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The debate concerning the similarity or dissimilarity of public and private sector unions is longstanding and heated. Since no federal legislation regulating labor and management relations on the state and local jurisdictional level seems forthcoming, there has been a proliferation of state laws. State laws on public sector collective bargaining range from those which strictly forbid any kind of activity on the part of employees, such as Arkansas, to highly structured statutes such as the Taylor law in New York state, considered a model for legislation. The public employee relations law in Texas permits collective bargaining only for police and fire department employees of cities, towns, and other political subdivisions if the citizens vote to extend the privilege through local option elections.

The purpose of the study is to investigate attitudes and opinions of police and fire association presidents and members about labor and management relations in their city and collective bargaining in general in the state. Presidents
of fourteen police and fire associations were interviewed to obtain information about their experiences with collective bargaining or in seeking collective bargaining in local option elections. They were also asked about necessary changes in state and federal law on public sector collective bargaining.

In eleven of the fourteen associations, members (N = 347) were surveyed and the following information was collected: (1) personal data, (2) perceived effectiveness of the association, (3) level of members' participation in association activities, and (4) reason for joining the association. To provide comparative data for private sector union member opinions, a similar survey was administered to sixty members of a local of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace workers. Respondents were also asked to indicate agreement or disagreement with twenty statements about collective bargaining and association and member relations, using a seven-point Likert scale.

Interviews with association presidents indicate difference between experiences as well as organizational structure and philosophy of police and fire groups. Fire associations are unions by affiliation and self-concept. They encourage the participation of all levels of supervision and are lobbying for compulsory statewide civil service coverage. Police associations see themselves as non-union, yet the leadership and membership are centered in the lower ranks. Police on the average do not desire affiliation with outside
labor organizations but are a major force in obtaining collective bargaining rights for all state public employees. All expressed a desire for repeal of the local option provision of the current state law, and for major amendments to make it more similar to the National Labor Relations Act or the Taylor law. Other aspects of developing labor-management relations are discussed.

On the survey, the opinions of police officers, fire fighters, and private sector union members were similar. Respondents believe labor and management relations are satisfactory but not better than in past dealings. None of the private sector members believe their union is weaker at the bargaining table, while over a third of the police officers and fire fighters indicate their association is weaker. The primary reason for joining a union or association is to have more influence on issues of job and working conditions. On the survey factors, respondents agree that employee representation is necessary and worthwhile. The IAMAW is more effective in performing representational duties, followed by the fire fighters' associations and the various police associations. All three groups agree that members should support their association or union; however, IAMAW members disagree that employees be required to join. This is somewhat surprising considering union security sentiments. Police and fire fighters are not sure whether collective bargaining or strike
rights are sufficient to balance their power in labor and management relations.

Some recommendations are made as to the treatment of public sector unions under the law in the state of Texas.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Public sector unionism as a social phenomenon is not yet two decades old if Presidential Order 10988 signified its birth. Yet it is one of the fastest growing union movements, with a current estimated membership of 6,000,000. Theorists have begun to speculate whether public sector unionism had the same origins and impetus as private sector unionism.

In many respects public sector unionism has the same roots as industrial unionism. Where workers are easily replaced, whether they are common laborers or garbage collectors, job security is important. All workers want to bargain for a balance between wages and effort expended. If the employee can be easily replaced and has no protection for his job status, then the employer or the government has the power to pay whatever it wants. All workers want due process. In other words, the employee wants some means of expressing a grievance when treated unfairly by the employer.

The variations between the craft and industrial union can be seen in the public sector union. Craft unions provide job security by limiting entrance into the craft and requiring apprenticeships. Craft union parallels in the public
sector are the associations of employees such as police officers, teachers, or nurses. The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), the largest public sector union, is like an industrial union and wants to represent all employees in a governmental agency, regardless of what job they perform.

Public sector unions are developing administratively along lines similar to private sector unions. Individual locals are responsible for day-to-day union business while they draw support and expertise from regional, national, and international hierarchies.

The equalizing factor in the relationship between the employer and the union member employees, when negotiation of the labor agreement breaks down, is the strike. Here it is said the similarities end. Both groups often strike; that is true. However, while private sector unions have the right to strike nationwide, only seven states extend even limited rights to strike to non-critical service employees, and only one, Hawaii, allows police and fire employees to strike under limited circumstances.

The purpose of the above discussion is to set the stage for some issues which remain largely unresolved in regard to unionism for the public sector. It appears that there are many more similarities than differences between the union movements in the two sectors. Should public sector union members be guaranteed the same rights and privileges as those
guaranteed under the Wagner Act and its amendments to private sector unions? Second, can the limited amount of data about the opinions and attitudes of private sector union members be applied to theory building on opinions and attitudes about public sector union members?

Legislation of Public Sector Unionism and Collective Bargaining

Federal legislation to extend collective bargaining to all public sector employees nationwide has been sponsored by AFSCME and other groups for about ten years in Congress. It has never passed. The potential for such legislation has been in doubt since the legislation to cover state, county, and municipal workers under the Federal Wage and Hour Law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court because of the separation of powers and commerce clauses of the constitution (National League of Cities v. Usery, 96 S. Ct., 2465 [1976]). Clearly the constitutional issue is an important one. Legal scholars differ in their opinions of whether the Federal government can legislate in areas where constitutional law might conflict with state autonomy.

State laws on public sector collective bargaining range from those which strictly forbid any kind of activity at all by employees, such as Arkansas, to highly structured ones such as the Taylor Law in New York State. The Taylor Law is considered a model for state public sector collective
bargaining legislation and includes the following provisions modeled after the National Labor Relations Act:

1. A three-member Public Employment Relations Board has responsibility for settling disputes in unit determination, recognition of bargaining unit representative, appointment of mediators, fact finders, and arbitrators, when requested by unions or employers.

2. Unions and employers have the duty to bargain over terms and conditions of employment. In case of impasse for police and fire employees, arbitration is mandatory.

3. As union security the agency shop is prohibited; however, dues deduction is provided for.

4. Employee/Employer unfair labor practices are listed and charges can be lodged with and settled by the Board.

5. Strikes by public employees are prohibited and punishable by Board or court action.

Though this is a brief description, it does indicate the issues which are provided for in the law.

The State of Texas has a collective bargaining law which is between the extremes discussed above. In 1973 State Statute 5154c-1 was passed, which permits collective bargaining only for police and fire department employees of cities, towns, and other political subdivisions within the state having such departments. However, the statute makes this right available only if the citizens of the political subdivision vote to extend the privilege through local
option election. Yet, the law states clearly that the right is necessary in order to insure compensation and other conditions of employment that are substantially the same as compensation and conditions prevailing in comparable private sector employment (5, p. 151). It states further that the right to collective bargain is mandatory because the state has the "obligation . . . to make available reasonable alternatives (i.e. collective bargaining) to strikes by employees in these protective services" (5, p. 151). The law states finally that a strike would be catastrophic because of the consequential injury to the health, safety, and welfare of the people (5, p. 151). As compared to the Taylor Law the specific provisions of the Texas Statute are these:

1. State enabling legislation for public sector collective bargaining has been extended to only two narrow groups of public employees--by definition, paid policemen and firefighters who are employees of cities, towns, and other political subdivisions having police and fire departments (5, p. 151).

2. The right to collectively bargain can be exercised by such employees only if this process is approved by local referenda (local option) according to a procedure set by the Act (5, p. 151).

3. The employees may be represented by any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan which exists for the purpose, in whole or
in part, of dealing with one or more employer concerning "grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work" affecting the employees. This representative is known as an Association and must be selected by a majority of those it seeks to represent (5, p. 151).

4. The right to strike is prohibited. The alternative to strike is a system of arbitration conducted under adequate legislative standards. Another alternative is judicial enforcement of the requirements of the Act regarding the compensation and working conditions applicable to firefighters and policemen (5, p. 151).

5. The employees covered consist of all permanent paid employees within the fire departments and all sworn certified full-time employees who regularly serve in a professional law enforcement capacity in the police departments with, in both cases, the sole exception of the chief of the department (5, p. 151).

6. The employing political subdivision "shall provide" compensation and other conditions of employment "that are substantially the same . . . [as those] which prevail in comparable private sector employment" (5, p. 151).

7. The parties must meet and confer in good faith; however, neither party is compelled to agree to proposals or concede on issues (5, p. 152).
8. All deliberations on the negotiation of a labor agreement shall be open to the public (5, p. 152).

9. Voluntary arbitration and mediation are available in the event an impasse is reached in the collective bargaining process or the appropriate "lawmaking body fails to approve" a negotiated contract. The Act does not require compulsory arbitration although this is strongly endorsed as a means of impasse resolution (5, 153).

10. Arbitration awards are to be final and binding, and if they are not complied with, the injured party or the neutral may seek redress in an appropriate state district court (5, p. 154).

11. If the public employer chooses not to arbitrate an impasse, the appropriate state district court has the power and authority to set the standards as provided in Section 4 of the Act, i.e. provisions provided in No. 6 supra (5, p. 154).

The Purpose of the Study

Relatively little is known about public sector collective bargaining and scholars are reluctant to come to definite conclusions based on information known about private sector or industrial unionism. The majority of research has been conducted among federal, state, and municipal government employees, where the enabling legislation is similar to the National Labor Relations Act, as discussed in Chapter II.
The situation in Texas is unusual. Only one study has been performed which investigated the outcomes of the local option elections.

The purpose of this study was to investigate attitudes and opinions of police and firefighter association presidents and members about labor-management relations in their city and collective bargaining in general in the state. Some of the questions to be answered were these:

1. What is the current state of collective bargaining for police and fire employees in Texas?
2. How well has the enabling legislation contributed to or hindered effective collective bargaining in Texas?
3. What are the opinions of Association members in regard to their reasons for belonging to their association, how well has their association represented them and performed its duties?

The Design of the Study

Since the State Statute was passed in 1973, thirty-one local option elections have been held. In twelve of these either police or fire or both groups of employees have been granted the right to collectively bargain. In nine collective bargaining has resulted in the negotiation of a contract; however, in the remaining cities the right to bargain was repealed in a subsequent election (4, p. 7).
There were four groups which required investigation:

(a) Group I--police officer associations which have been granted the right to collectively bargain, (b) Group II--police officer associations which have not been granted the right to collectively bargain even though they have sought it, (c) Group III--fire officer associations which have been granted the right to collectively bargain, and (d) Group IV--fire officer associations which have not been granted the right to collectively bargain even though they have sought it.

Groups for study were chosen from these four groups. The following were selected:

Group I--San Antonio, El Paso, Corpus Christi, Beaumont,
Group II--Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth,
Group III--San Antonio, El Paso, Corpus Christi, Beaumont, and
Group IV--Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth.

Criteria for selection also included size of employee group, to insure sufficient sample size, geographic distribution, and the existence of a structured employee association. With one exception association membership in each organization has been active in assessing the potential for collective bargaining. The associations included in the sample were therefore fairly knowledgeable of the law. A comparative group consisting of fifty-nine members of an International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers,
AFL-CIO Local No. 15, in Houston, Texas, was selected for base line data on the questionnaire.

The data were collected by two methods. First there were interviews conducted with association representatives who had been involved in the collective bargaining or local option election activities. In each city interviews were sought with presidents, officers, or executive board members of the employee associations. In each city an interview was conducted with the association's president.

The information obtained as a result of the interviews is reported in Chapter III in a narrative fashion and provides data on the contextual background, association structure, third party relationships, and legal frame of reference for the majority of the study. The major source of the data is the self-concepts, opinions, and attitudes of the association membership. It was collected where permitted by association leaders through the use of a questionnaire administered to a sample population from each city in the four groups. A sample of fifty was sought in each association but fewer than fifty responses were obtained in most cases. Three associations failed or refused to return questionnaires. The questionnaire had three parts.

1. Demographic data--including such items as age, educational level, rank, and sex.

2. Association data--including such items as level of association participation by the respondent, reason for
joining the association, and perceptions of association effectiveness.

3. Unionism and Collective Bargaining as a Social Process---this portion of the questionnaire was developed as a seven-point Likert scale. The scale showed direction and strength of opinions on twenty statements about the purpose, political affiliation, power, and nature of the particular association. It also indicated attitudes about some basic aspects of unionism such as union security, collective bargaining, and the right to strike. (Appendix A is a copy of the questionnaire for fire employees, Appendix B is a copy of the questionnaire for police employees, and Appendix C is a copy of the questionnaire for private sector union employees.)

To determine whether these attitudes are different from those expressed by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW) members, some comparisons were made between the direction and strength of the police and fire officer responses on the Likert, plus some demographic and association data, and similar data collected in the IAMAW group. The results are discussed in Chapters IV and V.

Analysis of the Data

The data collected on the questionnaire were analyzed using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences at the North Texas State University Computer Center. A one-way
analysis of variance was used with two groups of data. The police, fire fighter and comparative groups' responses were analyzed, using the ANOVA for each of the statements. An ANOVA was also performed on each of the statements by a number of subgroups within each of a number of demographic items and other items concerning association or union's effectiveness and member's level of activity in the association or union. A Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was performed on all combinations of variables. A further discussion of the analysis of the data and results obtained is found in Chapters IV and V.

Arrangement of the Dissertation

Chapter II is a discussion of the literature. Limited information was found concerning attitudes of union members in general, and public sector union members in particular. Only two articles were located which discussed bargaining for police and fire employees in Texas.

Chapter III is a discussion of the results of the interviews with Association presidents concerning the state of collective bargaining, and their criticisms of the state enabling legislation.

Chapter IV and V discuss the analysis of the data on the questionnaire. Comparisons are made between the opinions and attitudes of the members of a private sector union and IAMAW members concerning labor-management relations,
effectiveness of their association or union and perceptions of the power their group has in negotiating demands.

Chapter VI is a summary of the research; and includes an analysis of potential state and local collective bargaining. Finally, some suggestions for changes in the state law are discussed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

Restatement of the Problem

Unionism in the public sector is a fairly new phenomenon even though some public sector employee associations are 100 years old. Recognition of and collective bargaining for public sector unions are in various stages across the country. In Texas only two groups of public sector employees by law may seek collective bargaining--police and fire employees. In order to get collective bargaining they must get the measure passed in a local option referendum. This and other provisions of the state law have made a strong impact on the process of public sector unionism in Texas. Theories have been developed about the participants in, and the process and nature of, collective bargaining. These have been developed primarily from an analysis of collective bargaining between unions and management in the private sector. Investigations have also been made in the public sector, predominantly in federal agency unions and teacher unions. As a result of the research it has been hypothesized that the two types of unionization, regardless of the similarities, should be treated differently legally.
There are many questions about the status of collective bargaining in the State of Texas which remain unanswered. It is the purpose of the study to determine opinions and attitudes held by selected Texas police and fire department association members about collective bargaining and to make some comparisons generally to opinions and attitudes held by a private sector union group.

A review of the literature concentrated on four areas. To establish a base for existing information on the areas of investigation discussed above, a literature search was necessary. The review was concentrated on four areas:

(a) Labor Law--Labor law scholars have been interested in how laws are developing and how these laws are shaping labor-management relations in federal and local jurisdictions.

(b) Behavioral Science--Behaviorists in the field of industrial psychology, sociology, business, and education have only recently begun to perform attitudinal studies among private and public sector union or potential union members.

(c) Psychological Studies on Police Officers and Fire Fighters--Little has been done, relatively speaking, about psychological studies on police and fire fighters until the last twenty-five years. Though interest in police, and to a much lesser extent fire fighter, attitudes, aptitudes, and values is growing due to such factors as employment laws or police brutality cases, scholars in the field can point to few empirical or longitudinal studies of note.

(d) Collective
Bargaining in Texas--Only two publications which relate specifically to police and fire fighters in Texas were found.

Labor Law in the Public Sector

Michigan, in 1965, was one of the earliest states to enact a state law regarding public employee collective bargaining (16, p. 520). Since that time thirty-eight states have enacted collective bargaining laws for various state, county, and local government employees (26, p. 528). In most states some board, commission, or other group has been set up to oversee the relationships between unions and government management representatives, similar to the function performed by the National Labor Relations Board.

One of the most emotional issues involved in the unionization of public sector is the strike or other job action on the part of the employees as a consequence of a failure to reach agreement on contractual issues. In seven states these employees have the right to strike under certain conditions, i.e., safety or lockout (26, p. 528). Police and fire fighters in Texas are forbidden to strike and participate in picketing activities in furtherance of a strike, or to cause the restriction of deliveries (24, p. 640). The alternative to strikes in twenty-two states is interest arbitration. Interest arbitration is most often used in conjunction with fact finding and mediation. An investigation by Kochan into the results of interest arbitration in
New York State, as opposed to mediation and fact finding, showed that though in two-thirds of the cases arbitration findings and findings of fact did not substantially deviate, both sides did not agree on the benefits of arbitration. Union representatives were in favor of interest arbitration because they felt that they could get more with arbitration than without (15, p. 3). Questions have recently been raised, however, as to whether the use of binding arbitration is legal, particularly in cases of economic demand impasse. Constitutional scholars determine that binding interest arbitration provisions must be grounded on clear legal definitions of delegated authority and boundaries for decisions. The parties must know that arbitrators and panels will draw decisions from the parties' offers and that each side will bear equally the cost of arbitration (4).

What is clear from a review of recent periodicals and current events is that the state of public sector collective bargaining is in flux. The number of states enacting new collective bargaining legislation is slowing down. As a result of the Supreme Court decision in NLC v. Usery [The National League of Cities v. W. J. Usery, Jr., 96 S. Ct. 2465 (1976)], there is less interest in federal legislation to mandate national collective bargaining rights for public sector employees. There are, however, growing labor disputes in the public sector. States are looking toward newer
approaches to impasse resolution. Some states have enacted final best-offer arbitration—perhaps the most radical impasse resolution technique.

The State of Texas has no mandatory interest arbitration. In cases of impasse the parties may mutually elect arbitration. However, if one party, usually the employer, refuses to arbitrate, the other party may seek redress in the local district court. A recent court decision, City of Kingsville v. International Association of Fire Fighters, Local No. 2390 [Court of Civil Appeals, 13th Supreme Judicial District, Corpus Christi, Texas. No. 1249], in essence has removed this judicial alternative.

Another emotional issue associated with public sector collective bargaining is rising government costs. The bankruptcy of the City of New York, the passage of Proposition Thirteen in California, and the proposal of other tax cut measures across the country leave little room for doubt. In most jurisdictions 60 to 95 per cent of the expense of providing service is related to the payroll. If government spending is reduced, as in California and New York, and per capita wages are set by contract, the number of government employees will be reduced. Watkins says that "unions' traditional desire for 'more' has changed abruptly to a concern for income and job security, a protection of the status quo" (26, p. 528). For local jurisdictions it may mean being caught in the middle of a growing controversy. They may
choose to move over and let the unions and employees "take the heat" for higher taxes (5, p. 441). New York City has faced this kind of a crisis. There, Wollett says, certain trends in collective bargaining were emerging: (a) the development of a flexible contract allowing for leeway to meet unexpected fiscal demands, (b) recognition by all parties that a real economic crisis existed, (c) recognition that because both parties had a stake in the solution of economic problems, cooperation was necessary, and (d) absence of blame placing or singling out of one group or agency as the source of economic drain (29).

Despite the fact that, immediately following the passage of Proposition Thirteen, Governor Briscoe of Texas called a special session of the legislature to find ways to give the taxpayers some relief, there have been no really vocal signs of a taxpayers' revolt in Texas. And because Texas has a strong tradition of home rule, any tax relief measures passed at the state level may have a limited effect on local jurisdictions. The home rule tradition is evident in the collective bargaining law.

Until two years ago Texas was the only state which allowed each local jurisdiction to decide by referendum whether or not to allow police and fire fighters to collectively bargain on wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Alaska has now enacted local option provisions (5, p. 432).
Yet Barnun and Helburn, after analyzing the experience with local option elections in Texas during the first three years under the law, recommend a repeal of this provision (1).

Future Public Sector Labor Law

The very nature of the fact that collective bargaining takes place between two groups in an individual setting under unique circumstances makes it difficult to apply experience and law in one place to similar situations elsewhere. Labor law and practice are evolving different in different states and parts of the country. Stern, however, has projected some of the general changes in public sector bargaining which will take place by 1985. One big issue will be comparability—not only comparability with regard to wages and hours but also comparability through large union pattern bargaining. He also sees consolidation of bargaining units. This consolidation may take place because of the growing strength of unions which encompass all employees in a jurisdiction such as AFSCME, or all employees in a similar job, such as the IAFF. Larger unions will require greater coordination and cooperation on the part of legislators or law makers, whose job it is to finance and plan governmental operations, rather than leaving the complete negotiations to career administrators who have traditionally reacted after legislation has passed. Bargaining will become more sophisticated and broad. Partially this trend will occur because of
increased experience with bargaining, but it will also be necessary so that in the labor-intensive government agencies increased productivity will be an obligatory correlate to increased wages. Increases in union power will occur. There will be trends toward agency shop agreement, as now exist in Hawaii. The right to strike will become less necessary and less threatening. Impasse resolution will be handled by final-offer or final-offer selection arbitration. There will also be a greater use of mediation (25).

Studies on Union or Potential Union Members in Jobs Other Than Police or Fire Fighters

The review in this area concentrated on public sector studies; however, several studies in the private sector are also of interest. Researchers do not agree about why people join unions. Some say the reasons are economic; others say they are psychological or sociological. Herman showed in a study of workers in two plants that satisfaction was controlling, and the best predictor of pro-union attitudes. The pre-certification campaigns which were conducted by either the union or management did little to mitigate attitudes or actions (12). Messick determined in a study among workers that impetus to unionize is more a matter of social ethics than logic. People must be moved to join a union because they believe in group advancement rather than individual advancement (19).
Among government employees, two studies investigated attitudes held about unions. Immundo found that a group of non-union-member white-collar workers over thirty years of age were more pro-union than those under thirty years of age. The older workers were also less satisfied with their working conditions. The employees surveyed were represented by a union, though they paid no dues to the union. They expressed some apprehensions about the power of the union (12). Among another group of public employees, Biles reported that there existed less personal allegiance to either union or employer than among a comparable group of private sector union members. He recommends, therefore, that conclusions drawn about all union members based on private sector data should be considered carefully (3). Another study points out problems which may be a corollary in the public sector to craft unionism in the private sector. In a study on nurses in Pennsylvania, Schmidman found internal disagreement about the dichotomy between union labeling for professionals and the need to achieve job and financial security (23).

The majority of studies have been done among teachers and college faculty. Among teachers Nagi found a number of subjective states which influence the decision of teachers to unionize in one urban location. He found that several states such as affiliation are present, but the feeling of powerlessness is not a prime motivator (21).
University and college faculty and administrators were the subjects in a number of studies. Herman (11), Odwahn and Spritzer (22), Muczyk and others (20), and Wilkinson (28) were interested in the dichotomy between professionalism and unionization or collective action. Opinions were mixed. In Herman's study, 50 per cent of the faculty surveyed expressed the view that collective bargaining was inconsistent with professionalism (11, p. 277).

Odwahn and Spritzer reported that college and university administrators surveyed believed that faculty unions result in greater mediocrity in faculty performance (22). Muczyk and others reported an inverse correlation between professional commitment and faculty members' desire to be represented by a union (20). Bigoness (2) also found an inverse correlation between job involvement and union propensity in a larger study of satisfaction. Wilkinson found that faculty members in part of Florida's university system did not feel that union membership would necessarily lessen professional standards (28).

Also, some of the above studies and others investigated relationships between job satisfaction and similar factors, and the desire to join a union. Bigoness (2) found a significant relationship between job dissatisfaction with respect to work, pay, supervision, promotion opportunities, and felt need for collective bargaining. Faculty members who felt they were somewhat unable to control the events influencing their lives
were more disposed toward unions or collective action. Feuille and Blandin (7) also showed that demographic and job satisfaction measures were related to perceptions and sentiments toward collective bargaining. Heavy support is strongly related to expressed dissatisfaction. Wilkinson (28) found that faculty members with more economic and job security (older, tenured) were less predisposed toward collective third party representations. Ladd and Lipset (17) also found that faculty members who are high achievers are less predisposed to collective action; however, they are supportive of collective bargaining for themselves and their colleagues of lower standing.

Studies on Police and Fire Fighters

The most comprehensive article which summarizes psychological studies on police is that by Joel Lefkowitz (18). Lefkowitz found that police officers join a department predominantly because of a need for security. They have a high need for security and a fear of being laid off. This finding may be related to the fact that most police officers come from blue-collar or working-class backgrounds and have tried another occupation before police work (18, p. 347). Social needs are met more by the social interdependence among each other than by helping others. Police officers have a preference for hierarchical organizations. There is a certain amount of incongruity between need for autonomy and
assertive needs and the lack of freedom in the job to be truly assertive and initiate action (18, p. 353).

Cochran (6) also found that, while police are no more rigid or prejudiced, they tend to endorse traditional controls as such much more often than those of similar age and education.

The most notable book on the subject of police and collective action is Police Unionism, by Juris and Feuille (14). Along with a general overview of the union movement among the police, Juris and Feuille studied the union experience in several sample cities. The authors indicated that during job actions and strikes, contrary to common belief, there was no substantial escalation of public disruption. They also found that, in five cities where arbitration was used, it was perceived more favorably by the union than by management (14, p. 146).

Another issue investigated was the influence of the membership's rank on the nature of the union. Juris and Feuille indicated that officer-only (not including ranking supervisors) unions were more militant than those where all ranks were represented. This finding was attributed to the fact that younger officers are more aggressive and cohesive in the absence of senior officers who are also supervisors (14, p. 87).

Lefkowitz (18) also discusses differences between officers and supervisors on a variety of personal and job-related attitudes. He suggests that these differences may be a source of
antagonism between officers of different assignments and ranks (18, p. 350). The use of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) indicated that officers are more satisfied with their work, co-workers, and supervisors and more dissatisfied with pay, work schedules, promotional examinations, and service ratings (18, p. 349).

Lefkowitz states that "there is virtually no empirical information on police unionization" (18, p. 349). This void of data is even more the case as far as fire fighters are concerned. There are no known published articles on attitudes among fire fighters. In a 1976 study it was determined by using the JDI that fire fighters' satisfaction with work was highly correlated with satisfaction with supervisor and co-workers. This research would indicate that social needs for fire fighters are met by social interdependence as well as the social benefits of their work. This study showed that older, more senior fire fighters were less satisfied with their work (9). The findings are tentative in nature because of the limited number of subjects (N=30) in the sample.

In a study among the 712 cities which negotiate with the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), Wheeler (27) investigated whether ranking fire officers are supervisors. He concluded that, while in many cases they do not meet the definition of supervisor as it is used in the private sector or the Wage and Hour Law, if they perform any supervisory duties they qualify as supervisors. The lack of clearly
defined supervisory authority can lead to conflicts. A fire department supervisor's limited authority in discipline and discharge cases places him in an ambivalent position. Because of the inconsistencies, the author believes that "rules appropriate for application in the private sector are not appropriate for application in the public sector, at least in municipal fire departments" (27, p. 433).

Studies on Police and Fire Unions in Texas

An extensive study by Barnum and Helburn (1) on public sector labor relations is the single resource on the subject. The original study was conducted in 1975. From the study an article was written which summarized the major points. Elections for local option collective bargaining have been held in cities of all sizes. It would be difficult to attribute the 50 per cent success rate to any particular factor because there seem to be few patterns related to size, affluence, or political orientation. The two factors which Barnum and Helburn identified were the relationship between successful passage and the actions of city management in combating the drive for local option (1, p. 301). Where there was little or no opposition to the passage, it was successful. There was an inverse relationship between the passage of the Act and the per capita income of the city.

Also the study determined reasons for seeking local option. Of the twenty-two associations, fourteen said that
their primary reason was because they wanted input into management of their department. Of the employer representatives, only 14 per cent felt this was the reason for seeking collective bargaining (1, p. 295). Sixty-eight per cent of the employer representatives felt that employee desires for a "better economic benefits" package was the primary cause.

The authors were told that in about ten cases employees were afraid to even seek a public referendum for fear of reprisals. In other cases some associations refrained from seeking a public referendum because it seemed that there was little hope of passing the Act. The elections were split evenly on passage and failure. But there were also four recall elections, three of which passed (1, p. 293).

The authors chose to single out only one provision in the Act which they felt was most troublesome--the local option provision. The problems lie with the inconsistency between different treatment in different jurisdictions when the Act states that the primary purpose of the Act was to lessen labor strife. Also inherent in this inequality is the fact that only police and fire fighters are eligible for coverage under the Act. The authors believe that the voters have generally been relatively uninformed about the real issues involved. Their ignorance is not surprising. As discussed above, unionization for police and fire fighters is an emotional issue. Finally, there are few if any
provisions for the redress of unfair labor practices. Because of these problems the authors recommend repeal of the local option provision (1, p. 304).

In an analysis of the FPERA made in 1975, the following problems were anticipated because of the wording of the law (8):

1. The Act limits the benefits of collective bargaining to only two relatively small groups of government employees.
2. The local option provisions run counter to the intent of the Act to insure harmony in the place of employment.
3. No provisions are made for specific steps to take in case of questions about bargaining unit representation, unfair representation, unfair labor practices, and other potential procedural problems.
4. The entire department, with the exception of the chief, is eligible for inclusion in the bargaining unit.
5. The language which guides setting of salary levels and other conditions of employment is vague.
6. All deliberations on negotiations must be open to the public.
7. Final resolution of the impasse is available through the courts.

Contribution of this Research

The obvious void appears to be on the current status of collective bargaining in Texas. Another void would be
research into specific attitudes of police and fire fighters regarding unions and third party representation. This research seeks to contribute in a limited scope to a growing knowledge about unionism in the public sector, particularly among police and fire fighters from selected cities in the State of Texas. Chapter III, which follows, is a discussion of the attitudes and opinions of police and fire fighter association leaders about the current state law, its impact on their association, and current labor-management relations in their municipality. Chapters IV and V are analyses of the data collected on the survey. Chapter IV discusses the demographic data, while Chapter V discusses the attitudes expressed by the three groups--police officers, fire fighters, and the comparative group--on twenty statements about labor-management relations and collective bargaining.
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CHAPTER III

INTERVIEWS WITH ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS--THE
NATURE AND FUTURE OF PUBLIC SECTOR
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN TEXAS

Presidents of police and fire fighter associations were interviewed as a means of determining the experience they have had in collectively bargaining or seeking collective bargaining and to learn more about the associations' organizational structure and functioning. The interviews were not structured or written; however, the following points were covered.

1. Personal data on the presidents, such as age, rank, job assignment, self-concept as a leader, and prior experience with unions.

2. Organizational determinants in collective bargaining development, how the structure and policies of the department have affected association structure and collective bargaining.

3. Negotiation of the collective bargaining agreement.

4. Political activity on the part of associations.

5. Influences of the public, press, and national union organizations on the associations.

6. Perceived necessary changes in the state and federal laws on public sector collective bargaining.
In order to secure interviews, anonymity had to be guaranteed, and interviews will be discussed according to respondent groups as follows:

Group I--Police Associations with collective bargaining--Beaumont, Corpus Christi, El Paso, San Antonio;
Group II--Police Associations without collective bargaining--Dallas, Fort Worth, and Houston;
Group III--Fire Fighter Associations with collective bargaining--Beaumont, Corpus Christi, El Paso, San Antonio; and
Group IV--Fire Fighter Associations without collective bargaining--Dallas, Fort Worth, and Houston.

The Development of Public Sector Collective Bargaining in Texas

In order to understand the results of the interviews it is important at this point to discuss the development of state law under which public sector labor-management relations have operated in the past. Also included in the section is a brief description of the recent Kingsville decision, handed down since the interviews were conducted, which will drastically affect the public sector. Finally, there is a brief discussion of the organizing effort by outside labor organizations.

The first law passed in Texas which could be considered protective of employees' rights was the Firemen's and Police-men's Civil Service Act, in 1947 (5). The act protected
and legislated such personnel actions as standards for employment and promotion, tenure or seniority rights, comparability with similar jobs in other jurisdictions, and grievance procedures. The act was voluntary in nature, i.e. cities voted to be covered. More conservative jurisdictions chose to set up their own Civil Service Commissions or Boards rather than be subject to regulations and a Board in Austin.

The State and Local Civil Service Boards continue to function even when collective bargaining has been obtained, due primarily to the fact that they continue to have jurisdiction for all "covered" employees unless specific duties performed by them have been abridged by collective bargaining agreements. Stern (4), among others, believes that civil service will be undermined, perhaps eliminated, where collective bargaining occurs. Police and fire association presidents differ greatly in their opinions about the continued need for civil service protection. These feelings will be explored in a section below.

The next piece of comprehensive legislation was the Fire and Police Employee Relations Act (FPERA) passed in 1973. The provisions of the FPERA have been discussed in Chapter I. Like 1269m, this statute covered police and fire employees only in jurisdictions where it was voted on by public referendum.

As local options for collective bargaining were passed and contract negotiations began, interpretation of various
provisions of FPERA caused problems. Several jurisdictions requested and received clarification on certain provisions from Attorney General John Hill. An example was a question brought by the City of El Paso concerning the open meetings provision. The Attorney General determined that bargaining teams should be exempt from the provision when conferring separately about bargaining strategies. These rulings by the Attorney General have clarified but not necessarily strengthened the law.

In fact, the most chilling effect on the status of public sector bargaining has come about as the result of a judicial ruling about the constitutionality of a provision of FPERA. The case arose as the result of a dispute over collective bargaining rights of Local 2390 of the IAFF in Kingsville, Texas. The facts of the case are as follows and indicated clearly weaknesses of the FPERA on more points than just the one in question. In June, 1975, a local option election to allow fire fighters to bargain collectively was passed in Kingsville. The IAFF in January, 1976, sought to negotiate a contract; however, city representatives refused to recognize the authority of the IAFF to bargain for a majority of its employees. Shortly thereafter a county judge recognized the IAFF local as the appropriate agent and ordered the parties to go back to the bargaining table. Since the FPERA did not provide for a state board or agency to oversee disputes over status on representation, where the
question has come up, no guidelines for action exist. In another jurisdiction a representational question was referred from the State Department of Labor to the Federal Department of Labor to the FMCS before it eventually was resolved.

The parties bargained until June, 1976, when the fire fighters called an impasse and requested arbitration as a means of settling the issues in dispute. The city refused. The IAFF filed a case in the Kleberg County District Court requesting that it set the wages and other terms and conditions of employment pursuant to Section 16 of the FPERA. Section 16 provides for wages and other terms and conditions of employment in the public sector to be comparable to those which exist in the area for similar jobs in the private sector. The city filed for summary motion alleging that the court without jurisdiction because by setting wages, etc. it was in violation of the provision of the Texas constitution establishing separation of powers. During this time a repeal election was held and the IAFF lost its right to bargain collectively in Kingsville.

In April, 1977, the District Court ruled in favor of the city, whereupon the IAFF appealed the decision to the State Court of Appeals in Corpus Christi, alleging two points of error. In a corollary case the IAFF requested that the repeal election in Kingsville be declared illegal on the
grounds that collective bargaining had not been in effect for one year before it was called.

On April 27, 1978, the Appeals Court ruled in favor of the city (13th District Court of Civil Appeals, No. 1249, 1978). In essence, the decision did declare Provision 16 unconstitutional because the act delegated the legislative function of setting pay and benefits to the judiciary without prescribing sufficient guidelines. Justice Young, in his decision, said that since such guidelines were not available, and in the absence of any board or other agency which could define them, the District Court had jurisdiction only in matters where the opinion of an arbitration panel, used in the case of interest arbitration or impasse on negotiations, was in error, i.e. a substantial evidence trial. The District Court had no jurisdiction to make determinations on issues about collective bargaining generally (1, p. 34). In effect the union is left with no legal recourse if the city refuses to bargain. And the court did not comment on any suggested alternative actions. In the corollary case, the court voided the repeal election, of little consolation and value considering the outcome of the first case.

In the three years following the passage of the FPERA, a number of associations sought collective bargaining. Since then, most associations which were not successful in the local election, and others which did not even try to get bargaining, have been biding their time, so to speak, waiting to see what
will happen which might improve their chances. Even though the pace of collective bargaining has slowed somewhat--no new cities in the last year--the pace of organizing has increased, according to leaders of the four major statewide associations. One of the most recent IAFF drives occurred in the Los Alamos Fire Department, near San Antonio, the smallest IAFF local in the United States, with a membership of nine out of eleven department employees.

Three groups are currently vying for police affiliations. The oldest of the three, the Texas Municipal Police Association, traditionally has been fraternal and social in nature. The newly forming (1977) CLEAT--Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas--seeks a broader membership such as county sheriffs, state police, campus and airport security officers. While a good percentage of the state's 31,000 law enforcement personnel belongs to TMPA, CLEAT's membership had grown to 2,300 by January, 1978. In some departments, employees pay dues to both state groups through their local association. In other departments, the local association has forced the membership to decide which state affiliation to support. Both groups have state offices, Houston and Austin respectively, and are becoming more involved in political activity. There is a possibility that a group which now loosely provides national leadership and exchange of information for state and local police associations may
coalesce into a union which would compete for members with other national police unions.

The out-of-state organizer in the police field is the International Brotherhood of Police Officers (IBPO) which originated in Boston and is now headquartered in Washington, D. C. It is affiliated with the National Association of Government Employees. In 1974 the IBPO sent organizers to Texas, who zeroed in on the newly forming association in Beaumont. Since then the Texas organization drive had been led by Beaumont officers and represents police in six cities: Beaumont, Midland, Waco, Laredo, San Angelo, and Port Arthur. On June 1, 1978, they established a IBPO regional office in Austin and intend to work not only in Texas but adjoining states.

So far as could be determined, no other unions are organizing police groups. There has been some attempt by the Teamsters to organize police in other states, but no evidence of this in Texas was mentioned in any of the interviews.

Results of Interviews with Police and Fire Fighter Association Presidents

Personal Data on Association Presidents

In Group I (police with collective bargaining) three of the four association presidents were in their thirties, the fourth in his forties. Three of the four were fairly new
presidents, having held that office for two years or less. None of the presidents had prior union experience or membership. Only one of the four thought of himself as a union leader, although all four had held offices in state associations and had been leaders in collective bargaining efforts in their cities. One of the four has political ambitions after retiring as a police officer, and saw skills developed as an association leader as beneficial in the long term. Of the four, one held the rank of Captain, two the rank of Sergeant and one the rank of Detective, a specialist rank with supervisory duties.

Among the three men in Group II (police without collective bargaining), one was in his forties while the other two were in their thirties. All three held the rank of Sergeant. All three were new association presidents with less than one year in office. None had been associated with a union previously nor thought of himself as a union leader, preferring the term association leader or labor relations leader.

Two of the four men in Group III (fire fighter with collective bargaining) were in their thirties and two in their forties. Two held the rank of Captain and two the rank of Officer; one of these is a Certified Emergency Medical Technician. Two have been association presidents for more than two years, and two are new, with less than one year in office. Three have had union affiliations before: two have been members of unions--International Association of
Machinists and Aerospace Workers (AMAW), and a local carpenters union—while another was the son of a lifelong union member. Of the four, only one does not think of himself as a union leader. This attitude is understandable because, unlike most police associations, the IAFF is affiliated with the AFL-CIO at the national level. Two of these presidents are on state committees of the IAFF, one is a member of the AFL-CIO's Public Employees Board for Texas. As did one of the police association presidents, one of the presidents of the fire fighter associations has political ambitions and feels that the experience in the political arena as a union negotiator will be beneficial when running for political office.

Group IV (fire fighters without collective bargaining) is composed of one president in his forties and two in their thirties. Two held the rank of Lieutenant, somewhat analogous to the rank of police sergeant, and one is a fire Captain. All three have been presidents of their respective associations for over two years. None have had prior union affiliations; one of the three perceived himself as a union leader.

Among the fire fighters, all were assigned to station duty during the time of the interview. Such assignment is not unusual because of the small relative proportion of administrative to active duty positions in most fire departments. Also those on station assignments generally
have sufficient time available to handle association business.

None of the police association presidents were permanently assigned (at the time of the interview) to uniformed patrol duties. Two were working in plain clothes (detective) investigative units. Two others had administrative or support assignments at locations other than the central police headquarters. Only one, in one of the larger associations, was freed from duty to head the association full time.

As far as age, length of time in office, and prior experience with or knowledge about employee associations or unions, these presidents are probably similar to private sector union presidents. Two areas of difference, however, do stand out. Of the fourteen presidents, only three are first-line level officers; the rest hold supervisory rank. Of the police association presidents, not one sees himself as a union leader, nor feels that his membership think of themselves as union members.

Organizational Determinants in Association Structure and Collective Bargaining

Some of the reasons for opinions and beliefs about unionism held by the presidents and members can be attributed to departmental organization structure and members' work behavior. As was discussed by Lefkowitz (3, pp. 347-348), police, and the same applies to fire fighters, place high value on, and derive great satisfaction from the social
aspects of their work. For the police, who have primarily negative contacts with and responses from the public and press, there develops an "us versus them" feeling. Police officers primarily socialize with other police officers. They are highly dependent on each other for support, even so far as to trust a partner or fellow officer with their lives. However, there is also a more structured and authoritative supervisory hierarchy in the police organization. Police officers are taught to obey orders without thinking when a supervisor is present, and to follow stringent guidelines when one is not. A police hierarchy is much like a military one, with a broad span of control and a well defined chain of command. In fact, such terms as "troops" and "civilian" are used in police jargon to indicate sworn and non-sworn (non-police) employees in the department.

Because of this structure, it is easy to understand why fewer officers with "rank" or high-level supervisory positions are presidents in police associations than in fire fighter associations. The social "distance" between supervisor and officer is greater. The supervisors, particularly lieutenants and captains, think of themselves as managers. There is less socializing between ranks than within them. Juris and Feuille (2) found that this structure had an impact on the militancy of police unions. Lefkowitz (3) found that rank and age differences were strongly related to differences in attitude. As one Group I president expressed it, "Everyone
was dissatisfied but only the younger group [age twenty-five to thirty] was willing to 'face the heat' to do something about it." The more militant of the police associations limit the number and input of ranking officers on boards and negotiating teams.

While police and fire fighters have attitudes which are similar in some respects, there are differences which may be attributed to the variations in organizational structure of their departments. The big firehouse with lots of fire fighters who protected the entire town, often with volunteer assistance, has given way to the smaller, well-equipped station in the neighborhood. The old horses and hoses have given way to modern equipment which can maximize the efforts of several fire fighters. But the hierarchy has remained. In a firehouse with eight officers, there may be as many as four levels of supervisory rank and six different jobs. Apparently such an arrangement, plus the fact that most fire fighters spend the majority of their on-duty time in maintenance or leisure activities rather than fire fighting, means that supervisors spend little time supervising but much time doing the same things as their employees. Wheeler (6, p. 732) confirmed that this tends to be the case. In routine emergencies, one-alarm fires only, the fire fighters need little or no supervision; they are well skilled in such techniques. In larger emergencies, two alarms or more, each succeeding level of supervision which arrives on the scene
takes over. Therefore, organizationally speaking, the supervision in a fire department is looser than in a police department, and there is much more fraternization on the job, which in the firehouse is also a social situation. A person who does not fit in socially with his work group is transferred around, usually voluntarily, until he finds a group in which he fits. Fire fighter associations are thought of as democratic organizations, and, as one president put it, "There are no ranks in the union hall; everyone is equal here." This is possible because of the organizational structure of the fire department. Only in more militant associations were younger, less senior employees taking over control of the association's business.

These differences in self-concept and organizational democracy led to an interesting dichotomy between police and fire association presidents in regard to 1269m. Repeatedly from fire association presidents there were complaints that the police associations through negotiation of contracts were undermining 1269m. Specific and common was the demand by police that the chief of the department be allowed to select his own command staff or immediate subordinates rather than selecting from a list prepared as a result of competitive examination. Some proposed contracts soon to be negotiated by police associations contained provisions which would relieve civil service of several of its responsibilities, such as setting hiring standards, and defining grievance and
termination procedures. The organizational structure of fire departments, exhibiting a limited number of job types, numerous supervisory levels of authority and power, predominantly line rather than staff, means that job security and advancement based on examination are important. Thus the fire fighters' interest in civil service. Organizationally police departments have a wide variety of job types, supervisory levels which represent succeeding levels of authority and power, about half line and half support personnel. Therefore, job security and advancement should be based on performance and competence. This explains the interest of the police in tailoring a personnel system based on the individual differences between employees' performance.

In conclusion, it appears that fire associations, which are unions by affiliation and self-concept, are "democratic," embrace all levels of supervision, and are lobbying for mandatory statewide civil service coverage under 1269m, are similar in many respects to private sector unions. Police associations, on the other hand, are non-union in orientation, power-centered in the lower ranks and are seeking more aggressively to maintain autonomy for each individual group, even though their movement is toward joint action with other public unions to set up collective bargaining for all public sector employees. They too are like private sector unions in many respects.
Experiences of the Police and Fire Associations in Negotiating Collective Bargaining Contracts

With experience gained as the result of contract negotiation, the presidents in Groups I and III (police and firefighters with collective bargaining) have become more professional. In Group I (police) three of the four associations have received help from a labor relations expert formerly with the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The fourth association received assistance from its national union in Washington. All four police association presidents anticipate negotiation of their next contract with no outside assistance. All get input from membership either informally or by questionnaire. The bargaining committees are mixed; one preferred a cross section of the membership, two are composed of various members of the executive board, and another uses members who have had experience as contract negotiators. In each case the president is the prime spokesman for the group.

The composition of the city's negotiating team is also mixed in Group I (police). In one city the primary spokesman is the assistant city manager, in two others the personnel or industrial relations manager, and in the fourth an outside legal counsel. Other members of the city's team include assistant city attorneys, finance and budget officers, and outside experts. In only one city does the chief of police sit on the city negotiating team.
Group III (fire fighters) presidents expressed similar information about contract negotiations. Outside negotiating expertise has been available from the state and international association. Demands negotiated are those expressed by the membership. In the past the spokesmen for the group have been the association presidents. This year one president expressed the need to be free to deal primarily with the press, as his counterpart, the city manager, had done in past negotiations. Another president realized a problem of a large negotiating committee and intended to cut down from the previous twelve. "That was too much democracy to get anything done," he said. In only one case did the membership have the option to ratify the contract.

Negotiating teams for the city dealing with Group III are composed similarly to those in Group I. No mention, however, was made of the fire chief sitting on any negotiating team for the city.

The consensus was that few experienced public sector negotiators or neutrals were available to facilitate the negotiation process. There is a growing interest in arbitration, both interest and grievance in nature, and two association presidents were collecting files and information to identify acceptable arbitrators. Some support and education is available to fire fighters from their state and international organizations. For the police this is still in the formative stages.
Technical assistance and training are available to municipalities from their state and national groups. The Texas Municipal League, the National League of Cities, the National Conference of Mayors, the City Managers Association, the International Association of Chief of Police, and the International Association of Fire Chiefs and Marshalls are professional organizations providing such assistance. In two of the cities an assistant city attorney has served an internship in another jurisdiction to become more familiar with collective bargaining. However, learning by doing seems to be the most practical and widespread way for all concerned so far.

**Political Activity on the Part of Police and Fire Fighter Associations**

While most association presidents expressed reluctance to get involved in local or state politics, they all recognized the necessity for such involvement. Political activity seems to come more naturally to the police who deal regularly with elected judges and other court officials. Support from associations is sought by some candidates, and in some cases there are endorsements. In only one case did the president indicate that he alone made decisions on endorsements. In most situations candidates appeared personally before the Executive Board or before the membership to give a talk, or at a social function, and afterwards votes were taken about endorsement action. In state races,
the state or international associations make recommendations because of their understanding of the candidates' stands on issues of importance. It appears likely that political activity will escalate.

**Outside Influences on the Association**

These influences fall into three categories: the press, the public, and hierarchies of the associations. None of the three seem to be of major significance. Public opinion is important at two points, getting the local option passed and getting public sympathy on the importance of demands made at the bargaining table. One association president believed that the fire fighters had an easier time in swaying public opinion because they were held in higher esteem by the public. Most associations are involved in public-spirited projects such as sponsoring youth sports, supporting local or national charities, and encouraging overall good public relations for the department. Only one police association is engaged in a massive campaign to clean up its public image as a result of controversies in the department.

As to organizational hierarchies, the fire fighter associations find strength and support in their international affiliation. They see no conflicts between local control and such affiliation. Among police in both Groups I and II only one president endorsed national affiliation. Without
exception the remainder see no need to join with a group outside of Texas or to pay dues which will be sent outside the state.

With regard to the press, most presidents said that the presence of the press is a nuisance and hindrance to smooth negotiations. Each group has developed strategies of dealing with the press, based on years of experience even before collective bargaining was an issue. As one president put it, "We always look bad on the day we present our proposals. It appears that we want the moon and the threat of strike is imminent if we don't get it. The city capitalizes on this to present an approach of how economical they are and get the public on their side." Another president mentioned the development of the bathroom syndrome. "It's funny how everyone has to go to the bathroom at the same time."

**Necessary Changes in the Laws**

Changes in the law are priority items for all associations. Strategies in order of priority are (a) attempts to repeal, or amend certain provisions of the current FPERA or (b) repeal of the current FPERA and the substitution of a new employee act which will be substantially different and cover all public sector employees statewide, or (c) passage of a federal public employee labor relations act.

While not expressed by any president, it appears that repeal or amendment of provisions of the current law might be
the easiest to accomplish. Nine of the fourteen presidents believed that repeal of the local option provision of the FPERA was the number one priority in this course of action. Provision repeal may be possible because the governor who insisted on the local option provision before he would sign the FPERA is not running for reelection. It is generally believed that, of all the candidates, the present Attorney General, John Hill would be more sympathetic and knowledgeable on any collective bargaining legislation which reached his desk.

Three of the fourteen presidents, all of whose associations have collective bargaining, believed that the number one priority was for some definite impasse procedures. (The surveys were conducted before the Kingsville case was decided. Opinions on priorities might have been different if the interviews were conducted at the present time.) All three prefer compulsory final and binding arbitration, but some concern was expressed about whether or not this would take the form of final best offer arbitration, with the provision that the arbitrator could take offers from both sides to form the contract.

The remaining two presidents of police and fire associations in the same city believed that repeal of the open meetings provision is the first priority, indicating a rather aggressive attitude on the part of the press of that city.
In both cases, their second priority was for definite impasse procedures.

The remaining ranking for each was mixed between the issues already mentioned and others such as a comparability provision (the issue in the Kingsville case), a state public employee relations board, and mandatory grievance arbitration.

The method of changing the status quo which was of greatest interest was the effort to set up statewide mandatory collective bargaining for all public sector employees. On April 28, 1978, such legislation was introduced and was in the hands of the House Intergovernmental Affairs Subcommittee at the time of the close of the legislative session. It will be reintroduced at the beginning of the 1979 session and will be the object of lobby activities by all major association groups.

Only a few of the fire fighter presidents mentioned any concerted efforts on the part of their international to get federal legislation for nationwide public sector collective bargaining. It would seem unlikely that the police groups, with limited national affiliations, would seek such legislation.

The Future of Collective Bargaining in the Police and Fire Sector of Texas

The future of collective bargaining in the next few years is in question. The majority of collective bargaining contracts are up for renegotiation or reopening this year.
With no effective impasse resolution, it remains to be seen how many will be bargained to finality. Based on the events and the opinions expressed in the interviews, the future looks very discouraging unless some positive changes are made. It is hoped that, where good relations have existed, contracts will be renewed. However, labor and management relations have not reached sufficient maturity for a confident forecast of the future.

For the majority of police and fire fighter associations which do not have collective bargaining or have been frustrated in their attempts to get it will probably just wait the situation out. They have neither the finances nor the nerve to get involved in a campaign where the outcome is so much in doubt. Some, as in Dallas, will go to the public with their demands for pay and benefit increases. However, that too seems to be a somewhat futile effort, considering the public's reaction to measures which will increase taxes.

The organizers continue to keep busy getting associations into state or international groups. If and when the time comes that collective bargaining for public employees becomes mandatory, which it probably will, the employees will probably be much better prepared to negotiate and administer collective bargaining than the administrators in the city.
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CHAPTER IV

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF THE POLICE, FIRE FIGHTER, AND IAMAW GROUPS SURVEYED IN THE STUDY

The primary comparisons of data in the study were between police officers, fire fighters, and members of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Local No. 15, in Houston, Texas, on a comprehensive survey. Members of all three groups participated voluntarily in the survey. IAMAW members were sixty shop stewards and international representatives participating in a labor relations training seminar. These were used as a comparative or normative group. Police and fire fighters were from seven cities. Of a possible total of fourteen associations, eleven participated and three refused. Wherever possible the questionnaire was distributed at associations' meetings, accounting for the difference in sample sizes in the subgroups, as shown in Table I. By coincidence, there were equal numbers of fire fighters with and without collective bargaining (N = 117). There were eighty-seven police with collective bargaining and only twenty-six without. In four of the cities both police officers' and fire fighters' associations participated in the survey.
There were four major categories of demographic data on the survey.

1. **Personal Data**—All three groups were asked about years as an employee of their department or company, years as a member of their association or union, age, and sex. Police and fire fighters only were also questioned about rank and educational level.

2. **Perceived Effectiveness of Association or Union**—All three groups were asked to indicate the current status of labor and management relations between the association or
union and their employer, and the current status as compared to the past. The subgroups which had experienced collective bargaining also indicated the effectiveness of their association or union in dealing with their employer in contract negotiations.

3. Level of Members' Participation in Their Association or Union--All three groups were asked to check whether they attended association or union meetings occasionally or frequently, served as a work group representative or shop steward, acted as a local association or union officer or board member, or acted as an officer in the association or union on the regional, state, or international level. If the respondents checked more than one category only, that representing the greater amount of time worked was used.

4. Reason for Joining the Association or Union--All three groups were asked to rank in order of importance their reasons for joining their association or union. The reasons listed included the following: (a) Everybody else was joining, (b) I wanted more pay and benefits, (c) I wanted more to say about my job and working conditions, (d) I had belonged to a union before, and (e) My father or mother had belonged to a union. The survey had a blank space for the respondent to list any additional reason for joining which was not provided.
Personal Data for Police Officers, Fire Fighters, and IAMAW Members

Years Employed

The year divisions were chosen primarily to accommodate police officers and fire fighters. While new employees in all three groups are training for their jobs in the first year, it often takes six months to a year for new fire fighters and police officers to complete training and be permanently assigned. The turnover rate in the first year is fairly high. Another high turnover time is five years later, and then ten years later. The percentage of police and fire fighter respondents was very similar in each tenure category, as shown in Table II.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED BY CITY OR COMPANY BY POLICE, FIRE FIGHTER, AND IAMAW GROUP (Row Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Less Than 1 Yr.</th>
<th>1 to 5 Yrs.</th>
<th>6 to 10 Yrs.</th>
<th>More Than 10 Yrs.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1 (.9)</td>
<td>31 (27.7)</td>
<td>27 (24.1)</td>
<td>53 (47.3)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Fighter</td>
<td>7 (3.1)</td>
<td>60 (26.4)</td>
<td>62 (27.3)</td>
<td>98 (43.2)</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>26 (43.3)</td>
<td>6 (10.0)</td>
<td>28 (46.7)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (2.0)</td>
<td>117 (29.3)</td>
<td>95 (23.8)</td>
<td>179 (44.9)</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IAMAW members cluster at the groups one to five and more than ten years. The clustering was due more to hiring trends than to any other factor.

**Years as an Association or Union Member**

Almost half of the police and IAMAW members have belonged to their association or union for five years or less, as shown in Table III. Between 37.5 and 48.3 per cent of the members in all groups have belonged to their association or union for more than ten years.

**TABLE III**

**NUMBER OF YEARS AS A MEMBER OF THE UNION OR ASSOCIATION BY POLICE, FIRE FIGHTER, AND IAMAW GROUP (Row Percentage)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Less Than 1 Year</th>
<th>1 to 5 Yrs.</th>
<th>6 to 10 Yrs.</th>
<th>More Than 10 Yrs.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1 (.9)</td>
<td>48 (42.9)</td>
<td>20 (17.9)</td>
<td>42 (37.5)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Fighter</td>
<td>16 (7.0)</td>
<td>62 (27.3)</td>
<td>60 (26.4)</td>
<td>89 (39.2)</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>26 (43.3)</td>
<td>5 (8.3)</td>
<td>29 (48.3)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 (4.3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>136 (34.1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>85 (21.3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>160 (40.1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>398</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disparity between the correlate tenures of the members indicated by the above figures, predominantly in the
police and fire associations, probably leads to some differences of opinion about association or union policies. In police and fire fighter groups it has been shown that younger members are more militant and progressive (1). A number of association leaders who were interviewed mentioned the emergence of younger subgroups and elected officers as policy makers. But the older members, if they hold different opinions, may become disenfranchised because of the trend toward takeover of the association by younger members (2).

**Age**

Among fire and IAMAW members the predominant age group was thirty-one to forty years of age, both at 36 per cent as, shown in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**

POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW GROUPS BY AGE
(Row Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>20-25 Yrs.</th>
<th>26-30 Yrs.</th>
<th>31-40 Yrs.</th>
<th>41-50 Yrs.</th>
<th>More Than 50 Yrs.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>9 (8.0)</td>
<td>42 (37.5)</td>
<td>35 (31.3)</td>
<td>21 (18.8)</td>
<td>5 (4.5)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>36 (15.9)</td>
<td>58 (25.6)</td>
<td>82 (36.1)</td>
<td>39 (17.2)</td>
<td>12 (5.3)</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>12 (20.0)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
<td>22 (36.7)</td>
<td>18 (30.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57 (14.3)</td>
<td>107 (26.8)</td>
<td>139 (54.8)</td>
<td>78 (19.5)</td>
<td>18 (4.5)</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-seven per cent of the police officers were of age twenty-six to thirty years. The fact that the police group was younger on the average and the surveys were taken at association meetings further indicates that the attitudes displayed by police associations will probably differ from the attitudes of the fire association and IAMAW union members.

**Rank of Police Officers and Fire Fighters**

All members of the IAMAW group were hourly rated employees. However, since under state law, a police and fire fighter association must admit members of every supervisory rank within its respective department, with the sole exception of the chief of departments, it was important to determine the composition of membership by rank. Table V shows that, of the fire fighters, only 38.3 per cent were first line officers, while for the police, 52.3 per cent were first line officers. About 45 per cent of the members in both groups were first line supervisors or specialists (those who did not necessarily supervise others but had some special training or duties which set them apart from the first line officers). Only 2 per cent of the police association members surveyed were above the rank of first line supervisor, while 14 per cent of the fire fighters were above that rank.

Research discussed in Chapter II (2) indicated that higher ranking officers in a police union are a mitigating force on militancy. The small number of such ranking
officers participating in Texas police associations indicates greater militancy among them. To some extent, failure to participate in the association is a personal decision for ranking police or fire fighter association members; however, it is also related to organizational climate.

TABLE V
RANK OF POLICE AND FIRE FIGHTER GROUPS
(Row Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>First Line Supervisor/ Specialist*</th>
<th>Middle Manager*</th>
<th>Top Manager***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>56 (52.3)</td>
<td>49 (45.8)</td>
<td>2 (1.9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>87 (38.3)</td>
<td>108 (47.6)</td>
<td>24 (10.6)</td>
<td>8 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143 (42.8)</td>
<td>157 (47.0)</td>
<td>26 (7.8)</td>
<td>8 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranks included in each category include: Police--sergeant and detective; Fire--driver, engineer, lieutenant, and junior captain.

**Ranks included in each category include: Police--lieutenant, and captain; Fire--captain, and battalion chief.

***Ranks included in each category include: Police--assistant and deputy chief and major or colonel; Fire--district chief or comparable administrating rank.

Fire fighters association presidents mentioned more often than police association presidents that they encouraged ranking officers to participate in association decision making. Members had an equal voice, rank notwithstanding.
Police departments are paramilitary organizations. Deference to rank in order giving and decision making on the job would probably be perceived by lower ranking association members as potentially carrying over into association policy development.

**Educational Level of Police Officers and Fire Fighters**

Both fire and police departments have been requiring some college hours in order for an applicant to be employed. Increasingly departments have provided financial incentives for college credits. A number of junior and four-year colleges have introduced courses of study in police and fire science leading to both Associate's and Bachelor's degrees. Traditionally it has been thought that increased education would have some effect on the level of professionalism brought to the job. It was of interest to determine whether or not increased education would in fact result in differences of opinion.

Thiry-eight per cent of the fire fighters had a high school diploma only, compared to 18 per cent of the police officers, as shown in Table VI. Approximately the same percentage of police and fire fighters had either some college credits or Associate's degree. However, 25 per cent of the police officers held Bachelor's degrees, compared to only 9 per cent of the fire fighters.
TABLE VI
EDUCATION LEVEL FOR POLICE AND FIRE FIGHTER GROUPS
(Row Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Some College Hours</th>
<th>Associate's Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>20 (17.9)</td>
<td>48 (42.9)</td>
<td>16 (14.3)</td>
<td>28 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>86 (37.9)</td>
<td>81 (35.7)</td>
<td>40 (17.6)</td>
<td>20 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106 (31.3)</td>
<td>129 (38.1)</td>
<td>56 (16.5)</td>
<td>48 (14.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though it would seem that fire fighters have more opportunity to go to school, because of their schedules, it appeared that they did not have the same incentive to complete, or interest in completing their degrees as the police.

Perceived Effectiveness of the Association or Union

Current Status of Labor and Management Relations Between Association or Union and Employer

The police and fire fighter members had almost identical percentage distributions in respect to perceived status of the current relationship between their association and their employer, as shown in Table VII. Approximately 29 per cent of the police and fire fighters believed that relations were poor; however, none of the IAMAW members believed relations were poor.
TABLE VII

PERCEPTION OF CURRENT LABOR AND MANAGEMENT RELATIONS STATUS
BY POLICE, FIRE FIGHTER, AND IAMAW GROUPS
(Row Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>32(28.2)</td>
<td>53(46.9)</td>
<td>25(22.1)</td>
<td>3(2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>70(29.9)</td>
<td>113(48.3)</td>
<td>47(20.1)</td>
<td>4(1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>23(46.4)</td>
<td>32(25.6)</td>
<td>5(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102(25.1)</td>
<td>189(46.4)</td>
<td>104(25.6)</td>
<td>12(2.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half of the police and fire fighters believed relations were fair, compared to only 38 per cent of the IAMAW. More than half of the IAMAW members believed the relations were good, compared to about 20 per cent of the police and fire fighters. About an equal number (8 per cent or less) of all three groups believed relations were excellent.

The above finding is not surprising, considering the long-standing "adversary" nature of the relationship between private sector unions and employers, and the relatively recent emergence of such a relationship between associations and employers in the public sector in general, and Texas in particular. Labor and management relations usually develop
with the involved parties going from a confrontation stage to one of cautiousness to acceptance of a business relationship, and finally to one of mutual trust and respect. Evidently, the public sector associations are at an early point in the above continuum; therefore, relations between employees and management will improve with time.

Current Status of Association or Union Relations with the Employer as Compared to Past Status

About one-third of police and fire fighter association members saw the current status as better than in the past, as shown in Table VIII. None of the IAMAW members believed relations between their union and employer were better than in the past.

| TABLE VIII |
| CURRENT LABOR AND MANAGEMENT RELATIONS STATUS COMPARED TO PAST STATUS BY POLICE, FIRE FIGHTER, AND IAMAW GROUP |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Row Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately, the majority of the members in all three groups believed that the current situation was worse than in the past. About 20 per cent of the police and fire fighters believed the situation to be the same as in the past, however, a much greater percentage, 58, of the IAMAW members believed things were the same. The relatively poor assessment by the IAMAW members could be attributed to the recent tight economy; however, it is more likely that the current status was perceived as worse by associations due to their role change, which placed them in an adversary position.

Relative Strength of Associations or Unions at the Bargaining Table

The majority of the members in all three groups—police, fire fighters, and IAMAW members—believed their association or union was equal in strength to their employer in contract negotiation, as shown in Table IX. None of the IAMAW members believed their union was weaker in negotiating, compared to 35 per cent of the police and 39 per cent of the fire fighters. About 20 per cent of the police and fire fighter association members believed their organization was stronger than the employer, while 41 per cent of the IAMAW members believed they were stronger in negotiating union demands.

Needless to say, associations felt less potent at the bargaining table than union members, probably due to the fact that they have less chance of getting employers to the
table and fewer recourses to keep them there if an impasse is reached.

TABLE IX

PERCEPTIONS OF RELATIVE STRENGTHS OF ASSOCIATION OR UNION WITH THE CITY OR COMPANY IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY POLICE, FIRE FIGHTER, AND IAMAW GROUP (Row Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Association or Union Weaker</th>
<th>Association or Union Equal</th>
<th>Association or Union Stronger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>31 (35.6)</td>
<td>39 (44.8)</td>
<td>16 (18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>45 (39.1)</td>
<td>46 (40.0)</td>
<td>24 (20.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>35 (58.3)</td>
<td>25 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76 (29.0)</td>
<td>120 (45.8)</td>
<td>65 (24.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Activity of Members in the Association or Union

Since the IAMAW members were all shop stewards or international representatives, it was assumed they attended most union meetings and participated in other union activities, as is indicated in Table X. Only police and fire fighter data are typical of the activity levels of those respective groups. A greater percentage of the fire fighters attended meetings occasionally, 48.9 per cent, than police officers, 34.8 per cent. In the other categories the
percentages between the two were similar except that approximately 25 per cent of the police group were local or regional officers, compared to only 12 per cent for the fire fighters.

**TABLE X**

**LEVEL OF ASSOCIATION OR UNION ACTIVITY BY POLICE, FIRE FIGHTER, AND IAMAW GROUP**

*(Row Percentage)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Attend Meetings Occasionally</th>
<th>Attend Meetings Frequently</th>
<th>Represent Work Group</th>
<th>Local Association or Union Officer</th>
<th>State or Int. Assn. or Union Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>39 (34.8)</td>
<td>36 (32.1)</td>
<td>8 (7.1)</td>
<td>22 (19.6)</td>
<td>7 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>111 (48.9)</td>
<td>76 (33.5)</td>
<td>11 (4.8)</td>
<td>25 (11.0)</td>
<td>4 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>46 (76.7)</td>
<td>7 (11.7)</td>
<td>3 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152 (38.1)</td>
<td>114 (28.6)</td>
<td>65 (16.3)</td>
<td>54 (13.5)</td>
<td>14 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associations surveyed generally hold more than one monthly meeting to accommodate members' work schedules. Fire fighters hold evening meetings on two successive nights to allow for the twenty-four hours on-forty-eight hours off-duty of their members. Police associations often hold both day and evening meetings because of the configuration of day, evening, and night shifts in addition to the straight day shifts.
Reasons for Joining the Association or Union in Order of Importance

For all three groups, the majority of the members stated their prime reason for joining their association or union was to have more to say about their job and working conditions, as shown in Tables XI, XII, and XIII. For the police and fire groups, the predominant second reason was to have more say about pay and benefits. A good number of the IAMAW members, however, stated that pay and benefits determination was their first reason for joining. The third reason for police and fire fighters was that everyone else was joining, much more so for the police than for the fire fighters. For the IAMAW members, the rankings for third reason in order of importance were mixed, as shown in Table XIII. For both police and fire fighter groups, the fourth ranking was prior union membership, more so for the fire fighters than for the police. For the IAMAW, the fourth-ranked reason was that either their mother or father, or both, belonged to a union. Rankings of fifth and sixth place for all three groups were mixed or insignificant.
TABLE XI
REASONS FOR JOINING THE ASSOCIATION AS RANKED BY POLICE OFFICERS
(Row Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone was joining</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.1)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>(52.7)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to say about pay and benefits</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(38.5)</td>
<td>(57.1)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to say about job and working conditions</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56.8)</td>
<td>(33.7)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonged to a union before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
<td>(40.7)</td>
<td>(37.0)</td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/Mother had belonged to a union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(36.8)</td>
<td>(57.9)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other reason*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(42.9)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Could accomplish more with group action. Was approached to join while in the Police Academy. Life insurance benefits. Legal aid.
### TABLE XII

**Reasons for Joining the Association as Ranked by Fire Fighters**

*(Row Percentage)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone was joining</td>
<td>19 (22.1)</td>
<td>7 (8.1)</td>
<td>34 (39.5)</td>
<td>19 (22.1)</td>
<td>7 (8.1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to say about pay and benefits</td>
<td>63 (38.9)</td>
<td>88 (54.3)</td>
<td>10 (6.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to say about job and working conditions</td>
<td>134 (65.4)</td>
<td>54 (26.5)</td>
<td>15 (7.4)</td>
<td>1 (.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonged to a union before</td>
<td>7 (10.9)</td>
<td>7 (10.9)</td>
<td>24 (37.5)</td>
<td>20 (31.3)</td>
<td>5 (7.8)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/Mother had belonged to a union</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>11 (23.9)</td>
<td>8 (17.4)</td>
<td>25 (17.4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other reason*</td>
<td>4 (22.2)</td>
<td>6 (33.3)</td>
<td>4 (22.2)</td>
<td>2 (11.1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Was told I must join association. Life and health insurance benefits. Sports program for members.*
### TABLE XIII

**REASONS FOR JOINING THE UNION AS RANKED BY IAMAW MEMBERS**

(Row Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone was joining</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to say about pay and benefits</td>
<td>23 (46.9)</td>
<td>18 (36.7)</td>
<td>8 (16.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More to say about job and working conditions</td>
<td>26 (48.1)</td>
<td>20 (37.0)</td>
<td>6 (11.1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (3.7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonged to a union before</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/Mother had belonged to a union</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>3 (15.0)</td>
<td>5 (25.0)</td>
<td>9 (45.0)</td>
<td>1 (5.0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other reason*</td>
<td>2 (15.4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (7.7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (30.8)</td>
<td>6 (46.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Could accomplish more with others than alone.*
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCES AND CORRELATIONS OF THE RESPONSES OF SUBGROUPS OF POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW MEMBERS ON TWENTY STATEMENTS ABOUT THEIR UNION OR ASSOCIATIONS

Description of the Instrument

All of the groups were surveyed on a similar instrument, composed of twenty statements. The first group surveyed was the IAMAW members. Fifteen of the same statements with a few additions in wording were used in the survey for police and fire fighters. For example, the word workers was used on the survey for the IAMAW members, while for police and fire fighter associations the word employee was used (for the purpose of clarity the word employee will be used throughout the study). Five statements were added as well. The three questionnaires are shown in Appendices A, B, and C. Respondents could indicate agreement or disagreement with the statements on a seven-point Likert scale, as illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The points assigned to each response are shown below the scale. Though it might seem confusing, no standard positive or negative value was assigned consistently in rating the responses. The expected response, whether agreement or disagreement, was assigned a positive value; conversely, the unexpected or extraordinary response was assigned a negative value, on each statement.

Statements were developed to investigate four aspects of collective bargaining. The categories and statements assigned to them were these:

1. **Degree of participation in and support of an association or union.**
   a. Belonging to an association or union is good for all employees or workers.
   b. An association or union is primarily a democratic organization which reflects the thinking of a majority of its members.
   c. It is only fair to require all employees or workers to join their association or union.

2. **Duties and responsibilities of associations or unions.**
   a. The association or union protects employees' or workers' rights.
   b. The associations' or union's dues and fees are too high.
c. Protection of the employees' or workers' jobs is the primary concern of associations or unions.

d. The association or union helps employees or workers in trouble.

e. Associations or unions seem to take radical positions on issues of pay and working conditions.

f. An association or union is important in keeping people from being pushed around.

3. Perceptions of the need for an association or union.

a. Compared to the 1930s, associations or unions are much less necessary today.

b. More progress toward harmony between employees or workers and managers could be made if there were no associations or unions.

c. There are times when the presence of an association or union causes problems for its members.

d. An association or union is a worthwhile organization.

e. There is a certain amount of favoritism shown because of membership in the association.

f. The existence of an association or union is necessary in most departments or companies.

4. Perceived power and effectiveness of the association or union.
a. Associations do not have enough power to accomplish their objectives.
b. Associations do not have enough influence with city officials.
c. The management of the city or company is kept honest by having to deal with an association or union.
d. The right to bargain with the city for a contract balances the power between the association and city officials.
e. In order to successfully bargain for a contract the association needs to have the right to strike.

Statistical Analysis of the Data on the Survey

The data were analyzed in two ways using tests available on the North Texas State University computer, Statistical Program for the Social Sciences. A one-way analysis of variance was used with two groups of data. The police, fire fighter, and IAMAW members' responses were analyzed using the ANOVA for each statement. Probabilities of the statistical significance of variance between the means were computed and reported to four decimal places. For the purpose of simplicity, all significances were rounded to two decimal places. An ANOVA was also performed on each of the statements by the following subgroups within each of the police, fire fighter, and IAMAW groups:
1. Collective bargaining or no collective bargaining rights;
2. City;
3. Personal Data--years as an employee, years as an association or union member, age, sex, and for police and fire fighter groups, rank and educational level;
4. Perceived effectiveness of association or union--current status of labor and management relations, current status compared to past status, and effectiveness of the association or union at collective bargaining; and
5. Level of participation in the association or union.

Significances on these responses were also rounded to two decimal places. On both ANOVAs, because of the unequal number of subjects, the Cochran's C test for homogeneity was applied. Where appropriate, the significance levels on the Cochran's C are reported, also rounded to two decimal points. Another test applied to the ANOVA of all the three major groups and, where appropriate, the subgroups, was a Scheffe's test for multiple range. Where there were more than two groups or subgroups being compared, the Scheffe indicated whether the range of the means within compared groups was great enough to place them into separate like sets. Here again, significances were rounded to two decimal points.
A Pearson's correlation coefficient for each of the statements by the factors enumerated above was performed. The results can be seen in Appendix D. Significances on correlations were rounded to two decimal places.

To simplify the reporting of the data, the following format will be used in discussing the analysis of the data on each of the statements:

1. ANOVA on the three major groups--police, fire fighters, and IAMAW members (if the statement appeared on their questionnaire). The data are illustrated by tables showing ANOVA summary table, result of Cochran's C test, result of Scheffe's test where applied, and means for the three groups.

2. Correlation coefficients, where statistically significant.

3. ANOVAs on the subgroupings, as listed above, in each of the major groups.

Unless otherwise indicated in the text, where significances are reported, they are significant at the .05 level.

Analysis of Statements Grouped by Categories

**Degree of Participation in and Support of an Association or Union**

The statements in the category related to membership in and influence on the association or union. As in most organizations, the policies and actions are determined largely
by a minority of the membership. Members pay dues, expect
the association or union to take care of their needs, and
become vocal only when they are dissatisfied. Since all of
the participants in the survey were members who were attend-
ing an association meeting or represented their work groups
as shop stewards, it was anticipated that they would believe
employees should support their organizations and that the
organization was acting in their best interests.

Belonging to an association or union is good for all
employees or workers.--The purpose of the statement was to
investigate members' opinions about whether belonging to
the association or union was beneficial. Differences of
opinion would indicate the importance and effectiveness of
the union in meeting felt needs.

The ANOVA indicated significance of variance between
the groups at .01. Both IAMAW members and fire fighters
agreed with the statement and formed Subset 1, using the
Scheffe test for multiple range, as shown in Table XIV. The
mean response of the IAMAW members was 2.16 and of the fire
fighters, 2.08. Subset 2 was composed of the police, with a
mean of 1.38. Some disparity was to be expected because of
the union affiliation of the IAMAW and fire fighters. In
Texas, at least, few of the police associations are affiliated
with a traditional union.
TABLE XIV
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: Belonging to an association or union is good for all employees or workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>740.07</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>783.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.43  P = 0.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
<td>2.0897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.
Significant correlational data existed on every item discussed in Chapter IV except sex and the above statement. The positive correlations indicated that if the relationship between the association or union was perceived as good, and if the member was more senior in membership, employment, age, rank, and participation, the member agreed more strongly with the statement. A negative correlation occurred on the item education. Such correlation is not surprising because those with higher educational levels presumably believed they were more capable of taking care of their own future than any association.

Subgroups of police association members varied significantly in their opinion of whether belonging to an association was good, depending on their assessment of the current status. Officers who believed that the industrial relations climate was poor had a mean of 0.81 on the agree side of the scale. Officers who believed the climate was fair or good slightly agreed, 1.47 and 1.76 respectively. The three members who believed that the climate was excellent agreed, 2.66, with the statement. Assessment of bargaining table strength also distinguished between opinions of police respondents at a significance level of .01. If they assessed their association as weaker than management, the police agreed at 0.64. If they assessed their association as equal or stronger, the police respondent mean was in the slightly agree area, 1.84 and 1.68 respectively. Evidently if the association was
perceived as being more effective, the more the members agreed that belonging to the association is good.

There were significant variances of opinion at the .01 level on the above statement, depending on level of activity in the police association. The subgroup which agreed the least, 0.75, were work group representatives. Occasional attendants of association meetings were next with 0.82. Police officers who attended meetings frequently, or were local association officers, slightly agreed, 1.55 and 1.95 respectively. The highest in agreement were officers with state or regional association positions, with a mean of 2.42. With the exception of the work group representatives, who may have too many problems to be enthusiastic, as commitment to the association, increases the benefit of belonging becomes more attractive.

There were similar significant variances, .01 level, between the subgroups on the two demographic items years of employment and years as an association member. The sole new employee and association member with less than one year of service disagreed, -2.00, with the above statement. Means for police officers with one to five years as an employee and association member were 0.48 and 0.91 respectively, near the midpoint of the scale on the agree side. For employees of six to ten years, the mean was 1.66, and for ten years or more, 1.81. In terms of the number of years as a member, those who had been members for six to ten years showed that
they slightly agreed with the statement, 1.70, as did those of ten years or more, 1.80. The data indicate that older police employees and members believed more strongly that belonging to the association was good for all employees. The trend was also true for the rank item. First line officers showed a mean of 0.96 in agreeing with the statement. First line supervisors slightly agreed, 1.77, and middle managers agreed at 2.50. No officers holding any rank of chief responded to the questionnaire.

Among fire fighter subgroupings, some interesting variances occurred. Subgroupings by city showed that all fire fighters except those in Dallas agreed that belonging to their association was good for all employees. The discontent now being expressed by Dallas fire fighters would substantiate the finding.

Variances of the means for fire fighters on the item current status compared to past status were significant at the .01 level. Fire fighters who believed the climate was better now or the same as in the past agreed with the statement, with means of 2.29 and 2.00 respectively. The mean for fire fighters who believed the climate was worse was 1.45, showing slight agreement. The opinions indicated that members equated the deterioration of the situation with association practices or believed that membership would be less beneficial in a poor labor-management relations climate.
On the subgroupings on the item, level of activity, there was greater agreement with the statement than for the police. Fire fighters who attended meetings occasionally slightly agreed with the statement. Means ranged from 2.14 to 2.18.

As with the police, fire fighters' variances were somewhat similar on the items years as an employee and association member, Contrary to the police officer rookie, however, the seven rookie fire fighters indicated agreement with the above statement. On the item regarding employment, the rookie mean was 2.14, while on the item membership, the mean was 2.43. Means were lower on both employment and membership items for the subgroup one to five years. On the employment item the mean was 1.80; on the membership item it was 1.74.

There was great similarity between the means of the six to ten year subgroups on the two items. As members, fire fighters agreed with the statement, with a mean of 2.00; as employees, they slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.98. Those with over ten years as an employee and a member agreed, with means of 2.33 and 2.32 respectively.

Two of the few items where significant variances occurred between IAMAW subgroups were years as an employee and member. Though no new employees and members responded to the survey, a trend similar to that observed among police and fire fighters occurred among subgroups on the items. The means for employees with less than ten years of membership fell in the slightly agree segment of the scale. On both items, membership and
employment, IAMAW members with ten years of seniority or more agreed with the statement that belonging to the union was good for all employees.

In conclusion, the statement that belonging to the association or union is good for all employees indicated more than any other statement what the association or union means to older members. Stronger agreement was primarily a function of the number of years they had been members of the association or union, and correlates closely with other time-related demographic data, such as age, rank, and years of employment. In short, the older employees have more to lose if work relations with their employer are severed, and as a result become more security-conscious. They recognize that the association or union is a means of protecting their rights and security as employees.

An association or union is primarily a democratic organization which reflects the thinking of a majority of its members. --The purpose of the statement was to determine whether any of the groups of police, fire fighters, or IAMAW members differed from each other in their perceptions that their organization was carrying out policies without input from its membership. Both police and fire fighter associations must represent disparate employee groups. It was important to determine if members of the subgroups felt their needs were being met.
An analysis of variance indicated no significant differences between the means of the three groups on the statement. As shown in Table XV, of the three groups the IAMAW members showed a lesser degree of agreement.

The one significant variance at the .01 level between subgroups of police officers was on the item, effectiveness at the bargaining table. Subset 1, those who believed their association was weaker, slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.16. Subset 2, those who believed they were equal or stronger, agreed, with the above statement with means of 1.94 and 2.06 respectively.

The analysis of data on fire fighter subgroups indicated a significant variance at the .01 level on the item of whether or not collective bargaining had been achieved. Fire fighter association members with collective bargaining agreed that the association was democratic, with a mean of 2.16, while associations without bargaining only slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.74. Not surprisingly, the level of activity in the fire association also determined the level of agreement with the statement at a significant level. Regardless of frequency of attendance, members only slightly agreed that their association was democratic, while officers in the association at any level agreed with the above statement. The association leaders may be mistaken in their perceptions that their policies reflect accurately the feelings of their
TABLE XV

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: An association or union is primarily a democratic organization which
reflects the thinking of a majority of its members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>805.00</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>814.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.3874 \( P = 0.10 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
<td>1.6372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMAW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffé Procedure, significance .05.
members, since it is probably more likely that you cannot please all of the people all of the time.

There were no significant differences in the data for the IAMAW member subgroups' opinions on any items in responding to the statement concerning union democracy.

Police and fire fighters' associations which were more effective in dealing with their employers in the collective bargaining relationship were perceived by their membership as more democratic. However, it appears that in the fire fighter associations, which presidents believed were very democratic, members do not necessarily also believe they are being represented democratically. Total democracy and effective decision making may not be any more possible in a union organization than in a business organization. A true test of a democratic union may be member satisfaction with gains at the bargaining table. In the IAMAW union, where the president is a very forceful and dominant personality, members perceived less democracy than police and fire association members.

It is only fair to require all employees or workers to join their association or union.--The above statement, despite the fact that all respondents may not have been aware of its significance, was an evaluation of the Texas right-to-work issue. The variance between the three groups was significant at the .01 level, as shown in Table XVI. The
TABLE XVI
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: It is only fair to require all employees or workers to join their association or union.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134.72</td>
<td>67.36</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1733.23</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.3633  P = 0.364

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
<th>Subset 3*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>IMAW</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.2100</td>
<td>-0.0128</td>
<td>-0.6372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure Agree</td>
<td>Not Sure Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.
IAMAW members slightly disagreed, with a mean of 1.21, with the above statement, and formed Subset 1. Both fire and police association members agreed with the statement, but the variance between the means divided them into Subsets 2 and 3. The police agreed, with a mean of -0.63, while the fire fighters agreed, with a mean of only -0.01.

It is difficult to assess the significance of the finding. Opinions of the IAMAW members reflect the conservative stance in Texas on the issue of requiring union membership. The result is surprising, because mandatory union membership for all workers is central to union security. As to the police and fire fighter responses, the definition of the word "require" might have offended their sense of independence and resulted in a level of disagreement with the statement for some respondents. The word "fair," which indicated equally bearing the burden for benefits equally received, probably resulted in a level of agreement for other respondents, and together caused the mean response score to fall near the midpoint of the scale. Most police and fire fighter associations are supported by a majority of the department employees. Some respondents indicated coercion and bullying by other members as central to their decision to join their association.

There were a number of significant correlations between the items and the above statement. Of the personal data items, years of employment, membership, age, and rank correlated
positively, while level of education was negatively correlated with the statement. More knowledgeable and active members agreed with the statement more strongly. This finding is probably due to the fact that less satisfied, less active members are reluctant to support morally and financially a group they do not believe is effective; this may in part explain their inactivity. Members who were older, had longer service as employees, and as members, in either an association or union and held higher rank, agreed with the statement more strongly. These trends substantiated findings on the first statement in the section that more senior members were stronger association or union supporters. The negative correlation was similar, also, to the data found for the first statement. The more educated the member was, the less the level of agreement.

There were no significant variances between the police subgroups on the statement. As a group the police association members were unsure about whether all employees should be association members. Considering the findings discussed in Chapter IV, some of their uncertainty may be due to the organizational climate in most police departments. Police officers are unsure whether their association should represent all ranks. In some cities separate associations have been formed for each major rank.

On the statement about requiring membership, fire fighter subgroupings by level of association participation
varied from each other at the .01 level of significance. Officers of local and regional associations agreed with the statement, with means of -1.20 and -1.00 respectively. Members who frequently attend meetings agreed, with a mean of only -0.19. Finally, those who represented their work groups and who occasionally attended meetings disagreed, with means of 0.81 and 0.34, substantiating the findings discussed in the correlation section above.

Between the items years as a member, years as an employee, and age, there were significant variations of means for the subgroups. Younger fire fighters agreed with the statement, while more senior fire fighters disagreed with the statement. However, the means for all subgroups fell near the midpoint of the scale.

Opinions of fire fighter subgroups concerning the item education were mixed. Officers with high school degrees or associate degrees, probably in fire protection science, agreed with the statement, with means of -0.51 and -0.47 respectively. Those fire fighters with some college hours or a college degree disagreed at the 0.74 and 0.05 levels. It is difficult to interpret these findings when they are compared to those found on the items in the preceding paragraph.

Among the IAMAW members only one item showed significant variance between subgroups by age. Members aged twenty to twenty-five, and thirty-one and over agreed with the statement. A small group of members aged twenty-six to thirty
disagreed, with a mean of 0.14. In the age groups thirty-one to forty and fifty plus, members agreed, with a mean of -2.00. Those forty-one to fifty years of age slightly agreed, with a mean of -1.38, while the youngest group barely agreed, with a mean of -0.25. Again, the interest in and support of the union by older members is substantiated by the data.

In general, members of all three groups who were younger or less active in their associations or union felt less strongly that employees should be required to join. Most of the means indicated at least an ambivalence about the statement. It can only be speculated what the response would have been if the statement had been worded "It is only fair to require employees to support financially an association or union which collectively bargains and performs other services for its membership."

**Summary of the category, degree of participation in and support of an association or union.**--In conclusion, the opinions of the three groups on the three statements concerning participation in and support of an association or union was a function of the degree of participation and members' personal characteristics more than the actual performance of the association or union. All three groups agreed that belonging to an association or union was good for all employees. Members of all three groups slightly agreed that their association or union was a democratic
organization which represented the thinking of the majority of its membership. The public sector association members believed, although weakly, that requiring employees to join was fair. Union members disagreed very slightly with the statement related to the Texas right-to-work law. This opinion would probably be very surprising to union leaders, who almost violently oppose such laws and are constantly seeking to get them repealed nationwide. Ambivalence of opinion on the statement about requiring membership is probably due to the reluctance of some members to join and support an organization they feel does not benefit them personally.

Duties and Responsibilities of Associations or Unions

Most of the statements in the category enumerate the principal duties and responsibilities which union organizations have traditionally performed for their members. One statement concerns the association's rights in a system of industrial justice to protect employees' rights by acting as an advocate in grievance meetings. Job security for individuals, and groups in similar jobs, is another prime union concern. Most unions, and, for that matter, associations as well, have roots in the old benevolent or social brotherhood which helped members in times of trouble such as illness, debt, or family death. The practice exists today; however some unions are very paternalistic, probably due to
the philosophy and practices of the officers, while others are rather impersonal, with assistance provided to members in the form of company-paid health and life insurance policies, credit unions, and so forth. Unions and associations represent their members in negotiating with management on issues of pay, hours, terms, and conditions of employment, whether or not they have the right to collectively bargain. Because of the power of the group, it can act responsibly and effectively to protect each individual employee from punitive measures by the employer. To financially support the union, members pay dues and may be assessed special fees. The purpose of the portion of the questionnaire was to determine members' perceptions of whether or not their organization was performing each of the duties and if the dues and fees assessed were proportional to the perceived effectiveness of the organization.

The association or union protects employees' or workers' rights. Because the duty to protect employee rights is central to the existence of a union or association, it was important to determine whether or not the members of the three groups believed their organizations did so.

There were statistically significant differences between the responses of the groups on the above statement. As shown in Table XVII, the IAMAW members agreed, with a mean response of 2.71, while the fire fighters agreed, with a mean of 2.17. The police only slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.30.
TABLE XVII

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: The association or union protects employees' or workers' rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92.07</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td>32.58</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>570.79</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>662.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.6751 P = 0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 3*</th>
<th>Subset 3*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.7167</td>
<td>2.1795</td>
<td>1.3097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.
The statement positively correlated with every demographic item except sex and education, indicating again the relationship between positive support of the association or union and the members' seniority and effectiveness of the organization.

There were a number of police subgroups in which there were statistically different responses to the statement. Because of the small, unequal sample sizes, only those which were differentiated at the .05 level or better on the Cochran's C and Scheffe's tests are discussed. On the item, current labor and management relations status, the differences between subgroups of police met these statistical tests. The subgroup which believed relations were better slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.81. Those who believed relations were worse slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.00. For the subgroup who believed things had remained the same, the mean was 0.79. The impression given by the police association pattern is difficult to assess, but one explanation may be that if labor and management relations do not change over a period of years, apathy and discontent are the result, more so than if the situation changed for the better or worse.

Also meeting Scheffe's and Cochran's test was the police subgroup ranked by level of association or union activity. Officers who occasionally attended meetings, mean of 0.74, and frequently, mean of 1.50, agreed to a greater degree that the association protects employee rights than did those who represented their work group as stewards, mean
of 0.00 at the exact midpoint of the scale. These three formed one subset. Another subset was composed of the subgroups who occasionally and frequently attended meetings, plus the two subgroups of local and regional officers, with respective means of 2.00 and 2.71. The stewards may be ambivalent about the statement because of the ombudsman role they play, and because most associations have not vigorously pursued the arbitration of grievances.

Using the same test criteria, the following fire fighter subgroups were significantly differentiated in their responses to the statement. An interesting difference occurred on the subgrouping by city. In Subset 1, composed of two cities which did not have collective bargaining, the means of responses fell in the "slightly agree" portion of the scale. In Subset 2, composed of three cities which have collective bargaining and one which does not, all four mean responses fell in the "agree" portion of the scale. An explanation of the agree response for the fire fighters in the city without collective bargaining may be that a fairly good relationship exists on the determination of pay, hours, terms, and conditions of employment as a result of meet-and-confer negotiation.

In the subgrouping comparing the current labor and management relations status to the past status, fire fighters who perceived the status was better or unchanged, agreed with the statement. Those two formed Subset 1. Subset 2 was
composed of the latter subgroup from Subset 1 above, and those who believed things are worse, with a mean of 1.54, or slightly agree, on the scale.

Another subgrouping which met the aforementioned test criteria was that assessing strength in collective bargaining negotiations. All three subgroups agreed with the statement. However, Subset 1 was composed of fire fighters who believed their position was stronger than management, and those who believed their position was equal to that of the city. Subset 2 was composed of the subgroup assessing themselves as equal in strength or weaker than the city administration. The ranking indicated a perceived relationship between bargaining power and power to protect members' rights.

One other subgrouping, by level of association activity, was statistically differentiated but did not meet the tests. Ascending order of activity correlated with ascending order of agreement with the statement.

There were no statistically significant differences between the means of subgroups of IAMAW members on the statement about employees' rights.

Based on the data, ability to protect the employees' rights is primarily a function of having and effectively using collective bargaining rights, though associations without such rights also perform the function.
The association's or union's dues and fees are too high. --
The purpose of this statement is obvious, even though the parenthetical phrase, "for what the association or union does for me," was not added. All three groups were surveyed about the statement.

An ANOVA of the responses of the three groups to the above statement showed a statistically significant variance between them at the .01 level, as shown in Table XVIII. Subset 1 included police members, with a mean score of 1.47, and fire fighters, with a mean of 1.34. Both slightly disagreed with the statement that dues and fees are too high. Subset 2 was the IAMAW members. Their response had a mean of 0.80, in the midrange of the disagree side of the scale.

Positive correlations indicated a significant relationship between most of the items and the statement for the combined groups. As age, years of employment and membership in the association or union, rank, education, and level of activity increase there is stronger disagreement with the statement.

In the police group there were a number of significant variations between mean responses for subgroups. There was a significant difference, at the .01 level, between mean responses of police with collective bargaining and those without. The police subgroups without collective bargaining rights disagreed with the statement, with a mean response of 2.15
TABLE XVIII
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: The association's or union's dues and fees are too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>4.122</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>930.42</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>949.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.4224  P = 0.009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.4779</td>
<td>1.3419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.
while those with collective bargaining had a mean response of 1.27 in the scale range "slightly disagree."

Subgrouping of police by city also showed a significant variance, at the .01 level, between responses. In Corpus Christi and El Paso there was slight disagreement with the statement, 2.15 and 2.28 respectively. In San Antonio all respondents disagreed with the statement. In Beaumont the mean was 0.60, indicating that the responses clustered near the center of the scale, barely skewed toward disagreement. These responses did not relate to collective bargaining or non-collective bargaining rights.

Of interest are the mean responses relating to current status of labor and management relations as compared to past status. For police who believed the present status was worse than the past, there was stronger agreement than among those who saw the present as better or the same. The trend would indicate that there was a relationship between effectiveness of the association and expense of supporting it.

As was indicated by the correlations, the greater the number of years as a police association member, the stronger the disagreement with the statement about dues and fees. Excluding the one respondent who had been an association member less than one year, these were the means for the subgroups: one to five years as a member, 0.95, barely disagreed; six to ten years, 1.75, slightly disagreed; and over ten years, 1.97, also slightly disagreed. The trend
indicated that dues and fees are now used in productive activities as opposed to social or fraternal ones of limited appeal, as was often the case in the past.

The more involved the member was with the association, the stronger the level of disagreement that dues and fees are too high. The police association members who occasionally attended meetings disagreed, with a mean of 0.82, in the mid-range of the scale; those who attend frequently slightly disagreed, with a mean of 1.58; and those who represented work groups and served as officers in the association disagreed, with means of 2.00, 2.04, and 2.14 respectively.

For the fire fighters, somewhat different patterns emerged in response to the statement. Responses by city showed that with one exception, Fort Worth, where relationships with city management were fairly good, the fire fighters without collective bargaining disagreed, with a mean response which fell in the midrange of the scale, while in cities with collective bargaining the mean response fell in the slightly disagree or disagree portion of the scale.

Contrary to the results found for the police, discussed above, fire fighters who believed the current labor and management relations were worse now compared to the past disagreed with the statement, with a mean of 0.22, near the midpoint of the scale. Those who believed relations were better or the same as in the past slightly disagreed, with means of 1.54 and 1.36 respectively.
Generally speaking, those with more service more strongly disagreed with the statement than newer fire fighters. The combined subgroups with five years or less of employment only barely disagreed with the above statement; means were 0.85 and 0.66 respectively. The members with six or more years of employment slightly disagreed, with means of 1.29 and 1.78 respectively. A similar pattern occurred on the same subgrouping by association membership. In both subgroups, as was true of the police, the newest members or employees, with less than one year's service, disagreed more with the statement than those with one to five years of membership. The pattern was repeated in the subgrouping by age. The older the fire fighter, the stronger was the level of disagreement with the statement that dues and fees were too high. Similar patterns occurred in the subgroupings by rank and level of participation in the association. Since most of the data are time-related, it would seem that the members believed their dues and fees are being used more constructively now than in the past.

There were no significant differences in responses in any subgroup of the IAMAW members.

In conclusion, the level of satisfaction with the dues and fees is a function of seniority, level of association or union activity, and perceived improvement in the status of labor and management relations compared to the past. Newer employees and inactive members feel that they are paying too
much for the returns. It is impossible to determine which came first: lower activity in the association or dissatisfaction with dues and fees. What is most surprising is that even members who are dissatisfied with the association's dues and fees, and also with its performance, continue to pay them.

Protection of the employees' or workers' jobs is a primary concern of associations or unions. The purpose of the statement was to determine opinions of association and union members about the effectiveness of their organization in providing job security. In the past, potential for layoff or elimination of jobs in police and fire departments has been very low. Vacancies could not be filled. Many departments traditionally were undermanned. In light of the growing taxpayers' revolt, such job security may not exist much longer. It was important to determine members' perceptions of whether the association or union provided for job security.

There were statistically significant differences between the responses of the three groups to the statement, as shown in Table XIX. Subset 1 is composed of IAMAW members and fire fighters, who both slightly agreed with means of 1.95 and 1.88 respectively. Subset 2 contained only the police, who had a mean of 0.87 on the agree side of the midpoint of the scale. The disparity may be explained by the lack of union
## TABLE XIX

**ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS**
**POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW**

Statement: Protection of the employees' or workers' jobs is a primary concern of associations or unions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85.98</td>
<td>42.99</td>
<td>19.423</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>894.20</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>980.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test for Homogeneity of Variances**
Cochran's C = 0.5182  P = 0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
<td>1.8889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.*
affiliation of most police groups and their lack of concern with the traditional civil service system.

A Pearson's correlation for the combined group means showed a positive correlation between responses to the statement and the items comparing present to past status, relative strength at the bargaining table, and level of association or union activity. More active and supportive members tended to agree more strongly with the statement.

Police attitudes on the statement in the subgroup, current labor and management relations compared to past status followed the patterns discussed in other statements above. Subgroups who believed their status to be better and those who believed it to be worse slightly agreed, with means of 1.20 and 1.60 respectively. Those who believed the status was the same agreed, with a mean of 0.35, in the midpoint range of the scale.

More understandable were the mean responses in the subgroups on relative strength at the bargaining table. Police who felt their association was weaker than city officials only agreed at the level of 0.22, in the midrange of the scale, reflecting their feeling of powerlessness. The subgroups perceiving their association as equal to and stronger than city officials at the bargaining table slightly agreed with the statement about protecting jobs, with means of 1.33 and 1.50, reflecting perceptions of more power.

Among fire fighters, the only subgroup where statistically significant differences occurred was in subgroups broken down
by city. Most means fell near the agree range in the scale; from San Antonio (mean of 2.12), Corpus Christi (mean of 2.00), Beaumont (mean of 1.96), Fort Worth (mean of 1.95), and Houston (mean of 1.92). While Dallas did not fall into a separate subset, the mean is much lower in the slightly agree portion of the scale, at 1.04. However, the strength of agreement reflected an assurance on the part of the members that the association was concerned with and could act effectively to protect their jobs. The same interest was indicated by the concern of fire fighter associations for statewide civil service.

No differences between subgroups occurred in the IAMAW group.

In conclusion, concern with job security is more apparent among fire fighters, who feel that their association, if a strong civil service system is maintained, can protect their jobs. It is unclear whether police attitudes about job security are related to their associations' weakness or the perceived unsatisfactory past performance on the part of the associations. While a civil service system is not impossible under collective bargaining, one of the prime benefits in negotiating is to substitute individually tailored hiring, promotion, and grievance procedures for those designed to meet the need of each employee in every job in every locality across the state.
The association or union helps employees or workers in trouble. -- Unions traditionally have been fairly paternalistic in helping members with all sorts of trouble, from marital counseling to bail bonds. The pro-union leanings of fire fighter associations would indicate a similar sort of philosophy, but, traditionally, fire fighters have had fewer run-ins with city management that cannot be handled in civil service proceedings. Trouble for them might be defined as more personal than job-related in nature. The police have potential job problems which can be more drastic, even criminal, in nature. More and more associations, both police and fire, are providing legal assistance because many problems lie outside the traditional grievance procedure. It was important to determine whether or not members perceived their association as helping them with troubles.

Statistically significant differences between all three groups occurred on the statement about helping employees in trouble, as seen in Table XX. Subset 1 included the IAMAW members, who agreed, with the statement with a mean of 2.41. Subset 2 was the fire fighters, agreeing with a mean of 1.99. The police were Subset 3, with a mean of 1.33. These differences indicated the variety of perceptions about the purposes of associations or unions.

There were a number of positive correlations between the statement and various items. Positive correlations were
**TABLE XX**

**ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS**
**POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW**

Statement: The association or union helps employees or workers in trouble.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>23.285</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>466.79</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>520.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.6203  P = 0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
<th>Subset 3*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.4167</td>
<td>1.9957</td>
<td>1.3363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.
found in age, years as an employee and member, rank, current labor and management relations status, strength in collective bargaining, and level of association or union activity. There was a negative correlation on the item which evaluated current labor and management relations status when compared to past years.

The police subgroups showed only statistically significant variance at the .01 level on the issue of helping employees in trouble. The opinion mean of police officers who occasionally attended meetings was 0.76, in the midrange of the scale on the agree side. Police officers who frequently attended slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.55. Police who acted as local or regional officers of their associations agreed with the statement, with means of 2.00 and 2.28 respectively. However, the officers who act as work group representatives showed the lowest agreement, at 0.37. Their opinions may be due to their constant interaction with problems and troubles and perhaps their frustration at being less than totally effective in dealing with city administrators in getting grievances resolved.

One of the most revealing differences between fire fighter subgroups occurred in the breakdown by cities. Again with the exception of Fort Worth (mean of 2.07), the fire fighters in cities without collective bargaining only slightly agreed with the statements: Dallas (mean of 1.56) and Houston (mean of 1.68). All fire fighters in cities with
collective bargaining agreed with the statement: Beaumont (mean of 2.10), Corpus Christi (mean of 2.18), and San Antonio (mean of 2.28).

On the demographic item years as an association member, means for fire fighters with less than ten years' membership fell in the slightly agree portion of the scale. Those with ten years of membership or more agreed, with a mean of 2.21. These means indicated more satisfaction with association achievement as knowledge of association practices increased. The trend was substantiated by the variances, significant at .01, between responses on the subgroupings by level of activity. Fire fighters who occasionally attended meetings slightly agreed with the statement, with a mean of 1.71. All others agreed, in the range 2.00 or better, with the statement about helping employees in trouble.

There were no statistically significant differences between the responses of the subgroups of the IAMAW members.

In conclusion, perceptions of the association's ability to assist employees experiencing trouble was partly a function of the member's perception of labor and management relations effectiveness. This trend probably occurred if the respondent defined trouble as job-related. Responses about capacity of the association to aid employees in trouble were partly a function of the member's knowledge of the operations of the union and the member's definition of trouble as either personal or job-related.
Associations or unions seem to take radical positions on issues (of pay and working conditions).--The purpose of the statement was to determine whether association and union leaders are perceived by their membership as responsible or reckless in making demands on collective bargaining issues. Unions usually ask for more than they expect to get, and management usually offers less than it expects to give. The public is generally unaware of the vast majority of negotiating demands, counteroffers, and even settlements in the private sector. However, because of the provision in the Texas law that public sector collective bargaining sessions are open to the public, namely the press, who spring the initial offers on the unsophisticated public, association demands may be seen as excessive. As one association leader put it, "the public sees us as asking for the moon and sees the city management as acting as the guardian of the public purse strings." It is important to learn whether or not the members surveyed perceived bargaining demands as reasonable.

There were no statistically significant differences between the three groups on the statement, as shown in Table XXI. Both police and fire fighters slightly disagreed, with means of 1.36 and 1.23 respectively. The IAMAW members were less sure; their level of disagreement was 0.88.

Positive correlations with the statement near the .01 level appeared in the demographic items, years as an employee,
TABLE XXI
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: Associations or unions seem to take radical positions on issues (of pay and working conditions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.504</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1225.82</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1234.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.3580  p = 0.425

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Agree/Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1.3628</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>1.2308</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>0.8833</td>
<td>Not Sure (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and member, age, education, and level of association or union activity. Differences in direction of correlation may be due to felt need for maintenance of the status quo, but at first glance it would seem that older, higher-ranking members would see association or union stands as appropriate.

There were no significant variances between any of the police subgroups on the statement about radical stands.

For the three similar fire fighter subgroups--age, years as an employee, and years as a member--statistically significant variances occurred. Means for opinions of fire fighters with five years or less of employment and membership clustered around the center of the scale on the disagree side. In both areas, however, means for fire fighters with six or more years were between -1.00 and -1.99, in the slightly agree range of the scale. Among the age subgroups, only those fire fighters between twenty and twenty-five years of age reflected ambivalence about association stands, with a mean of 0.11, near the midpoint on the disagree side of the scale. All older fire fighters slightly disagreed, with means of between 1.15 and 1.63. These figures would further indicate that younger fire fighters would like more militance on issues, while older fire fighters are somewhat satisfied with things the way they are.

There were no significant variances between any of the IAMAW subgroups on the statement.
The lack of many variances on the issue of radical stands shows that policies and goals are perceived to be reasonable and appropriate. Several means, however, showed that the younger members are more comfortable with the policies than the older members.

An association or union is important in keeping people from being pushed around. --The purpose of the statement was to determine again perceived power of the association or union to effectively protect members from punitive action against them by management for any reason, including association or union membership. Unions have nondiscrimination provisions in contracts and enforce them through collective bargaining.

An analysis of variance indicated significant differences between the means for the three groups on the statement, as shown in Table XXII. Subset 1 was the IAMAW members, who agreed, with a mean of 2.63. The fire fighters fell into Subset 2, with a mean of 1.93. They slightly agreed with the statement. The police fell into Subset 3, with a mean of 1.44.

A positive correlation of combined means was significant at the .05 level or better for four times. These were current labor and management relations status, bargaining strength, rank, and level of activity. The correlations indicated that the better informed and more positive the respondents felt about their organization, the more they agreed
TABLE XXII
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: An association or union is important in keeping people from being pushed around.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56.15</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>538.70</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>594.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.5032  P = 0.000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
<th>Subset 3*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.6333</td>
<td>1.9316</td>
<td>1.4425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.
with the statement about protection. The response of the members by rank is curious. Ranking officers are often the initiators of transfer order for the officers they supervise, and often the reason is punitive in nature. But they are also often the object of a transfer which may put them into a job they do not like or are not suited for.

The subgroups of police respondents on the item, current status compared to the past, varied significantly. The subgroups who believed that the relationship was better or the same slightly agreed, with means of 1.65 and 1.06 respectively. Those who believed things were worse agreed with the statement, with a mean of 2.10. Whether the mean indicated the actual situation or a felt need was unclear.

Another significant variance at the .01 level occurred between the police subgroups on level of activity. Members who attended meetings occasionally or frequently, or who represented work groups slightly agreed with the statement with means of 1.00, 1.44, and 1.00 respectively. The officers of the associations agreed with the statement, with means of 2.04 and 2.42 respectively. The disparity of opinions about what effectiveness the association achieved in preventing punitive actions against members is related to loyalty to and knowledge about the association.

For the fire fighters there was a significant variation between collective bargaining and no collective bargaining subgroups on the statement. Those with collective bargaining
rights agreed, with a mean of 2.28, while those without only slightly agreed, with 1.83. The differences in percentage are related to city-association relations.

There were no significant variances between subgroups for the fire fighters or the IAMAW.

In conclusion, the data bear out the idea that there is more punitive action taken in police departments than in the other two groups, and that associations are not as successful in dealing with it.

**Summary of the category, duties and responsibilities of associations or unions.** In some ways these statements are related to the duties and responsibilities which members perceive their association or union should perform for them, and in some ways the responses indicate how well associations or unions are doing the job. If the presumption that the responses on these statements are more closely aligned with perceptions of effectiveness than with desire priorities, the IAMAW is most effective, the fire associations are in the middle, and the police associations are the least effective. The relationships between effectiveness and power are discussed in more detail in a later category of the chapter.

**Perceptions of the Need for an Association or Union**

The statements used in this section were intended to investigate whether or not police and fire fighter association members perceived a need for a unionization movement in
public sector labor and management relations. On the continuum discussed in Chapter IV, most associations are at the confrontation level, while most unions recognize at least a need for a business-like relationship with their employer. It was important to determine what opinions were held by members in regard to whether their association or union, in particular, and the unionization movement, in general, were necessary to obtain desired goals in the workplace.

Compared to the 1930s, associations or unions are much less necessary today. The 1930's were a time of union and management confrontation, often violent in nature. Jobs and money were scarce during the Depression. A strong union could guarantee both equitable wages and job security. Things are not as bad today as they were then, but higher wages and job security are still strong union appeals.

As shown in Table XXIII, among all three groups there was a slight agreement that the association or union is still a necessary organization. There was no significant correlation between the statement and any of the items discussed in Chapter IV.

Among the police and fire association members, there was no significant variation between means of any subgroups on the above statement for any of the items.
TABLE XXIII
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS

POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAN

Statement: Compared to the 1960s associations or unions are much less necessary today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1149.81</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1152.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.5489 P = 0.629

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Agree/Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAMAN</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1.6814</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>1.8205</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was a difference significant to the .01 level between the opinions expressed on the above statement by IAMAW members subgrouped by years of employment. The means of members with one to five years of employment fell in the disagree portion of the scale, while those with over ten years of employment only slightly disagreed. For the small N subgroup of members with six to ten years of employment, the mean was near the midpoint of the scale on the disagree side. Workers with ten or more years of seniority only slightly agreed with the above statement.

There was more uniformity of opinion on the statement of continuing need for unions and associations than on any other statement. The finding is consistent with the fact that public sector unions are experiencing rapid growth, and the percentage of unionized workers in the private sector remains consistent.

More progress toward harmony between employees or workers and managers could be made if there were no associations or unions.---Disagreement with the statement was anticipated. It may be true but the situation would not be as satisfactory to employees. Association or union members by definition do not believe that managers and owners will meet employees' needs voluntarily. It was necessary, however, to explore the subject to determine whether or not there were perceptions among some police and fire fighters that they
were not unduly uncomfortable with the paternalistic climate characteristic of a bureaucracy.

All three groups disagreed with the above statement, as shown in Table XXIV. There were no significant correlations between combined means for the three groups and any of the items.

There were no significant variances between any of the police or fire association subgroups on the statement.

However, among the IAMAW members subgrouped by number of years as a union member, there was a significant difference of opinion. In the larger subgroups, those members with one to five years and those of over ten years, there was disagreement with the statement, while those in the smaller subgroup six to ten years only slightly agreed. A similar level of significance of difference occurred between IAMAW members subgrouped by years of employment. It is not known why these differences of opinion occurred.

Members of both associations and unions reacted predictably to the above statement and indicated clearly their perceived need for security and improved conditions, even at the expense of harmonious relations in the work place.

There are times when the presence of an association or union causes problems for its members. The purpose of the statement was to explore perceptions of punitive measures taken by management against association or union members.
TABLE XXIV
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: More progress toward harmony between employees or workers and managers could be made if there were no associations or unions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>610.46</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>612.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.3531  P = 0.543

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4667</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most private sector labor agreements contain provisions which prevent management from discrimination against employees solely because of union membership. Such is not yet the case in the public sector in Texas. It was important to determine whether association members believed they were being treated unfairly as a result of belonging to an employee group.

There was no significant difference of opinion between the three groups on the statement. Though the IAMAW group slightly disagreed, the police and fire groups fell near the midpoint of the scale on the disagree side as seen in Table XXV.

The statement was positively correlated at the .01 level with the item education for the combined groups. Another positive significance correlation occurred with the item which indicated perceived bargaining strength. The strongest positive correlation, greater than .01, was with the level of association or union activity. It is interesting to find that association and union leaders believe that membership in the organization caused no problems for employees.

For the police subgroups the only significant difference was between respondents on the evaluation of the current status of labor and management relations with city government. Those who ranked the relationship as poor, fair, or excellent formed one subset and disagreed, with means in the range of 0.64 and 0.71. Those who ranked the relationship as good slightly disagreed with the statement; the mean score was 1.92.
TABLE XXV

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: There are times when the presence of an association or union causes problems for its members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1387.54</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1398.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.3509  P = 0.588

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subgroups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>IAMAW 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In neither the fire nor IAMAW groups were there any significant differences on any of the items.

The findings of the statement indicated that while there may be some problems related to the presence of, or membership in, an association or union, they do not represent a major concern for the employees.

An association or union is a worthwhile organization. --Worthwhile is defined as something important or valuable enough to repay time and effort spent. Equity in the opinion of members was expected to vary according to demographic items. It was important to determine whether there was a pattern in the variance between subgroups on the statement.

All three groups agreed with the statement, as shown in Table XXVI. For the three combined groups there were significant positive correlations on the three items--status compared to past years, relative effectiveness of collective bargaining, and level of association or union activity--indicating that worth was related to association or union effectiveness.

Analysis of the police group by their responses to current status compared with past status showed a significant difference at the .01 level. Members who believed the current status was worse agreed, with a mean of 2.50, with the statement. Members who believed the climate was better agreed only slightly less, with a mean of 2.47, with the statement. The lowest level
TABLE XXVI

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: An association or union is a worthwhile organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>334.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>358.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.6324 P = 0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Fire</th>
<th>IAMAW</th>
<th>Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4900</td>
<td>2.4800</td>
<td>2.2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of agreement, 2.04, was among the members who believed that the current status had not changed from the past.

There were no significant differences of opinion between subgroups of fire fighters on the above statement.

Analysis of the IAMAW member responses showed significant differences of opinion between subgroups on the item effectiveness of negotiating a contract. As noted above, none of the members believed their union was weaker in negotiating. However, there was almost a point difference between the means of agreement with the statement between the subgroups of those who believed their union was equal to management, with a mean of 2.14, or stronger than management, with a mean of 2.96, in getting demands on the contract.

Judging from the minimal differences of opinion between all subgroups by item on the statement, worth is only slightly related to effectiveness in meeting employee needs.

There is a certain amount of favoritism shown because of membership in the association. The opposite side of the statement about problems because of association or union membership concerned favoritism as a result of membership. The statement was used only on the questionnaire for the police and fire fighters. It was substituted for a statement about union corruption used with the IAMAW members. It was believed that associations are neither powerful enough nor wealthy enough to have corruption problems. Moreover,
most pension funds are managed by employee boards under strict city supervision, with little discretion for investment.

Though both groups barely disagreed with the statement, no significant differences between the groups were indicated, as seen in Table XXVII. Because of the low means, 0.71 for fire fighters and 0.60 for police officers, there may have been misunderstanding about whether favoritism was perceived as positive or punitive in nature. For the combined groups the statement correlated positively for only one demographic item--age.

No difference of opinion existed between the police groups on the statement.

Subgrouping by city was the only item where significant differences between means (at the .01 level) occurred. Corpus Christi fire fighters were the only group to slightly agree with the statement, with a mean of 1.34. Means for fire fighters in Beaumont (0.75), Dallas (0.72), Fort Worth (0.78), and Houston (0.64) fell on the disagree side of the midpoint. Fire fighters in San Antonio were the most undecided about the statement, with a mean of -0.07, which also fell very near the midpoint.

As indicated by the only significant difference among subgroup means, favoritism is partially a function of the relations between department and city management, and the association.
TABLE XXVII

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE TWO GROUPS
POLICE AND FIRE FIGHTERS

Statement: There is a certain amount of favoritism shown because of membership in
the association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1150.43</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1131.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.5287  P = 0.269

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The existence of an association or union is necessary in most departments or companies. -- In essence the statement translates "our situation would be intolerable if there were no association or union." The level of agreement on the statement should indicate the level of commitment of membership to a system of employee representation on a group basis rather than bargaining on an individual basis for wages, hours, and terms and conditions of work, or accepting those which are offered by the management, without protest.

As seen in Table XXVIII, the opinions of police officers differed from those of IAMAW members and fire fighters at the .01 level of significance. IAMAW members agreed with the statement, with a mean of 2.35, as did fire fighters, with a mean of 2.19. Police officers only slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.84.

As expected, the two items which correlated positively with the statement at the .01 level were relative status in collective bargaining and level of association or union activity.

The only significant variance (.01) between subgroups of police officers occurred in the item number of years employed. The only rookie (employed less than one year) disagreed with the statement. Officers with one to five years' service agreed with the statement. Both groups of officers with six to ten years and over ten years of service slightly agreed with the statement. These means may
TABLE XXVIII
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: The existence of an association or union is necessary in most departments or companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>553.73</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>567.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.4509  P = 0.001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.3500</td>
<td>2.1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.
indicate that older police officers, contrary to the findings described in the first section of this chapter, believe factors other than the association have caused things to improve on the job.

There were no statistically significant differences between subgroups of fire fighters and IAMAW members on the above statement. In short, members confirmed the idea that associations are necessary for employees in order to help them in getting the wages, hours, and working conditions they want.

Summary of the category, perceptions of the need for an association or union.--In conclusion, all three groups agree that they are better off with an association or union than without one. It is interesting that on the statements concerning the existence of favoritism and trouble for members, police officers and fire fighters are uncertain. Based on the interview findings, it is clear that departments take association leadership into consideration when making job assignments. Some presidents were shuttled off to remote locations, making daily contact with other members difficult. Some remained in demanding jobs with little free time to handle association business. Others were given liberal leave and tacit or open approval to conduct local and state associations' affairs. However, of the fourteen presidents, only one was completely relieved of duty to manage association business.
Effective collective bargaining depends on an equal give and take by both parties at the bargaining table. Finally, the parties can only meet successfully over the bargaining table if each perceives it is dealing from a position of strength equal to the other, a theory known as countervailing power. It was believed that the private sector union members would perceive that their organization was sufficiently powerful to effectively participate in collective bargaining, a belief substantiated by findings reported in Chapter IV. Not one member believed that his IAMAW union was dealing from a weaker position. Another factor balancing the power of the IAMAW was its right to strike in certain situations. Therefore IAMAW members were polled on only one statement in the section.

Associations do not have enough power to accomplish their objectives. In the statement, power could be translated as the right to strike, though it was not specifically stated as meaning right to strike. It might also be translated as mandatory impasse procedures. Since neither are available to Texas police or fire fighters in collective bargaining, perceived power is probably related to some other factor which is unique to their individual situation.
Only the police and fire fighters were surveyed on the statement. Both groups indicated ambivalence about the statement in that the mean responses were near the midpoint of the scale, although they fell on the agree side. The mean for fire fighters was higher; -0.61, as shown in Table XXIX. The police mean response was -0.55. But there was no significant variance between the group responses.

Significant positive correlations between the above statement and perceptions of current labor and management relations status, current status compared to the past, and strength in bargaining were found.

Because of the familiarity in the group variances and the fact that there were significant variances between police subgroups on all items except sex, education, and level of activity, only those variances which met the Scheffe test for multiple range at the .05 level are discussed.

Significant variances were found between the police sub-groupings by city. Subset 1 was composed of Corpus Christi (mean of -0.12) and San Antonio (mean of -0.92) both of which agreed with the statement in the midpoint of the scale. Subset 2 included El Paso, San Antonio, Beaumont, and Houston. The mean for Houston, the only city in the group without collective bargaining, was the highest in level of agreement (-1.69) in the subset. The variances between mean scores are probably explained by perceived differences in effectiveness at bargaining, whereas for Houston, the
TABLE XXIX
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE TWO GROUPS
POLICE AND FIRE FIGHTERS

Statement: Associations do not have enough power to accomplish their objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1315.46</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1315.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.3633  P = 0.364

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Agree/Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>-0.6111</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>-0.5575</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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relatively high level of agreement indicated frustration at not having collective bargaining rights.

When the police group responded to the relationship concerning current labor and management relations status, the subgroups rating the status as poor, fair, and excellent agreed with the above statement, with means of -1.37, -0.54, and -0.33. These three subgroups formed Subset 1. The inclusion of the subgroup rating status as excellent in Subset 1 may be explained by the small N of 3, with a SD of 2.88. The subgroup rating climate of labor and management relations as good disagreed, with a mean of -0.44, and formed Subset 2, along with the subgroups which rated climate as fair and excellent.

Difficult to interpret were the responses of police subgroups in the item current labor and management relations status compared to past status. Those police who believed the current status was better than before had a mean response of -0.07, while those who believed it was worse agreed, with a mean of -0.50. Together they formed Subset 1. Subset 2 was composed of the members assessing the status as worse than before and those who believed it was the same, with a mean of -1.12, or "slightly agree." Responses may indicate that when things do not change, people are more discouraged than when changes do occur, regardless of whether they are for the better or the worse.
The most predictable responses were found in the subgroup indicating perceived bargaining strength. Subset 1 was composed of the subgroups who believed their association was equal, with a mean of 0.20, and stronger, with a mean of 0.68, at the bargaining table, both disagreeing with the above statement. Those who believed their association was weaker slightly agreed with the statement, with a mean of -1.16, and formed Subset 2.

As in the police subgroups, only those variances which met the Scheffe test for multiple range at the .05 level of significance are discussed for fire fighters subgroup data. Variances between means responses for the fire subgroups by city met the Scheffe test. Understandably, the greatest agreement with the statement was found for Houston (-1.42) and Dallas (-2.28), two of the three cities without collective bargaining rights, and forming Subset 3. Subset 2, composed of Houston, Fort Worth (-0.64), and Corpus Christi (-0.53), fell in the middle of the scale on the agreement side. Fort Worth was the third city without collective bargaining and had the third highest level of agreement with the above statement. Subset 1 included the two cities with collective bargaining rights, plus Fort Worth. Beaumont (mean of 0.27) and San Antonio (mean of 0.76), disagreed with the statement. It should be noted that with the exception of Dallas and Houston, the means of all other cities fell in the mid-range of the scale.
The findings suggest that while the right to collectively bargain does have some effect on members' perceived power in dealing with city officials, effectiveness at negotiating, with or without collective bargaining, also influences perceived power.

Associations do not have enough influence with city officials. Only the police and fire fighter association members were surveyed on the statement. Influence is the ability to persuade, and is generally thought of as related to credibility and responsibility. "City officials" signifies the mayor and city council members who are elected for fixed terms. In cities where there are strong mayors, associations may negotiate directly with them. However, in most cities the association negotiates with the city manager or his designate. In either case the city council must ratify the negotiated contract. One of the best ways to achieve influence with elected officials is to provide support at the polls in exchange for support in the council chambers for association issues. So it was important to determine how important members believe having influence is in achieving goals.

Police association members agreed, with a mean of -0.81, with the above statement, as shown in Table XXX. Fire association members agreed slightly less, with a mean of -0.77.
TABLE XXX

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE TWO GROUPS
POLICE AND FIRE FIGHTERS

Statement: Associations do not have enough influence with city officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D. F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1148.54</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1148.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances

Cochran's C = 0.5026  P = 0.478

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-0.7788</td>
<td>-0.8162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure (Agree)</td>
<td>Not Sure (Agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The influence statement correlated positively with only one personal item--age--at the .01 level. It correlated positively with three other items--current labor and management status, present status compared to the past status, and strength in collective bargaining--also at the .01 level. The correlational trend is consistent with that found in other sections.

The similarities on the responses between the two groups were such that only those variances in the subgroups which met the Scheffe test are discussed. The single item where the test was met in the police subgroupings was in the item of relative strength at the bargaining table. Variances between groups were significant at the .01 level. The police subgroup which believed they were weaker at the bargaining table than management slightly agreed with the above statement, with a mean of -1.51. This subgroup formed Subset 1. Subset 2 was composed of the police subgroups who believed they were equal to or stronger in bargaining. The subgroup which believed they were equal to the city agreed, with a mean of -0.25, near the midpoint of the scale. The police subgroup which believed they were stronger than the city in bargaining disagreed, with a mean of 0.31, also near the midpoint on the scale.

The first fire fighter subgroup which met the Scheffe test was divided by city. Subset 1 was composed of three subgroups by city whose means of agreement with the above
statement fell near the midpoint of the scale: Beaumont (-0.72), Corpus Christi (-0.87), and Fort Worth (-0.028). San Antonio was the fourth city in Subset 1 whose mean (0.17) fell near the midpoint on the disagree side of the scale. The finding is consistent with the opinion expressed by the president in Fort Worth, that his membership are fairly well satisfied with their "meet and confer" status. Fort Worth is often grouped with collective bargaining cities in the subsets. Subset 2 was composed of Dallas and Houston, neither of which has collective bargaining rights. Houston fire fighters slightly agreed with the influence statement, with a mean of -1.24, while Dallas fire fighters agreed, with a mean of -2.44.

Another significant difference between fire fighter subgroups occurred on the item, current labor and management relations status. All subgroups agreed with the above statement. Subset 1 was composed of those association members who believed the current status was fair (mean of -0.71), good (mean of -0.10), or excellent (mean of -0.25). Subset 2 included subgroups who believed the status was poor (mean of -1.48), plus the groups who believed the status was fair and excellent.

Similar variances, significant to the .01 level occurred in the item, current status compared to past status of labor and management relations. Subset 1 was the subgroup who believed the current status was better than the
past, with an agreement of -0.34, near the midpoint of the scale. Subset 2 was composed of the subgroups who believed the current status was the same as in the past, with a mean of 1.16, and those who believed things were worse, 1.50, in the slightly-agree range of the scale.

The findings indicate that influence, like power, is a function of success in dealing with city management on issues of pay, hours, terms, and conditions of employment. The findings correlate with the discussion, in Chapter III, of the need for greater political activity on the part of the police and fire fighter associations.

The management of the city or company is kept honest by having to deal with an association or union.--The purpose of the statement was to investigate the perceptions of all three groups' members about the effectiveness of collective bargaining in forcing truthful, sincere, and straightforward dealings with city and company managements. Some respondents, however, may have defined "kept honest" in the statement as "kept from cheating." It was important to determine members' perceptions of the meaning of bargaining in good faith.

All three groups varied significantly at the .01 level from each other in their responses to the above statement, as shown in Table XXXI. Subset 1 was the IAMAW members, who slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.95. Subset 2 was the fire fighters, who agreed, with only a mean response of 0.63. The
TABLE XXXI

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE THREE GROUPS
POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, AND IAMAW

Statement: The management of the city or company is kept honest by having to deal with an association or union.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146.58</td>
<td>73.29</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1390.91</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1537.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.4036  P = 0.038

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset 1*</th>
<th>Subset 2*</th>
<th>Subset 3*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>IAMAW</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
<td>0.6368</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Not Sure (Agree)</td>
<td>Not Sure (Agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple Range Test, Scheffe Procedure, significance .05.
lowest mean response, 0.01, at the midpoint of the scale, was for Subset 3, the police officers. The IAMAW members probably knew that collective bargaining was a way of forcing good faith in negotiating. The indecision of police and fire fighters could be due to either disbelief or lack of experience.

The following items—current labor and management relations status, strength at the bargaining table, level of association or union activity, length of union membership, education, and age—were positively correlated, at the .01 level or better, with the honesty statement. As discussed in statements above, the greater the seniority and commitment to the association or union, the greater the perceived power of the organization.

The significant variances between police subgroups by city are probably due to differences in past dealings with city management. The responses of the following police associations fell near the midpoint of the scale. Corpus Christi, at 0.28, and El Paso, at 0.11, fell on the agree side of the midpoint; both groups have collective bargaining. Beaumont, at -0.60, which has collective bargaining, and Houston, at -0.19, which does not have collective bargaining, fell on the disagree side of the midpoint. Only San Antonio, which has collective bargaining, had a mean of 1.14 on the slightly agree range of the scale.
A revealing variance at the .01 level existed between police subgroups on the item, current labor and management relations status. The members who believed the current status was poor were in Subset 2, with a mean of -0.96 on the disagree side of the scale. Subset 1 was composed of the subgroups which believed the current status was fair, with a mean of 0.26, good, with a mean of 0.44, and excellent, with a mean of 2.66. Perceived effectiveness in negotiating with the city partially explains the variation. However, changes in city officials or management or changes in policy also might have brought about a change in attitude.

Perceived effectiveness might also explain the variance at the .01 significance level among the police subgroups on the statement about strength in collective bargaining compared to the city administration. Subset 1 included police officers, who agreed with the above statement and perceived that their association was equal to or stronger than the city in bargaining, with means of 0.46 and 1.00 respectively. Subset 2 was the subgroup which perceived their association as weaker and disagreed with the statement, with a mean of -0.90. The variances between fire fighter subgroups by city were also significant at the .01 level. Four fire associations, both with and without collective bargaining, fell on the agree side of the midpoint, with means of 0.50, 0.68, 0.73, and 0.86 respectively. As in the police subgroups divided by
city, the fire fighters in San Antonio had the highest level of agreement with the statement, with a mean of 1.25, which may indicate most clearly that the relationship which has developed between the associations in San Antonio and the city officials is very balanced and mature, or may indicate that the leadership of the association has been very effective in its labor-and-management relations. Another interesting subgroup mean was that for the Dallas fire fighters at -0.64. The Dallas opinion was a forecast of the current poor relations between the association and the city management.

There were no significant variances between subgroups of the IAMAW on the above statement about honesty on the part of management.

As in the two statements discussed above, for the police and fire fighters, getting city managers to negotiate in good faith is a function of the effectiveness of the association in negotiating, as perceived by the membership, whether or not the group has collective bargaining rights.

The right to bargain with the city for a contract balances the power between the association and city officials. This was one of two statements on the survey which specifically mentioned collective bargaining rights. It was necessary to determine whether police and fire fighter association members believed that the right to collectively bargain under the Texas law would give them power they needed to successfully
bargain with city managers and other officials. It was anticipated that because of the weakness of the law, members would not be completely assured that collective bargaining rights would give them enough power.

As shown in Table XXXII, the variance between the fire and police groups, the only two surveyed on the statement, was significant at the .01 level. The fire fighters slightly agreed, with a mean of 1.63, while the police agreement, with a mean of 0.83, fell in the midrange of the scale. Evidently the fire fighters have more confidence in the effectiveness of mandatory collective bargaining rights than do the police.

Three items—current labor and management relations status, strength at the bargaining table, and years as an association member—were positively correlated with the above statement. The correlation indicated that those with greater seniority with the association and those who believed that their association is very effective in bargaining have greater faith in collective bargaining.

The police subgroup divided by city varied at the .01 level. The highest positive level of agreement with the statement was for San Antonio, with a mean of 2.00. The means of the other collective bargaining cities fell in descending order and certainly indicated perceptions of the effectiveness of collective bargaining: Corpus Christi, 1.32; El Paso, 1.00; and Beaumont, 0.10. The mean for the single non-collective bargaining city, Houston, was the lowest at 0.46.
TABLE XXXII

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE TWO GROUPS
POLICE AND FIRE FIGHTERS

Statement: The right to bargain with the city for a contract balances the power between the association and city officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>883.90</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>933.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances

Cochran's C = 0.5532   P = 0.127

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Fire 1.6368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8319 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By applying the Scheffe test to the subgroupings by comparative labor-management relations status, two subsets emerged. Subset 1 was composed of police officers, who believed the current status was better or worse than before. While both agreed, the means were 1.37 and 0.80 respectively.

The variances between subgroups on the item relative bargaining strength followed a similar trend. Subset 1 was composed of the police, who believed they were equal to or stronger than city management at the bargaining table. Both subgroups agreed with the statement, with means of 1.35 and 2.12 respectively. Subset 2 was composed of the subgroup who believed the current status was similar to the past and those who believed it was worse, with a mean of 0.81 on the agree side of the mid-range of the scale.

These findings indicate that the discouraged groups do not necessarily believe collective bargaining will be a positive force in changing the status of labor and management relations in their city. It also indicates that the police group, though composed mainly of associations with collective bargaining rights, is not as certain as the fire fighters that the right to collectively bargain as it now exists in Texas is an effective means for negotiating hours, wages, terms, and conditions of employment.

In order to successfully bargain for a contract, the association needs to have the right to strike.--Police and
fire fighters do not have the right to strike but it was important to determine whether members felt it was a necessary feature of successful collective bargaining. Of all the leaders interviewed only one expressed the willingness to strike if that was the only way to achieve the association's goals.

Not surprisingly, there was no significant variation between the fire and police groups, the two surveyed on the statement, as shown in Table XXXIII. However, the degree of uncertainty of the membership in disagreeing with means of 0.53 for the police and 0.24 for the fire fighters, does not indicate the same assurance as that given by association leaders.

Only one of the items correlated positively, at the .01 level, with the statement. Those who believed that the current labor and management relations status was the same or worse than in the past disagreed less with the statement than those who believed the status was better than in the past. Obviously, if the status had improved, there was less of a perceived need for strikes to achieve association aims. The remaining significant correlations were negative, indicating that where members believed their associations were stronger, and the seniority in terms of age, rank, and employment were greater, the members more strongly disagreed with the statement.
TABLE XXXIII
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE TWO GROUPS
POLICE AND FIRE FIGHTERS

Statement: In order to successfully bargain for a contract the association needs to have the right to strike.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1811.66</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1818.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for Homogeneity of Variances
Cochran's C = 0.5149  P = 0.375

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>0.5398</td>
<td>0.2479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disagree)</td>
<td>(Disagree)</td>
<td>(Disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between police subgroups on the item current labor and management relations status, there was a significant variance at the .01 level. Subset 1 included the officers who believed the current status was poor, who agreed with the statement, with a mean of -0.93; those who believed it was fair, who disagreed, with a mean of 0.66, and those who believed it was excellent, who disagreed, with a mean of 1.33. The officers who believed the current status is poor were the only ones whose responses agreed with the statement. Subset 2 included the police subgroup who believed the current labor-management status was fair, good, or excellent.

On the item, current labor and management relations status compared to the past status, a similar trend occurred. Only police association members who believed the status was worse as compared to the past agreed with the statement, with a mean of -0.20. Members who believed the status was the same disagreed with the statement, with a mean of 0.06, near the midpoint of the scale, while those who believed that the status was better also disagreed, with a mean of 1.09, in the slightly disagree range of the scale.

The variances, significant at the .01 level, between three demographic items related to seniority reflected the correlations. Younger officers agreed with the statement. With increasing age and seniority, these officers were more strongly in disagreement with the above statement.
There is no sound explanation for the variances of opinion between fire fighters by city. One explanation might be the strength and militancy of the leadership. Two fire fighter subgroups without collective bargaining, Houston and Fort Worth, indicated disagreement with the statement as did Beaumont fire fighters, who have collective bargaining rights. Two of the subgroups which agreed with the statement have collective bargaining rights, Corpus Christi and San Antonio. The strongest level of agreement occurred among the Dallas fire fighters, with a mean of -0.36, where there is no collective bargaining.

Variances between subgroups were significant on the item, current labor and management relations status. The members who believed the current relations were poor agreed with the above statement, with a mean of -0.22. The members who believed the current relations were fair, with a mean of 0.19; good, with a mean of 0.95; and excellent, with a mean of 1.75, disagreed with the statement about striking. On the item, current status of the labor and management relations compared to the past status, predictable variances occurred, significant at the 0.01 level. In disagreement, with a mean of 0.69, were the fire fighters who believed relations were better than in the past. Fire fighters who believed relations were worse, with a mean of -1.00 and the same, with a mean of -0.08, agreed with the statement about striking.
As in the police subgroups, fire fighters with five or less years as employees, and age thirty or less, agreed with the statement, while older, more senior fire association members disagreed that striking was necessary to achieve successful collective bargaining.

In conclusion, not all members share the strength of conviction of their leadership that successful collective bargaining can be achieved without the right to strike. This opinion is a function of seniority and perceived effectiveness of the association in achieving collective bargaining aims.

**Summary of the category, perceived power and effectiveness of the association or union.**—Both police and fire fighters, even with the predominance of associations with collective bargaining, felt they were somewhat powerless in dealing with city officials. As groups they were unsure about their abilities to influence the administrators and the city council, the group which usually has final approval of any settlement reached at the bargaining table. Police and fire fighter association members were also unsure about the need for the right to strike as a measure to insure successful bargaining. These findings indicate that police and fire association members are less certain than the Texas legislature that harmony in their departments can be achieved without strike rights. In fact, the police are uncertain
that even collective bargaining, presumably under Texas law, can balance the power between their association and the city. Of particular importance, and substantiating some earlier studies cited, younger officers in both groups believe their association to be impotent and perceive a need for the right to strike as a means of obtaining countervailing power. If younger officers become increasingly the voice of labor in the public sector in Texas changes in the labor management relations will occur. Changes must inevitably occur.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Public Sector Labor Relations Is A New Experience

It has long been felt that public sector unions are different from private sector unions. The basis for the difference is difficult to pinpoint, but the consensus of opinion is that public sector unions should be allowed to collectively bargain but that they should not be allowed to strike. Experience has shown that while public sector employee strikes are a nuisance and an inconvenience, the results are not usually catastrophic or long-lasting.

State legislation on public sector collective bargaining ranges from liberal to conservative in nature. In some states laws are similar to the National Labor Relations Act and in some none exists. Under federal law industrial unions have been given collective bargaining. As the relationships between individual unions and management developed, the parties have been made more equal in strength; and further, the rights of the individual union members have been strengthened to assure that they were fairly represented and that their unions were honestly administered.
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In some states such as New York and Michigan, public sector labor relations have progressed to the second step. Amendments to the state laws have included mandatory impasse arbitration and the right to strike. The state of Texas has, figuratively speaking, raised its foot in the direction of the first rung of the ladder toward full public sector collective bargaining. As the law stands currently, police and fire associations can collectively bargain if a majority of the voters in their communities say they can. They are the only public sector unions which can do so.

**Opinions of Association Leaders**

Personally, leaders of police and fire fighter associations are probably similar to union leaders. They are selected for their positions and have many responsibilities in seeing that the needs and wants of their association members are met.

Discussions with them indicated some significant differences between the organizational structure and philosophy of police and fire associations. Fire associations are unions by affiliation and self-concept. They encourage the participation of all levels of supervision and are lobbying for mandatory statewide civil services which place emphasis on job security as it relates to seniority. Police associations on the other hand see themselves as non-union, yet the leadership and membership are centered in the lower ranks. Police
do not desire affiliation with outside labor organizations but have been the prime movers in a drive to get collective bargaining for all public employees in the state. There are clearly both differences and similarities between fire and police associations and private sector unions, based on comparative union results, in philosophy and structure.

Association presidents, without exception, are dissatisfied with the current Fire and Police Employees Relations Act. The majority, whether they have collective bargaining or not, feel that the change most needed is the repeal of the local option provision. A benefit potentially extendable to approximately 50,000 people but enjoyed by about 10 percent of them is not much of a benefit.

Other desired legislative changes were sections on definite and effective impasse procedures, a state public employees administrative agency or board, repeal of the sunshine or open meetings provision, comparability of provisions setting clearly criteria for determination of comparable wages, salaries, hours, and terms and conditions of work in the private sector, and grievance arbitration. The proposed state public sector employees relations act has provisions to meet all of the criteria.

Associations with collective bargaining are becoming more sophisticated and independent in negotiating their own contracts. They are developing strategies to counteract the perceived "dirty tricks" tactics of employer negotiators.
They feel confident of their own skills and will become increasingly adept in developing their own demands and bargaining contracts.

Associations without collective bargaining are also learning to cope. Some are taking demands to the public, hoping to force issues with their employers, while others are carefully maintaining good relations and obtaining goals through a meet and confer process.

Associations are realizing the necessity for political involvement by endorsing state and local candidates and by taking their cases to office holders. The police are less enthusiastic to do so as a group, but most leaders concede it is a necessary evil. They are also recognizing the need to lobby together with other groups in order to show unified strength. Lumped together, at least in the public mind, they might as well work together to achieve common goals.

**Demographic Data for the Three Groups**

Police and fire fighters are generally younger than union members even though they have been employees and association members, for a comparable number of years. Fewer middle- and top-ranking officers participate in police associations than in fire associations. Police as a group are better educated than fire fighters, though it is unclear whether the education was gained before or after employment.

The majority of police and fire fighters felt that relations between their groups' association and their
employer were less than satisfactory. However, a majority of all three groups also believed that current relations were not any better than in the past, a very discouraging finding. In all three groups, in organizations which have collective bargaining, the majority of the members believed they were equal to management at the bargaining table. Of more importance, however, was the fact that none of the IAMAW members believed their union was weaker than management, while over a third of the police officers and fire fighters perceived themselves to be disadvantaged in collective bargaining situations.

The primary reason for joining an association or union was to have more decision-making input on the issues of job and working conditions. Of secondary importance was decision making on pay and benefits.

The groups then are essentially matched on all areas except perceived bargaining power.

Variances and Correlations Between the Subgroups

According to Item Arranged by Twenty Statements Within Four Categories

Category 1. Unions and associations are necessary and worthwhile organizations. --The attitudes and opinions of the public and private sector employees surveyed were similar. Achievement of the goals and needs of employees on the job is dependent on the existence of an employee representative.
Category 2. Duties and responsibilities of associations and unions.--The statements concerned commonly accepted duties of an association or union. Assuming that members have a good ideal of what their organization should be doing for them, responses indicated level of satisfaction with the quality of performance. As a group, the IAMAW is most effective in getting things accomplished. The fire-fighter associations are in the middle and the police associations are least effective. The findings are substantiated by the level of disagreement with the statement regarding the fact that dues and fees are too high. Evidently most association or union members feel that they are getting what they pay for.

The findings raise more questions than they answer. Is the level of satisfaction in the IAMAW related to the fact that over the years that union has been able to achieve four of the basic demands of its membership? Is the level of satisfaction in the fire fighter associations related to the perceived satisfaction of members related to the civil service system, which also has responsibility for satisfying three of the five category statements? Are the police as a group more militant or less easily satisfied with association gains than those in the fire fighters, or are they just less comfortable with having an employer representative handling what they might think of as personal affairs? This researcher believes the answer to the first two questions is yes, and further believes that police are less willing
to allow someone else, even an officer in their own association, to make decisions for them.

Category 3. Participation in and support of the association or union.--All three groups felt that being a part of the association or union is beneficial for all employees, including in the police and fire departments everyone but the chief. The IAMAW members agreed most strongly with the statements in the category, followed usually by the fire and police officers. Also all three groups agreed that associations and unions did a fairly good job of representing the thinking of a majority of their membership. The fire fighters felt their associations were more democratic than did the police and IAMAW members. The sociological closeness of police and fire fighters as a work group and the resulting close communication between members partly explains this response. However, it is also true that police and fire fighters are still heavily concerned with pay and benefits, where demands of members are more easily determined than with working conditions, as in the IAMAW union, where individual concerns are less easily met.

Members of the IAMAW, virtually a union shop, disagreed that employees should be required to join. However police officers and fire fighters, though somewhat unsure on the issue, slightly agreed that all employees should be required to join. To some extent the attitude can be attributed to the strong feeling of oneness in these groups. But the lack
of unanimity may be due to the confusion over the words "fair" and "require." For many association members it is probably perceived as fair that each recipient of the benefits of the association efforts pay for them; however, requiring or demanding the participation goes against their sense of independence and autonomy.

**Category 4. Perceived power and effectiveness of the association or union.** The responses to these statements reflected opinions in earlier sections of the survey. Neither the police or fire fighter groups believed that they had the power or influence they needed in order to deal with their employers in labor and management relations. Unfortunately, they are not sure whether collective bargaining or strike rights are sufficient to balance the power. To a large degree, these feelings are probably related to perceived effectiveness of individual association leadership, as indicated by the variances in response means for cities. The fact, however, cannot be overlooked that the state law does little to provide countervailing power which leaders of police and fire fighter associations would need to feel they go to the bargaining table on an equal footing with city negotiators. All association leaders discussed the point, and the Kingsville case further deteriorated the situation.

Generally, the opinions of all three groups were similar on all categories surveyed. Levels of opinion between the groups varied statistically in many cases, but, given the
potential for variance (seven points), the variance was not substantial. The conclusion is that public sector union members and private sector union members are not that different from each other in their opinions on the questionnaire statements. They support their organization, they had similar reasons for joining, and they believe that their organizations are representing their best interests. Where differences do occur they are related not so much to the organizations or members themselves as to the legal framework in which labor-management relations occur. Based primarily on the response to the demographic item about power at the bargaining table, the IAMAW members believed they were equal to the employer, without exception. Based on the opinions expressed on the statements in the fourth category, police and fire fighter association members do not share the view. The obvious conclusion is, therefore, that the legal framework for collective bargaining, at least in the public sector in Texas, is too weak to provide for the countervailing power necessary for truly effective labor and management relations and collective bargaining.

Recommendations

It is obvious that the next step in the development of public sector collective bargaining depends heavily on changes made in the law by the Texas legislature. Fewer associations are seeking collective bargaining, but the number of organizing drives is escalating. Associations frustrated
in their attempts to achieve collective bargaining by local option are seeking other ways to achieve their goals. Appealing directly to the public for pay and benefit increases will probably have limited success if the impact of California's Proposition Thirteen and a recessionary trend is felt nationwide. The financial pinch because of lower taxes and reduced government spending may alter completely the complexion of employee and employer relations in the public sector.

Public sector unions will probably become more militant. Their primary bargaining issues may become pay and benefits, and they may be willing to give up demands on job and working conditions to get them. They will probably negotiate for longer-term contracts with reopener clauses on pay, perhaps even cost of living or escalator clauses. The potential for public sector labor and management strife is high. City negotiators will inevitably take harder stands as well. The strike may be a more acceptable alternative, notwithstanding the legal and moral resistance to it.

It would be foolish to suggest that changes in the state law such as (a) public employee relations board, (b) precise definition of comparability between wages, salaries, hours, terms and conditions of employment in the public and private sectors, (c) establishment of countervailing power through mandatory collective bargaining, or (d) mandatory impasse arbitration with judicial review will eliminate all the potential problems in public sector labor relations in Texas
or elsewhere. The economics of collective bargaining are more compelling in the public sector in determining the outcome of such bargaining than is the legal structure in which it operates. The intent of the present state law was to insure harmony in the work place by providing collective bargaining as an alternative to work stoppages. In actuality, because of the local option provision and legal actions, collective bargaining is operating on a very limited basis in the state. Judging from the results of the interviews and surveys, collective bargaining, where it has succeeded, has done so in spite of the law and courts. Positive changes are necessary to provide the legal framework for collective bargaining and to alter attitudes on the part of public officials. It appears that, on the whole, public sector unions will meet their collective bargaining responsibilities as well as private sector unions do, provided that they are given the same opportunity and atmosphere in which to do so.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR IAMAW MEMBERS

Please check the appropriate blank(s):

1. Number of years as member of the current Union.
   ( ) Less than 1 yr.       ( ) 6-10 yrs.
   ( ) 1-5 yrs.             ( ) More than 10 yrs.

2. Number of years at present Company.
   ( ) Less than 1 yr.       ( ) 6-10 yrs.
   ( ) 1-5 yrs.             ( ) More than 10 yrs.

3. Age
   ( ) 20-25 yrs.           ( ) 41-50 yrs.
   ( ) 26-30 yrs.           ( ) Over 50 yrs.
   ( ) 31-40 yrs.

4. Sex
   ( ) Male                 ( ) Female

5. Level of Union Activity
   ( ) Attend meetings occasionally (only several times a year)
   ( ) Attend meetings frequently (almost every meeting)
   ( ) Local Steward
   ( ) Local Union Officer (Pres., V.P., Sec./Treas., etc.)
   ( ) International Union Officer

6. Working relationship between Local and Employer
   ( ) Poor                  ( ) Good
   ( ) Fair                 ( ) Excellent

7. Relative to the employer, the Union is in getting its own issues negotiated into the agreement.
   ( ) Weaker     ( ) Equal     ( ) Stronger

Please number the following reasons for joining the Union in order of their effect on your decision to join.

   _____ Everybody else was joining
   _____ I wanted more pay and benefits
I wanted more say in how my job was structured
I had belonged to a Union before
My father (mother) had belonged to a Union
I had to belong to a Union to get the job

(Other reason)

Please indicate how you feel about the statement by marking the appropriate blank below it. The same categories apply throughout the questionnaire as those listed in question 1.

1. Unions protect workers' rights.

   Strongly Agree  Slightly Don't Slightly Disagree  Strongly Disagree
   Agree           Know           Disagree           Disagree

2. Many unions' fees and dues are too high.

3. Compared to the 1930's, unions are much less necessary today.

4. Protection of workers' jobs is a primary concern of unions.

5. Unions help people in trouble.

6. More progress could be made toward industrial harmony if there were no unions.

7. Belonging to a union is good for all workers.

8. Unions seem to take radical stands on current labor issues.

9. There are times when the presence of a union makes trouble for the employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Unions on the whole are worthwhile organizations.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>There is a certain amount of corruption to be found in most unions.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A union is important in keeping people from getting pushed around.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The existence of a union is necessary in most business organizations.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>There are times when the presence of a union makes trouble for the employees.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A union is a totally democratic organization.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Unions have too much power.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>It is only fair to require workers to join the union.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Management is kept honest by having a union around.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Most unions are benevolent groups.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR POLICE ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

The following is a survey instrument for collecting data to be used in a Doctoral Dissertation. The information will give me an opportunity to investigate the Collective Bargaining Experience in the police and fire service for the State of Texas.

Your Association and Department have been selected, among others, because of the interest in or experience with collective bargaining. Your opinion as a member of such a group is very important. Please give me honest answers and responses to the questions and statements on the survey. As an individual you cannot be identified.

The data will be collected and compared with that collected in other cities and with that collected from some industrial labor unions.

In this survey, the term Association means the organized employees' group which is seeking to collectively bargain or has the right to collectively bargain with their City Administration for a contract covering terms and conditions of employment. Please indicate how you feel about the statement by marking the appropriate blank below it.
Strongly Agree Slightly Don't Slightly Disagree Strongly Agree Agree Know Disagree Disagree

1. The Association protects employees' rights.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

2. The Association's dues and fees are too high.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. Compared to the 1930s, employee Associations are much less necessary today.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

4. Protection of the employees' jobs is a primary concern of most Associations.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

5. The Association helps employees in trouble.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. More progress toward harmony between employees and City officials could be made if there were no employee Associations.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

7. Belonging to an Association is good for all sworn employees, including those of higher rank.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

8. Associations seem to take radical positions on issues about working conditions and pay.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

9. There are times when the presence of an Association causes problems for its members.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

10. An Association on the whole is a worthwhile organization.
    ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
Strongly Agree  Slightly  Don't  Slightly  Disagree  Strongly
Agree  Agree  Know  Disagree  Disagree

11. There is a certain amount of favoritism shown because of membership in an Association.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )

12. An Association is important in keeping people from getting pushed around.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )

13. The existence of an Association is necessary in most Police Departments.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )

14. An association is primarily a democratic organization which reflects the thinking of the majority of its membership.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )

15. Associations do not have enough power to accomplish their objectives.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )

16. It is only fair to require all sworn employees to join their Association.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )

17. Associations do not have enough influence with City officials.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )

18. The City management is kept honest by having to deal with an Association.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )

19. The right to bargain with the City for a contract balances the power between the Association and City officials.

   ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )  ( )
20. In order to successfully bargain for a contract the Association needs to have the right to strike.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BLANKS ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

How would you describe the current relationship between your Association and the City?

( ) Poor ( ) Fair ( ) Good ( ) Excellent

Compared to past years, is the current relationship between your employees' Association and the City

( ) Better ( ) Worse ( ) About the Same

Please rank the following reasons for joining the Association in order of their effect on your decision to join. Number only those which affected your decision.

Everybody else was joining
I wanted more pay and benefits
I wanted more say about my job and working conditions
I had belonged to a Union before
My father or mother had belonged to a Union

(Other reason, please state)

If your Association does collectively bargain with the City, relative to the City, your Association is _________ in getting its own issues negotiated into the Contract.

( ) Weaker ( ) Equal ( ) Stronger

Number of years as an employee of the Police Department:

( ) Less than 1 yr. ( ) 6-10 yrs.
( ) 1-5 yrs. ( ) Over 10 yrs.

Number of years as a member of your Employee Association:

( ) Less than 1 yr. ( ) 6-10 yrs.
( ) 1-5 yrs. ( ) Over 10 yrs.

Age: ( ) 20-25 yrs. ( ) 31-40 yrs. ( ) Over 50
( ) 26-30 yrs. ( ) 41-50 yrs.
PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BLANKS ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

Sex:  ( ) Male  ( ) Female  Rank: ________________________________

Educational Level:

( ) High School Degree  ( ) Associate Degree
( ) College Hours  ( ) Bachelor's Degree

Level of Activity in your Employee Association:

( ) Attend meetings occasionally (only several times a year)
( ) Attend meetings frequently--not an officer
( ) Represent your work area
( ) Local Association Officer, Board Member
( ) State or International Association Officer

Thank you for your cooperation in the study. If you have any questions after filling out the form I would be glad to talk to you personally or you can write to me at the following address:

Barbara Hastings
College of Business Administration
North Texas State University
Denton, TX 76203
APPENDIX C

SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR FIRE FIGHTER ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

The following is a survey instrument for collecting data to be used in a Doctoral Dissertation. The information will give me an opportunity to investigate the Collective Bargaining Experience in the police and fire service for the State of Texas.

Your Association and Department have been selected, among others, because of the interest in or experience with collective bargaining. Your opinion as a member of such a group is very important. Please give me honest answers and responses to the questions and statements on the survey. As an individual you cannot be identified.

The data will be collected and compared with that collected in other cities and with that collected from some industrial labor unions.

In this survey, the term Association means the organized employees' group which is seeking to collectively bargain or has the right to collectively bargain with their City Administration for a contract covering terms and conditions of employment. Please indicate how you feel about the statement by marking the appropriate blank below it.
Strongly Agree Slightly Don't Slightly Disagree Strongly Agree Agree Know Disagree Disagree

1. The Association protects employees' rights.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

2. The Association's dues and fees are too high.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

3. Compared to the 1930s, employee Associations are much less necessary today.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

4. Protection of the employees' jobs is a primary concern of most Associations.

5. The Association helps employees in trouble.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

6. More progress toward harmony between employees and City officials could be made if there were no employee Associations.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

7. Belonging to an Association is good for all employees. Including those of higher rank.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

8. Associations seem to take radical positions on issues about working conditions and pay.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

9. There are times when the presence of an Association causes problems for its members.
   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

10. An Association on the whole is a worthwhile organization.
    ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

11. There is a certain amount of favoritism shown because of membership in an Association.
    ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
12. An Association is important in keeping people from getting pushed around.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

13. The existence of an Association is necessary in most Fire Departments.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

14. An Association is primarily a democratic organization which reflects the thinking of the majority of its membership.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

15. Associations do not have enough power to accomplish their objectives.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

16. It is only fair to require all uninformed employees to join their Association.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

17. Associations do not have enough influence with City officials.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

18. The City management is kept honest by having to deal with an Association.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

19. The right to bargain with the City for a contract balances the power between the Association and City officials.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

20. In order to successfully bargain for a contract the Association needs to have the right to strike.

   ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BLANKS ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

How would you describe the current relationship between your Association and the City?

( ) Poor  ( ) Fair  ( ) Good  ( ) Excellent

Compared to past years, is the current relationship between your employees' Association and the City

( ) Better  ( ) Worse  ( ) About the Same

Please rank the following reasons for joining the Association in order of their effect on your decision to join. Number only those which affected your decision.

- Everybody else was joining
- I wanted more pay and benefits
- I wanted more say about my job and working conditions
- I had belonged to a Union before
- My father or mother had belonged to a Union
- [Other reason, please state]

If your Association does collectively bargain with the City, relative to the City, your Association is _______ in getting its own issues negotiated into the Contract.

( ) Weaker  ( ) Equal  ( ) Stronger

Number of years as an employee of the Fire Department:

( ) Less than 1 yr.  ( ) 6-10 yrs.
( ) 1-5 yrs.  ( ) Over 10 yrs.

Number of years as a member of your Employee Association:

( ) Less than 1 yr.  ( ) 6-10 yrs.
( ) 1-5 yrs.  ( ) Over 10 yrs.

Age:   ( ) 20-25  ( ) 31-40  ( ) Over 50
( ) 26-30  ( ) 41-50

Sex:   ( ) Male  ( ) Female  Rank:  

Educational Level:

( ) High School Degree  ( ) Associate Degree
( ) College Hours  ( ) Bachelor's Degree
PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BLANKS OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

Level of Activity in your Employee Association:

( ) Attend meetings occasionally (only several times a year)
( ) Attend meetings frequently -- not an officer
( ) Represent your work area
( ) Local Association Officer, Board Member
( ) State or International Association Officer

Thank you for your cooperation in the study. If you have any questions after filling out the form I would be glad to talk to you personally or you can write to me at the following address:

Barbara Hastings
College of Business Administration
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203
## APPENDIX D

### TABLE XXXIV

**PEARSON'S CORRELATION COEFFICIENT (N)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Status of Relations Between Assoc./Union and City/Co.</th>
<th>Status Compared to Past</th>
<th>Strength at Bargaining Table</th>
<th>Number Years As An Employee</th>
<th>Number Years As A Member</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Level of Union/Association Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belonging is Good</td>
<td>0.1586*</td>
<td>-0.1310**</td>
<td>0.1263**</td>
<td>0.2327*</td>
<td>0.1986*</td>
<td>0.1721*</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.1334**</td>
<td>-0.1451*</td>
<td>0.3181*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(339)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Organization</td>
<td>0.0582</td>
<td>-0.1226**</td>
<td>0.1431**</td>
<td>0.0420</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
<td>0.0825</td>
<td>0.1082</td>
<td>0.0561</td>
<td>0.0393</td>
<td>0.1496*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(339)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair to Require Membership</td>
<td>0.1458*</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
<td>0.1886*</td>
<td>0.2035*</td>
<td>0.1681*</td>
<td>0.2111</td>
<td>0.0706</td>
<td>0.1359**</td>
<td>-0.1104**</td>
<td>0.1967*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(339)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protects Employees' Rights</td>
<td>0.2679*</td>
<td>0.1806*</td>
<td>0.2636*</td>
<td>0.1550*</td>
<td>0.1361*</td>
<td>0.1714*</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>0.1712*</td>
<td>-0.0232</td>
<td>0.2598*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(339)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Status of Relations Between Assoc./Union and City/Co.</td>
<td>Status Compared to Past</td>
<td>Strength at Bargaining Table</td>
<td>Number Years As An Employee</td>
<td>Number Years As A Member</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>Level of Union/Association Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues/Fees Too High</td>
<td>0.0658 (407)</td>
<td>-0.1005 (345)</td>
<td>-0.0048 (262)</td>
<td>0.2170* (399)</td>
<td>0.1179* (399)</td>
<td>0.1658* (399)</td>
<td>0.0122 (399)</td>
<td>0.1820* (334)</td>
<td>0.1236** (339)</td>
<td>0.2012* (399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Employees' Jobs</td>
<td>0.0763 (407)</td>
<td>-0.1359** (345)</td>
<td>0.1365** (262)</td>
<td>0.0414 (399)</td>
<td>0.0698 (399)</td>
<td>0.0309 (399)</td>
<td>-0.0028 (399)</td>
<td>0.0683 (334)</td>
<td>-0.1012 (339)</td>
<td>0.1106** (399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps Employees in Trouble</td>
<td>0.2049* (407)</td>
<td>-0.1455* (345)</td>
<td>0.1604* (262)</td>
<td>0.1562* (399)</td>
<td>0.2015* (399)</td>
<td>0.1446* (399)</td>
<td>0.0485 (399)</td>
<td>0.2256* (334)</td>
<td>0.0353 (339)</td>
<td>0.2812* (399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes Radical Positions</td>
<td>-0.0387 (407)</td>
<td>-0.1001 (345)</td>
<td>0.0253 (262)</td>
<td>0.1757* (399)</td>
<td>0.1981* (399)</td>
<td>0.1328* (399)</td>
<td>-0.0377 (399)</td>
<td>0.1052 (334)</td>
<td>0.1322** (339)</td>
<td>0.1304* (399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps People From Being Pushed Around</td>
<td>0.1332* (407)</td>
<td>-0.1098** (345)</td>
<td>0.1779* (262)</td>
<td>0.0039 (399)</td>
<td>0.0732 (399)</td>
<td>0.0322 (399)</td>
<td>0.913 (399)</td>
<td>0.1404* (334)</td>
<td>0.0357 (339)</td>
<td>0.2678* (399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Status of Relations Between Assoc./Union and City/Co</td>
<td>Status Compared to Past</td>
<td>Strength at Bargaining Table</td>
<td>Number Years As An Employee</td>
<td>Number Years As A Member</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>Level of Union Association Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to 1950s Necessary</td>
<td>-0.0609</td>
<td>-0.0381</td>
<td>-0.0486</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>-0.0040</td>
<td>0.1077</td>
<td>0.0495</td>
<td>0.0372</td>
<td>-0.0202</td>
<td>0.0814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Toward Harmony</td>
<td>-0.0540</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>-0.0787</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>0.0749</td>
<td>-0.0033</td>
<td>-0.0027</td>
<td>0.0770</td>
<td>0.0651</td>
<td>0.0733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence Causes Problems</td>
<td>0.0726</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
<td>0.1211**</td>
<td>-0.0350</td>
<td>-0.0173</td>
<td>-0.0675</td>
<td>0.0323</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.1270</td>
<td>0.2193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Organization</td>
<td>0.0743</td>
<td>-0.1444</td>
<td>0.1555**</td>
<td>0.0586</td>
<td>-0.0781</td>
<td>-0.0737</td>
<td>0.0832</td>
<td>0.0778</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.2193*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism Because of Membership</td>
<td>-0.0044</td>
<td>-0.0247</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1005</td>
<td>0.0578</td>
<td>0.1176**</td>
<td>-0.0424</td>
<td>0.0753</td>
<td>-0.0167</td>
<td>0.1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(347)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(202)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(339)</td>
<td>(339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence Necessary</td>
<td>0.0684</td>
<td>-0.1002</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>-0.0260</td>
<td>0.0898</td>
<td>-0.0063</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>-0.0475</td>
<td>0.1979*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(407)</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>(262)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(334)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
<td>(399)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXXIV--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Status of Relations Between Assoc./Union and City/Co.</th>
<th>Status Compared to Past</th>
<th>Strength at Bargaining Table</th>
<th>Number Years As An Employee</th>
<th>Number Years As A Member</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Level of Union/Association Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Power</td>
<td>0.1817* (347)</td>
<td>-0.1431* (345)</td>
<td>0.2585* (202)</td>
<td>0.0726 (339)</td>
<td>0.0432 (339)</td>
<td>0.0729 (339)</td>
<td>0.0340 (339)</td>
<td>-0.0045 (334)</td>
<td>-0.0182 (339)</td>
<td>-0.0097 (339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Influence</td>
<td>0.2998* (347)</td>
<td>-0.1998* (345)</td>
<td>0.2257* (202)</td>
<td>0.1019 (339)</td>
<td>0.0846 (339)</td>
<td>0.1575* (339)</td>
<td>0.0640 (339)</td>
<td>0.0553 (334)</td>
<td>0.0408 (339)</td>
<td>0.0472 (339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Kept Honest</td>
<td>0.2583* (407)</td>
<td>-0.0919 (345)</td>
<td>0.3199* (262)</td>
<td>0.0904 (399)</td>
<td>0.1097** (399)</td>
<td>0.1056* (399)</td>
<td>0.0146 (399)</td>
<td>0.0999 (334)</td>
<td>0.0392 (339)</td>
<td>0.1659* (399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining Balances Power</td>
<td>0.1661* (347)</td>
<td>-0.1107** (345)</td>
<td>0.3292* (202)</td>
<td>0.0765 (339)</td>
<td>0.1359* (339)</td>
<td>0.0453 (339)</td>
<td>0.0588 (334)</td>
<td>0.0637 (339)</td>
<td>-0.0312 (339)</td>
<td>-0.0639 (339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Strike is Necessary</td>
<td>0.2818* (347)</td>
<td>0.1579* (345)</td>
<td>0.1630** (202)</td>
<td>0.2202* (339)</td>
<td>0.2338* (339)</td>
<td>-0.2395* (339)</td>
<td>-0.0546 (339)</td>
<td>-0.1726* (334)</td>
<td>-0.0848 (339)</td>
<td>-0.0946 (339)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01. **Significant at .05.
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