</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, etc.</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, etc.</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, QUESTION4</td>
<td>(Sum of categories 7, 8, and 9)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, etc.</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, etc.</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, etc.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td>(Sum of categories 10, 11, and 12)</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Input Condition #1, Moderate Polarization</td>
<td>Input Condition #2, High Polarization</td>
<td>Input Condition #3, Low Polarization</td>
<td>Input Condition #4, Favorable Polarization</td>
<td>Input Condition #5, Management Polarization</td>
<td>Input Condition #6, Union Polarization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, etc.</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, etc.</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, etc.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 1, 2, and 3)</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, etc.</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, etc.</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, ANSWERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 4, 5, and 6)</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, etc.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, etc.</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, etc.</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK ORIENTED REACTIONS, QUESTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 7, 8, and 9)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Disagrees, etc.</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shows tension, etc.</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shows antagonism, etc.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE SOCIAL EMOTIONAL REACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sum of categories 10, 11, and 12)</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To enable the writer to test for statistical significance, there was a further condensation as shown in Table VI. In Table VI, findings are the averages for "social emotional" and "task-oriented" behaviors are considered.

Table VI shows that the social emotional behaviors of the negotiating groups increases directly as the polarization of the attitude orientation increases. On the other hand, task-oriented behavior generally decreases as the polarization increases for the first three input combinations. There is significantly less task oriented interaction and significantly more social emotional interaction.

In Table VII, the General Linear Models Procedure of the analysis of variance is applied to test whether the null hypothesis can be rejected. The hypothesis under discussion states that the more social emotional a group is the less task-oriented it tends to be. It is clear that the higher the polarization of negotiating groups there is significantly less task oriented interaction and significantly more social emotional behavior.

Table VII clearly shows that where there is a decrease in polarization of the negotiating groups, there are statistically significant differences in the task
TABLE VI

THE SUMMARY REFLECTING THE ANALYSIS OF NEGOTIATING GROUP TASK-ORIENTED AND SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIORS, AVERAGES OF GROUPS FOR INPUT COMBINATIONS 1 THROUGH 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Percentage of the Total Statements Made by Groups in Each Area—Three-Group Averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input Condition #1, Very High Polarization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social-Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Reactions, Answers</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Reactions, Questions</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social-Emotional Reactions</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Emotional Reactions Total</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Reactions Total</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VII

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE) SHOWING THE FOUR AREAS OF THE BEHAVIORAL (VERBAL AND TASK) ASPECTS OF THE NEGOTIATING GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable Issues as Viewed by Groups</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>f-ratio</th>
<th>Probability of f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social-Emotional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>Input Comb. 1 - 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>494.000</td>
<td>247.000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.2627*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Answers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>108.666</td>
<td>Input Comb. 1 - 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8138.666</td>
<td>4069.333</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>0.0142*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Questions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51.777</td>
<td>Input Comb. 1 - 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>574.888</td>
<td>287.444</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.2309*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social-Emotional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>118.000</td>
<td>Input Comb. 1 - 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18000.666</td>
<td>9000.333</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>0.0084*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All p < .05 level of significance.*
performances of the groups according to areas identified in
the three relevant combinations, i.e., combinations 1-3.
The polarization of attitude orientation seems to have
greatest impact on the negative social emotional behavior
shown by negotiators. The data presented in Tables VI,
VII, and VIII reflect that statistically significant
differences in behavior occur in task performance as
attitude orientation is more polarized. Therefore, the
higher the degree of attitude orientation in polarization
the more negative social emotional behavior shown by
negotiators.

The Findings Relative to Hypothesis Two Which
Reflect the Satisfaction of the Negotiators
with the Negotiations

The hypothesis is stated in the null form as follows:
There will be no significant differences in
satisfaction (measured in numerical terms by the
Post-Session Questionnaire) perceived by more
highly polarized negotiating groups as a result
of the negotiations when these are compared to
less highly polarized negotiating groups.

In this study, negotiator satisfaction with the
negotiation sessions were measured by means of
administration of the Post-Session Questionnaire (Appendix
D). The items (1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10) of this
questionnaire were used in computing level of
### Table VIII

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE) SHOWING THE FOUR AREAS OF THE BEHAVIORAL (VERBAL AND TASK) ASPECTS OF THE GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable Issues as Viewed by Groups</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>f-ratio</th>
<th>Probability of f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social-Emotional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.714</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>555.4285</td>
<td>302.2142</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.1610*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.0000</td>
<td>18.8250</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.6368*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Answers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>120.000</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>635.2500</td>
<td>2462.7500</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.2968*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4290.2500</td>
<td>442.1250</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>0.0367*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55.1428</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>177.1904</td>
<td>376.5952</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.2426*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>576.0000</td>
<td>94.4166</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.0690*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social-Emotional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>121.857</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1618.1904</td>
<td>8892.5952</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>0.0178*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1600.0000</td>
<td>1074.4166</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.2894*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All p < .05 level of significance.*
satisfaction. The possible scores on the items ranged from 11 to 60. A possible score of 11 indicates very high dissatisfaction with the outcomes of negotiation sessions, while a possible score of 60 expresses very high satisfaction with the outcomes of the negotiations.

Table IX provides the raw scores for each individual negotiator and the averages of the scores presented for negotiating teams, groups, and input combination, respectively. In Table X, there is a summary of the averaged raw scores for each negotiating team, group and input combination presented.

A comparison among the input combinations 1, 2, and 3 show a clear difference in satisfaction. In an attempt to test the hypothesis, analysis of variance (General Linear Models Procedure) was used to analyze the data indicated in Table X. The data show that in the input combinations statistically significant differences in satisfaction exist. Input combination number 1, very highly polarized, had the lowest averaged satisfaction scores when compared with other groups' satisfaction averaged scores.

As explained earlier, the writer considers only input combinations 1, 2, and 3 in testing this hypothesis. There is a consistent increase in the satisfaction derived by negotiators between input combinations 1, 2, and 3. Based on the data provided in Tables IX and X, the findings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Combination</th>
<th>Negotiating Group</th>
<th>Management (Administrator) Team Scores</th>
<th>Labor (Nigerian Union of Teachers) Team Scores</th>
<th>Average Score for the Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiator #1</td>
<td>Negotiator #2</td>
<td>Negotiator #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very Highly Polarized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Groups 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 High Polarization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Groups 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Moderate Polarization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Groups 5, 6, &amp; 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Combination</td>
<td>Negotiating Group</td>
<td>Management (Administrator) Team Scores</td>
<td>Labor (Nigerian Union of Teachers) Team Scores</td>
<td>Average Score for the Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#1  #2  #3   Average</td>
<td>#1  #2  #3   Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Low Polarization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50  42  -   46.0</td>
<td>35  40  -   37.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48  41  -   44.5</td>
<td>45  37  -   40.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average for Groups 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45  43  43   43.6</td>
<td>43  40  -   41.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49  40  47   45.3</td>
<td>33  43  -   38.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45  51  42   46.0</td>
<td>35  47  -   41.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average for Groups 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Union</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52  53  -   52.5</td>
<td>29  51  45   41.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49  40  -   44.5</td>
<td>42  48  46   45.3</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47  40  -   43.5</td>
<td>50  44  42   45.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average for Groups 13, 14, &amp; 15</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE X

SUMMARY SHOWING BOTH THE INPUT COMBINATION AND THE GROUP SATISFACTION SCORES THROUGH THE AVERAGE RAW SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Combination</th>
<th>Management (Administrator) Team Average Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Labor (Nigerian Union of Teachers) Team Average Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Negotiating Group Team Average Satisfaction Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number 1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 5</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indicated both by Table XI and Table XII demonstrate that there are statistically significant differences in satisfaction derived in task performance as attitude orientation is more polarized. Therefore, the greater the degree of polarization in attitude orientation, the less satisfaction shown by negotiators in the specific outcomes and process of negotiation itself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Combination According to Group</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>f-ratio</th>
<th>Probability of f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input Combination for 1, 2, and 3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.095</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120.3869</td>
<td>60.1934</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.7730*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4147.4226</td>
<td>230.4123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Combination for 1, 2, and 3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.857</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>584.8095</td>
<td>274.4047</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.0478*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1365.7619</td>
<td>75.8756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All probability of f < .05 level of significance.
TABLE XII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE) SUMMARY
OF POSTTESTS SHOWING SATISFACTION DERIVED BY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Combination According to Groups</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>f-ratio</th>
<th>Probability of f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Combination for 1, 2, and 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.411</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>489,189</td>
<td>364,6781</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.1599*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1076,1074</td>
<td>220,1602</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.2876*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Combination for 1, 2, and 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.705</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>176,5056</td>
<td>152,8431</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.1977*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>282,0238</td>
<td>95,7692</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.2652*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All probability of f < .05 level of significance.
The Findings Relative to Research Question A
Which Reflect the Time Required to
Reach Agreements

The research question being investigated under this circumstance is

"Do more highly polarized negotiating groups require more time to settle or reach agreement on a given number of specific issues than less highly polarized negotiating groups?"

Table XIII presents data with regard to the issues each group was able to resolve or compromise.

The data provided by Table XIII indicate that the very highly polarized groups, 1 and 2, within input combination 1 were able to arrive at only two compromises or decisions. It can be seen that from other input combinations the negotiators' ability to resolve issues were very mixed and no clear pattern is shown.

It is interesting to note that the data also reflect a relationship between the number of issues resolved by negotiators and their satisfaction with the outcomes of the negotiation sessions. In an attempt to determine the relationship between the number of issues resolved and the satisfaction derived, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was applied to compute the coefficient of the correlation. The coefficient of the correlation was obtained by using both the number of issues resolved and
TABLE XIII
THE NUMBER OF ISSUES EACH NEGOTIATING GROUP RESOLVED
WITHIN THE STANDARDIZED NINETY MINUTES PROVIDED
FOR THE NEGOTIATION SESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiating Group</th>
<th>Number of Issues Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of issues 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of issues 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of issues 5, 6, &amp; 7,</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of issues 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of issues 10, 11, &amp; 12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of issues 13, 14, &amp; 15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the results obtained from the Post-Session Questionnaire items which measure the satisfaction scores of the negotiating groups. The rho was established at .9 which is significant beyond the 0.01 level of significance. This indicates that satisfaction is directly related to the number of issues resolved.
The research question being investigated is:

"Do more highly polarized negotiating groups reach a settlement position or agreement which favors one side over the other on the issues for negotiation than do less highly polarized negotiating groups?"

In Chapter III, a method for measuring the terms of agreement in the sense of who won was discussed. A reasonable "going rate" was established in order to determine how much and which way the agreements deviated from this position. Essentially, the terms of agreement on issues (Appendix E) were analyzed to determine whether agreements of highly polarized negotiating groups deviated from a norm "average" or "going rate" as opposed to the agreements of less highly polarized groups. Therefore, positive or negative deviation values were assigned to show the magnitude of deviation from the "going rate." Negative deviation values were assigned to positions that favor management, while positive values are assigned to positions that favor the union (NUT).

Data regarding the negotiating groups, number of issues resolved, specific issues resolved, the total deviation from a reasonable "going rate," and a total
"cost" of the agreements reached by each of the negotiating groups are presented in Table XIV.

The data presented in Table XIV show no clear pattern of outcomes in terms of polarization of the groups. It is not surprising that group 4 (LoM-LoL) made rather high cost agreements since this group had no strong vested interest in the needs of either management or labor. It is surprising that group 5 (HiM-LoL), which is the management favorable group, yielded to so many high cost issues. One would have predicted the opposite.

It is possible that if all fifteen groups had more than ninety minutes for the negotiations sessions to resolve the seven issues, findings shown on Table XIV might have been different and may have shown that a relationship exists between the degree of polarization of attitude orientation and the nature of agreements. Clearly, the least realistic aspect of the simulation in terms of real world negotiation is the ninety-minute time frame.

The Findings Relative to Research Question C
Which Reflect on the Seven Issues as Presented in the Order of Most, More, and Least Important as Seen by the Negotiators

The research question being investigated is

"Which of the seven issues that will be presented for the simulation will be seen as most and least important by the negotiators?"
### TABLE XIV
THE NATURE OF THE AGREEMENTS FOR THE FIFTEEN NEGOTIATING GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiating Group</th>
<th>Number of Issues Resolved on the Average</th>
<th>Specific Issues Resolved</th>
<th>Deviation of Agreements from the Going Rate</th>
<th>Cost to the School Local Government Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>- 50</td>
<td>N 19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None Except</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2, 4, 5</td>
<td>- 37.5</td>
<td>N 34,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>All except 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>All issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+ 25</td>
<td>N 113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2, 4, 5</td>
<td>+ 8.3</td>
<td>N 3,818,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Favorable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>All but 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>- 58.3</td>
<td>N 118,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Post-Session Questionnaire (Appendix G), item number 13 was presented to the negotiators to enable the writer to determine which two issues of the seven negotiated issues made available for negotiation were considered to be most important and which two were least important.

It is shown in Table XV that management and union had a general disagreement on the most important issue of the seven issues. On the management side 35.3 percent of the negotiators had the opinion that the school facilities and equipment issue was the most important, while 31.4 percent of the union negotiators believed the salary issue to be of the greatest importance. The class size issue was seen as next important by 20.6 percent of the management negotiators; 24.3 percent of union negotiators considered school facilities and equipment to be the second most important issue.

There were also disagreements regarding the least and second least important issue of the seven issues considered as shown in Table XVI. Of management negotiators, 26.4 percent considered the duty free lunch period issue as least important while 34.3 percent of union negotiators perceived class size to be least important. Hospital cost and insurance were considered by 19.1 percent of management negotiators as next least important while 17.1 percent of
### TABLE XV

**ISSUES SEEN AS MOST AND SECOND MOST IMPORTANT BY NEGOTIATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Management Negotiators</th>
<th>Union Negotiators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duty Free Lunch Period</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Relevance of Courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increase</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Cost and Insurance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Periods; Curriculum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Negotiators</th>
<th>Union Negotiators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Free Lunch Period</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Relevance of Courses</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increase</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Cost and Insurance</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Periods; Curriculum</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
union considered preparation periods as next least important.

Table XVII indicates the opinions expressed by labor and management negotiators in terms of the importance attached to each of the seven issues given for simulation. Table XVII shows that issues 1 and 6 (Duty Free Lunch and Preparation Periods) showed consistencies in agreements of the importance attached by management and union. Apart from these two, there were no consistent agreements between management and labor in the rankings indicated on Table XVII. Table XVII indicates that management ranked school facilities as its first priority while union ranked salary increase as its first priority. Also, Table XVII shows that class size is ranked as the second in importance by management while union ranked school facilities and equipment as second in importance.

The Findings Relative to Research Question D Which Reflect on the "Management and Union Favorable" Polarization of the Negotiators with the Negotiations

The research question being investigated is "Do management and union negotiating teams in the highly pro management and union attitude orientation gain agreements on the issues which are consistently more favorable to the management and union "sides" than the agreements negotiated by the other combinations of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Management Negotiators</th>
<th>Union Negotiators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duty Free Lunch Period</td>
<td>18 26.5</td>
<td>7 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Relevance of Courses</td>
<td>7 10.3</td>
<td>8 11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increase</td>
<td>10 14.7</td>
<td>7 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Cost and Insurance</td>
<td>13 19.1</td>
<td>9 12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>2 2.9</td>
<td>3 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Periods;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>8 11.8</td>
<td>12 17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>10 14.7</td>
<td>24 34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68 100.0</td>
<td>70 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVII
NEGOTIATORS' OPINIONS INDICATING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SIMULATED ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Management Administrators Ranking</th>
<th>Labor Union (NUT) Negotiators' Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Duty Free Lunch Period</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Relevance of Curriculum (Decision-Making Process)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salary Increase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hospital Cost and Insurance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparation Periods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Class Size Limitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

management and union negotiating teams?" Because of the confounding data shown in Table XIV for groups 5 and 6, no conclusions can be drawn with regard to this research question.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V is divided into these subareas:
1. summary of the experimental method used in the study,
2. summary of the findings of the study,
3. conclusion, and recommendations for solving problems in real world negotiations sessions in Nigeria.

Summary of the Experimental Methodology

The quasi-experimental method used in this study is that of creating a model system which simulates, portrays vividly and closely negotiations sessions in real world educational settings. The standardized conditions of the simulation negotiations permitted the manipulation of the independent variable, i.e., the labor-management attitude orientations of the negotiators. Labor-management attitude orientations as an independent variable were manipulated in order to measure the consequences on the dependent variables including verbal behavior, satisfaction, time, and terms of agreements.

The simulation materials used in the study were materials originally designed, field-tested, and standardized by Horvat (1, 1968) when he was a research
assistant in the University Council for Educational Administration at the Ohio State University, Columbus. However, the writer made some necessary changes to suit the cultural environment where this study was conducted. The subjects in this study numbered sixty-nine comprised of thirty-four administrators representing management negotiators and thirty-five teachers representing labor union negotiators. All the subjects for this study were final year undergraduates of education who have had, in every case, some previous experience in either school administration or teaching and in negotiating skills. The subjects for the study were carefully screened to insure that they possessed the necessary characteristics and attitude orientations required for the manipulation of the input variable.

Each subject acted as one member of a two or three man negotiation team. Each group consisted of four or five negotiators and actively negotiated for ninety minutes on seven issues provided for the simulated negotiation sessions. The subjects were given the simulation background materials to study carefully to enable them to have a thorough feel for the role assigned in the sessions. At the beginning of each simulation session, the writer read standardized guidelines before the sessions took place.
Four areas of dependent variables were measured:

1. Verbal behavior exhibited during negotiation sessions,
2. Satisfaction of the negotiators with the negotiations,
3. Time required to reach agreement, and
4. The seven issues as presented for simulation in the order of most, more, and least important as seen by the negotiators.

The hypotheses and research questions were tested to determine the relationship between attitude orientations and the outputs outlined.

Summary of the Findings of the Study

Behavioral Results

Each of the fifteen negotiation sessions was tape-recorded in its entirety. Verbal interactions were analyzed by using a modified version of the Bales' method. The writer was interested in carefully analyzing all behavioral aspects that dealt with task-oriented and social emotional behaviors in the negotiation sessions. According to the hypothesis tested, the more highly polarized negotiating groups as compared with less highly polarized negotiating groups tend to engage in less task-oriented behaviors and more social emotional behaviors.
Satisfaction with Negotiations

The administration of the Post-Session Questionnaire items enabled the writer to measure the level of satisfaction shown by negotiators. The hypothesis tested was stated in the null form. "There will be no significant differences in satisfaction (measured in numerical terms by the Post-Session Questionnaire) perceived by more highly polarized negotiating groups as a result of the negotiations when these are compared to less highly polarized negotiating groups."

The analysis of variance (GLMP-General Linear Models Procedure) was used to analyze the data. The findings indicate that there is statistical significance found to exist in the very highly polarized groups when compared with satisfaction scores of the less polarized groups. Therefore, there are statistically significant differences in satisfaction derived in task performance as attitude orientation is more polarized. It can be concluded that the greater the degree of attitude orientation in polarization, the less satisfaction shown by negotiators in the groups' specific outcomes and the negotiation process itself.

The Time Required to Reach Agreement

In each of the fifteen negotiations sessions, the ultimate aim of negotiators was to resolve problems by
arriving at compromises. The research question stated, "Do more highly polarized negotiating groups require more time to settle or reach agreement on a given number of specific issues than less highly polarized negotiating groups?"

Table XIII provided in Chapter IV indicates that the very highly polarized groups 1 and 2 within input combination 1 were able to arrive at only two compromises or decisions. It can be seen that from other input combinations the negotiators' abilities to resolve issues were mixed and no clear pattern is shown.

In an attempt to determine the correlation between attitude orientation polarization and the specific number of issues resolved per unit of time, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was applied as a statistical technique. It was determined that there is a relationship between the number of issues resolved and the attitude orientation polarization. In the very highly polarized groups, there were few items resolved in negotiations and these groups required the most time to resolve issues. There is a statistically significant difference in the time needed to resolve issues by the very high polarized groups as compared to less polarized. The reason that highly polarized needed more time is that they engaged in competition with their opponents, thus leading to more social-emotional behavior and less task oriented behavior.
Also, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to compute the coefficient of correlation to determine that there is a positive relationship between satisfaction derived and the number of issues resolved in negotiations sessions. This was accomplished by using the number of issues resolved and the results of the Post-Session Questionnaire items that measured satisfaction of the negotiating groups. The result of the statistical test indicated that this correlation is significant beyond the 0.001 level.

**Negotiators' Opinions on Issues According to Importance**

The main concern in determining the opinions of the negotiators was to enable the writer to identify the importance attached to each of the seven issues by either labor or management. There were no consistent agreements between management and labor.

"Management and Union Favorables" Polarization of Negotiation Groups

The question under consideration was "Do management and union negotiating teams in the highly pro management and union attitude orientation gain agreements on the issues which are consistently more favorable to the management and union 'sides'
than the agreements negotiated by the other combinations of management and union negotiating teams?"

All of the groups categorized under the management and union favorable input combinations were found to resolve issues solely in line with the union expectations. The anticipation that management favorable polarization groups would fail to yield to union demands was not confirmed. No explanation for this anomaly can be put forth. This is a source for further investigation.

Conclusions Based on the Findings

As a result of the findings of this study, the following major conclusions appear to be warranted.

1. It can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between the polarity of attitude orientation and the negotiating behavior and that the greater the polarization the more social emotional the less task-oriented will be the behavior of the negotiators. From this it can be further concluded that the typical practice of placing highly pro-management and highly pro-labor negotiators on bargaining teams is counterproductive.

2. Negotiators with more moderate attitude orientation produce better negotiation results in these areas: (a) task-oriented behavior, (b) satisfaction with negotiations sessions, and (c) ability to resolve the issues in more reasonable lengths of time.
Recommendations

1. Immediate governmental attention ought to be given to the need for study of the professional negotiations process in Nigeria. There is the need to encourage a thorough study of the mechanism itself as well as the behavioral-motivational factors involved in negotiations. The government, administrators (management) and teachers (labor who are the key actors in the process) ought to understand the process itself to enable a continuous decreasing of problems and an advocacy of cooperative and constructive methods in achieving either problem-solving or decision making.

2. The natural tendency is to use strong negotiators to represent both management and labor. However, if more reasonable and effective negotiations are derived, it is recommended that a joint government-management-labor body be established to identify from time to time the hard-liners in negotiations. Removal of such persons will enhance the outcomes of negotiations. The function of this management-labor body would be to convince "staunch conservatives or radicals" to take the approach of a more moderate view to facilitate future negotiations. However, if such individuals fail to be flexible in their approach to enhance productive cooperative constructive negotiations, it is in the interest of Nigerian public
education to replace the individuals because they will continue to be stumbling blocks to progress.

3. In the future, appointments of negotiators serving on negotiating teams as chief negotiators should involve careful screening in order to insure that positive and constructive results are obtained in negotiations. The purpose of the careful selection is to make sure that negotiators do not perceive the other negotiating team as an enemy, but as a group that can be worked with to achieve the best outcomes for public education.

4. Because this study is based on the relationship between employer and employee in the process of professional negotiations in Nigeria, it is recommended that a number of methods, such as promoting agreeable rational problem-solving, be utilized. Occasionally, either management or labor should take the initiative to identify problem areas and call for improvement in the area of concern.

5. It is important that immediate attention be given by the Nigerian government concerning the processes and behaviors that transpire in professional negotiations sessions. It is recommended that modified versions of this study be used to help provide training for future negotiators in Nigerian public education. There is no doubt that information and knowledge gained from training
of this nature can assist negotiators who engage in negotiations between labor (teachers) and management (administrators).

6. The government should encourage a standing committee (management-labor) made up of different chief negotiators to devise better evaluation methods concerning educational issues. This method can help the government and negotiators in organizing seminars and workshops in each of the local government areas of the Nigerian states, thereby, introducing and familiarizing the personnel with the most up-to-date techniques in school management and collective bargaining per se. As a result, healthy and open means of addressing labor-management problems can be established.

These recommendations which appear feasible seem worthy of prompt application. The recommendations must, of course, be set in the framework of existing realities of Nigerian labor-management practice and political needs. If such attention is given to improving the negotiations of Nigerian public education, it should be capable of meeting the dynamic challenges that lie in the future.
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NIGERIAN TRADE DISPUTES DECREE 1976
TRADE DISPUTES DECREES

(1st January 1976)

THE FEDERAL MILITARY GOVERNMENT hereby decrees as follows:

PART I

PROCEDURE FOR SETTLING TRADE DISPUTES

1.—(1) Where a trade dispute exists or is apprehended, the provisions of this Part of this Decree shall apply in relation to the dispute.

(2) In those provisions, unless the context otherwise requires
(a) “the dispute” means the trade dispute in question;
(b) “party” means a party to the dispute.

2.—(1) Where there exists any collective agreement for the settlement of a trade dispute, at least three copies of the said agreement shall be deposited by the parties thereto with the Commissioner—
(a) in the case of a collective agreement entered into before the date of commencement of this Decree, within thirty days of that date; and
(b) in the case of a collective agreement entered into on or after the date of commencement of this Decree, within thirty days of the execution thereof,
and any person who fails to deposit copies of the said agreement within the period prescribed in the foregoing provisions of this subsection, shall be guilty of an offence under this Decree.

(2) Where before the commencement of this Decree a collective agreement has been deposited with the Commissioner pursuant to the provisions of any enactment repealed by this Decree, that agreement shall be deemed to have been deposited in accordance with subsection (1) of this section.

(3) Subject to the provisions of this Decree, the Commissioner may, upon receipt of copies of a collective agreement deposited in accordance with subsection (1) above, make an order the terms of which may in respect of that agreement specify that the provisions of the agreement or any part thereof as may be stated in the order shall be binding on the employers and workers to whom they relate.
(4) If any person fails to comply with the terms of the said order he shall be guilty of an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine of $100 or to imprisonment for six months.

3.—(1) If there exist agreed means for settlement of the dispute apart from this Decree, whether by virtue of the provisions of any agreement between organisations representing the interest of employers and organisations of workers or any other agreement, the parties to the dispute shall first attempt to settle it by that means.

(2) If the attempt to settle the dispute as provided in subsection (1) above fails, or if no such agreed means of settlement as are mentioned in that subsection exist, the parties shall within seven days of the failure (or, if no such means exist, within seven days of the date on which the dispute arises or is first apprehended) meet together by themselves or their representatives, under the presidency of a mediator mutually agreed upon and appointed by or on behalf of the parties, with a view to the amicable settlement of the dispute.

4.—(1) If within fourteen days of the date on which a mediator is appointed in accordance with section 3(2) of this Decree the dispute is not settled, the dispute shall be reported to the Commissioner by or on behalf of either of the parties within fourteen days of the end of the fourteen days.

(2) A report under this section shall be in writing and shall record the points on which the parties disagree and describe the steps already taken by the parties to reach a settlement.

5.—(1) The Commissioner shall, if not satisfied that the requirements of sections 3 and 4 have been substantially complied with, issue to the parties a notice in writing specifying the steps which must be taken to satisfy those requirements and may specify in the notice the time within which any particular step must be taken.

(2) Where after the expiration of the period specified in the notice issued under subsection (1) above or, if no period is specified, after the expiration of fourteen days following the date the notice is issued, the dispute remains unsettled and the Commissioner is satisfied—

(a) that the steps specified in the notice have been taken, or
(b) that either party is, for its part, refusing to take those steps or any of them,
the Commissioner may proceed to exercise such of his powers under section 6, 7, 12 or 23 as may appear to him appropriate.

8—(1) The Commissioner may for the purposes of section 5 above appoint a fit person to act as conciliator for the purpose of effecting a settlement of the dispute.

(2) The person appointed as conciliator under this section shall inquire into the causes and circumstances of the dispute and by negotiation with the parties endeavour to bring about a settlement.

(3) If a settlement of the dispute is reached within fourteen days of his appointment, the person appointed as conciliator shall report the fact to the Commissioner and shall forward to him a memorandum of the terms of the settlement signed by the representatives of the parties, and as from the date on which the memorandum is signed (or such earlier or later date as may be specified therein), the terms recorded therein shall be binding on the employers and workers to whom those terms relate.

(4) If a settlement of the dispute is not reached within fourteen days of his appointment, or if, after attempting negotiation with the parties, he is satisfied that he will not be able to bring about a settlement by means thereof, the person appointed as conciliator shall forthwith report the fact to the Commissioner.

7—(1) Within 14 days of the receipt by him of a report under section 6 (4) of this Decree, the Commissioner shall refer the dispute for settlement to the Industrial Arbitration Panel established under this section.

(2) The Industrial Arbitration Panel (in this section referred to as "the Panel") shall consist of a chairman, a vice-chairman and not less than ten other members all of whom shall be appointed by the Commissioner so however that of the ten other members

(a) two shall be persons nominated by organisations appearing to the Commissioner as representing the interests of employers; and

(b) two shall be persons nominated by organisations appearing to the Commissioner as representing the interests of workers.

(3) For the purpose of the settlement of any dispute referred to the Panel by the Commissioner the chairman of the Panel shall constitute an arbitration tribunal in accordance with whichever of paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of subsection (4) below
appears to him to be appropriate having regard to the subject-
matter of the dispute and the means by which an attempt to
settle the dispute was made in pursuance of the foregoing provi-
sions of this Decree.

(4) An arbitration tribunal may consist of—
(a) a sole arbitrator selected from among the members of the
Panel by the chairman; or
(b) a single arbitrator selected from among the members of
the Panel by the chairman and assisted by assessors appointed
in accordance with subsection (5) below; or
(c) one or more arbitrators nominated by or on behalf of the
employers concerned and an equal number of arbitrators
nominated by or on behalf of the workers concerned, all
nominations being made from among the members of the
Panel, and presided over by the chairman or vice-chairman.

(5) The assessors for an arbitration tribunal which is to consist
of a single arbitrator assisted by assessors shall be appointed
by the chairman as follows:—
(a) one or more shall be persons nominated by or on behalf
of the employers concerned from the panel of employers'
representatives drawn up under section 33 of this Decree; and
(b) an equal number shall be persons nominated by or on
behalf of the workers concerned from the panel of workers'
representatives drawn up under the said section 33:

Provided that if after 7 days of being required to do so by the
chairman the employers or workers concerned or their repre-
sentatives fail to make a nomination for the purposes of any
appointment failing to be made in accordance with this sub-
section, the chairman may appoint from the appropriate panel
such person as he thinks fit.

(6) The award of an arbitration tribunal consisting of a single
arbitrator assisted by assessors shall be made and issued by the
arbitrator only; and if, in the case of an arbitration tribunal
consisting of more than one arbitrator, all the members of the
tribunal are unable to agree as to their award, the matter shall
be decided by a majority of them.

(7) In this section "chairman" means the chairman of the
Industrial Arbitration Panel appointed pursuant to subsection
(2) of this section; and functions conferred on the chairman
may in the absence of the chairman be exercised by the vice-
chairman.
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9—(1) The Arbitration Act shall not apply to any proceedings of an arbitration tribunal appointed under section 7 of this Decree or to any award made by such a tribunal.

(2) Where an arbitration tribunal appointed under section 7 of this Decree consists of a single arbitrator assisted by assessors and any vacancy occurs in the number of assessors, the chairman of the Industrial Arbitration Panel may either—
   (a) direct the tribunal to act notwithstanding the vacancy, or
   (b) fill the vacancy by appointing another assessor in accordance with section 7 (3) of this Decree.

(3) Where an arbitration tribunal appointed under section 7 of this Decree consists of more than one arbitrator and any vacancy occurs in their number the tribunal may, with the consent of the nominating party, act notwithstanding the vacancy.

(4) An act, proceeding or determination of an arbitration tribunal appointed under section 7 of this Decree shall not be questioned on the ground that a member or assessor was not validly appointed or on the ground of any unfilled vacancy authorised by subsection (2) or (3) above.

(5) Where a trade dispute referred to an arbitration tribunal under section 7 of this Decree involves questions as to wages, hours of work or any other terms or conditions of or affecting employment which are regulated by any statutory provisions, the tribunal shall not make any awards that are less favourable to the workers concerned than those provisions.

In this subsection "statutory provisions" means provision contained in any written law in force in Nigeria or any part thereof, or in any instrument made in the exercise of any power conferred by any such law.

(6) The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Federal Commissioner for Finance, pay to any arbitrator or assessor appointed under section 7 of this Decree such remuneration as he thinks fit:

Provided that no remuneration, fees or allowances shall be paid to any public officer other than such allowances for expenses as may be expressly authorised for the purposes of this section by the Public Service Commission of the Federation or the State in question, as the case may be.
9.—(1) An arbitration tribunal constituted under section 7 of this Decree—

(a) shall make its award within forty-two days of its constitution or such longer period as the Commissioner may allow; and

(b) on making its award shall forthwith send a copy thereof to the Commissioner.

(2) On receipt of a copy of the award of the tribunal the Commissioner shall immediately cause to be given to the parties or their representatives, and to be published in such other manner (if any) as he thinks fit, a notice—

(a) setting out the award;

(b) specifying the time (not being more than twenty-one days from the publication of the notice) within which and the manner in which notice of objection to the award may be given to the Commissioner by or on behalf of either party to the dispute; and

(c) stating that, except where notice of objection to the award is given within the time and in the manner so specified by one or both of the parties, the award will be confirmed by the Commissioner.

(3) If no notice of objection to the award of the tribunal is given to the Commissioner within the time and in the manner specified in the notice under subsection (2) above, the Commissioner shall publish in the Gazette a notice confirming the award and the award shall be binding on the employers and workers to whom it relates as from the date of the award (or such earlier or later date as may be specified in the award).

10.—(1) If notice of objection to the award of an arbitration tribunal appointed under section 7 of this Decree is given to the Commissioner within the time and in the manner specified in the notice under section 9 (2) of this Decree, the Commissioner shall forthwith refer the dispute to the National Industrial Court established by this Decree.

(2) The award of the National Industrial Court shall be final and shall be binding on the employers and workers to whom it relates as from the date of the award (or such earlier or later date as may be specified therein).

(3) In so far as the terms and conditions of employment to be observed by an employer in accordance with any award made by the National Industrial Court under this section are more
favourable than any statutory provisions affecting the terms and conditions of employment of the workers concerned, the award shall prevail.

In this subsection "statutory provisions" means provisions contained in any written law in force in Nigeria or any part thereof, or in any instrument made in the exercise of any power conferred by any such law.

11—(1) If after an award of—

(a) an arbitration tribunal appointed under section 7 of this Decree; or

(b) the National Industrial Court,

has become binding on the employers and workers to whom it relates, any question arises as to the interpretation of the award, the Commissioner or any party to the award may make an application to the National Industrial Court for a decision on that question.

(2) On an application under this section the National Industrial Court shall decide the matter after hearing the parties to the award or, with the prior consent of the parties, without hearing them; and the decision of the Court, which shall be final, shall be deemed to form part of the original award and shall have effect accordingly.

12—if in the case of any trade dispute of which he has received a report under section 4 of this Decree it appears to the Commissioner—

(a) that the dispute is one to which workers employed in any essential service are a party, or

(b) that in the circumstances of the case reference of the dispute to an arbitration tribunal would not be appropriate, then, within seven days of the receipt by him of a report under section 6(4) of this Decree, the Commissioner shall refer the dispute directly to the National Industrial Court.

13—(1) An employer shall not declare or take part in a lock-out and a worker shall not take part in a strike in connection with any trade dispute where—

(a) the procedure specified in section 3 or 4 of this Decree has not been complied with in relation to the dispute; or

(b) an award by an arbitration tribunal has become binding under section 9 (3) of this Decree; or

(c) the dispute has subsequently been referred to the National Industrial Court under section 10 (1) or 12 of this Decree; or

(d) the National Industrial Court has issued an award on the reference.
(2) Any person who contravenes subsection (1) above shall be guilty of an offence and be liable on conviction—

(a) in the case of an individual, to a fine of N100 or to imprisonment for six months;

(b) in the case of a body corporate, to a fine of N1,000.

(3) It is hereby declared that where a dispute is settled under the foregoing provisions of this Decree either by agreement or by the acceptance of an award made by an arbitration tribunal under section 9 of this Decree, that dispute shall be deemed for the purposes of this Decree to have ended; and accordingly, any further trade dispute involving the same matters (including a trade dispute as to the interpretation of an award made as aforesaid by which the original dispute was settled) shall be treated for the purposes of this section as a different trade dispute.

PART II

THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL COURT

14—(1) There shall be a National Industrial Court for Nigeria (in this Part of this Decree referred to as “the Court”) which shall have such jurisdiction and powers as are conferred on it by this or any other Decree with respect to the settlement of trade disputes, the interpretation of collective agreements and matters connected therewith.

(2) The members of the Court shall be—

(a) the President; and

(b) four other members (in this Decree referred to as “ordinary members” of the Court) all of whom shall be persons of good standing being, to the knowledge of the Commissioner, well acquainted with employment conditions in Nigeria, and at least one of whom shall, to his satisfaction, have a competent knowledge of economics, industry or trade.

(3) For the purpose of dealing with any matter which may be referred to it the Court shall, at the discretion of the President, be constituted of either—

(a) all five members; or

(b) the President and two ordinary members.

(4) For the purpose of dealing with any matter as aforesaid, the Court may, at the discretion of the President, be assisted by assessors appointed in accordance with section 17 of this Decree.
(5) Any decision of the Court in the exercise of its functions shall be taken, in the event of a difference between the members dealing with the case, by the votes of the majority of those members.

(6) The Court shall normally sit in the city of Lagos, but for the purpose of dealing with any particular trade dispute referred to it under Part I of this Decree may sit elsewhere in Nigeria.

15—(1) The Court shall, to the exclusion of any other court, have jurisdiction—

(a) to make awards for the purpose of settling trade disputes; and

(b) to determine questions as to the interpretation of—

(i) any collective agreement;

(ii) any award made by an arbitration tribunal or by the Court under Part I of this Decree;

(iii) the terms of settlement of any trade dispute as recorded in any memorandum under section 6 of this Decree.

(2) No appeal shall lie to any other body or person from any determination of the Court.

(3) Nothing in subsection (1) or (2) above shall prejudice any jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Nigeria under section 115 or 117 (2) (d) of the Constitution of the Federation or any jurisdiction of a High Court under section 32 of that Constitution.

16—(1) The members of the Court shall be appointed by the Supreme Military Council acting, in the case of the President of the Court, after consultation with the Advisory Judicial Committee.

(2) A person shall not be qualified to hold the office of President of the Court unless—

(a) he has been a judge of a court of unlimited jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters in some part of the Commonwealth or a court having jurisdiction in appeals from any such court; or

(b) he is qualified for admission as an advocate in Nigeria and has been so qualified for not less than ten years:

Provided that, in computing the period during which any person has been qualified for admission as advocate, any period during which he has been in office as judge or magistrate after becoming so qualified shall be included.
(3) If the office of President or an ordinary member of the Court is vacant or if the person holding any such office is for any reason unable to perform the functions of his office, the Supreme Military Council, acting, in the case of the office of President, after consultation with the Advisory Judicial Committee, may appoint a person qualified to hold that office to act therein; and any person so appointed shall continue to act for the period of the appointment or, if no period is specified, until his appointment is revoked by the Supreme Military Council, acting, in the case of the President, after consultation with the Advisory Judicial Committee.

17—(1) The assessors to assist the Court in dealing with any matter referred to it shall be appointed by the President of the Court as follows—

(a) two shall be persons nominated by or on behalf of the employers concerned from the panel of employers' representatives drawn up under section 33 of this Decree; and

(b) two shall be persons nominated by or on behalf of the workers concerned from the panel of workers' representatives drawn up under the said section 33:

Provided that if after seven days of being required to do so by the Commissioner the employers or workers concerned or their representatives fail to make a nomination for the purposes of any appointment failing to be made in accordance with this subsection, the Commissioner may appoint from the appropriate panel such person as he thinks fit.

(2) The remuneration, if any, to be paid to persons for acting as assessors in relation to any proceedings before the Court shall be determined by the Court:

Provided that no remuneration, fees or allowances shall be paid to any public officer other than such allowances for expenses as may be expressly authorised for the purposes of this section by the Public Service Commission of the Federation or the State in question, as the case may be.

18—(1) If, after the Court has begun to consider any matter referred to it, the President becomes incapable of continuing to take part in the proceedings on account of sickness or for any other reason, the Head of the Federal Military Government, acting after consultation with the Chief Justice of Nigeria, shall as soon as possible appoint a person qualified to hold the relevant office to act therein for the purposes of those proceedings,
and any person so appointed shall be deemed to have been so appointed under and in accordance with section 16 (3) of this Decree.

(2) If, after the Court has begun to consider any matter referred to it, an ordinary member becomes incapable as aforesaid, then—

(a) if the Court as constituted for the purposes of the proceedings includes all four ordinary members, the President shall re-constitute the Court by removing therefrom the ordinary member in question and one other ordinary member;

(b) if the Court as constituted for the purposes of the proceedings includes two ordinary members, the President shall re-constitute the Court by substituting for him another ordinary member.

(3) If, after the Court has begun to consider any matter referred to it any assessor appointed to assist the Court in relation to that matter becomes incapable as aforesaid, the President of the Court shall appoint from the same panel, to act as assessor in his place for the purposes of the proceedings, another person nominated by or on behalf of the employers or workers who nominated the assessor in whose place he is to act.

(4) Where any appointment or substitution has been made under the section in the course of any proceedings before the Court, the proceedings may, with the consent of all parties thereto, be continued before the Court as reconstituted by virtue of that appointment or substitution and be determined accordingly, but in default of that consent shall be re-heard and determined by the Court as so reconstituted:

Provided that where the Court is reconstituted in pursuance of subsection (2) (a) above by the removal of two ordinary members, the proceedings shall, if the chairman so directs, be continued before the Court as so reconstituted irrespective of whether the parties thereto or any of them has consented to the continuance.

19.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this section, a person holding or appointed to act in the office of President of the Court shall vacate that office when he attains the age of sixty-two years:

Provided that the Head of the Federal Military Government may permit such a person to continue in his office or appointment for such period after attaining that age as may be necessary to enable him to make an award, deliver a decision or do any other thing in relation to proceedings that were commenced before him before he attained that age.
(2) An ordinary member of the Court shall hold office for such term as may be fixed by the Supreme Military Council, but shall not continue to hold office after attaining the age of sixty-two years:

Provided that the Head of the Federal Military Government may permit such a person to continue in office for such period after the end of his term of office or the attainment by him of the said age as may be necessary to enable him to make an award, or do any other thing in relation to proceedings which were commenced before him before the end of his term of office or his attainment of that age.

(3) Any person who has vacated the office of a member of the Court may, if qualified, again be appointed to hold that office in accordance with the provisions of section 16 of this Decree.

(4) A person—
(a) holding or appointed to sit in the office of President of the Court; or
(b) holding or appointed to sit in the office of an ordinary member of the Court,
may be removed from his office or appointment by the Supreme Military Council acting, in the case of a person falling within paragraph (a) above, after consultation with the Advisory Judicial Committee.

(5) A member of the Court may resign from his office by notice in writing addressed to the Head of the Federal Military Government, and any such resignation shall take effect when notice is received by the Head of the Federal Military Government or by any person authorised by him to receive it.

20—(1) The President and the ordinary members of the Court shall be paid such salaries as may be approved by the Federal Executive Council.

(2) There shall also be paid to each member of the Court on account of expenses incurred in connection with his office or otherwise such allowances as may be approved by the Federal Executive Council.

(3) All sums payable by virtue of this section shall be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Federation.

21—(1) The provisions of the Supreme Court Act 1960 specified in subsection (2) below shall, with such modifications as may be necessary, apply in relation to the Court as they apply in relation to the Supreme Court.
(2) The said provisions are the following—
section 5 (officers)
section 6 (seal)
section 7(1) (process)
section 11 (reserved judgments).

22. The Constitution of the Federation is hereby amended as follows—

(a) in section 133 (which relates to the remuneration of the members of the Supreme Court and certain other officers), in subsection (4), after the word “Lagos” there shall be inserted the words “member of the National Industrial Court”;

(b) in section 147 (which relates to the appointment, etc., of officers in the public service) in subsection (2) (a), after the word “Lagos” there shall be inserted the words “or of any member of the National Industrial Court”;

(c) in section 163 (which relates to the powers of Commissioners in relation to grant of pensions, etc.), in subsection (2) after the word “Lagos” there shall be inserted the words “or of a member of the National Industrial Court”;

(d) in section 165 (which relates to interpretation), in subsection (2)(a), after the word “Lagos” there shall be inserted the words “and of the members of the National Industrial Court”.

PART III

BOARDS OF INQUIRY

23—(1) Where any trade dispute exists or is apprehended, the Commissioner may cause inquiry to be made into the causes and circumstances of the dispute and, if he thinks fit, may refer any matter appearing to him to be connected with or relevant to the dispute to a board of inquiry appointed for the purpose by the Commissioner; and the board shall inquire into the matter referred to it and report thereon to the Commissioner.

(2) The Commissioner may refer any other matter connected with industrial conditions in Nigeria to a board of inquiry appointed for the purpose by the Commissioner; and the board shall inquire into the matter referred to it and report thereon to the Commissioner.
(3) A board of inquiry appointed under this section shall consist of a chairman and such other persons as the Commissioner thinks fit to appoint or may, if the Commissioner thinks fit, consist of one person only.

(4) A board of inquiry consisting of two or more persons may act notwithstanding any vacancy in the number of members.

(5) The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Federal Commissioner for Finance, pay to any member of a board of inquiry appointed under this section such remuneration as he thinks fit:

Provided that no remuneration, fees or allowances shall be paid to any public officer other than such allowances for expenses as may be expressly authorised for the purposes of this section by the Public Service Commission of the Federation or the State in question, as the case may be.

24—(1) A board of inquiry appointed under section 23 of this Decree may, if it thinks fit, make interim reports.

(2) Every report of such a board of inquiry, including any interim report and any minority report, shall be submitted to the Commissioner.

(3) Subject to subsection (4) below, the Commissioner may cause to be published, at such time or times and in such manner as he thinks fit, any information obtained or conclusions reached by any such board of inquiry in the course of or as a result of its inquiry.

(4) Except with the consent required by this subsection there shall not be included in any report made by such a board of inquiry, or in any publication authorised by the Commissioner under this section, any information obtained by the board in the course of its inquiry—

(a) with respect to any trade union; or

(b) with respect to any particular business or undertaking, whether carried on by a particular individual, a firm or a company or other body corporate,

being in either case information which is not available otherwise than through evidence given at the inquiry.

The consent required by this subsection is, in the case of information with respect to a trade union, consent given on behalf of the union by an official thereof authorised by the union to give that consent and, in the case of information with respect
to any business or undertaking, consent given by or on behalf of the Individual, firm, company or other body corporate carrying on the business or undertaking.

(5) If any individual member of a board of inquiry appointed under section 23 of this Decree, or any other person concerned in the inquiry, discloses any such information as is mentioned in subsection (4) above without the consent required by that subsection, he shall be guilty of an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine of N200.

PART VI

SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISIONS:
THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL COURT,
ARBITRATION TRIBUNALS AND BOARDS OF INQUIRY,

25.—This Part of this Decree applies to the following bodies that is to say—

(a) the National Industrial Court;
(b) any arbitration tribunal constituted under Part I of this Decree; and
(c) any board of inquiry appointed under Part III of this Decree.

26.—(1) For the purpose of dealing with any trade dispute or other matter referred to it under this Decree, a body to which this Part of this Decree applies may—

(a) require any person to furnish, in writing or otherwise, such particulars relating to the matter referred to it as the body may require;
(b) require any person to attend before the body and give evidence, on oath or affirmation or otherwise, with respect to any matter relevant to the matter referred to it;
(c) compel the production before it of books, papers, documents and other things for the purpose of enabling them to be examined or referred to so far as may be necessary in order to obtain information relevant to the matter referred to the body;
(d) consider and deal with the matter referred to it in the absence of any party who has been duly summoned or served with a notice to appear.
(e) admit or exclude the public or the press, or both, from any of its sittings;
(f) adjourn from time to time; and
(g) generally give all such directions and do all such things as are necessary or expedient for dealing speedily and justly with the matter referred to it.

(2) For the purpose of enforcing any summons, direction or order issued, given or made by virtue of subsection (1) above, a body to which this Part of this Decree applies shall have the like powers as are exercisable by the Supreme Court of Nigeria.

(3) If any person, on being required by virtue of this section to furnish any particulars, answer any question or produce any book, paper, document or other thing, objects to doing so on the ground that to do so would tend to incriminate him or on any other lawful ground, he shall not be bound to comply with the requirement and shall not be liable to any punishment for refusing to do so.

(4) Any person who commits an act of contempt, whether the act is or is not committed in the presence of the members of any such body as aforesaid sitting in the exercise of its functions under this Decree, shall be liable on summary conviction before a High Court to a fine of N200 or to imprisonment for three months.

27.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this Decree, the Chief Justice of Nigeria may make rules as to the practice and procedure to be followed by the National Industrial Court.

(2) The Commissioner may make regulations regulating the exercise of the functions of any arbitration tribunal constituted under Part I of this Decree and any board of inquiry appointed under Part III of this Decree.

(3) Subject to the provisions of this Decree and of any rules or regulations made under this section, a body to which this section applies—
(a) may regulate its procedure and proceedings as it thinks fit, and shall not be bound to act in any formal manner; and
(b) shall not be bound by any rules of evidence but may inform itself on any matter in such manner as it thinks just.

28.—In any proceedings before the National Industrial Court or an arbitration tribunal constituted under Part I of this Decree, either party may appear by a legal practitioner; and in any proceedings before a board of inquiry appointed under Part III of
this Decree, the board may, at its discretion, permit any interested
person to appear before it by a legal practitioner.

29.—(1) Where, in the case of any sitting or part of a sitting
of a body to which this Part of this Decree applies, the press have
been admitted thereto, but not otherwise, a fair and accurate
report or summary of the proceedings during that sitting or part
(including any evidence heard in the course thereof) may be
published, but until the award of the Court or tribunal, or the
result of the enquiry, has been officially published, no comment
shall be published in respect of the proceedings or the evidence.

(2) Any person who contravenes subsection (1) above shall
be guilty of an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine of
N200.

Made at Lagos the 7th day of February 1976.

GENERAL M. R. MUHAMMED,
Head of the Federal Military Government
Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces
Federal Republic of Nigeria

EXPLANATORY NOTE

(The note does not form part of the above Decree but is
intended to explain its purpose)

The Decree makes fresh provisions with respect to the settle-
ment of trade disputes and repeals the Trade Disputes (Emergency
Provisions) Decree 1968 and the Trade Disputes (Emergency

Under the Decree where a trade dispute arises between
employers and workers effort must first be made to resolve it at
a meeting. If there is failure to reach an agreement the matter
should be reported to the Commissioner for Labour who, in
certain specified cases, may appoint a conciliator. The con-
icilator is to endeavour by negotiation to seek to bring about a settlement.
If conciliation fails the Commissioner is empowered to refer the
matter to arbitration and, ultimately, to a National Industrial
Court established under the Decree. It is an offence under the
Decree for any party to a dispute to take part in a strike or a lock-
out whilst any of the steps enumerated above remains to be taken.
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BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. NAME: ____________________________ COURSE #: ____________________________

2. ADDRESS: ____________________________ TELEPHONE: ____________________________

3. I am working toward a: ( ) M.A. or M.S. ( ) Ph.D. ( ) Specialist
   ( ) Other degree or certificate in ____________________________

4. My present or most recent position is (was):

   IN TEACHING
   ( ) Secondary School Level
   ( ) Post Sec./Higher School Level
   ( ) Elementary School Level
   ( ) Other. Describe. ______

   IN ADMINISTRATION
   ( ) Inspector
   ( ) Assistant Inspector
   ( ) Executive Headship
   ( ) Director of ______

   OTHER
   ( ) Principalship
   ( ) Vice Principalship
   ( ) Supervisor of ______

   ( ) Other. Describe. ______

5. I have had: ( ) 1 to 5, ( ) 6 to 10, ( ) 11 to 15, ( ) 16 to 20,
   ( ) over twenty years of teaching experience.

6. I have had: ( ) 1 to 5, ( ) 6 to 10, ( ) 11 to 15, ( ) 16 to 20,
   ( ) over twenty years of administrative or supervisory experience.

7. Have you ever belonged to a labor or craft union of any kind?
   ( ) Yes ( ) No

8. This questionnaire is merely a preliminary screening device for the purpose of selecting subjects to participate in an experimental investigation of the professional negotiations process. Subjects who are selected to participate in the experiment will be asked to spend about three hours in a simulated negotiation session. Would you be willing to be one of these subjects?
   ( ) Yes ( ) Perhaps ( ) Definitely not
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LABOR-MANAGEMENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE
LABOR-MANAGEMENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Preliminary Remarks

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the importance of some of the issues in the field of labor-management relations today, as well as to determine the position that various groups will take on those issues.

In filling out the questionnaire, it is extremely important that you answer them according to your own ideas on the subject and not as someone else thinks about it or the way that you think it should be answered.

Marking the Questionnaire

On the following pages you will find various statements concerning one phase or another of an issue of present day labor-management relations. Before each statement are columns marked from 1 to 5. If you mark in column:

-1- **Strongly disagree** - it means that this statement read opposite to your attitudes on this issue or that you definitely disagree with the statement.

-2- **Disagree** - it means that you partially disagree with the statement or that you believe it to be more wrong than right.

-3- **Undecided** - it means that you are undecided about the statement or that you stand in the middle-of-the-road on this issue.

-4- **Agree** - it means that you partially agree with this statement, that you agree with the statement with reservations or that the statement is more right than wrong.

-5- **Strongly agree** - it means that you fully agree with the statement or that this statement expresses your attitude on the issue involved.

Please circle the item in the column which most clearly represents your attitude about the statement. Be sure that you have circled one and only one answer for each statement.
Scoring the Questionnaire

Each questionnaire item is scored on a scale which ranges from one to five points. That is, a "strongly agree" answer counts five points, an "agree" answer counts four points, down through a "strongly disagree" answer which counts one point. Some of the items are scored directly, i.e., as above, while others are scored inversely, i.e., reversed from the examples above. Thus, an inversely scored answer of "strongly agree" would be scored as one point rather than five, an inversely scored answer of "agree" would be scored as two points rather than four, and an inversely scored answer of "strongly disagree" would be scored five points rather than one.

The following questionnaire items are scored directly: 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, and 38. All other items are scored inversely.
1 2 3 4 5

SD D U A SA 1. Union demands of excessive wage increases are primarily responsible for large increases in prices.

SD D U A SA 2. Layoffs should be made on the basis of seniority.

SD D U A SA 3. The company should be given the right to discharge a man it considers unsatisfactory at any time during his employment.

SD D U A SA 4. Individual initiative is more important than collective security.

SD D U A SA 5. Union leaders are more interested in their own financial welfare than in the workers' financial welfare.

SD D U A SA 6. The union should be given equal representation with management on the Board of Directors.

SD D U A SA 7. White collar workers as well as laborers should be organized.

SD D U A SA 8. Since management considers the worker as just another commodity to be used in production, workers must organize unions to defend their rights as individuals.

SD D U A SA 9. Management must preserve the sole right to govern the company's pricing policy if industry is to survive.

SD D U A SA 10. Unions should lobby for labor legislation.

SD D U A SA 11. Unions struggle to keep existing work rules in order to ensure the health and safety of the worker, not to make unnecessary work or to featherbed.
SD U A SA 12. Most of the violence found at picket lines is instigated by management itself.

SD U A SA 13. In all probability, management will someday break all unions since they do not fulfill any duty which cannot be fulfilled by management itself.

SD U A SA 14. Michael Imoudu has gained much for his men, but most of the gains have been at the expense of the public.

SD U A SA 15. In recent years, the high profits of management have been thrown away on advertising and the like when they should have been used to compensate workers for their increased productivity.

SD U A SA 16. A closed shop (all workers must join the union) is beneficial to the worker.

SD U A SA 17. The union does not represent the plant owners and should not attempt to participate in management's decisions on plant policies.

SD U A SA 18. Corporation profits today are excessive.

SD U A SA 19. The Unions no longer represent the interest of the workingman but that of top union executives.

SD U A SA 20. Management's assertion that inflation is a result of rising labor costs is a distortion of facts and degrades labor's contribution to industrial growth.

SD U A SA 21. In a piece-rate system of payment, management should be allowed to set the piece-rate since they have hired experts in this field to do the work.
1  2  3  4  5

SD D U A SA  22. The NUTC merger was another great step forward for Nigerian Industry.

SD D U A SA  23. There is no reason why high union officials should not be paid as much as high management officials.

SD D U A SA  24. Shortening the work week with no loss of pay is a sensible union solution to the problem of automation and unemployment.

SD D U A SA  25. The union should help management in setting the pricing policy of the company.

SD D U A SA  26. The higher standard of living that is enjoyed by the average Nigerian workingman today would have come about without the aid of unions.

SD D U A SA  27. Some of the union's power should be taken away from it.

SD D U A SA  28. Unions will eventually bring about the downfall of the Free Enterprise System.

SD D U A SA  29. Management's practice of discrimination against older workers makes the union's fight for seniority rules a necessity.

SD D U A SA  30. The problem in labor relations today is not that unions are too strong but management's refusal to accept labor as an equal partner in the industrial process.

SD D U A SA  31. Unions should intensify their effort to organize government employees.

SD D U A SA  32. The recent spiral in prices is due to price hikes on the part of management after which the unions demand pay hikes to keep up with the cost of living.
SD D U A SA 33. The actions of top union officials are more for their own benefit than for the workers.

SD D U A SA 34. Unions should not meddle in politics.

SD D U A SA 35. The union is not interested in power itself but only in protecting the welfare of its workers.

SD D U A SA 36. Unions are more to blame for inflation than are managements.

SD D U A SA 37. Unions weaken individual initiative.

SD D U A SA 38. Any policy changes in personnel procedures should be worked out in a joint conference between both management and union officials.

SD D U A SA 39. White collar workers should not be unionized.

SD D U A SA 40. The motives governing the action of top union officials are prestige and financial gain, and not the welfare of the workers.
APPENDIX C

LABOR-MANAGEMENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE
Note: The materials in this appendix will be used by the negotiators in the experimental simulation. All materials will be given to all negotiators with two exceptions: (1) Management negotiators will be given the "management letter of appointment and confidential memorandum" only, and (2) union negotiators will be given the "union letter of appointment and confidential memorandum" only.
Appointment to Management Negotiating Team

You have been selected by the Management (Ministry of Education) to represent it as a member of a two-man team in its negotiations with the Nigerian Union of Teachers (NUT).

The Management recognizes that the so-called "increasing militancy" of the teaching profession has had considerable impact upon a majority of the teachers of our school system. As a result, it appears that the past practice of dealing with teaching personnel in an informal and unofficial manner cannot be maintained for many more years.

The union will, no doubt, make several demands, but their major concern seems to be with gaining inputs into decision making and a written contract from the Management. You are to do the best possible job you can to get a reasonable settlement with the NUT, while keeping in mind that the Management has an obligation to not only the teachers of the system, but to the children and adults of the community.

It is essential that a fair agreement be reached in this bargaining period. We realize that this will involve compromise on both sides, and you are appointed to engage in negotiations for us. Remember, your job is to reach a settlement, one that is both fair to the teachers and educationally and financially sound and defensible.

John F. Omar
President, Nigerian Public Schools Ministry of Education
Appointment to Union Bargaining Team

You have been selected by the membership of the Nigerian Union of Teachers to represent it as a member of a two-man team in its negotiations with the Ministry of Education. Your colleagues are depending upon you to get a powerful input into decision making made by the Ministry of Education.

You are to do the best possible job you can to get a good contract for the teachers of the state. The system's teachers have become increasingly dissatisfied with the results of the informal, unofficial, and unilateral relationship between the teaching profession and the Ministry of Education.

The NUT membership has decided to attempt to negotiate a two-year contract with the Ministry of Education. Several issues must be resolved if a contract is to be achieved, but the most important issues are (1) salary, (2) including the Union into key decision making affecting teachers and pupils, and official, bargaining representative for the teachers of the state, and (3) gaining a written contract with the Management.

The membership feels it essential that a contract be achieved with the Ministry of Education which will provide for representation of the teaching profession in the determination of educational policy and practice in the community's public schools. Your colleagues are especially interested in gaining a voice in the determination of staff personnel policies. The membership realizes that the achievement of a contract will involve compromises on both sides, and you are appointed to carry out negotiations for us.

Remember, your job is to reach a contract agreement with the Management—an agreement that is good for your colleagues and for the teaching profession.

J. J. Ajayi
President, Nigerian Union of Teachers
Background Information

Umu is a city of slightly over 110,000 inhabitants. The city is located in Bendel state. It has no large slum or deteriorating sections. Civic pride and interest in local government are high. For example, 88.5 percent of the city's eligible voters cast ballots at the last local general election.

Umu's many social and service organizations are energetic in their attempts to maintain the city as a "progressive, clean, and attractive place in which to live and work."

The city government is of the council variety with one council-man being elected from each of the city's ten wards and five councilmen being elected at-large. The Umu local government area is coterminous with the city of Amai; however, it is a fiscally independent city. The five-member ministry of Education is appointed from the state at large; one seat on the management being filled each year.

Four men and a woman make up the present Management Committee. The members are: Mr. John F. Omar, President (Inspector of Education)

Dr. Ase J. Peifa (Deputy Inspector of Education)

Mr. Uvo L. Ubong (Assistant Secretary)

Mr. Kofi B. Abaje (Zonal Inspector of Education)

Mrs. L. W. Akpomudaire (Senior Assistant Secretary)

The city has no heavy industries. There are numerous small manufacturing concerns in Umu, most of which employ less than 300
persons and other people are engaged in subsistence farming. Coconut oil, and vegetable oil are the major products of Umu light industries.

The average annual family income in Umu is $8,157. Only 4.6 percent of the families in the city have an annual income of less than $4,000. The educational level of the city's citizens is fairly high. Women, aged 25 and over, average 8 years of education while men of the same age group average 7.5 years of education. Of the city's "over 25" population, 7.2 percent have college degrees. The unemployment rate in the city has averaged about 2.3 percent of the total work force for the last five years.

The school system is a source of pride to the city's citizens. They point with great pleasure to the school plant, which is, in general, fairly new. Most citizens of Umu believe that theirs is a "progressive" school system and that the system's administrators and teachers keep up with, and use, all that is good and new in educational practice and theory.

The school system operates on a three track system wherein students elect a "college preparatory," a "commercial," or a "general education," series of courses. Over 25 percent of the system's graduates attend college each year.

The total assessed valuation of the district is $510,012,750. The total bonded indebtedness of the district is $35,700,892 which is about 7 percent of the district's total valuation. The legal limit on indebtedness is 5 percent of total valuation. The
operating budget for the last school year totaled $12,862,200. Of this amount 45 percent was derived from the state, 54 percent was derived from the federal government, and the remainder was derived from local tax sources. The tax rate for school operation and debt retirement is 18.2 mills.

After the Second World War, NUT became the only bargaining union for teachers at the federal, state, and local levels. The NUT accepted, and now accepts, all educators in the system as members. The relationship between NUT and the management has not always been amicable. In the past the management has not made every effort to communicate with and cooperate with the NUT, and the NUT has not taken this attitude kindly. The management usually does not accede to the relatively infrequent demands made by the NUT, and conversely, the NUT attempted to negotiate and push for any requests made to it by the Management and/or Inspector. The relationship between the management and the NUT was not so cordial that some teachers began to view the management as an arm of the government's sole interest. According to one of the assistant inspectors, "the leaders of this small group were active and militant and began to stir up discontent among the teachers." The Umu Teachers' Association, a local wing of the NUT, has gained membership very rapidly over the past two decades. A disagreement between the teachers in Umu and the local government council came up over the money paid to the local government for teachers' salaries. Instead of paying teachers' salaries with this money, the council diverted and disbursed the money on drainage, sanitation, and street lights, etc. This situation enabled the state government to understand
more clearly that the affairs of the primary schools will not be entrusted anymore into the hands of the local government. Instead, the school board will be responsible.

The change of who should be in charge brought some controversy within the school system. In an attempt to resolve the controversy, there was an election. The election was held under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and State Labor Relations Management. At this election the Union won the right to bargain for issues such as relevant courses, salary increases, duty free lunch periods, and improving the curriculum, etc., for the classroom teachers. The final tally was:

For the School Board  444  (87 percent)
For the local government  78  (12 percent)
Not voting  8  (1 percent)
TOTAL  530  (100 percent)

Other data with regard to the Umu school system are presented on the following pages.
## School System Statistics

### Schools in System and Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools (K-6)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools (7-9)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Schools (10-12)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elementary School Professional Personnel

- Teachers: 530
- Principals: 39
- Vice Principals: 5

### Secondary School Professional Personnel

- Teachers: 207
- Principals: 19
- Vice Principals: 9

### Higher School Professional Personnel

- Teachers: 282
- Principals: 4
- Vice Principals: 8
## School System Statistics

### Professional Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Teachers</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Administrators</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supervisors</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Professional Staff</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Central Office Professional Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Inspector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistants and Directors</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL SYSTEM STATISTICS

Secondary School and Higher School

Homeroom and Attendance -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary schools are in session from 8:00 a.m. through 3:30 p.m.

Secondary teachers are expected to be in their buildings from 8:15 a.m. through 4:00 p.m.

Elementary teachers are expected to be in their buildings from 7:30 a.m. through 4:00 p.m.
# School System Statistics

## Educational Attainment of Professional Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers possessing:</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a Bachelor's degree (N.C.E., Higher, &amp; Secondary School Certificates)</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Master's degree</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,019</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrators possessing:</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Master's degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(REVISED CONVERSION TABLE FROM THE UNIFIED GRADING AND SALARY SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS CURRENT) EXPERIENCE STEPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training classifications and levels</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 7</td>
<td>2,832</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 8</td>
<td>3,564</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>4,464</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 9</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>4,992</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 10</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>5,922</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>6,246</td>
<td>6,408</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>6,732</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 11</td>
<td>6,744</td>
<td>6,924</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>7,284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 12</td>
<td>7,404</td>
<td>7,620</td>
<td>7,836</td>
<td>8,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 13</td>
<td>8,064</td>
<td>8,384</td>
<td>8,704</td>
<td>9,024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 14</td>
<td>9,168</td>
<td>9,488</td>
<td>9,888</td>
<td>10,128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 15</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>10,812</td>
<td>11,238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. 16</td>
<td>11,568</td>
<td>12,144</td>
<td>12,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

1. G.L. 7 - National Certificate of Education (N.C.E.)
2. G.L. 8 - Starts with Bachelor of Arts or Science Degree
3. G.L. 9 - Starts with Master's Degree
4. G.L. 10 - Starts with a Doctorate
BACKGROUND INFORMATION 2

Data from a State Ministry of Education Survey

The following table gives information on Umu and on three other local government areas of comparable size in the state. Data on one other school district (a large metropolitan area) are given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Umu</th>
<th>Ever</th>
<th>Ama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment - A.D.A.</td>
<td>33,150</td>
<td>29,634</td>
<td>34,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Expenditures per pupil</td>
<td>₦384.92</td>
<td>₦414.11</td>
<td>₦409.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Valuation per pupil</td>
<td>₦15,383</td>
<td>₦14,696</td>
<td>₦16,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Teaching Salary</td>
<td>₦6,200</td>
<td>₦6,000</td>
<td>₦6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Teaching Salary</td>
<td>₦8,600</td>
<td>₦8,200</td>
<td>₦9,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into decision making of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Association or Union</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any form of written contract</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relevance of Courses</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide extra pay for extra</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duties (other than coaches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management pays medical insurance</td>
<td>yes (½)</td>
<td>yes (½)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' transfers on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basis of seniority</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide paid sabbaticals</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School facilities &amp; equipment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for at least two hours for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation for all teachers</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have class size limits</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have formal Grievance Procedure</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCMA</td>
<td>SELU</td>
<td>Average for other city school districts in the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment - A.D.A.</td>
<td>32,379</td>
<td>144,584</td>
<td>7,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Expenditures per pupil</td>
<td>N501.17</td>
<td>N400.17</td>
<td>N395.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Valuation per pupil</td>
<td>N18,611</td>
<td>N17,871</td>
<td>N15,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Teaching Salary</td>
<td>N 6,600</td>
<td>N 6,100</td>
<td>N 6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Teaching Salary</td>
<td>N 9,800</td>
<td>N 9,600</td>
<td>N 8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal recognition of Union or Teacher Association</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>38% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any form of written contract</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>32% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Relevance of Courses</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>21% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide extra pay for extra duties (other than coaches)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>79% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management pays medical insurance in full or in part</td>
<td>yes (4)</td>
<td>yes (4/4)</td>
<td>18% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' transfers on basis of seniority</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>82% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide paid sabbaticals</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>94% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School facilities &amp; equipment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>91% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for at least two hours for preparation for all teachers</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>43% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have class size limits</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>57% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have formal Grievance Procedure</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>33% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88% no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25% yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75% no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue for Bargaining # 1

Statement of Positions

Duty-Free Lunch Period

Union: THE NTU demands that all teachers be given a full (50 minutes) duty-free period for lunch.

Management: The Management rejects this demand on the grounds that elementary teachers must lunch with and supervise their pupils.

Past Practice

All except elementary school teachers now have a duty-free lunch period. Elementary teachers lunch with their classes.

Naira Value

If aides are employed to supervise lunch periods in elementary schools, approximate cost will be N100,000 per year.
Issue for Bargaining # 2

Statement of Positions

The Relevance of Courses

Union: The NUT demands a panel of four, consisting of two administrators and two teachers, that should have input into decision making that will influence policymaking to change the number of hours teachers devote to the teaching of science, mathematics, and a Nigerian language.

Management: The Management rejects the demand for input into decision making.

Past Practice

NUT members were not allowed to change the number of hours courses are taught through their school's union representative.

Naira Value

The cost to the management will be approximately ₦3,000 per year if the NUT demand is accepted.
Salary Increase

Union: The NUT demands a N400 across-the-management annual pay increase for all teachers.

Management: The management refuses outright and makes no counter offer.

Past Practice

Minimum (starting) salary for a teacher with no experience and a bachelor's degree is N3,200. Maximum salary for a teacher with a bachelor's degree is N5,316 in 12 steps. Teachers with a master's degree receive N300 per year above the amounts received by bachelor's degree teachers, i.e., minimum is N4,666, maximum is N5,690. The last salary increase was granted two years ago. This increase was a N192 across-the-management raise. (See Schedule A, for current salary schedule.)

Naira Cost

Approximately N500,000 per year if full N400 per year increase is given.
Hospital and Medical Plan

Union: The NUT demands that the Management pay the full cost of hospital and medical insurance.

Management: The management refuses to pay more than \( \frac{1}{4} \) of the cost of hospital and medical insurance.

Past Practice

Management has paid \( \frac{1}{4} \) of the cost of the insurance and teachers have paid remaining \( \frac{3}{4} \). Average cost of insurance per teacher is \( \text{₦}18.60 \) per month.

Naira Value

Will vary according to proportion of cost paid by the management as follows:

\( \frac{1}{4} \) of cost--approximately \( \text{₦}36,000 \) per year. (No increase over present practice.)

\( \frac{1}{2} \) of cost--approximately \( \text{₦}72,000 \) per year.

\( \frac{3}{4} \) of cost--approximately \( \text{₦}116,000 \) per year.

\( \frac{4}{4} \) of cost--approximately \( \text{₦}144,000 \) per year.
Issue for Bargaining 5
Statement of Positions

School Facilities and Equipment
Union: The NUT demands that all teachers be given full school facilities and equipment such as projectors, screens, television sets, and accommodations.

Management: The Management rejects this demand on the grounds that the additional costs cannot be met by the annual budgetary allocations.

Past Practice
All except elementary school teachers now have new school facilities and equipment. Elementary teachers have inadequate and outdated school facilities and equipment in their classes.

Naira Value
If aides are employed to supervise new equipment and facilities in elementary schools, and provide residential accommodation approximate cost will be ₦15,000 per year.
Preparation Periods

Union: The NUT demands that every secondary and high school teacher have at least five preparation periods (50 minutes each) per week. All elementary teachers are to have at least two (50 minute) preparation periods per week. Only fully qualified teachers are to be employed to fill the gap created by the loss of teaching time created by granting preparation periods.

Management: The management accepts this demand in general, but demands that the phrase "to the extent possible and consistent with good practice" be added to the union demand statement, and that it be free to hire teacher aides to fill the teaching-time gap.

Past Practice

Most junior and senior high school teachers now have five scheduled (50 minute) preparation periods per week. However, these periods are often filled with non-teaching chores or substitute duties which are assigned to teachers by building principals. Elementary teachers have no scheduled preparation periods.

Naira Value

1. Add more staff—about 30 teachers - ₦225,000.
2. Add teacher aides at ₦2.00 per hour - ₦80,000.
Class Size Limitation

Union: The NUT demands that self-contained classes in elementary schools shall not exceed 30 pupils and that subject classes in junior or senior high schools shall not exceed 28 pupils. In the event that it is necessary to assign a teacher to a class which exceeds the limits listed above, the principal shall stipulate the reason for the excess, in writing, to the teacher and to the Inspector of Schools. Such statement of reasons shall be made available for examination by Union officials in the office of the Inspector.

Management: The management rejects the union demand.

Past Practice

There is no official policy on class size. Unofficial policy has been to attempt to maintain class size at about 30 pupils per class. At present the average elementary class has 32 pupils, the average secondary class has 29 pupils, and the average higher school class has less than 28 pupils. Range in class size is from 24 to 37 pupils in elementary schools and 13 to 48 pupils in secondary schools.

Naira Cost

Using calculations on average class sizes and current enrollments, the system will require at least 26 additional elementary teachers, 11 additional junior high teachers, and no additional senior high teachers. Estimating the average salary of the 37 new teachers to be ₦7,000 per year, the cost of accepting this demand would be ₦259,000 per year.
To: Management Negotiator  
From: The Ministry of Education  
Subject: Issues and "Good Faith" Negotiating

The following statements provide a terse outline of the Management's position, at this time, on the issues which will be the subject of the forthcoming negotiations with the Union. While these statements are not to be taken as the Management's final position on the issues, they should be emphasized in your discussion with the Union representatives.

**Issue #1**  
The Union demands that all classroom teachers be given a full (50 minute) duty-free period for lunch. Many local government areas in the state have agreed to similar demands. The management rejects this demand to the Union, but will only yield to the demand of the teachers if the teachers will lunch and supervise the pupils.

**Issue #2**  
The management rejects the idea of teachers trying to influence decision making that will affect the course system. It may be illegal for the teachers to change the number of hours devoted to teaching certain courses without the consent of management.

**Issues #3 and #4**  
In general, the Union demands for general salary and fringe benefit increases are unreasonable. The salary schedule and other benefits presently provided by the management are in line with those provided by other local government areas throughout the state. Granting increased salaries and further benefits would necessitate asking the voters for a major increase in tax millage.

**Issue #5**  
It is the feeling of the management (ministry) that elementary school teachers should not seek and use new school facilities, such as projectors, screens, and others to improve the learning process for the pupils. This is because the management cannot afford the cost of the new equipment now.

**Issue #6**  
The management is willing to accept this demand in principle. However, the terms of agreement need to be changed somewhat. (See the management public statement on "Issue #6," page 1.)

**Issue #7**  
The management rejects this demand. The management has done, and will do, all it can do to maintain reasonable class size in all schools. This demand is clearly another attempt by the Union to gain control of administrative functions.
At the present time the labor laws of the country do apply to management—teacher negotiators. So far as we have been able to determine, the Ministry of Education can be held to answer for an unfair labor practice in a court of law or in a labor relations court.

To bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession.

The phrase "Wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment" is a broad one and it has been liberally interpreted. It has now been established in industry that the following are all mandatory subjects of collective bargaining—pensions, group insurance, the no-strike clause, an incentive system, merit raises, bonus plans, employee stock purchase plans, plant removal or transfer, and "break" time.

One of the most important tasks of good faith bargaining is the amount of effort that is exerted to reach an agreement. The law does not require either party to agree to any specific proposal, but it does require a consideration of proposals and the making of counterproposals. Such counterproposals need not necessarily be concessions, but they must be based upon reasoned arguments and they must be feasible as a basis for agreement.

The introduction of insincere or frivolous demands, the refusal to consider compromise propositions, the take-it-or-leave-it manner, and the insistence upon illegal arrangements as a condition for a signed contract, are all evidence of the absence of good faith in bargaining. Other tactics which are usually found to be failure to bargain are:
refusal to make counterproposals; failure to assign a negotiator with power to act; and giving the union the "run-around." In short, an open door and an open mind are the marks of good faith in bargaining. The employer should do all he can to keep it so and insist that the union do likewise.¹

To: Union Negotiator  
From: Nigerian Union of Teachers  
Subject: Issues and Bargaining Rules

The following statements provide a short summary of the Union's position with regard to the major issues for bargaining which will be discussed in the forthcoming collective bargaining sessions with the management. These statements are not meant to represent our final position on all issues, but are presented as guidelines and "talking points" for use in the bargaining sessions.

Issue # 1  
The Union membership demands that the classroom teachers be given a full (50 minute) duty-free period for lunch. The management may reject this plan because the teachers do not want to lunch and supervise the students.

Issue # 2  
The Union demands for a panel of four (two administrators and two teachers) to influence decision making that will affect the number of hours the teachers devoted to the teaching of science, mathematics, and a Nigerian language.

Issues # 3 and # 4  
The Union membership is thoroughly irritated with the management's refusal to grant teachers decent salary and badly needed benefit increases. Teachers are especially disturbed with the extra duties they must perform without pay. The management will claim that they cannot afford any increases, but the financial condition of the district indicates that more funds for education are available.

Issue # 5  
Any teacher deserves an improvement in school facilities and equipment such as projectors, screens, and others to improve the learning process for the pupils.
Issue 6  Preparation is essential to good instruction and all teachers should be given some time during the school day for preparation.

Issue 7  Research will substantiate the position that smaller class sizes mean better education. The Union is clearly justified in making this demand. The management may contend that the Union is attempting to infringe upon administrative decision-making areas, but the Union believes that class size is a professional matter, not an administrative matter.

A very important point which all Union negotiators should recognize is that frequently they will have a tendency to react to the management negotiators as status figures. A classroom teacher often finds it difficult to argue with his superintendent as an equal in all respects. Remember, however, that you represent all classroom teachers in the system, and that, in the bargaining situation, your status and power is as great as is that of any other member of the negotiating group.

The labor laws of the Nigerian government, and the rulings of the NIC with regard to collective bargaining, do apply in a technical sense to bargaining between ministry of education and teachers' unions. However, we believe that both unions and management have a moral obligation (we hope this will soon be a legal obligation) to behave in a manner which does not violate these laws and rulings.

We are especially concerned with seeing to it that our negotiators do not engage in what would be termed, in industry, unfair labor practices. We would also like our negotiators to be in a position to warn the management's negotiators if and when they show signs of engaging in unfair labor practices. Therefore, we present the following summary of "must" and "must not" rules for collective bargaining.
1. Both employer and employee representatives must meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party. Such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal of require the making of a concession.

2. The law does not require either party to agree to any specific proposal, but an honest effort to reach agreement must be exerted by both parties.

3. Both parties must consider proposals of the other party and, if the proposals are rejected, counter-proposals must be made.

4. Any counter-proposals submitted by either party need not be concessions, but they must be based upon reasoned arguments and they must be feasible as a basis for agreement.

5. Insincere or frivolous demands must not be introduced.

6. Negotiators must not insist upon illegal agreements as a precondition for the signing of a contract.

7. Negotiators must not exhibit a take-it-or-leave-it manner.

8. Negotiators must be given power to act.*

Be sure that you do not break any of these rules, because, if we fail to come to an agreement with management, we may be able to take our cast to a higher authority. If this should occur, our negotiators' behavior will be carefully scrutinized.
APPENDIX E

ISSUES SIMULATED FOR NEGOTIATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Final Agreement Position</th>
<th>Deviation Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duty Free Lunch</td>
<td>a. Yes, all teachers given full fifty minute duty free period</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Elementary teachers given duty free period every other week</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Rejected, no change in policy</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel of Four-Decision-making</td>
<td>a. Accepted</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Rejected</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increase</td>
<td>a. No increase</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. N50 increase</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. N100 increase</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. N150 increase</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. N200 increase</td>
<td>0 (GR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. N250 increase</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. N300 increase</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. N350 increase</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. N400 increase</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j. Over N400 increase</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Cost and Insurance</td>
<td>a. 0/4 of costs</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid by the Ministry</td>
<td>b. 1/4 of costs</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1/2 of costs</td>
<td>0 (GR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. 3/4 of costs</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. 4/4 of costs</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>a. Accepted union demand</td>
<td>0 (GR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Accepted management's proposal</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Period</td>
<td>a. Accept union demand</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Accept management's proposal</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size Limitation</td>
<td>a. Accept union</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Accept management's proposal</td>
<td>0 (GR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Other</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. The issues presented for the simulations are
#1 Duty Free Lunch Period
#2 The Relevance of Curriculum (Decision-Making Process)
#3 Salary Increase
#4 Hospital Cost and Insurance
#5 Facilities and Equipment
#6 Preparation Periods
#7 Class Size Limitation

b. The method used for the computation showing deviation from the reasonable "going rate" is presented in the discussion. Negative values are favorable to the management while positive values are favorable to union (NUT) per se.
APPENDIX F

BALES' VERBAL TECHNIQUE
Bales' Verbal Technique

The verbal behaviors of the 18 negotiations sessions will be placed, according to the Bales' technique, into the following 12 categories and 4 areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Categories</th>
<th>Problem Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward:</td>
<td>Social-emotional area: positive reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives suggestion, direction, implying autonomy for other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish:</td>
<td>Instrumental adaptive area: attempted answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gives orientation, information repeats, clarifies, confirms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks for orientation, information repetition, confirmation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling:</td>
<td>Instrumental adaptive area: Attempted questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation Categories

10. Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help:

11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field:

12. Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self:

Problem Areas

Social-emotional area: negative reactions

KEY:

a. Problems of Communication (Orientation--6 & 7).
b. Problems of Evaluation (Opinion--5 & 8).
c. Problems of Control (Suggestion--4 & 9).
d. Problems of Decision (Agree & Disagree--3 & 10).
e. Problems of Tension Reduction (Tension--2 & 11).
f. Problems of Reintegration (Solidarity & Antagonism--1 & 12).

Footnote:
"According to Bales, "The problem-solving sequence is visualized as a system of interaction distributed in time and between members with a general tendency to move from an initial state in which some problem is recognized to a terminal in which the problem is solved."

Each of the problems mentioned in Appendix E falls into the numbers identified at the bottom of the instrument. "The solution of the problems of evaluation assumes an ongoing successful solution to the problem of communication; the solution to the problem of control assumes an ongoing successful solution of both the problems of communication and evaluation; and so on. The solution of each problem in turn can be regarded as a functional prerequisite to the solution of the next. In this sense, each in turn becomes a more complicated or higher order problem than the last, since each involves all of those preceding and something more. Finally, all of the preceding problems are nested into the problem of social integration or reintegration."
APPENDIX G

THE POST-SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE
NEGOTIATIONS GAME - POST-SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions:

Please indicate your frank reactions to the contract and to the negotiating session you have just completed. FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BY YOURSELF, DO NOT CONSULT WITH YOUR NEGOTIATING PARTNER.

NAME __________________________

Circle your assignment:

Management 1  Management 2  Union 1  Union 2

1. How would you rate the general performance of the other member of your negotiating team? (Check one)

   a. ( ) very poor   b. ( ) poor   c. ( ) fair   d. ( ) good
   e. ( ) very good

2. In general, how defensible did you feel your given positions were on the issues presented? (Check one)

   a. ( ) generally indefensible
   b. ( ) less defensible than the positions of the other side
   c. ( ) just as defensible as the positions of the other side
   d. ( ) more defensible than the positions of the other side
   e. ( ) highly defensible.

3. How well did your assigned role in the negotiations coincide with your own general beliefs and attitudes? (Check one)

   a. ( ) coincided not at all
   b. ( ) coincided only slightly
   c. ( ) coincided moderately
   d. ( ) coincided highly
   e. ( ) coincided completely.

4. In general, how satisfied are you with the contract results of the negotiations? (Check one)

   a. ( ) highly dissatisfied
   b. ( ) somewhat dissatisfied
   c. ( ) moderately satisfied
   d. ( ) highly satisfied
   e. ( ) completely satisfied.
5. In an actual negotiations situation, how acceptable would the contract that you have negotiated be to the group which you represented in the negotiations? (Check one) Yes or No.

6. In general, how would you rate the group processes and behaviors within your negotiation session? (Check one in each list).

- a. ( ) highly emotional atmosphere
- b. ( ) somewhat emotional atmosphere
- c. ( ) moderately emotional atmosphere
- d. ( ) slightly emotional atmosphere
- e. ( ) low emotional atmosphere

- a. ( ) low problem-solving orientation
- b. ( ) slight problem-solving orientation
- c. ( ) moderate problem-solving orientation
- d. ( ) generally high problem-solving orientation
- e. ( ) very high problem-solving orientation

7. In your opinion, who got the better deal in the final contract? (Check one)

- a. ( ) Management
- b. ( ) Teachers
- c. ( ) Both sides fared equally well.

8. Rank the other three negotiators in your session on the basis of their overall contribution to solving the problems of the negotiations. Use the designations "Management 1," "Management 2," "Union 1," and "Union 2."

- a. The most valuable negotiator was ____________________.
- b. The second most valuable negotiator was ____________________.
- c. The least valuable negotiator was ____________________.

9. Using one of the terms given below, how would you categorize your own performance in the negotiations?

- a. ( ) antagonistic
- b. ( ) competitive
- c. ( ) objective
- d. ( ) cooperative
- e. ( ) collaborative,
10. If you had to categorize your general feelings toward the negotiations with one of the terms given below, which one would you select?

a. ( ) negative  
b. ( ) frustrated  
c. ( ) unpleasant  
d. ( ) neutral  
e. ( ) pleasant  
f. ( ) rewarding  
g. ( ) productive  
h. ( ) exhilarating.

11. What did you like or enjoy most about your experiences in the negotiation session? (Use the back of this questionnaire for your answer)

12. What did you dislike most about your experiences in the negotiation sessions? (Use the back of this questionnaire for your answer)

13. In your opinion, what were the two most vital or important issues and the two least important issues in the negotiations. (Mark the most important issue with a "1," the second most important issue with a "2." Mark the least important issue with a "y," the next to the least important issue with a "y.")

( ) Duty Free Lunch Period
( ) Relevant courses
( ) Salary Increase
( ) Hospital and Medical Benefits
( ) School facilities and equipment
( ) Curriculum
( ) Class size limitation
Scoring the Post-Session Questionnaire

Items 3, 11, 12, and 13 of the Questionnaire are not used in computing satisfaction scores.

Items 1, 2, and 9 are scored as follows:

- If "a" is checked, 1 point is scored.
- If "b" is checked, 2 points are scored.
- If "c" is checked, 3 points are scored.
- If "d" is checked, 4 points are scored.
- If "e" is checked, 5 points are scored.

Item 6 is scored in the same manner as are items 1, 2, and 9 but points are scored for each of this item's two columns.

Items 4 and 5 are scored as follows:

- If "a" is checked, 2 points are scored.
- If "b" is checked, 4 points are scored.
- If "c" is checked, 6 points are scored.
- If "d" is checked, 8 points are scored.
- If "e" is checked, 10 points are scored.

Item 7 is scored as follows:

- If "a" is checked by a Management negotiator, 5 points are scored.
- If "a" is checked by a Union negotiator, 1 point is scored.
- If "b" is checked by a Union negotiator, 5 points are scored.
- If "b" is checked by a Management negotiator, 1 point is scored.
- If "c" is checked, 3 points are scored.

Item 8 is scored as follows:

- If the respondent's partner is seen as "most valuable," 5 points are scored.
- If the respondent's partner is seen as "second most valuable," 3 points are scored.
- If the respondent's partner is seen as "least valuable," 0 points are scored.

Item 10 is scored as follows:

- If "a," "b," or "c" is checked, score 0 points.
- If "d," or "h" is checked, score 3 points.
- If "e," "f," or "g" is checked, score 5 points.

A total score of 11 indicates a very high degree of dissatisfaction while a total score of 60 indicates a very high degree of satisfaction.
FINAL TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT
ISSUE 1 - SAMPLE

Duty Free Lunch Period for All Classroom Teachers.

a) □ Accepted.

b) □ Rejected.

c) □ Other arrangement. Describe ____________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

Initials of Negotiators:

Management 1 _________    Management 2 _________

Union 1 _________    Union 2 _________

Management 1 _________    Union 2 _________

Naira Value: Indeterminate
FINAL TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT
ISSUE 2 - SAMPLE

Relevance of Course System.

a) ☐ Accepted.

b) ☐ Rejected.

c) ☐ Other arrangement. Describe __________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Initials of Negotiators:

Management 1 ___________ Management 2 ___________

Union 1 ___________ Union 2 ___________

Management 1 ___________ Union 2 ___________

Naira Value: Indeterminate
FINAL TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT
ISSUE 3 - SAMPLE

Salary Increases.

a) □ Accepted.

b) □ Rejected.

c) □ Other arrangement. Describe ____________________

______________________________

______________________________

Initials of Negotiators:

Management 1 ___________ Management 2 ___________

Union 1 ___________ Union 2 ___________

Management 1 ___________ Union 2 ___________

Naira Value: Indeterminate
FINAL TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT
ISSUE 4 - SAMPLE

Fringe Benefits.

a) ○ Accepted.
b) ○ Rejected.
c) ○ Other arrangement. Describe ________________

______________________________

Initials of Negotiators:

Management 1 ____________ Management 2 ____________
Union 1 ________________ Union 2 ________________
Management 1 ________________ Union 2 ________________

Naira Value: Indeterminate
School Facilities and Equipment.

a) Accepted.

b) Rejected.

c) Other arrangement. Describe ________________________

Initials of Negotiators:

Management 1 ___________ Management 2 ___________

Union 1 ___________ Union 2 ___________

Management 1 ___________ Union 2 ___________

Naira Value: Indeterminate
FINAL TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT
ISSUE 6 - SAMPLE

Curriculum Design.

a) ○ Accepted.
b) ○ Rejected.
c) ○ Other arrangement. Describe


Initials of Negotiators:

Management 1 __________ Management 2 __________
Union 1 __________ Union 2 __________
Management 1 __________ Union 2 __________

Naira Value: Indeterminate
FINAL TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT
ISSUE 7 - SAMPLE

Class Size Limitations.

a) O Accepted.

b) O Rejected.

c) O Other arrangement. Describe

____________________________________________________________________

Initials of Negotiators:

Management 1 _________ Management 2 _________

Union 1 _________ Union 2 _________

Management 1 _________ Union 2 _________

Naira Value: a) ₦200,000/year
b) NO
c) Estimate cost
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